



**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES**  
**DEBATES**

**2nd Session**

**9th Assembly**

**Official Report**

**WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1980**

**Pages 830 to 882**

**Speaker: The Honourable Robert H. MacQuarrie, M.L.A.**

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

## SPEAKER

The Honourable Robert H. MacQuarrie, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 2895  
Yellowknife, N.W.T., X0E 1H0  
(Yellowknife Centre)

The Honourable George Braden, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 583  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
X0E 1H0  
(Yellowknife North)  
(Minister of Economic Development  
and Tourism)

The Honourable Thomas H. Butters, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 1069  
Inuvik, N.W.T.  
X0E 0T0  
(Inuvik)  
(Minister of Education and of Justice  
and Public Services)

The Honourable Arnold J. McCallum, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 454  
Fort Smith, N.W.T.  
X0E 0P0  
(Slave River)  
(Minister of Social Services  
and of Health)

The Honourable Richard W. Nerysoo, M.L.A.  
General Delivery  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
X0E 1H0  
(Mackenzie Delta)  
(Minister of Renewable Resources)

The Honourable James J. Wah-Shee, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 471  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
X0E 1H0  
(Rae-Lac la Martre)  
(Minister of Local Government)

Mr. Kane E. Tologanak, M.L.A.  
Coppermine, N.W.T.  
X0E 0E0  
(Central Arctic)  
(Deputy Speaker)

Mr. Dennis G. Patterson, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 262  
Frobisher Bay, N.W.T.  
X0A 0H0  
(Frobisher Bay)  
(Deputy Chairman of Committees)

Mr. Tagak E.C. Curley, M.L.A.  
Rankin Inlet, N.W.T.  
X0C 0G0  
(Keewatin South)

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

Mr. Moses Appaqaq, M.L.A.  
General Delivery  
Sanikiluaq, N.W.T.  
X0A 0W0  
(Hudson Bay)

Mr. Mark Evaluarjuk, M.L.A.  
Igloodik, N.W.T.  
X0A 0L0  
(Foxe Basin)

Mr. Robert Sayine, M.L.A.  
General Delivery  
Fort Resolution, N.W.T.  
X0E 0M0  
(Great Slave East)

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

Mr. Peter C. Fraser, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 23  
Norman Wells, N.W.T.  
X0E 0V0  
(Mackenzie Great Bear)

Mr. Nick G. Sibbeston, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 560  
Fort Simpson, N.W.T.  
X0E 0N0  
(Mackenzie Liard)

Mr. James Arreak, M.L.A.  
Clyde River, N.W.T.  
X0A 0E0  
(Baffin Central)

Mr. Bruce McLaughlin, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 555  
Pine Point, N.W.T.  
X0E 0W0  
(Pine Point)

Mrs. Lynda M. Sorensen, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 2348  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
X0E 1H0  
(Yellowknife South)

Ms. Nellie J. Cournoyea, M.L.A.  
Box 1184  
Inuvik, N.W.T.  
X0E 0T0  
(Western Arctic)

Mr. William Noah, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 125  
Baker Lake, N.W.T.  
X0C 0A0  
(Keewatin North)

Mr. Donald M. Stewart, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 1877  
Hay River, N.W.T.  
X0E 0R0  
(Hay River)

## OFFICERS

Clerk  
Mr. W.H. Remnant  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
X0E 1H0

Clerk Assistant  
Mr. P.F. de Vos  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
X0E 1H0

Sergeant-at-Arms  
Major D.A. Sproule, C.D. (SL)  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
X0E 1H0

Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms  
Captain H.L. Mayne, C.D. (Ret'd)  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
X0E 1H0

## LEGAL ADVISOR

Mr. S.K. Lal  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
X0E 1H0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

27 February 1980

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	830
Oral Questions	830
Questions and Returns	830
Petitions	834
Notices of Motion	834, 838
Motions	835, 838
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Report by the Chairman of the Northwest Territories Water Board	843
- Bill 1-80(1) Appropriation Ordinance, 1980-81	843
Report of Committee of the Whole of:	
- Report by the Chairman of the Northwest Territories Water Board	881
- Bill 1-80(1) Appropriation Ordinance, 1980-81	881
Orders of the Day	881

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1980

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Appaqaq, Mr. Arlooktoo, Mr. Arreak, Hon. George Braden, Hon. Tom Butters, Mr. Curley, Ms. Cournoyea, Mr. Evaluarjuk, Mr. Fraser, Hon. Arnold McCallum, Mr. McLaughlin, Hon. Robert H. MacQuarrie, Hon. Richard Nerysoo, Mr. Noah, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Pudluk, Mr. Sayine, Mr. Sibbeston, Mrs. Sorensen, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Tologanak, Hon. James Wah-Shee

ITEM NO. 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

SPEAKER (Hon. Robert H. MacQuarrie): Item 2, oral questions.

ITEM NO. 2: ORAL QUESTIONS

Mr. Arlooktoo.

Question 83-80(1): Water Delivery Truck

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) Mr. Speaker, I have a question relating to the water delivery truck. We were going to be given a water truck. There is water used from a muddy lake and the mud is set aside. We would prefer to use it from the other lake now and this question is directed to the Minister of Local Government. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: All right Mr. Braden, please.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Wah-Shee, I will take that oral question as notice and have him reply in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: I just noticed that Mr. Wah-Shee is in the House. You have had a question addressed with respect to water supply. Would you like to repeat the question, Mr. Arlooktoo, and perhaps Mr. Wah-Shee is prepared to answer it? Or would you be willing to wait for a reply tomorrow or the following day?

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) Yes. I can wait and I will be leaving tomorrow. I think I will be satisfied if the question is replied to when I get back.

MR. SPEAKER: All right. Thank you then. Notice is taken. Other oral questions, please.

Item 3, questions and returns.

ITEM NO. 3: QUESTIONS AND RETURNS

Mr. Patterson.

Question 84-80(1): Cost Of Fort Smith Hospital

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, this is a written question to the Minister of Health. What were the design costs of the Fort Smith hospital compared to construction costs? If I may ask another, Mr. Speaker...

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, Mr. Patterson.

Question 85-80(1): Power Rates For Hamlets

MR. PATTERSON: This is to the Minister of Local Government, a written question. Do hamlets in the Northwest Territories pay higher power rates because they are considered to be "government" users under the NCPC, Northern Canada Power Commission, tariffs and thereby are charged higher power rates by the Northwest Territories government? If so, is there anything your department can do to permit hamlets in the Northwest Territories to pay the lower rates which are paid by private users?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Other written questions. Returns from Ministers. Hon. Mr. Braden.

Return To Question 73-80(1): Economic Development's Plans Concerning Arts And Crafts In The N.W.T.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a return to Question 73-80(1) asked by Mr. Evaluarjuk. It is concerning the Department of Economic Development and Tourism's plans on arts and crafts projects in the Northwest Territories. I would say to Mr. Evaluarjuk that prior to negotiating the turnover of each individual government-owned arts and crafts commercial enterprise, all interested community groups and individuals will be notified and given the opportunity to bid on the specific enterprise. Every effort will, of course, be made to protect the integrity of the arts and crafts industry in the Northwest Territories. To this end, the final turnover of each enterprise to private ownership, that includes co-ops, will require the approval of the Executive Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Hon. Mr. Braden. Other returns from Ministers. Hon. Mr. Nerysoo.

Further Return To Question 36-80(1): Outpost Camps, Lake Harbour And Cape Dorset

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Mr. Speaker, I have a number of returns. Mr. Speaker, with respect to oral Question 36-80(1) asked by Mr. Arlooktoo on February 8th, 1980, I wish to advise that a written return will be submitted to the Clerk today for distribution to Members tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Hon. Mr. Nerysoo. Other returns.

Return To Question 31-80(1): Bathurst Caribou Herd

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: To Question 31-80(1), Bathurst Caribou Herd, asked by Mr. Tologanak.

(a) The estimated size of the Bathurst caribou herd is 150,000.

(b) The harvest figures of past years have been reassessed and are thought to have been conservative, consequently underestimating the kill and thereby, total mortality to the herd which is probably excessive if the herd is to be maintained at historic levels. The wildlife service is continuing a reassessment of the status of this population while closely documenting the kill throughout the range of this herd but in particular, the kill associated with the Gordon Lake winter road. The total estimated harvest of the herd over the past five years, we now estimate to be approximately 12,000 animals per year. The kill thus far has not exceeded the average annual kill but it may before break-up, depending on the continued availability of caribou.

(c) Necessary action can be taken under the Wildlife Ordinance to protect the herd through the creation of a special management area which would effectively control access, kill and disturbance to the caribou from all sources.

(d) The development of a comprehensive proposal for the conservation of the Bathurst caribou herd will be completed and submitted to the Executive Committee for consideration before mid-March. This proposal will outline a general approach to the management of the herd, general options for various interest groups and specific alternate regulative controls.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Nerysoo. Do you have another return? Please proceed.

Return To Question 52-80(1): Hunters' And Trappers' Conference, Baffin Region

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Question 52-80(1), Hunters' and Trappers' Conference, Baffin Region, asked by Mr. Patterson. I am pleased to announce that funding has been found and a regional hunters' and trappers' conference will be held for the Baffin region during the week of March 17, 1980. This conference will probably be held in Frobisher Bay.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Another return, Mr. Nerysoo, please.

Return To Question 53-80(1): Caribou Hunting, Baffin And Keewatin Regions

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Question 53-80(1), Caribou Hunting, Baffin and Keewatin Regions, asked by Mr. Patterson. I recommend to the Assembly that the regulations not be amended until such time as regional committees have been formed and these committees have had the opportunity to review the matter and make recommendations.

I am attempting to arrange a meeting with the various political organizations to discuss the closure of areas B/5, J/1 and J/2 and the present status of the herds in these areas. If we can obtain an agreement, I would set up management committees comprised of the members of the hunters' and trappers' associations to review this and other matters that directly affect their well-being. It is important that the hunters' and trappers' associations assume greater responsibility and become involved to a greater extent in the decision making role. As the closure season does not take effect until the 15th of May, it is my opinion that we have time to set up the committees and seek their advice and recommendations.

I would also like to report to the Assembly that the apparent decline of the Kaminuriak herd is having a significant adverse effect on the Dene people in northern Manitoba. Only a few years ago, the Kaminuriak herd was a major source of food for the Dene in Manitoba. However, over the past few years the herd has not migrated south into Manitoba with the result that one of their major sources of food has been cut off. I think it is very important to both the Inuit of the Keewatin and the Dene in northern Manitoba that the implication of the action recommended be looked at very closely before action is taken to eliminate the closed season. I would like to think that because of the concerns of the people in the Keewatin and northern Manitoba, that a co-operative approach be taken in attempting to resolve this matter. For the reasons outlined, I would recommend to this Assembly that we do not amend the regulations at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there other returns from Ministers? Mr. Nerysoo, you have the floor.



Return To Question 58-80(1): Tree Of Peace, Caribou Stew

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: To Question 58-80(1), Tree of Peace, Caribou Stew, asked by Mr. Sibbeston. The practice of selling meals of caribou to the general public can be carried on by any group, by purchasing meat designated and tagged for commercial use. This meat comes from a commercial quota assigned to a caribou population which is healthy and has an identifiable surplus after subsistence hunting needs have been satisfied. The latest biological information on the Bathurst herd indicates that there is no identifiable surplus and the herd is, in fact, unstable. For this reason the commercial quota of 800 has been removed. Consequently, this source of commercial meat is no longer available to the Tree of Peace and the wildlife officer has drawn this to their attention.

Commercial caribou meat is still available from other herds, such as the Bluenose herd, could continue to be served under a permit as set out in section 57 of the Wildlife Ordinance. These permits would be issued by the wildlife officer. The question is simply changing the procedures for obtaining and serving caribou meat by the Tree of Peace rather than preventing them from carrying out their commendable activities.

MR. SPEAKER: Other returns. Mr. Nerysoo.

Return To Question 62-80(1): Government Role In Water Diversion Program

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Question 62-80(1), Government Role in Water Diversion Program, asked by Ms. Cournoyea. The primary responsibility in all matters pertaining to water belongs to the Northwest Territories Water Board through the Northern Inland Waters Act. Six out of the nine members of the board are appointed through recommendation of the Legislative Assembly. In addition, the Government of the Northwest Territories has members sitting on the technical committee which supports the Water Board.

Diversions taking place outside the Northwest Territories but with downstream effects within the Territories are dealt with and studied by the Mackenzie River Basin committee which has one member from every jurisdiction touched by the watershed. This committee was organized by an initiative of the Legislative Assembly in 1972 and proclaimed under the Canada Water Act.

In addition, in the case of the proposed Slave River hydro project, the Government of Alberta offered the Government of the Northwest Territories a seat on the project committee. This was accepted and our member is fully informed in every stage.

MR. SPEAKER: Other returns. The Hon. Mr. Butters.

Return To Question 19-80(1): Fuel Costs, Coral Harbour

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I have a return in response to Question 19-80(1), Fuel Costs, Coral Harbour, asked by the hon. Member for Keewatin North on February 4th.

The price of fuel in Coral Harbour, as elsewhere in Canada, is governed by the world price of oil and the Canadian government's reaction to world prices. As you are aware, the world price of oil has steadily escalated and our prices have followed this trend. The subject of assistance to northerners to offset these costs was discussed with the former minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and he publicly indicated his support of a northern energy policy.

The Conservative cabinet was sympathetic to the problem and approved a policy memorandum calling for a northern fuel subsidy. The essence of the policy is that it ensures that fuel prices, heating oil, in remote settlements will be equal to fuel prices in Yellowknife. This subsidy would apply up to 1500 gallons of fuel per residence annually. While this policy has not been legislated, it is unlikely that the Liberal government will reverse the previous government's cabinet decision. When, and if, such assistance becomes available, price relief for communities will be implemented as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: Other returns?

Item 4, petitions.

ITEM NO. 4: PETITIONS

Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of petitions and with your permission I would just like to read the first one in its entirety.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it lengthy, Mr. Curley, as I believe the rules state that only a certain portion is to be read. Is it lengthy first of all?

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is rather a short petition from Keewatin students attending school in Yellowknife.

MR. SPEAKER: Would you hold on a moment, please? Yes, I think the item is allowed if it is on one page. Mr. Curley, you may proceed.

Petition 4-80(1): Return Home For Spring Break

MR. CURLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I will read it in its entirety. It contains 29 signatures, including mine, and reads:

Dear Sirs: We would like to know if we could go home for spring break since there is going to be so many other students going home too. It gets very lonely and very easy to get homesick. Especially when practically everybody who has a chance to go home during the holidays. It even gets embarrassing when people ask you, "Are you going home for spring break?" or any other holidays and we say no, because it costs too much to go home, then they would ask, why does the government not pay for it and we are left speechless after that. We would like to know why we never go home on long holidays.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Curley. Did you say you had another?

Petition 5-80(1): Amendment To Municipal Ordinance

MR. CURLEY: Thank you. Again this petition contains 29 signatures and is from Rankin Inlet, the residents. It is asking for an amendment to the Municipal Ordinance to allow municipalities to regulate the importation of dogs according to sex, breed, size and weight. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Curley. Are there any other petitions?

Item 5, tabling of documents.

Item 6, reports of standing and special committees.

Item 7, notices of motion.

ITEM NO. 7: NOTICES OF MOTION

Mr. McLaughlin.

Notice Of Motion 25-80(1): Extension Of Session

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, when the rule of this House concerning the length of sessions was adopted there were only 15 Members. According to that rule, today would be the last day of this session unless extended. Therefore I give notice and will be asking for unanimous consent today to move that the length of this session be extended and that prorogation occur not later than Friday, March 14th. Mr. Speaker, my motion does not propose any extension of the sitting hours.



MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. McLaughlin.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Other notices of motion. Mr. Patterson.

Notice Of Motion 26-80(1): Inuit Tapirisat Of Canada, Nunavut

MR. PATTERSON: I wish to give notice that on Friday, February 29th, I will move: Be it resolved that this Assembly encourage the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada to make assumptions about the creation of Nunavut necessary to expedite negotiating matters of aboriginal rights between Inuit Tapirisat of Canada and the Government of Canada; and be it further resolved that this Assembly encourage the Government of Canada to recognize assumptions about the creation of Nunavut made by Inuit Tapirisat of Canada while negotiating matters of aboriginal rights; and be it further resolved that this Assembly reserve its own position on the creation of Nunavut to a later date; and be it further resolved that this Assembly communicate these resolutions to Inuit Tapirisat of Canada and the new federal Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Are there any other notices of motion?

Item 8, motions.

ITEM NO. 8: MOTIONS

We have Motion 22-80(1), Canada Works Program. Mr. Patterson.

Motion 22-80(1): Canada Works Program

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS there is now significant unemployment in the Northwest Territories;

AND WHEREAS existing job creation programs which depend on the creation of jobs through tax credits or incentives to private industry are limited in effectiveness, particularly in remote areas of the Northwest Territories, where there is a very small private business sector;

AND WHEREAS the Canada works program of the job creation branch of Employment Canada provided much needed employment with socially useful consequences in many communities of the Northwest Territories;

AND WHEREAS it is desirable that the Government of the Northwest Territories be apprized of employment projects which might produce capital facilities which might require costly ongoing maintenance by the Northwest Territories government;

NOW THEREFORE, I move this Assembly strongly urges the federal government and the Minister of Employment Canada to reinstate the Canada works program or its equivalent in the Northwest Territories and further that the Government of the Northwest Territories be consulted before capital projects are approved under the Canada works program.

MR. SPEAKER: Secunder? Did you state the seconder? I am sorry. When you got to that part of the motion I was preoccupied.

MR. PATTERSON: It was seconded by Mr. Arreak, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Duly moved and seconded. To the motion, Mr. Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Mr. Braden announced in answering a question last week, there appears to be significant unemployment in the Northwest Territories. This is a matter of common knowledge, but his figures based on the data that could be gathered through his department indicated approximately over 13 per cent unemployment currently in the Northwest Territories. It is also probably well known that when the government changed last May, a new policy for job creation was instituted which depended on the private sector to create jobs and remove the Canada works program. This may well have been appropriate in areas where there was a significant private sector, but in many areas of the Northwest Territories there is not a significant private industry sector and therefore those incentives to create jobs were lost to those regions.

#### Expression Of Concern In Baffin Region

There has been a great deal of expression of concern in the Baffin region and other regions, I believe, about the decision to terminate the Canada works program as it was made by the former government. Particularly strong concern has been raised at the Baffin Regional Council for example, on the impact on school projects in the Baffin region, which provided an opportunity for the hiring of local people and the employment in the schools and increasing the cultural and local content of the curriculum in the schools in that region.

Also, as is probably well known to many Members, Canada works program was a vehicle through which many other socially useful projects were undertaken. There has been some concern expressed by the Government of the Northwest Territories and, I believe, the finance committee of this House that there must be consultation with the government in connection with Canada works program and other employment projects so that if capital facilities are created, they not leave the Government of the Northwest Territories saddled with operating and maintenance costs which are unforeseen and unplanned. Therefore, I have included in the motion a request that there be consultation with the Government of the Northwest Territories before any such projects which have capital aspects under Canada works program are approved.

The motion simply urges the new federal government which, of course, created the Canada works program and which hopefully has a different philosophy about creation of jobs, particularly where there is not an active private sector, urges that the new minister reimplement this program. I am not going to say much more, because I feel that most Members will recognize that this was a matter of some concern to people all across the Northwest Territories. I feel that the motion will not be opposed because in effect, we are asking for an additional source of federal funds. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Other comment on the motion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am in somewhat of an uncomfortable position. Originally I had planned to respond and not give my support to part of this motion, but I think after hearing the hon. Member's remarks I will indicate my support, at this point in time, for the motion. However, I want to put a few riders on that support, if I may.

#### N.W.T. Government Could Be Responsible For Program

I agree that the Government of Canada should investigate the feasibility of establishing or re-establishing a Canada works program or some equivalent in the Northwest Territories. I think that this House would look forward to such a move. However, I do have problems with the clause which suggests that the Government of the Northwest Territories should be consulted before capital projects -- and I would suggest that my concern refers to all projects which are approved under the Canada works program or its equivalent -- I say I have problems with that clause because I think that if it is possible in the future when such a program has been reinstated that perhaps the Northwest Territories government could be responsible for management of funds and of the program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: I want to point out to the hon. Member that we already have delegated to regions the responsibility for allocation of STEP, Subsidized Term Employment Program, funds and I would suggest that in the future if we were to ever manage such job creation program funds, we would look to a similar type of arrangement where a region would exercise considerable control and authority over the distribution of a Canada works project fund in communities. I think that we also have to come to terms with the best use of job creation money and I would say to the hon. Member and to this House that we should look to the long-term benefits in terms of skill development and the development of general community assets...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Appropriate Means Of Managing Funds

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: ...which a works program can offer. Now, I respect, Mr. Speaker, that the wheels of change turn slowly and that it might take some time for us to convince the appropriate section of the federal government, the Department of Employment and Immigration, that the Northwest Territories government and its agencies are appropriate means of managing such a fund. So to conclude, I will support the hon. Member's motion. However, I just had to take the opportunity to throw a few of these riders in. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Other comment on the motion? Hon. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Before I say anything, in speaking to the motion, am I correct, sir, in that I could direct a question of clarification to the mover?

MR. SPEAKER: I do accept that, yes.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Proceeding on that basis, I would like to have the mover confirm that the Canada works program is no longer a federal program and no longer available to any jurisdiction and in effect what the motion is calling for is a reinstatement of the program which was cancelled out some months ago.

MR. SPEAKER: Would you respond to that? I think the word "reinstate" would serve to answer that but, Mr. Patterson, what do you say in clarification?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, according to my information that is correct. The program was terminated across Canada including the Northwest Territories and the motion seeks to have it reinstated in the Northwest Territories.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I agree with what the hon. Minister of Economic Development has placed before the House. I would suggest the motion would be improved if we recognized, or if it recognized that such an initiative and such an objective should also be placed in the hands of the representatives of the people of the Northwest Territories who sit in the House of Commons. I would like to see the mover reflect the responsibility that Mr. Ittinuar and Mr. Nickerson have and that they would likewise carry forward such an objective and such an initiative. Maybe we could even include our senator, Senator Adams.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other comments on the motion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion 22-80(1), Carried

MR. SPEAKER: The question is being called. Are you ready? It has been duly moved and seconded that this Assembly strongly urge the federal government and the Minister of Employment Canada to reinstate the Canada works program or its equivalent in the Northwest Territories and further that the Government of the Northwest Territories be consulted before capital projects are approved under the Canada works program. Those in favour of the motion, please indicate by raising your hand. Opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Mr. McLaughlin.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, due to the results of a meeting held this morning, I have a notice of motion which I would have liked to have given but you moved into motions before I realized you had done it. I would like to ask your indulgence and the House to go back to item 7 on the orders of the day.

MR. SPEAKER: That would be with respect to the Workers' Compensation Board, is it?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Does he have unanimous consent to return to notices of motion?

---Agreed

REVERT TO ITEM NO. 7: NOTICES OF MOTION

Please proceed, Mr. McLaughlin.

Notice Of Motion 27-80(1): Workers' Compensation Board

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Regarding Northwest Territories Workers' Compensation Board, I will give notice of motion that on Friday, February 29th, I will move that this Assembly recommend to the Commissioner that (a) J.D.C. MacLean be reappointed as chairman for a term of four years; and (b) Messrs. A.W.R. Hettrick, Colin Adjun, W. Berezowski, D. Johnston and C. Lambert be reappointed for further terms of two years each; and further that the Workers' Compensation Board be increased in size by the appointment of two additional members.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. McLaughlin. We are still on motions.

Item 8, motions.

REVERT TO ITEM NO. 8: MOTIONS

Mr. McLaughlin.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: You said earlier you were going to ask for unanimous consent for something you had given notice for.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Whereas the business of this session will not be completed within the period provided in the rules; now therefore, I move, seconded by the hon. Member from Mackenzie Great Bear, that the length of this session be extended and that prorogation occur...



MR. SPEAKER: You must secure unanimous consent to proceed, Mr. McLaughlin. Does Mr. McLaughlin have unanimous consent to proceed with his motion?

---Agreed

All right. Now you may proceed, Mr. McLaughlin.

Motion 25-80(1): Extension Of Session

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS the business of this session will not be completed within the period provided in the rules;

NOW THEREFORE, I move, seconded by the hon. Member from Mackenzie Great Bear, that the length of this session be extended and that prorogation occur not later than Friday, March 14th.

MR. SPEAKER: Duly moved and seconded. To the motion, Mr. McLaughlin.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House allow for only four weeks of meeting during a session which deals with the main estimates and as today would be the 20th day and therefore the four weeks would be up, I have made this motion in order that we may continue to deal with the main estimates. I have also set a final date of March 14th which would be the final time that we could go to, due to the fact that this room would no longer be available to us anyway.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Sorry, my motion does not propose to deal with any extension of the sitting hours as I realize you ruled yesterday that that question could not be addressed until the motion dealing with that presented by Ms. Cournoyea was brought up tomorrow. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. McLaughlin. Are there any other comments on the motion? Mr. McLaughlin, you did say seconded by the hon. Member from Mackenzie Great Bear, did you, when you introduced the motion?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: I did.

MR. SPEAKER: I thought that is what I heard. Anyone else to the motion? Mr. Stewart.

MR. STEWART: No thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but just a point of clarification. Is the hon. Member's motion suggesting we do not meet past March 14th?

MR. SPEAKER: Would you please clarify, Mr. McLaughlin?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Could Mr. Braden ask that question again please?

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of clarification. Is the Member's motion suggesting that we do not meet after March 14th?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: It does.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Braden.



Rule Unnecessarily Binding

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: First I would like to indicate that our rules committee should take a look at these rules. It is Rule 7(1)(a), which I think unnecessarily binds the Assembly in its deliberations. I notice that one of the rules, which concerns our second session, was adopted back in October, 1976. I guess with respect to the motion I just have a little problem with the fact that it binds us to having everything done and all wrapped up by March 14th.

MR. SPEAKER: Other comments on the motion. Ms. Cournoyea.

MS. COURNOYEA: I would just like to support Mr. Braden's comments, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I tried to clarify just how much time we have as it relates to business. It appears to me that the motion is in order and yet I believe it will unnecessarily bind us to completing this session on March 14th. If we go according to the day plan we have been in, I do not believe we will be able to finish the business at hand.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Fraser.

MR. FRASER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not think this motion binds us to March 14th, as another motion could be made next week or three or four days prior to March 14th, if we are still not finished the business. It is not really binding us to March 14th.

MR. SPEAKER: That is an opinion which perhaps I will check with the Clerk before we proceed.

MR. FRASER: Good idea.

MR. SPEAKER: I would be able to give that undertaking that I would entertain a further motion at a later date to extend beyond March 14th if some Member wished to introduce that. If this motion is carried and our session is extended then I would have to agree with someone who would have the right to ask for a further extension at some future point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is being called. Are you ready for the question? Mr. Clerk, would you please read the motion? Mr. McLaughlin, would you please deliver the motion?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Now therefore, I move that the length of this session be extended and that prorogation occur not later than Friday, March 14th.

Motion 25-80(1), Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Duly moved and seconded. Those in favour of the motion please indicate by raising your hands. Those opposed? The motion is carried. Ms. Cournoyea.

MS. COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, may I again seek unanimous consent to deal with the motion presented yesterday with regard to extending sitting hours?

MR. SPEAKER: I would say that I cannot allow that to be raised again, Ms. Cournoyea. The matter was raised yesterday and unanimous consent was not given. We will therefore deal with the extension of hours motion tomorrow, as previously agreed.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: A point of order. I wonder if you could give us the number of the rule under which you are making that decision?

---Applause

Speaker's Ruling

MR. SPEAKER: I would be pleased to. I am referring Mr. Butters to Rule 51(1): A motion being once made and carried in the affirmative or negative cannot be put again in the same session but a vote in the affirmative may be rescinded on a motion to that effect. I feel that Ms. Cournoyea had requested unanimous consent of the Assembly yesterday; it was denied. In other words the notice of motion period was required with that denial and I feel that I must rule in that way, although this may be interpreted by yourself not strictly as a motion, but we could have, if the ruling were not made in that way, we could have a Member who persisted again and again in raising a matter that is voted down. Yes, Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Speaking to your decision, sir, I cannot see that "motion" as included in Rule 51(1) can be defined as a request for unanimous consent. They are totally different requirements and requests. I think, sir, that you should give very careful consideration to what you are doing. A Speaker of this House has the responsibility to ensure that every individual, and the minorities most especially, should be heard when that request to be heard is made.

Now, I do not think you can require a Member not to request to be heard and that is what has happened now. The Member should be able to state the requirement to be heard and if, as the rules say, there is someone here who will not give that Member consent to be heard then the simple expedient is to say "nay". I think to prevent that Member from speaking or requesting the right to speak is a very serious remission of the responsibility that has been placed upon you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Butters. Is there other comment? Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Member for Inuvik has the privilege to ask the Assembly whether or not you could waive that rule so she may proceed in asking the Members whether she should proceed with the motion with unanimous consent. On that basis I am inclined to support Mr. Butters in allowing a Member to state his case again, or her case.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there other comments? Mr. Fraser.

Unanimous Consent Would Not Be Forthcoming

MR. FRASER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned yesterday on this motion, there was a request for unanimous consent and I will not give unanimous consent again today...

---Applause

...until they can prove to me they have adequate support for the interpreters, who I understand have been working long hours and if we are going to extend sitting hours I do not think I will be one who will be sitting, so there is no use in me giving unanimous consent. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you for making that statement, Mr. Fraser, but of course the principle that has been raised still stands, whether you would or would not give unanimous consent and I must make a ruling on that. Is there further comment before I do so? Mr. Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON: I think your ruling is now academic, Mr. Speaker.

---Laughter

MR. SPEAKER: I would tend to disagree, Mr. Patterson, because if I do not make a ruling on it, or rather when I do make a ruling on it, it will set a precedent for the future and so it is not merely an academic question, just because we know someone is going to deny unanimous consent. Are there other comments before I can confer with the Clerk? Mr. McLaughlin.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: I think the reason for notice of motion, giving the 48 hours, the reason the rule is in existence is to make sure that a Member can be guaranteed of his attendance. Now, when it is discussed he would obviously want to have some input into it, and to seek unanimous consent would be basically an emergency type situation. I think that when consent is refused once, to try and gain it again the next day I think is sort of overbending the rules. I think there is flexibility to bend the rules, but if you cannot get unanimous consent the first time I do not believe you should be able to try it the second time because the main point is: Why is a 48 hour rule there in the first place? Thank you.

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

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that if you do rule that the rules prevent unanimous consent being requested again today, which strikes me as being somewhat out of keeping with the spirit of flexibility that that rule seems to suggest...

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Hear, hear!

Unanimous Consent To Vary Rules Could Be Requested

MR. PATTERSON: If you do rule in that way I suppose an alternative available to the Member placed in that situation might be to use Rule 1(3) to ask the Assembly for unanimous consent to vary the rules to permit unanimous consent to be requested again the next day which would put us in a somewhat ridiculous position. I think Rule 1(3) clearly allows unanimous consent to be requested, anytime, to make any change to the rules. So, it might be open to the Member if you rule that she cannot request it today for her to request unanimous consent to change the rules.

MR. CURLEY: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Are there other comments please? All right, will the Assembly come to order please? The Hon. Mr. Butters raised what could be a serious allegation, of course, Members will have to take that into account in the future. He stated that he felt that freedom of speech was being thwarted by the ruling I had made. I maintain that it is not, that I am acting in accordance with the rules that are set by this House.

I quoted Rule 51 stating, or which states that motions once negated may not be brought again and I feel that if the Member is being thwarted as a result of that, it is the rules of this House and not me who would be doing that thwarting of freedom of speech. I do not see that the issue is prejudiced in any way by waiting until tomorrow to deal with the issue that was raised by the hon. Member from the Western Arctic, and that is with respect to extending sitting hours to mornings, evenings, or perhaps weekends.

Ruling Not Changed

I, therefore, will not change my ruling. I maintain that I ruled correctly. I point out first of all that there is no appeal to my ruling. Secondly, that the Member has the right, if she should wish, to ask for unanimous consent under Rule 1(3) in order to waive any of the rules of this House and if the Members gave unanimous consent to waive Rule 51(1), then I would be prepared to have the hon. Member raise the issue again, but I would maintain that if Mr. Butters' principle is right that she ought to have a chance to raise it again

today, then I would say that he would have to agree that she would have been right to raise it a second, or third, or fourth time yesterday, which is obviously opposed to the intent of these rules. So, I will stick by my ruling and will advise the hon. Member that if she wishes she may ask for unanimous consent under Rule 1(3) to waive Rule 51(1). Ms. Cournoyea.

MS. COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, I am now asking unanimous consent to waive the rules under Rule 1(3).

MR. SPEAKER: She is asking unanimous consent to waive Rule 51(1) according to Rule 1(3). Does the hon. Member have such consent?

---Agreed

All right, in which case you may ask for unanimous consent to deal with your motion.

MS. COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, may I ask for unanimous consent to deal with a motion which was raised yesterday to extend sitting hours of this House?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member have -- I hear a "nay", therefore we cannot proceed until motion time tomorrow. Are there other motions? At this point I was going to make a little statement about time to speed up proceedings but I think that may not be appropriate right at this moment. Is it agreed that we move into committee of the whole?

---Agreed

Item 9, consideration in committee of the whole of bills, recommendations to the Legislative Assembly and other matters.

ITEM NO. 9: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS, RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND OTHER MATTERS

This House will now resolve into committee of the whole to deal with the matters as listed on the order paper, with Mr. Tologanak in the chair. Report by the chairman of the Northwest Territories Water Board.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into committee of the whole for consideration of Report by the Chairman of the Northwest Territories Water Board, and Bill 1-80(1): Appropriation Ordinance, 1980-81, with Mr. Tologanak in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES WATER BOARD, AND BILL 1-80(1): APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1980-81

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): The committee will come to order. Is it agreed that we invite the chairman of the Northwest Territories Water Board?

---Agreed

Mr. Glenn Warner. I would like to welcome you, Mr. Warner. You have the floor, Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: I am just wondering whether there are other members of the Water Board and if so, whether they would also like to come before us here today.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Is it agreed?

---Agreed



Do you have other members of the Water Board, Mr. Warner?

MR. WARNER: Yes, there are other members here in the gallery.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Would you like to invite the other members of the Water Board?

---Agreed

Would the other members of the Water Board please join Mr. Warner?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: It seems to me when this motion came before the House and it was Motion 7-80(1), the motion was amended and it passed as amended as I recall, where the Speaker was to request the chairman of the Northwest Territories Water Board to appear before this House at a date determined by the Speaker. The amendment of that motion was made specifically to have the chairman in because the original motion had indicated to have all members of the Water Board to attend the Legislative Assembly. We had the motion duly passed by the House to have the chairman. What is the purpose of going against the motion?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. McCallum. In view of the motion that was passed by this House, we will have only the chairman of the Water Board, Mr. Warner. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I think that the reason the amendment was placed was so that there would not be an unnecessary expense to bring other members before us. It was felt that the chairman would be answering the questions and obviously it would only be required that he come, but I think that the members of the Water Board have paid us a very great courtesy. In fact, it would appear that the board is almost here in its entirety and obviously they have come to listen because they recognize that they are almost a creature of this Legislature. I think as they have shown us the courtesy to appear and listen that we should return that courtesy and allow them to sit with us and converse.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Sibbeston.

Motion That Members Of Water Board Present In Gallery Appear Before Assembly

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion. I move that all members of the Water Board present in the gallery be requested to appear before the Assembly.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): To the motion. Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, we had the occasion already to discuss that during one of the meetings of the committee of the whole last time and I cannot support the motion since we normally do not have the practice of asking all the board members of boards or corporations to appear before the House and on that basis I will not support the motion.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Sibbeston, do you want to make a comment?

MR. SIBBESTON: I realize that the motion that dealt with the invitation to the Water Board was eventually amended so we would just ask the chairman of the board, but my understanding of the way the motion went and the way the debate went is that it was simply that only the chairman would be asked because of the high costs involved in bringing other members here. That I take it, was the main argument against having all members of the board come before us. It appears today that just about all of the members, or a large number of the board is here and why not have them come before us? I do not see any difficulty in that. What do Members have against it?



THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Any further discussion? Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, a further reason I would not support the motion is it is not a good businesslike approach where you are asking all the different board members and dealing with them in the different areas it would seem that maybe there is a conflict with the board of directors, I do not know. But it does not seem to be a good sound business approach to have all the different board members present when dealing with...

MR. SIBBESTON: How many board members are there who appeared from Inuit Tapirisat of Canada?

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, when we had ITC members of the board there was only one board member and the rest of the members were staff who specialize in the affairs of the organization.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Any further discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Sibbeston, would you pass us a copy of the motion? Mr. Stewart.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that the motion is out of order under Rule 51(1).

Motion Ruled Out Of Order

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Yes, Mr. Stewart, you are quite correct. Mr. Sibbeston, I am going to rule your motion out of order.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, could you please provide the basis why you made that decision?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): The Members' manual, page 20, Rule 51(1): A motion being once made and carried in the affirmative or negative cannot be put again in the same session but a vote in the affirmative may be rescinded on a motion to that effect. It seems we have dealt with this motion, this question before was dealt with in formal session and under that rule I am ruling it out of order. Now, is it the wish of the committee to continue?

---Agreed

Will you, Mr. Warner, make some opening remarks?

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is my privilege to appear before this body this afternoon. I think it is the first time that you have requested the presence of the Water Board and I hope that it results in a continuing relationship leading to the devolution of responsibility from the federal government to the Government of the Northwest Territories in renewable resources fields.

I have some background on the Water Board and some information on the rules and powers of the board if you would like me to bring them before the Assembly, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner, when you speak would you slow down a bit so the interpreters can keep up? Thank you. Go ahead.

Background And Role Of Water Board

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a statement here on the background of the development of the Water Board and information on the roles and powers of the board if it is the opinion of this Assembly that I deliver this to them.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Go ahead.

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The legislative responsibility for inland water resources in the Northwest Territories rests primarily with the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. However, much of his authority has been delegated to the Northwest Territories Water Board. The board, created by section 7 of the Northern Inland Waters Act, exercises key functions in granting the right to use water and the permission to dispose of water-borne waste. It is also given broader responsibilities by section 9 to provide for the conservation, development and utilization of the water resources in the Northwest Territories in a manner that will provide the optimum benefit therefrom for all Canadians and for the residents of the Northwest Territories in particular. Under section 15 of the act, the board is required through the public hearing process and open registry to undertake through public consultation when discharging its key statutory responsibilities. Given the inevitable requirement of almost every major industrial or municipal undertaking to use water and to dispose of wastes, there can be little doubt that the board will be of continuing importance in the future growth and development of the Territories.

Intent Of Northern Inland Waters Act

It is clear from the Northern Inland Waters Act that the parliament of Canada intended to grant a significant measure of territorial control over water resources when it created the Northwest Territories Water Board. The siting of the board's office in Yellowknife and the provision for naming not less than six members to the board by the Commissioner in Council are evidence of that intent. In fact six of the nine positions currently available to the board are named by the Commissioner in Council to the Minister for his approval. Moreover, the mandate of the board relates to all significant aspects of control over water resources. Therefore, this legislation has already provided the foundation for a devolution of power to the people of the Northwest Territories by creating this board.

I have further information, Mr. Chairman, on the membership of the board and a statement of attendance of members of the Water Board as requested by the caucus of the Legislative Assembly of about a year ago. Would you like me to go ahead with that?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Go ahead.

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The members of the board at present are as follows: the vice-chairman is Mr. D.P. Mersereau, regional director, Government of the Northwest Territories, Fort Smith. The members include Mr. Darcy Arden of Prelude Lake; Mr. Wayne Bryant, director, Department of the Environment, Yellowknife; Mr. Bill Gibney, general manager and vice-president of Pine Point Mines Limited; Mr. Arthur Redshaw, assistant director, renewable resources, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development of Yellowknife. Our legal adviser is Mr. George N. Carter of Yellowknife and our executive secretary, Mrs. Jo MacQuarrie, also of Yellowknife. My name is Glenn Warner and I am chairman of the board and I live in Yellowknife in the winter and Bathurst Inlet in the summer.

During 1979 the board had nine meetings. The attendance of members at these meetings are as follows: Mr. Mersereau, eight; Mr. Arden, seven; Mr. Bryant, nine; Dr. Covill, six, and Dr. Covill is no longer a member of the board. He was the appointed member from the Department of National Health and Welfare. Mr. Gibney attended seven; Mr. Arthur Redshaw attended eight; and Mr. Bill Lafferty attended three.

During the year public hearings were held at the following locations: at the hamlet of Tuktoyaktuk; the town of Fort Smith; an application on behalf of Terra Mining; an application was held in Yellowknife; a mill water licence renewal for the Pine Point mines was held at Pine Point, and a mill licence renewal for the Con mine was held in Yellowknife. In addition a public hearing was held in the hamlet of Fort Franklin.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Perhaps before we continue we could break for 15 minutes for tea.

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Tologanak): The committee will come to order and we will return to Mr. Warner's presentation. Go ahead, Mr. Warner.

Recommendations Of The Water Board To The Drury Commission

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have one short statement that the Members of the Legislative Assembly may be interested in and it is a brief summary of the presentation by the Water Board to the Drury commission regarding the transfer of responsibilities to the Northwest Territories. In this, the board endorses the intention of the territorial government as revealed in previous statements, to transfer the control of renewable resources, including water, to the Government of the Northwest Territories. The board recommends that this be achieved initially through amendments to the Northern Inland Waters Act. Accordingly, the board would remain under federal jurisdiction for an interim period and thus maintain its present reporting relationship to the federal minister responsible for this legislation, and he would continue to approve water licences upon recommendations by the board. However, the board has recommended to the Drury commission that the water resources section of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development be transferred to the territorial government, together with the authority to administer the departmental functions of this act.

The board further recommended that once the Executive Committee of the Government of the Northwest Territories has evolved to a point where it becomes the equivalent of a provincial cabinet, then the board envisages that its reporting and licensing recommending relationship would shift to the appropriate Minister within the Legislative Assembly. Ultimately the board recognizes and recommends that complete responsibility for the management and allocation of water resources be brought within the control of the Government of the Northwest Territories through enactment of territorial legislation and the repeal of the federal law. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. Warner. Are there any questions or comments? Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Just to get the discussion rolling, Mr. Chairman, I mentioned earlier that the Northwest Territories Water Board is a creature of this House. I guess that is not quite correct but probably more than any other federally appointed board, this one is responsible and responsive to this House. The reason being as the chairman indicated when he referred to the legislation which established this board, three of the seven members are appointed by the Commissioner in Council, and as Members quite well know three of those Members named were put forward and approved by the Assembly.

I would look forward to the day when we would have a similar involvement and a similar dimension of participation in other boards which rule and deal with the environment and the renewable resources of the Northwest Territories. We are well aware of a number of federally funded and in many cases federally appointed panels running around the North making decisions on applications related to development in which we have little or no more than token voice or token effect. So, saying that I think the departure which occurred when this board was established is a most positive one and one which I think I would wish to see the federal government continue to move. Having said that, I would like to, through you, direct to the chairman of the board, some questions relative to the applications which have been examined and which are currently being examined by the board.

Municipal Use Of Water

I understand that the utilization of water, both in a municipal sense and in a development sense falls within the purview of the board. I am wondering, first of all, in the sense of the municipal use of water, are our municipalities currently meeting with the standards of water use which is required by other agencies seeking to use water? I guess simply I am saying are the municipalities putting the water back into the system in a manner and a condition which one could describe as unpolluted and acceptable for downriver consumption?



THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner.

MR. WARNER: Generally speaking the answer is yes. In the cases where the communities are licensed and licences are required for communities of hamlet status, town status or city status, their requirements, or acceptable requirements are being met. However, there are several communities or many communities in the Northwest Territories that do not require a licence and until they do the control of the water and the degree of effluent may not be to the standards that the board would like or that the public of the Northwest Territories would like.

Ability To Influence Decisions In Other Jurisdictions

HON. TOM BUTTERS: A question on another matter, Mr. Chairman. The board makes rulings relative to utilization or proposed utilization of water within the Territories. Now, what concerns me, especially in the West where we share a river system with four, five or six other jurisdictions, is the Water Board able to influence, be aware of, make recommendations about uses of water that occur in other jurisdictions, that have downriver effect, and if the board does not, does it see that such an ability would be advantageous to the board in so carrying out its mandate and its responsibility to the people of the Northwest Territories?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner.

MR. WARNER: Mr. Chairman, again the answer is yes. The board does have authority in this area. However, to date it has not exercised authority regarding provincial-territorial jurisdiction. I will quote from the Northern Inland Waters Act, subsection 15(1) and it states: A public hearing may be held by a board in connection with any matter relating to its objects where the board is satisfied that such a hearing would be in the public interest. I qualify the definition of "objects" of the board meaning utilization, development or conservation of the waters in the Northwest Territories.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: One brief question. Would such influence or ability to influence decisions in other jurisdictions also include what might be described as a basin exchange in part or in whole?

MR. WARNER: I would hope so. There will certainly be other jurisdictions involved. What I think we are all thinking of, if I may presume to say so, the proposed hydro-electric development on the Slave River and also on the Liard River and there will be a lot of other agencies involved besides the Water Board.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Patterson.

Composition Of The Water Board

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask some questions relative to the composition of the board. I notice that the board seems to have representation from people who might well be experts in certain areas but who also have the potential for creating in the public eye at least, the appearance of bias or conflict of interest. I know our Conflict of Interest Ordinance in the Northwest Territories covers only pecuniary interest, but I am just wondering, Mr. Warner, if you see a problem in that, for example, the manager of Pine Point mines or the regional director of the Fort Smith region and the director of the Department of the Environment, all of whom have different experience and all of whom have different interests in water works. For example, the regional director might be presumed to have an interest in the water works of the municipalities in his region. The manager of the Pine Point mines, of course, might appear to have an



interest in the water works of the mines and the director of the Department of the Environment might, of course, have a different kind of interest in that his responsibility is for environmental protection which might in some cases give him knowledge or a perspective that might go against the interest of someone applying for a licence. I guess my point is I am certainly not alleging that there is any bias or any conflict of interest but I am just wondering do you not see, notwithstanding the expertise that such people might have, do you not see some difficulty from the point of view of the public in dealing with a board which is pretty heavily oriented toward civil servants and other than independent persons? Has that been a difficulty, or do you see that as a difficulty?

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That has not been a difficulty in the past and I do not foresee any difficulty in the future. The board is quite firm in that the members sitting on the board are sitting there as individual members representing themselves, if you like, as citizens of the Northwest Territories. Although they may be wearing another hat the next hour or the next day, to date I have certainly not seen any conflict of interest or bias and at the same time anyone who has a direct interest in the situation, for instance the manager of Pine Point mines, is excused when the board is discussing matters concerning Pine Point mines and does not participate in discussion or in voting on those matters.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Further questions or comments? Mr. Sibbeston.

Membership Of The Manager Of Pine Point Mines

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, just one question on this point of membership on the Water Board. I notice that in 1979 there were six public hearings and two of these had to do with Pine Point mines. I am a bit curious as to your feeling that despite the fact that Mr. Gibney is on the board that you feel that the Water Board is still able to make independent and unbiased judgments. I am aware of the Water Board hearing in Pine Point on November 29, 1979, at which time Pine Point mines made a submission to the Water Board and the submission was signed by Mr. Gibney. Do you not think, Mr. Warner, that the board is open to a certain amount of bias as a result of Mr. Gibney being on the Water Board?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner.

MR. WARNER: Mr. Chairman, I can see the Member's point, sir. However, I personally have no qualms whatsoever in the fact that the manager of Pine Point mines sits as a member of the board. In fact, the fact that he is a member of the board may well result in Pine Point mines being treated more strictly, if anything, than other operations. However, on the subject of two public hearings in one year, the Pine Point mines has two water licences. One covers pit dewatering and that was a new licence this year, and the other licence, on the public hearing of November 29th, is for water use in the mill. This is the reason we had two public hearings in Pine Point. One was a new licence and one was a renewal of the licence that happened to expire in 1979.

People Independent Of Government And Industry Should Be Appointed

MR. SIBBESTON: Just one more comment further on the membership of the board. In my view, when you set up a board such as the Water Board, it is something like a court and it is important to get people on there who are not biased and who do not appear to the public as being biased. In my view it is important to have a board that is very independent, to have people on the board who are independent and who are able to make decisions without fear of reprisal. If they make a decision a certain way, either the federal government is going to be mad at them or if they work for a company, if they do not make the right decision, the mine or the company that employs them may give them a hard time or even fire them. It is important, very important to have people on the board I think who are not associated with the government, federal government, territorial government and also any of the major mines in the North.

As I see it, one of the purposes of the board, and this is stated in the Northern Inland Waters Act, is the matter of conservation and utilization of water so that there can be optimum benefit for all Canadians and for residents of the Northwest Territories in particular. I am just wondering what I would consider the common people in the North here, the ordinary people who are not working for government or associated with big mines, whether there is anybody who is representing them and whether in the future, in any future appointments of members to the board we ought to get away from appointing government people and industry people and try to appoint people who are simply independent of these two forces, government and industry.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner.

Long-time Northern Residents On The Board

MR. WARNER: Mr. Chairman, that is a very good point and I think one that the Northwest Territories Water Board realizes. In fact, long-time northern residents probably make up a majority of the board now or at least did until some recent resignations. Mr. Arden is a lifetime resident of the Northwest Territories. Our previous member from Baker Lake, Tom Kudlu, was a lifetime member and Bill Lafferty of course is a dedicated northerner. I have been here 25 years. The aim of the board is to get people who have a real stake in the country and who intend to stay here and make this their home and the home of their children. I would certainly agree, Mr. Chairman, that we would like to see the make-up of the board, at least the majority of the board from this group. However, this group also includes people from industry and from government who are in this category.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to now get into the area of the Water Board in its dealings with the settlement of Fort Resolution. As you know, Mr. Chairman, the people of Fort Resolution have stated publicly and they have made a submission on a number of occasions to the Water Board and my understanding of their submission thus far and their responses after making submissions, is that they do not feel that the Water Board has given them a fair hearing. They are generally suspicious of the composition of the Water Board and you have the president or manager of Cominco mines and you have the regional director of the territorial government, people like that and a lot of federal government people. Where you have people like that on the board and the settlement is raising some real issues that really concern the people and raising a lot of questions about the performance, let us say, of Pine Point in this case, as to whether they are living up to the terms of the licence, people just simply do not feel that the present Water Board would ever stand up and say definitely that "We agree with you people and because there are some serious problems or some serious matters that you raised regarding the environment, we are prepared to not give a licence to Pine Point." People just feel that despite what they say, despite what concerns they raise, the Water Board would never dare to refuse a water licence to Pine Point mines. I would like to hear your reaction on that.

Communities Can Recommend Appointments

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The concerns of the people in Fort Resolution are really not unlike the concerns of the people at Arctic Bay regarding Nanisivik or like the people at Resolute Bay regarding the forthcoming Polaris project. Myself and some other board members have given this a good deal of thought and have come up with the idea that perhaps it would be wise for the Northwest Territories Water Board to invite people from the community directly affected to sit on the technical advisory committee that advises the Water Board in its decision making process. In this way the community would have direct input and also the member nominated would have access on a first hand basis to all information available. I think that this would be a good start and in so far as the appointment of members to the board, this is not a board responsibility. We do not have that authority. If this House wishes to recommend people from Fort Resolution or anywhere else, that is the prerogative of the Legislative Assembly, not the board. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. Warner. Any further comments or questions? Mr. McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct some questions to you, sir, through the chairman. The first question deals with the membership of the board and again under section 7 of the Northern Inland Waters Act it indicates that there be one nominee of each of the departments of the Government of Canada that in the opinion of the Governor in Council are most directly related. As I understand at the present time, we have the assistant director of Renewable Resources of DIAND and we have the environmental protection of the Department of the Environment but there is not anybody from National Health and Welfare at the present time because I understand Dr. Covill has resigned. I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, has there been at any time within the board, any other nominee from the federal government other than those three departments?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner.

Appointments From The Federal Government

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, Mr. Chairman, there have been in the past appointments from other government departments as I recall. The Department of Transport was one of them. The Department of Public Works was one of them and one or two other related ministries.

However, when the Northern Inland Waters Act was amended and gave the Commissioner in Council the right to appoint six of the nine members, at that time the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs chose to have representatives from Environment Canada, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs and National Health and Welfare as his three direct appointees.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, just to get it straight and I must profess ignorance of the act, at least in terms of the amendment of the act, did I understand the chairman to indicate that the Commissioner in Council now nominates six of the nine members?



MR. WARNER: That is correct, Mr. Chairman. Section 7, paragraphs (2)(a) and (b) have been amended and I believe in the back of the booklet provided to the Members the amendment is provided there and it indeed changes the numbers in 7(2)(a) and 7(2)(b) and (a) should read 3 and (b) should read 6.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was interested as well, Mr. Chairman, in some of the comments that the chairman of the Water Board made regarding I guess changes within proposed sections of the act in relation to reporting responsibility, and I understood the chairman of the Water Board to indicate that he could foresee an interim period where the current relationship would carry on until such time as I think the chairman of the board indicated, until such time as the Executive Committee of the Government of the Northwest Territories took on provincial cabinet status. I wonder if I could have the chairman of the board, Mr. Chairman, just elaborate a little bit more on the whole concept as the board sees it of this relation, or this reporting relationship.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner.

#### Reporting To The Legislative Assembly

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In our submission to the Drury commission, as was stated, this was a recommendation of the board, and the rationale behind it is that the Northwest Territories Water Board is now responsible directly to the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs. There is no one in between, or let us say there are no appointed people in between the board and the elected member. When this can be the case in the Northwest Territories, this is the way that the board would like to see the role of the board progress. At the time that the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories has responsibility for water resources, and has the final decision making power, at that time we will, by recommendation, recommend that we report to this body through the Minister chosen by the Legislative Assembly.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. McCallum, have you further questions or comments?

#### Objects And Powers Of The Board

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I do. I will not pursue that much further, other than to indicate, and I hope these sections are not changed but I want to refer to section 9, as the Member from Mackenzie Liard did in relation to the powers, or rather the object of the board for the conservation, development and utilization of the waters that flow in and around the Territories, or the object being that they would provide optimum benefit for Canadians and the residents of the Northwest Territories in particular. Then I go back to section 5 on agreements with provinces and I find in here that it is the Governor in Council who gives the approval for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to enter into agreement with provinces concerning the management, on a co-operative basis on water situated either partially in the Territories or flowing into the Territories. I guess the spectre comes to mind of, of course, the development of the hydro potential on the Slave River. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that this government does not have any say in terms of that. If the board is directly responsible to the Minister, of course, and if the utilization and the development of waters into the Territories, either totally or partially should be for the benefit of citizens in particular of the Northwest Territories, then I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we have a difficulty in trying to put forth what we would consider to be to our particular benefit and have that made known.

Now, I realize that we may very well in particular instances have to make representation to the Water Board. I wonder do we as a body make that representation through the Water Board, so we make known what we see that we would want in optimum benefit in the development and utilization of a body of water that partially flows in or that flows in to the Territories. I wonder if I could get a comment from the chairman of the Water Board in terms of that, specifically since they have made recommendations through the Drury commission as to their reporting relationship. Have they in fact made any kind of recommendation to changes in other specific sections of the act?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner.

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The statement I have just heard is absolutely correct in that section 5 gives the Governor in Council the authority, or it is delegated to the Minister, authority to make decisions regarding inter-territorial-provincial use of water. Section 15 permits the Water Board to hold public hearings in so far as its objects are concerned, but there is nothing in the act that says that the results of these public hearings will be of any consequence. In this sense the Water Board can hold the public hearings and could make submissions to the Minister or to whoever. To answer the rest of the questions the answer is no, we have not recommended changes in this area although it is a very good point.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. McCallum, have you any further comments?

Benefits From Development

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I guess at the point of seeing the frustration of this kind of thing I have a concern, that in point of fact a provincial jurisdiction will move toward a development of a body of water that concerns people in the Territories and we have very little to say on it. We, in point of fact, will not be able to derive benefits and we will be affected by a development. Now, in this instance I refer directly to the Slave River but that is not the only area where this goes on. I guess I am kind of -- no, I am rather quite perturbed that there have been suggestions made by the board to make certain changes in the act. I would have hoped that they would have made even further recommendations or, in point of fact, had recommended that the entire Northern Inland Waters Act be totally reviewed and that there would be some input into that review by this particular body.

I just have one further question if I may, Mr. Chairman. Does the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development still designate the chairman and vice-chairman of the board?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner.

MR. WARNER: The answer is affirmative, Mr. Chairman. As provided in the act, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development names the chairman and vice-chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you. Mr. Fraser.

NTCL In Great Bear Lake

MR. FRASER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of questions for the chairman of the Water Board. I received a letter, or some information from the Water Board that NTCL, Northern Transportation Company Limited, have plans of sinking one of their lake boats in Great Bear Lake. I wrote a letter to the different communities concerning this and I have not yet got replies, but I just wonder if the Water Board has any power to stop this. I realize that NTCL is a crown corporation and too many times Ottawa has made decisions, or their representatives have made decisions, contrary to the people in the North, and my first question would be have we any power to stop NTCL from sinking this ship in Great Bear Lake?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner.

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with the hon. Member and the board does have power to forbid the sinking of the vessel in Great Bear Lake, as that comes within our jurisdiction. However if they want to sell it or pull it up on the beach or do almost anything with it, it is of no concern to the Water Board. However, Mr. Chairman, the House may be assured that no action will be taken until we have the comments of the Member concerned.



THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Fraser.

MR. FRASER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Another thing that concerns me and it concerns a lot of people in the communities along the Mackenzie River, I am not sure, I think this is a territorial responsibility, but raw sewage is being dumped into the river. I know of two of the settlements now where raw sewage is being dumped into the river. According to their surveys and figures that they have come up with, it does not hurt, the Mackenzie River is so wide, but I am just wondering what will happen 20 years from now if everybody took that attitude of dumping everything into the river. Any river or stream North of the 60th parallel right now is safe, you can drink the water, make tea or do anything with it, but if the practice of dumping raw sewage from all the communities along the Mackenzie continues, I just wondered what would happen and I wonder if the Water Board has any authority over this practice, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner.

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The answer is yes, in those areas where the Water Board has jurisdiction, and that is incorporated hamlets, towns or cities. Then a licence can be written with the effluent qualities written into it. In the past it has been a cause of some frustration and indeed disagreement between the Department of Local Government and this board, as there have been no standards that were applicable to all situations. The study that has been commissioned by the board will be completed in June or July and at that time the study will recommend to the board the quality of the water waste and I would hope that it would get around the problem raised by the Member. As a resident, I would hope so as well.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Fraser, did you have a further question?

Damming Of The Slave River

MR. FRASER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a further question and I think it should concern most of the people in the valley. There was a motion made earlier in the session on the Alberta damming of the Slave River and I was just wondering if the Water Board was concerned about this dam going through on the Slave River which feeds most of the Delta and most of the Mackenzie. If the dam was permitted without any input from the territorial Assembly or the people living in the Mackenzie Valley, then I think we should be concerned. If they are going to dam the rivers up at Fort Smith, I do not think we would need a Water Board. There probably would not be any water left down there. I think we should be concerned now as to what would happen if that dam went through on the Slave River, what would happen down the Mackenzie? Would it stop all the navigation on the river? It would definitely be of some concern to people and I wonder if the Water Board has done anything as to looking into this problem.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner.

MR. WARNER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Water Board is certainly concerned and has raised it at meetings several times. Number one, is whether or not the dam will be built and number two, is where it will be built. If in fact the dam is to be built in the Northwest Territories, then the Northwest Territories Water Board will have everything to do with it. If it is built in the province of Alberta, then the section that I mentioned previously will apply. However, I am aware that there is a great deal of interest other than the Water Board in this project. Government representatives, for instance, are on the Mackenzie Basin committee. The federal environmental assessment and review panel has been requested by Parks Canada to have public meetings. I think, Mr. Chairman, there will be a great deal of discussion before a dam is ever put across the Slave River.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. MacQuarrie.

Community Input

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There are two matters that I would like to deal with. The first, Mr. Warner, I was intrigued by the idea that you might find it possible to have community input by having community representatives sit with the technical committee when matters concerning that community were being dealt with. How would you effect this? The Members who are discussing it, how would it be put into effect? Would you run into the problem that the other interested party, that would be the industrial developer, also feels the right then to sit with the technical committee?

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That is a possibility, that the technical committee could get so large and unwieldy if everyone interested had a seat on it, that it would become less useful. The proposal that has been discussed is that any interested party, whether it is a settlement council, band council, hunters' and trappers' association or a fish and game association could make an application to the Water Board and the case would be dealt with on its merits. I think there is no doubt that any application from a settlement or hamlet or a hunters' and trappers' association or a band council, if any of them wished to sit on that as a member of the advisory committee, I can guarantee that on behalf of other members, they would be welcome.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. MacQuarrie.

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: Mr. Chairman, just following up on that. It seems to be an idea that is just germinating but what kind of steps will take place to see that that is effected, that sort of procedure is effected?

MR. WARNER: Mr. Chairman, I will bring that matter before the Northwest Territories Water Board in our deliberations this evening. I suppose the simplest way would be, when a licence is under consideration for a specific area, that the communities affected be identified and invitations sent to the settlement council or the band council, whoever the body responsible is, to have them recommend the appointment of someone to the technical committee.

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: So, it would not require anything on the part of the federal government or any other government but simply a decision of the Water Board to have that done, is that right?

MR. WARNER: Yes, the Water Board certainly has full authority to appoint people to its technical advisory committee.

Municipal Water Licences

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: The other matter I wanted to deal with, I know that in addition to licensing industrial developers, the board also deals with municipal water licences. I am sure you have encountered a situation that may be somewhat embarrassing and somewhat difficult for you to deal with and that is where you are in a position of demanding certain standards from industrial developers when you issue licences and also the same with respect to municipalities. Yet, I know the city of Yellowknife, because of the Water Board's requirements, was to establish a sewage lagoon that met certain standards and so on, and then simply found that they did not have the money to undertake what was being demanded of them. Is it possible for them not to go ahead with it? How do you deal with that sort of thing? Is there a kind of double standard you are faced with, and if there is, what problems do you see, what ought to be done about it?

MR. WARNER: Mr. Chairman, yes, the question hits the nail right on the head and in fact the phrase double standard has been used in our Water Board deliberations. The case in point recently is the city of Yellowknife application in November, to defer the construction of a dam on the proposed new sewage lagoon system until money is available from the Government of the Northwest Territories. Because of federal government cutbacks, the Department of Local Government simply does not have the money that it had expected and therefore the city passes on to us that they cannot build this dam because they do not have the money. Fortunately, in this case, the environmental considerations were examined and the delay in the dam for six months into the next fiscal year will not cause any alarming environmental concerns. However, the point of double standard is certainly well taken in so far as for instance, if this was a mining company coming to us and saying "We will build you a dam but we have not got any money until next year or maybe the year after that." In the past, the board has taken a hard line with the mining companies and other industrial users and more or less we have had to shrug our shoulders in government funded matters. To answer the question, we have not resolved this. If there is any input from this body, I would welcome it.

#### Financing Municipal Requirements Of The Water Board

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So as not to undermine the credibility of the Water Board and its decisions, it seems that it would be incumbent on us to do everything possible to ensure that our municipalities are able to meet the legitimate requirements imposed on them by the Water Board. We also are in a difficult spot of not being able to get funds from the federal government and that is outside our power to do whatever we want. Is it possible that the Water Board when it is making demands on municipalities could recommend that the federal government provide capital funds for these undertakings, so that we are assured that they do take place in the time that is required by the Water Board ruling?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner.

MR. WARNER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The regulations provide that with the application for a water licence, details should be included as to the financing of the operation and in the Yellowknife case that I mentioned, the board could have taken a hard line and said that this requirement must be met. However, the environmental concerns were such that it was not necessary, in our opinion, to take this hard line in this particular case and we decided that the six month delay would not be of paramount importance. However, that could well be different in another set of circumstances.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Sayine.

MR. SAYINE: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions to ask Mr. Warner. The question is, at one of our meetings in Fort Resolution with I think, Mr. Bryant, who was present at the time, we were discussing the Water Board and its role and the thing that came up was that the Water Board was very much restricted in its work because of lack of staff and lack of money. Is this a fact, and if so, what has the board done to this date to sort of overcome this?



Lack Of Staff And Money

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the opportunity to mention that. It is indeed a fact that lack of staff has seriously hindered the operations of the board and in fact licences have, and still are, being allowed to expire without renewal because the background work has not been completed. However, things are on their way to being rectified. At least the previous minister agreed to staffing increases, to the board over the next two years which if they are carried out, in our present situation, should resolve a great many of our concerns and the concerns that were raised at Fort Resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Sayine.

MR. SAYINE: Yes. I had another question. Fort Resolution has been trying or has been, in the past five years anyway, very active in Water Board hearings, especially in the area of Pine Point and one of the things that Fort Resolution has always been asking the Water Board for, is that an independent study be done rather than the mine having its own study done. An independent study should be done around the area. Has the board given any thought to this, or what has it done toward this suggestion of the Fort Resolution people?

Independent Study For Fort Resolution

MR. WARNER: Yes, indeed the matter has been discussed, Mr. Chairman, and the board shares the concern of the people on the south side of Great Slave Lake, in particular Fort Resolution, that a great many things are happening down there or seem about to happen and the study referred to is agreed with. There is no question about that. It would aim, at the request of the Fort Resolution delegation, that continuing soil and vegetation samples be taken, continual water samples be taken in Great Slave Lake and in the areas between the tailings pond and the lake, and also a continual monitoring of the groundwater that is affected by pumping the groundwater in order to mine the pits. This is so in the present situation where the Pine Point mines are doing this. We may well have requests for increased pumping if Western mines or Shell decide that they wish to proceed with their operations. I believe I can assure your House, Mr. Chairman, that from this committee a study group will be established and Fort Resolution will certainly have an opportunity to participate.

Studies On The Impact Of Mining Operations

MR. SAYINE: I have one more. Also during our meetings many times the environmental service people said to us that the studies that are made to this date around Pine Point were what they called very patchy and the impact of mining operations on the environment remains the big unknown. That is what we got back from the environmental people. Do you think this is a fact?

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Studies do not necessarily agree with one another and consultants do not necessarily agree with one another and there are differences of opinion in the consultants who have submitted reports from the Pine Point area. It is up to the board as a decision making body to make the decision to the best of their ability. I am certainly not a proponent of studies going on forever but in this case there does seem to be merit to commission this independent study, one that is not government and not total industry, as requested by the delegation from Fort Resolution and probably on an on-going basis it will be necessary to monitor that area on the south side of the lake.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Curley.



MR. CURLEY: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I have two general questions and I will make it three. The first one is, and I do not know very much about the Water Board, but would your jurisdiction cover the whole of the Northwest Territories? That seems simple enough. I would also like to ask at what stage of any proposed development or water useage does the Water Board normally get involved? The reason I ask that question is the experience where we have the Arvik mine on Cornwallis Island and what kind of role does the board play with respect to the mining site and the tailings needs of the mining site in that area? Were you asked to play a role in assessing the possible problems as they relate to the tailings at that mining site?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner.

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On the first point the answer is yes, the Northwest Territories Water Board is responsible for the entire Northwest Territories in so far as inland waters are concerned. That can generally be described as the fresh waters of the Northwest Territories, although it can become a little ambiguous with rivers flowing into the sea, but generally all the fresh waters of the Northwest Territories.

#### Polaris Mine Project

On the Polaris mine project on Little Cornwallis Island the board as far as I know, has been kept fully aware of what the company is doing, and they have sent us copies of all their studies and correspondence that I am aware of, and the mine is presently under an authorization to use water for the exploration program. However, prior to the mine going into production a licence will be required to use water for the mill and for the domestic uses of the people at the mine, and also this licence will be required to dispose of the mill tailings and the liquid waste from the community that will be established. There will be a public hearing under the Northern Inland Waters Act at Resolute on May 22nd of this year to hear the comments of anyone interested in this application.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Just before we continue I would like to recognize Mayor Watsyk, the mayor of Fort Simpson. Would you please stand?

--Applause

Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: I am sure the people of Fort Resolution will be quite happy as Mr. Warner said that the Water Board will try and do some studies in order to check the exact effect on the environment, by Pine Point mines in particular. I have some correspondence here, Mr. Chairman, which might help in identifying the precise area that the people of Fort Resolution are concerned about, and this is a letter I received from the land protection committee of the Fort Resolution settlement council and it says that the two major concerns, or areas they are concerned about is as follows: One, the effect of pit dewatering on soil and vegetation and at the same time the effect of pit dewatering, 100 million gallons per day on the groundwater system of the area. Secondly, the possible contamination of the soil and water, Great Slave Lake and groundwater by the waste water coming out of the mill.

#### Effect On Fish And Wildlife

So, as you can appreciate the people appear to be concerned because all of this will eventually effect the wildlife and the fish in the Fort Resolution area. As I said earlier there is great suspiciousness of feeling that Pine Point mines is polluting the whole area. I think it was even said that in the last few years in Fort Resolution there were quite a number of cancer cases, and people because they do not know perhaps, and industry or perhaps the Water Board is not able to tell them, they are suspicious this is partly due to the contamination from Pine

Point mines. So, it would be very important if these studies in these two areas were done. Can I just get a response from Mr. Warner whether he sees any difficulty with centring on or dealing with these two areas I mentioned?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner.

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There is no problem at all in that respect. As I believe I mentioned earlier, these are the areas that will be focused on, the vegetation, the soils and the pit dewatering.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, one other matter I wish to raise is does Mr. Warner recall two submissions that were made at the Pine Point hearing on November 29, one by the Pine Point Mines Limited, and I have given Members a copy of it, particularly the summary of the submission, and the other submission by Environmental Protection Service which also has conclusions and recommendations? From reading the summary it appears obvious that the summary and conclusions are quite different. That of Pine Point's is quite different from that of Environmental Protection Service. Which of these recommendations does the board intend to follow?

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I presume the recommendations made at the November 29th public hearing and in cases of this nature, the first step is to refer the matter to our technical advisory committee and have them study all aspects of the submission. They then present to the Water Board their conclusions and recommendations. If their conclusions are not of the majority the Water Board makes a decision without the advice of the technical committee. If their conclusions are generally agreed upon this is generally the direction the Water Board will follow.

MR. SIBBESTON: Another question, Mr. Chairman. I direct the Members' attention to the conclusion and recommendations of the Environmental Protection Service, the second short sheet, and in particular the conclusion number one which says: For each year of operation under the existing water licence Cominco Pine Point has produced an effluent quality that did not meet the stipulations of the licence.

This appears to me, Mr. Chairman, as though Pine Point mines were not meeting the conditions or stipulations of the licence. Does a situation like this not warrant the Water Board to lay charges against Pine Point mines for not living up to the licence and conditions?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner.

#### Division Of Responsibilities And Powers Of The Board

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to mention the division at this time of the responsibilities and powers of the board. The Northwest Territories Water Board is responsible for gathering the input, having a public hearing and writing the licence. This licence, after it is signed by the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs is a legal document. Any infractions of that licence are the responsibility of the water resources division of the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs to investigate and to enforce the provisions of the water licence.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, is Mr. Warner saying that it is not the role or responsibility of the board to deal with breaches of conditions that it sets for licences?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner.

MR. WARNER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is true. The board writes the licence and the enforcement of the licence after it is signed by the Minister is the responsibility of the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, in particular the division of water resources.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, does the fact that a mine such as Pine Point, in the opinion of one of the government agencies, seem to have breached its licences, does that have any adverse effect on whether the board will grant another water licence to the Pine Point mines, or are these things really insignificant?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner.

MR. WARNER: I do not think they could be considered insignificant, Mr. Chairman, and certainly this is a matter that is taken into consideration by the Water Board on any licence, the past performance of the company is certainly taken into consideration.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, is Mr. Warner saying that in the event there is a continual breach of conditions that there may come a point when the Water Board may refuse a licence to Pine Point mines and in fact force the mine to shut down? Is it within the realm of possibility for that to happen, or is that just such an impossibility?

MR. WARNER: Mr. Chairman, it is certainly within the realm of legal possibility.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Sibbeston, do you have still more questions? Then I will say we will have some good clean water diluted with tea bags for 15 minutes.

--SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): The committee will come to order. Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, one other area that was raised by the people of Fort Resolution is that of having membership on the board. I do not know whether I am repeating this point too much, but the people there feel that their submissions are not being heard, that nothing is being done. I think Fort Resolution has been involved with the Water Board as regards Pine Point as far back as 1972. The settlement council through its land protection committee has made submissions on a number of occasions, asking for independent studies but nothing was ever done, so they really feel that the board with its present composition of members are not able to be affected and certainly the board is not hearing them. They have also raised the idea of having one or two persons from the community to be placed on the board when the board is sitting in the Fort Resolution area. I realize that this, of course, is in part our responsibility to make that possible if we think it is okay, but does that seem like a reasonable request to you, Mr. Warner?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner.

MR. WARNER: Mr. Chairman, yes, it certainly does seem like a reasonable suggestion and the same would apply to any other locality that was directly affected, to have a member on the board. However, the legal aspects would have to be examined in light of the Northern Inland Waters Act. If it can be arranged that the legislation can be made to provide for it, certainly the Water Board would be most receptive to the idea.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Sibbeston.

Technical Committee

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, the other area I would like to deal with is that of your technical committee. Is it true that the Water Board, when it sits, never makes a decision right then and there? If so, is it because the matters under consideration are really so complex that you are not able to make decisions on your own, that you in fact need the technical committee to advise you?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner.

MR. WARNER: Mr. Chairman, perhaps what is being referred to is, the Water Board does not make a decision at the public hearing. All the information presented there is assessed by the technical committee and the members prior to a decision being made. On the other part of the question, the majority of the members of the Water Board are not technical people. They are not scientific people and personally, speaking for myself, I would be reluctant to make a decision without input from the professional community in so far as the chemicals and the effluents and the levels that have to be set in the licences.

MR. SIBBESTON: What I am concerned about is, I get the feeling that really the decisions of the Water Board are really decisions of the technical committee and not the Water Board's decision. If this is true, then we have a situation where it is the technical committee that is making the decisions and we do not know who they are, how they function. I would like to hear your opinion on that.

MR. WARNER: Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that the Water Board does make the decisions and on the other point, the make-up of the technical committee is public knowledge. If anyone wants to have more information about it, it is available immediately through the office of the Water Board.



MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, has there ever been an occasion when the Water Board has made a different decision than the technical committee?

MR. WARNER: Yes. The board has made a decision that was not supported by the technical committee.

MR. SIBBESTON: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): I might remind the Members that they should address the Chair because we are having problems with the lights and the controller cannot see who wants to speak. Mr. Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON: No.

---Applause

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Curley.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: The last time there was a miracle there was a star in the East...

MR. CURLEY: I defer to Mr. MacQuarrie.

Stipulations In Licences Should Be Fair And Realistic

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take special note of something that Mr. Sibbeston pointed out and that was the fact that conditions are stipulated under licences and sometimes not met and then apparently nothing is done. Now I would like to say in favour of industrial development companies that stipulation in licences ought to be fair and realistic and not so stringent that they could not possibly be met. I would like to see that type of regulation, but once that type of regulation is made, I would like to see that it is abided by. It is called to our attention in this paper that Cominco Pine Point has not met stipulations and I know that at an earlier time in this Assembly I noted that Dome did not meet stipulations. There were spills that were not reported. They were supposed to have called Yellowknife as soon as there was a spill. They unilaterally decided not to do it. They were dumping drilling muck, which was a contravention of the environmental operating conditions. Those environmental operating conditions were reaffirmed as being good ones and yet to my knowledge nothing is done. If it is the responsibility of the Department of Northern Affairs to do something, I would like to see that something be done in these cases. Whether or not it should be in the nature of charges being laid, I do not say that, but certainly the next time round when licences are to be granted, or in the case of Dome when they are asking for further extensions in the fall to drill, then I think that these infractions should be pointed out to them and used as reasons for not doing what they want until they will abide by those regulations that are stipulated as being fair regulations in the first place. I guess that was not really a question but a statement and in a sense I sympathize with the Water Board setting regulations and then not being able to see later that they are enforced.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Did you wish to make any comment on that, Mr. Warner?

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I have no comment to make.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Ms. Cournoyea.

MS. COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I think from our conversation and from other questions that arose on the role and validity of the Water Board and how it does work, it is something this Assembly is seriously looking into. Certainly when you look into any kind of department that is formed under the guise of any government, it sometimes takes a little time and certainly we are doing this in terms of the Water Board. On behalf of this Assembly I would like to thank the Water Board for appearing at this time and suggest to them that they will be receiving from us possibly a brief on what we feel they should be doing.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Ms. Cournoyea. Mr. Noah.

Exploration Around Baker Lake

MR. NOAH: (Translation) Mr. Chairman, I have been looking at the recommendations but I think I have a question directed to Mr. Warner. Firstly, particularly in my area, the Kazan River flows right into Baker Lake and very close to that they are starting to drill for uranium and they have discovered some. There is not any change in the water but around the marshes I feel this is quite dangerous when they start exploring the rivers and the lakes. I feel this is going to be quite dangerous, if this were to go on. There is also exploration for gold and they have found various other minerals. The river runs right into Baker Lake. I think this is going to be very dangerous for us in the future because of the waste flowing into the lake through the rivers. If there is to be any accident, what kind of actions would you be able to take? My question is directed through the chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Warner.

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That was a very good question. A bit of background. The people doing the exploration in the Baker Lake area and anywhere else in the Northwest Territories are required to have a permit, an authorization to use water for their camps and their diamond drills. Any waste that results from this has to be contained in an area that will not affect any stream or river or lake. Certainly, if and when any of these properties wishes to become an operating mine, they will require a licence to use water and to dispose of their waste. Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure you that it will be examined very carefully. There is every precaution taken that none of the contaminants, the bad stuff if you like, will be permitted to reach the Kazan River or Baker Lake or other important streams and waterways in that area.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Noah.

MR. NOAH: (Translation) Thank you. I do not have any further questions, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Any further discussion or questions? If not, can I report the matter concluded?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Sibbeston.

Motion To Revoke Membership Of Certain Members Of Water Board

MR. SIBBESTON: I would like to make a motion. The motion is that firstly this Legislative Assembly recommend to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development that he revoke the appointments of Messrs. D.P. Mersereau, W.H.R. Gibney and A.W. Lafferty and secondly, that we consider and make recommendations to the Minister of DIAND, as to new members of the Water Board during this session.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Sibbeston, the caucus has been dealing with the membership of the various boards we have and so I would have to rule the motion out of order.

MR. SIBBESTON: On a point of privilege. I respectfully submit that any matters dealt with in caucus have no bearing on what happens or should not influence the way that things are dealt with in this Assembly and in this committee. I appreciate the matter is on the agenda of the caucus but my understanding is that present members of the board are appointed for approximately another year and this motion seeks to revoke those appointments and deal with the matter immediately.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Could you send a copy of the motion to the chair, please, Mr. Sibbeston? Just one moment while we consult. Mr. Sibbeston, the Legal Advisor will advise you to the direction of the motion. The motion as it stands is not in order, but the Legal Advisor will explain it to you and perhaps you could change it if you would rescind what you have said.

MR. SIBBESTON: Sure.

LEGAL ADVISOR (Mr. Lal): Mr. Chairman, the motion or the proposed motion calls upon this House to immediately revoke the appointment of certain members. The appointment in the first instance was made by the Commissioner in Council which would require a motion to have been passed by this House making a recommendation to the Commissioner and the Commissioner would have named the persons recommended by that motion. It would therefore be necessary to revoke the earlier motions which appointed the members in question, or rather recommended their appointment to the Commissioner. If the hon. Member is willing to amend his motion accordingly, the motion would then be in order.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Sibbeston.

Motion Withdrawn

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I have been persuaded to simply withdraw the motion and have the matter dealt with in caucus.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. Is there any further discussion? If there is no further discussion I would like to thank Mr. Glenn Warner. Mr. Stewart.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is with regret that I have witnessed in this House today certain actions which I think are not befitting. Those people who are working on various committees, whether it be the Water Board or any other committee are doing so often, are putting in a great deal of time and oftentimes very valuable time and to be singled out in the manner as was done in this Legislature today is a thing that, I think, that I personally wish to offer my apology to the people concerned for and to the board itself. I think the Water Board has done a good job and I do not think that they should be put to this type of a task. There are other methods of making changes

if it is the desire of this House and I feel and would personally offer my congratulations for the good work the board has done to date. It is a new board and they are trying to clean up certain areas which have been in disrepair for 35 years and you cannot expect them to do it overnight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEWART: To them I say, thank you for your efforts and I apologize for some of the actions of some Members.

---Applause

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you. I believe that concludes our discussion. Mr. McLaughlin, I am sorry, the lights over there bother me.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chairman, the lights have been bothering you and the discussion has been bothering me. I thought this morning we dealt with the boards and we discussed why boards are made up and the reason they are made up the way they are, is so that you get input from all the areas of interest. I think it is very unfortunate that the individuals were singled out by this motion because those people are on that board because they represent certain interests. For example, you have a person from mine management on the board. If the board made the decision or dealt with general policies of the board without having a person from mine management on it, they would be making decisions in a vacuum. So, then they announce their decision and realize the decision is impractical, unenforceable, the mining companies could not operate within that decision and then the board has to scramble back and review the thing and come out with a proper decision. That is probably the reason why there is a mine management person on the board.

#### Possibility Of Expanding Membership Of Boards

I think what the Members should do is look at this board and ask who is not on this board? The question I asked of one of the other Members is why is there not a housewife on this board who wonders whether her child is getting drinkable water when the kitchen tap is turned on? That is obviously who is missing off this board. On our Workers' Compensation Board we have some ordinary people, workers who are not management or who are not union. What I would suggest on this board is, we should look at expanding the board if we have to, or replacing these vacant positions with interests that are not on this board and those interests could be, like I suggested, a housewife, a mother, or it could be a person from the Dene Nation, a person from the trappers association or something like that. I think we are ill-advised to pick out personalities in this House before we have even considered what the board is doing and what their role is. That is why the board came here this afternoon so that we could ask questions, that is, of course knowing that we have to make these appointments. Now we know a lot more about what the role of the board is, we will have an awful lot more information in making appointments.

I personally know two of the members of the board who were singled out in the motion and I am very upset at the possibility of the integrity of their character being attacked by this motion. I would like the Members to think about the role of the Water Board and when we do, as a group, make our appointments we can take into consideration what areas are not represented right now and not worry about individual personalities until we decide what areas we want represented on the board. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Curley.



Responsibility Of The Assembly

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am a little disturbed to hear that some hon. Members seem to imply we are singling out some government staff. Look, this is the government of the Territories and it is supposed to be the one that sets policies for the administration. They are not singling out the members, the Commissioner has given approval for them to sit because he is the head of the government, the administration. The Commissioner of the Northwest Territories has access to Mr. Warner at any time he feels like it and does not have to send his regional director to sit on any board. What the hon. Members seem to suggest is there appears to be in the eyes of the public the possibility of there being a conflict here, and there could, because he is in charge of the region. He is vested with the responsibility to look after the region, not just the government interests and this is a government agency. Therefore, as a result of that I would caution the chairman of the caucus that he should have tried to consult with the Members of the caucus before he got on to debating the whole question of the Members of the Water Board during the caucus meeting. I think he is just as much to be blamed because he did not bother to give any prior consultation before he got on to reviewing the Water Board membership.

I am a little disturbed and I would be embarrassed if I was the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories to have so many members of the government who are supposed to have the full responsibility in administering government programs and yet at the same time sit on the Water Board which is supposed to be non-prejudiced, non-biased to any development that is taking place. I think as a result of that, the concern is voiced by some Members, and I will not apologize, I think they are just trying to set out the direction. If there seems to be any indication that we are disturbing the credibility of the government members I would have to say I do not think so because their jobs, we are not concerned with their role, we are satisfied with their role as regional director and I think that should be the case, but if they are going to go on to the membership of other boards of the government it is the responsibility of this Assembly to see that the others get a fair chance. That is all I want to say, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Sayine.

MR. SAYINE: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to say that I apologize because one of my main reasons for making this motion that the Water Board appear before the Assembly was that I was instructed by my constituency that I look into all of these things and this is what I have done. I must say I was very happy about the whole outcome of this afternoons session. Going on, I must say I was really happy and I will not apologize because this is what my constituency sent me out here to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Ms. Cournoyea.

Motion To Thank Water Board

MS. COURNOYEA: I would like to make a motion to thank the Water Board for appearing and that we say thank you and get on with other business right at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SIBBESTON: On a point of privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: I just want to say that I feel absolutely no remorse in making the motion and I can tell this to Mr. Stewart and Mr. -- the person from Pine Point.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): That is not a point of privilege.

MR. SIBBESTON: The Members opposite did raise the matter about the fact that the motion I made perhaps was not of a good nature or that it was embarrassing to certain persons. I just wanted to reply to that accusation made and I think I should be entitled to do so.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): We have a motion on the floor thanking the Water Board and to carry on with the business. Go ahead, Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say I remain steadfast in my view that the Water Board in its handling of matters of concern to the people of Fort Resolution, that the Water Board has not done a very good job and that people in Fort Resolution have attempted to make and have made submissions to the Water Board a number of times during the last few years and...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Sibbeston, you had a chance to debate your position and I do not believe that is a point of privilege at this time. To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): The question is being called. All those in favour of the motion please indicate by raising your arm. Would you put them up again, please? Mr. Sibbeston is requesting a recorded vote.

CLERK ASSISTANT OF THE HOUSE (Mr. de Vos): It is too late.

Motion Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Would you put up your arms, please? Opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Thank you, Mr. Warner, for spending your time this afternoon reporting to the committee. Thank you.

---Applause

Is it the wish of the committee to go into estimates again? Mr. MacQuarrie.

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: Just before you do that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the House that I am seriously thinking as a matter of principle, of voting against all motions that have rather greater implications, that are not urgent, that could as easily be given notice of motion and people have the opportunity to think about the implications rather than just raising them suddenly in committee of the whole. I am not saying whether I would have supported or gone against Mr. Sibbeston's motion, but I believe that kind of motion has serious implications. I would like to see that kind of motion given notice of motion so we have a chance to think about it. If motions are brought that I feel are of that type of significance, just as a matter of principle, I am seriously considering automatically voting against them, because I do not want to feel rushed into doing something that could have great importance.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. MacQuarrie, your points are well taken. Are we going into the estimates? We are on page 15.03.

---Agreed

Department Of Education, O And M, Schools

This is under the activity for schools in the amount of \$32,011,000.

Motion To Recommend Two Hours Per Week In Native Language Training, Restated

When we broke yesterday, it was moved by Mr. Noah: I move that it be recommended to the administration that in the schools where students are being taught native languages the time given to native language training be increased to one hour twice per week. Mr. Stewart had the floor.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was just trying to make the point when we quit last night that we have tried to put the authority of the operation of the schools into the settlements, to promote the devolution of the authority with regard to education to the local plane and although I have no disagreement with Mr. Noah's motion, I think that it should have a definite preface, or a beginning to say "If this is what the people in the various areas want, the local school boards and the societies, that that is fine," but the way these motions are actually being made is really putting the authority back into Yellowknife, taking it out of the local areas where we have just tried with our new Education Ordinance to put it. Now we are taking it back and bringing it back to Yellowknife and giving it back...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): One moment, Mr. Stewart. I think we are having some translation problems. Go ahead.

MR. STEWART: Basically that is the only point I am making, so on that basis I would have to oppose the motion although I find nothing wrong with it but I do not like to see that as a definite instruction to the Department of Education. I think the local authorities are the ones to make that choice, not us.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. Stewart. Is it the wish of the committee to ask Mr. Butters to sit at the witness table?

---Agreed

Mr. Butters, please.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I was asking for the opportunity to be recognized, Mr. Chairman. I would have...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Would you perhaps return to the witness table first, please?

Allocation Of Professional Moneys

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I will in a moment. I did not wish to make any change while the motion was being debated because I asked to be recognized yesterday to speak to that point and I wanted to have an opportunity to speak to that point and not be in the process of moving all my stuff to the table. I would like to speak to the point I wished to speak to yesterday. The hon. Member suggested yesterday evening that there had been a number of motions that had been presented yesterday which would have seemed to be taking away from the authority of the local education authorities, two, to which, I think, he made reference. One was the matter in which professional moneys, decisions with regard to the allocation of professional moneys was one motion which he referred to. I just wish to point out that that is not in the area of the local education authorities. It is in the area of the NWTTA for the \$65,000 and in the area of the joint committee for the remaining \$180,000, but I agree in this motion the Member is correct in what he says. The responsibility which we are

discussing and debating here is a responsibility that has been devolved to a certain extent to the community and the local education authority. But in my short experience I have found that the local education authority can have quite a different degree of understanding of its responsibilities. As yet the communities have not begun to realize just what the Education Ordinance has given them both in an obligatory and in a discretionary sense, so that really we have two points of view here.

The hon. Member from Hay River is correctly reflecting the fact that for his community this is very much the responsibility of the local education authority and is seen by members to fall within that responsibility, but in a community such as the mover of the motion was referring to in his motion, I am quite convinced that many local education authorities have no understanding or at best very little understanding of their prerogatives under our ordinance. So there is required a great deal of education I think and consultation and discussion with the local education authorities in the smaller communities to assist them to take an increasing role and a responsibility in education. So, I had hoped the hon. Member from Hay River could support the motion and recognize that the local education authority in his community is more experienced and more aware of their responsibilities. I would just ask for his support.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Hon. Mr. Butters. Mr. Patterson.

Authority Of Local Education Authorities

MR. PATTERSON: I, too, agree with the sentiments of Mr. Butters and I think hon. Mr. Stewart may be overstating his concern. I would certainly hate to ever be accused of being one who seeks to remove authority from a local education authority. I think if we look at Mr. Noah's motion it says: In schools in which students are being taught native languages the time given be increased... etc. The only way schools are going to be schools where they are taught native languages is if the education authority so determines according to the ordinance. If the Hay River authority did not determine that, then the rule does not apply, so I think that this motion does not seek to take away any authority from the local education authorities. They have the choice as to whether or not native languages should be taught in their schools. I do agree very much with the sentiments expressed by the hon. Minister that these local education authorities may unfortunately not be aware of the option for native language instruction and more important, they may not be aware of the advantages of native language instruction even in the learning of English, but that is a problem of community development and may be a subject of our discussions when we consider the Department of Local Government

There is one thing, however, Mr. Chairman, that does bother me about the motion in that it seems to be too specific. It would seem to confine the time to two hours a week. Perhaps the mover of the motion can help me out with this, but I would hope that there would be some schools in the Northwest Territories and perhaps even schools in Baker Lake where we could have 100 per cent native language instruction. I would simply suggest that it would be better if the motion read: Time given to native language training be substantially increased.



Amendment To Motion Recommending Two Hours Per Week In Native Language Training

I would so move an amendment to the motion. I would delete "to one hour twice per week" and move an amendment that says "The time given to native language training be substantially increased." I think if that amendment goes through it will once again underscore that a priority of this House is overcoming the imbalance between English language instruction which is predominant in schools in the Northwest Territories, even where the majority of students have a first language which is not English and those native languages which I believe this House seeks to encourage instruction in. So that is my amendment, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): The hon. Member for Frobisher Bay amends the motion as follows: I move that it be recommended to the administration that in the schools where students are being taught native languages the time given to native language training be substantially increased. To the amendment. Mr. Patterson, did you want to speak on it? Did you give sufficient explanation?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): To the amendment, any further discussion? Read that again? I move that it be recommended to the administration that in schools where students are being taught native languages the time given to native language training be substantially increased. Can I call the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Amendment Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Question being called. All those in favour of the amendment, please indicate by raising your arm. Opposed? The amendment is carried.

---Carried

To the motion as amended, Mr. MacQuarrie.

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I said I would think more about voting against certain motions on principle. I want time to do that so this is not going to be included in that category. I would maybe ask a question first of all and then have a comment. Is the motion dealing with the teaching of subjects such as mathematics, science, social studies in the native language which is provided for in our ordinance in grades kindergarten, one and two, or is it referring to teaching the native language as a language, not only at those grade levels where there is no full time mode of instruction but also at higher levels, grades five, six, seven, eight and nine? It is important for me to know that first of all.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Yes, Mr. MacQuarrie. As I understand the motion, it is being recommended that at schools where students are being taught in the native languages the time given to native language training be substantially increased. I take that to mean the training of native languages.

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: It is not the instruction of native languages but instructing in the native languages. If it were the other case I would say there is no need for a motion because there could be full time instruction in native languages as Mr. Patterson pointed out. If it is the way you have interpreted it and I will now interpret it, that it is simply teaching native languages as a language, I would far prefer to see a motion that did not order all communities to do such and such a thing but as Mr. Stewart said leave it up to them. However, I would support a motion that called on this Assembly to send a circular around and remind them that they have the right to do it, that I can support, but I cannot support a motion that tells them all they must do it more if there are some that want to do less or some who want to continue on doing what they are doing now.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Any further discussion? Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I support the motion and I just wanted to comment about Mr. MacQuarrie's view or position that we ought not to deal with important things. It seems some time ago it was him who raised the matter of not trying to change anything.

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: A point of privilege. I have never said we should not deal with important things.

MR. SIBBESTON: In committee of the whole.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): To the motion as amended. Mr. Patterson.

Further Amendment To The Motion

MR. PATTERSON: I want to try and satisfy everybody. I think Mr. MacQuarrie brought up a fair point. So, I am going to suggest an amendment to the motion which will protect the local education authorities' right to determine curriculum as they see fit and the amendment would read: That in schools where students are being taught native languages by direction of the local education authority -- that is the addition, by addition of the local education authority, the time given etc.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): It has been further amended and I move that it be recommended to the administration that in the schools where students are being taught native languages by the direction of the local education authority the time given to native language training be substantially increased. Is that correct?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): We are just going to make sure the motion is in the correct order. Mr. Patterson.

Amendment Reworded

MR. PATTERSON: There is another small addition which I hope will make everyone happy. After "substantially increased" add the words "where the local education authority so desires". That should be added.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): All right. I will read it once again. I move that it be recommended to the administration that in schools where students are being taught native languages by the direction of the local education authority the time given to native language training be substantially increased where the local education authority so desires.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Ms. Cournoyea.

MS. COURNOYEA: I am not going to vote for that motion but I will not amend it. However, I would like the Minister of Education to take note that in Inuvik, to leave that up to the local education authority is quite unfair because when they draw up the language program in Inuvik the children who came from other settlements are not considered because the decision is made in Inuvik. Inuvik has a hostel which brings in young people from all the settlements and I do not believe that the Inuvik education authority should have the control to say that a native language program should be dropped, particularly in that school. I will not amend the motion but I want that taken into account.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: The hon. Member for the Western Arctic has suggested that the local education authority of Inuvik, or implied that it arbitrarily dropped native language education. She may have a lot more greater detail on this than I do but I do not believe this is the case. I believe there was a great degree of research done in the community. I think probably one of the major problems was the difficulty in acquiring an adequate instructor. I think there is more to the dropping of the language than is implied in the remarks of the hon. Member.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. Butters. To the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Further Amendment To Motion, Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): The question being called. All those in favour of the amendment please indicate by raising your arms. Opposed? The amendment is carried.

---Carried

Now, to the motion as amended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion To Recommend Two Hours Per Week In Native Language Training, Carried As Amended

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): The question being called. All those in favour please indicate by raising your arm. Opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Therefore the motion is carried as amended.

Now, we are back on page 15.03 in the amount of \$32,011,000. Mr. Patterson.

Motion To Increase O And M Budget For Schools

MR. PATTERSON: I move that this Assembly strongly urge the administration to seek funds to bring the operations and maintenance budget for schools up to last years level and that progress be reported at the next session of this Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): It has been duly moved by the hon. Member for Frobisher Bay that this Assembly strongly urge the administration to seek funds to bring the O and M budget for schools at least up to last years level and that progress be reported at the next session of this Assembly. To the motion. Mr. Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, I spoke about this yesterday so I will try and be very brief. The point is the schools have been maintained at existing levels by this budget. The staff has been maintained and the only cuts that have taken place are in this area of supplies and materials. I am concerned, and my constituents are concerned and members of the teaching profession and administration are concerned that we have no shortage, or no cutback in the teachers, but they will not have adequate tools to teach with. On top of that the budget, the O and M budget for schools has not been increased in the last two years, notwithstanding rising enrolments, especially in the Nunavut lands where we are out-producing the rest of the population by over two to one and where audio-visual materials, classroom materials are a very important part of teaching, especially where you are working with students learning in other languages than English.

The cuts are estimated to affect the budgets by, in the area of a third or a half, and these are territorial-wide cuts. Our deficit is already over \$13 million and I am not sure if it will be necessary to increase the deficit but, if we are going to go that far and run a deficit of that amount, then what is another \$800,000 which is what I understand...

---Laughter

...which is what I understand the Executive Committee cut. That may be thrown back at me some time.

---Laughter

#### Cut Will Make Big Difference In The Schools

However, in the context of almost a \$14 million deficit it is not much and in the context of materials for students in the schools it makes a big difference. I think we are going to have a problem with morale in teachers and the quality of education will seriously suffer; soapstone for teaching students carving, art materials, these are the areas that will suffer and I think everyone can agree that we should ask the administration to try and find the funds. That is all the motion asks for. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Mr. Butters, would you care to comment?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. But before I comment on the motion, the hon. Member who made the motion asked two days ago if we might table or produce some type of philosophy or policy on education in the Northwest Territories. There are two books which will be circulated, one being: Philosophy of Education in the Northwest Territories, and the other being: Approved Programs and Courses, 1979-80. I said we would do this and I think this will satisfy the hon. Member.

With regard to the motion he mentioned in one case, the audio-visual needs. Audio-visual material does not fall under this particular item. We have already voted money for the resource centres and it is in the resource centres where the audio-visual support is identified and provided. This item is for the paper, the scribblers, the pencils, the xeroxing that is done, the copying and all this type of support.



Executive Committee Made Recommendation

I mentioned yesterday and I think we discussed this that Executive Committee Members had made the recommendation to remove this knowing what they were doing. We did it because we are in an area of fiscal restraint and although the motion -- I do not have copies of the motion and perhaps the Member might provide me with copies of this motion. I gave away the ones he did let me have earlier. Well, "to seek funds". We can seek funds but I think I would be somewhat less than honest if I were to encourage you and suggest that we could probably find those funds.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. McLaughlin.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: It is all right, it is not to this motion.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. MacQuarrie.

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: Yes, thank you. I can only say that as a teacher of 22 years who knows how difficult it is to write on a blackboard with your finger, or with respect to the North, where health conditions are not good and where rolls of toilet paper are necessary on the desks at the front of the room for runny noses and where notepaper and so on, is very important I just have to concur with the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you. Mrs. Sorensen.

Priority For Renewable Resources

MRS. SORENSEN: I think it is important, Mr. Chairman, that we point out a couple of things. One is that the Department of Education has received this year, an increase of around 12 per cent in their budget. I believe that was necessary; that there have been problems with funding in the past. However, it is, in comparison to other departments, a significant increase and very shortly we will be discussing the Department of Renewable Resources where we definitely want considerable funds. If you compare the kind of funds that we need in the Department of Renewable Resources, for instance for on-the-job training, to supplies in education, I think that the priority has got to be Renewable Resources.

On another point, it is my understanding, Mr. Butters, that some \$900,000 was removed from the Department of Education and went to the Department of Personnel and that the supplies was an internal decision, the removal from O and M, and supplies was an internal decision by the department and therefore would it not be incumbent upon yourself to look within your own budget of some \$46 million, 23 per cent of our total budget, to find extra money that you might need for supplies?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, it would be incumbent to look for it, but I am not offering the Member any hope that it can be found. The Member is aware of the condition under which the cuts were made in materials and supplies, that while I can accept the motion and attempt to find it, I say it will be difficult to put back into the budget the \$800,000 that was cut.

Dire Need Will Be Looked At

I do not agree with Members that there is going to be necessarily a shortage of supplies in this area. I said yesterday that if there is an urgent requirement or request, I think everything will be done to identify it and meet it. I do not know how frequently you visit the schools. The schools

I have been in seem to have fairly well-stocked supply rooms for this time of the year. I have seen schools with many cases of toilet paper and various other things that are required. So, I feel that while this restraint may see the staffs being more careful than they have been in the past, I think that they will be able to get through it. As I pointed out, it is a 42 per cent cut across the board and I think we will make it. I think that where there is a dire need it will be looked at.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): I will read the motion again: That this Assembly strongly urges the administration to seek funds to bring the O and M budget for schools at least up to last years level; and that progress be reported at the next session of this Assembly. To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion To Increase O And M Budget For Schools, Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Question being called. All those in favour of the motion please indicate by raising your arm. Opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Now we are back to the \$32,011,000. Mr. Patterson.

Motion To Certify Language Assistants

MR. PATTERSON: My last motion of the day. I promise, Mr. Chairman. That this Assembly strongly urges the administration to institute certification of "language assistants" for classroom assistants who specialize in teaching language; and that progress be reported at the next session of this Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): It has been duly moved by the Member for Frobisher Bay that this Assembly strongly urges the administration to institute certification of "language assistants" for classroom assistants who specialize in teaching language; and that progress be reported at the next session of this Assembly. To the motion. Mr. Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, this motion simply seeks to recognize the invaluable contribution that is presently being made by a number of classroom assistants, who are actually running language programs, in certain schools in the Northwest Territories. They are hired as ordinary classroom assistants but, in fact, they have special abilities in native languages and are carrying on a significant amount of the work that is presently being done in native language instruction in the Northwest Territories.

I understand that the department has considered certification in recognition of this special category of classroom assistant for some time but has yet to make a decision on actually giving them recognition and certification and the motion seeks to simply ask or urge the administration to take that step and presumably if they decide not to, we will find out the reasons why. This is simply another effort on the part of the Assembly, Mr. Chairman, if it passes, to point out to the public and the Department of Education our view of the importance of native language instruction in schools where it is requested and it is simply an effort to reinforce that direction. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. To the motion. Any further discussion? Mr. Stewart.

Criteria For Certification

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For certification it would appear to me that you must have some criteria. How do you see this being done? Do you have an exam or how do you go about certifying? Is there a certain level and who sets the levels?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, I think that is a good question but I do think it is implied in the word "certification" that there would be a standard requirement for in-service training and special courses in language teaching, which courses are presently being offered through the linguistics division. I think that the motion, if it results in the administration certifying language assistants as a special category of classroom assistants, will result in standards, tests and, you know, recognizable criteria. That is my intention in the word "certification", Mr. Chairman, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. MacQuarrie.

Amendment To Motion

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: My question was exactly the same as Mr. Stewart's, although I want to go one step further. If you do not have standards then the issuance of a certificate would soon be meaningless so I am concerned about the motion but not because I do not want to see it being implemented. I will amend it to read -- I move that following the word "to" in the first line, add the words "consider the matter of" and change the word "institute" to "instituting" and that would give them a chance to talk them out or consider standards and that sort of thing. So it would now read: That this Assembly strongly urges the administration to consider the matter of instituting certification of "language assistants" for classroom assistants who specialize in teaching language; and that progress be reported at the next session of this Assembly.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. MacQuarrie, I would remind you to slow down when you speak. We have problems in the booth here. I will read the motion as slowly as I can as it has been amended by Mr. MacQuarrie: That this Assembly strongly urges the administration to consider the matter of instituting certification of "language assistants" for classroom assistants who specialize in teaching language; and that progress be reported at the next session of this Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): To the amendment.

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: I simply feel that that would enable the department to think about standards and that is an important question or the certificates would be meaningless.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure exactly where I stand on this. I am tired of this, considering whether the Inuit assistants, really all you think of them as being is assistants, and for that reason I am not going to support this amendment because it simply would mean again that, considering, the teacher assistant in the settlement would be given a further title as a language assistant and on that basis I am not going to support the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): To the amendment. Are you ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Amendment, Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Question being called. To the amendment: That this Assembly strongly urges the administration to consider the matter of instituting certification of "language assistants" for classroom assistants who specialize in teaching language; and that progress be reported at the next session of this Assembly. All those in favour please indicate by raising your arm. Opposed? The amendment is carried.

---Carried

To the motion as amended. Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am going to oppose that motion because, as I said, I feel equally strongly that I am tired of seeing my own people just being assistants, classroom assistants and now we are going to give them another grand title of language assistant. Who are they going to assist, themselves, the native students or the teacher? Who eventually supervises them? On that basis, because of the principle of my belief that native students, Inuit people should not only be assistants in the classroom, on that basis, I am not going to support it because it is to me a step in the wrong way. I think we should come up with a motion to the effect that we qualify them as linguists at the settlement level and on that basis I will not support that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Patterson.

Recognition Of Special Status

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, the only reason I made the motion was because these people who are now called classroom assistants are doing more than the ordinary classroom assistant. In fact, they have special abilities in the area of language and they have been receiving special training in that area of language which the ordinary classroom assistant who is not bilingual or multilingual does not receive. I think this is a way of recognizing that they are better qualified and that they have a special status. I would not go so far as to say that we can call them teachers if they are not teachers. If they have not got any more training than a classroom assistant now gets, I am all for the training of the maximum of native northerners to be teachers in the Northwest Territories through the TEP, teacher education program, and if people cannot go through the two years presently required in TEP as classroom assistants. I secretly hope that if they are labelled "language assistants" we can also encourage the administration to give them a raise in pay. So this is just a little bit of further explanation, perhaps a reply which will make Mr. Curley a little happier. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Any further discussion on the motion as amended?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion To Certify Language Assistants, Carried As Amended

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): The question being called. All in favour of the motion as amended please raise their arm. Opposed? The motion is carried as amended.

---Carried



Now, we are back on page 15.03, O and M, schools, \$32,011,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

O And M, Schools, Agreed

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): This is for \$32,011,000. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Capital, Schools

We are now into capital, \$5,256,000. Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: I believe we are now talking about page 15.10, are we not, under capital, schools? The finance committee in its recommendations, Mr. Chairman, recommended that a high degree of priority be given to the establishment of a regional high school in the Keewatin. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if Minister Butters could tell me what is the result of that recommendation and whether that recommendation is reflected in the capital budget.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, the budget as presented here does not include capital money for the Rankin Inlet high school -- that is a slip, I do not think it has been designated a high school yet, but the Rankin Inlet school. The school, as Members realized, burned down in the spring of 1978 and possibly or maybe I could just use this opportunity to take a little time and provide background on the status of the school situation at Rankin Inlet.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Are the Members agreed?

---Agreed

HON. TOM BUTTERS: The money will have to be found in the same pot probably as the money we will be seeking for the Pine Point school, that is, from the federal government and by an arrangement that is currently outside the capital, the capital projection for our building plan. We will be seeking and are in the process of developing a Treasury Board submission for the replacement of the Rankin Inlet school. This indication on how to go was given to the Government of the Northwest Territories at an intergovernmental committee meeting held in Edmonton in the fall of last year. This was the suggestion as to how the money should be acquired to replace that school.

Rankin Inlet School Planning

The school burned down in the spring of 1978. By fall 1978, the school was back in operation in individual classrooms accommodated in converted housing units which were brought in for that purpose at a cost of just under \$900,000. The planning of a replacement school was also started at once. By the end of 1978-79 school year a final design for the replacement school had been approved. However, the attached price tag indicated a requirement for more than nine million dollars with approximately half of this amount being required during the fiscal year 1980-81.

At that point the department assessed how adequate were the temporary facilities, that is, the converted housing units. Comments from both teachers and students were favourable regarding these units. Both seemed to indicate that the programs and the instruction being carried out within those structures were most satisfactory. The main criticism associated with the temporary classrooms was that there was a lack of a gym in close proximity to the classrooms. As Members probably realize the buildings in question are sprinkled throughout the Rankin Inlet community. A large shop building some distance away from the school site was and is being used as a temporary activity room. So, the lack of a gym has been an important concern. The second major concern raised was the lack of a centrally placed and readily accessible resource centre and staff room.

Some time ago the Commissioner approved in principle, a high school for the Keewatin region. In the spring of 1979 the question of where this high school was to be built was actively being discussed in the Keewatin settlements. In the minds of many, Rankin Inlet is one logical location for such a regional high school. Thus, the department concluded that if the high school were to be built in Rankin Inlet we should not build two separate schools but that the structure should be inclusive, in that it would offer from kindergarten to grade 12. For the reasons described thus far, the suggested cost of a new school and consequently the tremendous strain on the department's capital budget, the relatively favourable comments re the adequacy of the temporary classrooms in the sense of the programs being offered, and the unresolved question of siting the regional high school, the department has proposed to the Executive that in July or that during 1980, a community facility be built in close proximity to the temporary classrooms, containing a gymnasium and a number of other meeting rooms which on an interim basis could be used as a recreation centre and staff base. The cost of such a facility would approximate some \$1.5 million.

#### Questions On Rankin Inlet School Unresolved

In addition, the addition of such a facility to the school complex would make it acceptable to use the temporary classrooms for a number of years whereas eventually, or after completion of the new replacement school, that facility would be turned over to the community as its community hall and recreation building is developed. To date that is about as far as the development has gone. There has been a recommendation that such a temporary facility be provided. The final resolution of the problem has not been determined yet. There are a number of options and the high school option is still to be concluded. The Treasury Board submission is still to be made to the federal government and there remains a number of questions that will require answers in that whole area. I do not know if that is helpful but I am trying to indicate that there are a number of question and concerns that have been raised with respect to replacing the Rankin Inlet school and they have not been resolved to a satisfactory degree at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. Butters. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: The Commissioner has accepted the principle of a high school in the Keewatin. I would expect therefore that somewhere in the budget there would be planning funds and yet I do not see the planning funds reflected, particularly in view of the fact that you are making a Treasury Board submission for the primary school and all indications are such that attached to the primary school will be a high school. If your Treasury Board submission is successful, in the very near future you will need planning funds to undertake the planning that is needed for the high school in the region.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Butters, please.

#### Treasury Board Submission For Replacement Of Loss

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I would possibly like to request that Mr. Lewis attend because I am not too familiar with the background to the manner in which this presentation has been developed. However, the Treasury Board submission, to my understanding, will just be for the amount of money that will replace the institution that was lost. So, there is a discrepancy between what we will be asking for which is six million dollars I believe, plus a few hundred thousand

dollars, and the \$9.1 million which would include the high school arrangement. I do not know, and this is why I would like Mr. Lewis to possibly attend at this time because I am not sure that the consultations with regard to the eventual location of the high school have been completed. I do know peripherally, that those discussions and that consultation have been going on for a period of time within the Keewatin communities, but whether the communities have agreed that the site of that school will be Rankin Inlet, I cannot tell from my own knowledge.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. Butters. In view of the time, is it the wish of the committee to invite the Deputy Minister of Education or to continue our discussion for another minute or so?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Report progress.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Is it the wish of the committee to continue?

MR. SIBBESTON: I move we report progress.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): It is moved that I report progress to the Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): It has been agreed.

---Agreed

I will now report progress to the Speaker. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will come to order. Mr Tologanak.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES WATER BOARD, AND BILL 1-80(1): APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1980-81

MR. TOLOGANAK: Mr. Speaker, the committee has concluded its discussion with the chairman of the Northwest Territories Water Board.

We also continued our consideration of Bill 1-80(1), Appropriation Ordinance, 1980-81, and with respect I wish to report progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Tologanak. Are there any announcements, Mr. Clerk?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, February 28th, standing committee on finance, 9:30 a.m., Katimavik A.

ITEM NO. 10: ORDERS OF THE DAY

Orders of the day, February 28, 1980, 1:00 o'clock p.m. at the Explorer Hotel.

1. Prayer
2. Oral Questions
3. Questions and Returns
4. Petitions
5. Tabling of Documents
6. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
7. Notices of Motion
8. Motions: Motions 23-80(1), 24-80(1)

9. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills, Recommendations to the Legislative Assembly and Other Matters: Report by Director, CBC Northern Service; Bill 1-80(1)
10. Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. This House stands adjourned until 1:00 o'clock p.m., February 28, 1980, at the Explorer Hotel.

---ADJOURNMENT



Available from the  
Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories,  
Yellowknife, N.W.T. at .50¢ per day, \$5.00 per session and \$12.50 per year.  
Published under the Authority of the Commissioner  
of the Northwest Territories