



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES  
**DEBATES**

**3rd Session**

**9th Assembly**

Official Report

**FRIDAY, JUNE 20, 1980**

**Pages 370 to 436**

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,  
Tourism and Energy)

The Honourable Thomas H. Butters, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 1069  
Inuvik, N.W.T.  
X0E0T0  
(Inuvik)  
(Minister of Education and of Justice  
and Public Services)

The Honourable Arnold J. McCellum, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 464  
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. Kene E. Tologanak, M.L.A.  
Coppermine, N.W.T.  
X0E 0E0  
(Central Arctic)

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.  
Igloolik, 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)

Vacant  
(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. D.M. Hamilton  
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.J. 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

20 June 1980

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	370
Oral Questions	370
Questions and Returns	372
Notices of Motion	381
Motions	382
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Report on Northern Canada Power Commission	419
- Bill 2-80(2) Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance, No. 1, 1980-1981	420
- Motion 20-80(2) Agreements with COPE Re Inuvialuit Land Rights Settlements	429
- Report of the Standing Committee on Finance	430
Report of Committee of the Whole of:	
- Report on Northern Canada Power Commission	428
- Bill 2-80(2) Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance, No. 1, 1980-1981	428
- Motion 20-80(2) Agreements with COPE Re Inuvialuit Land Rights Settlements	435
- Report of the Standing Committee on Finance	435
Third Reading of Bills	428
- Bill 1-80(2) Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance, No. 2, 1979-1980	
- Bill 2-80(2) Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance, No. 1, 1980-1981	
Assent to Bills	429
Adjournment	436

BAKER LAKE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

FRIDAY, JUNE 20, 1980

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Appaqaq, Mr. Arlooktoo, 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. Sibbeston, Mrs. Sorensen, Mr. Stewart, Hon. James Wah-Shee

ITEM NO. 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

SPEAKER (Hon. Robert H. MacQuarrie): Just before beginning the days work, there are some announcements with respect to departure arrangements that I would like to call everyone's attention to. The flight is scheduled to leave at 10:00 o'clock tonight and arrive in Yellowknife at 11:00 o'clock. Baggage pick-up; your luggage should be here at the school not later than 7:00 o'clock this evening. There will be transport service to the airport starting at 9:00 o'clock and the check-out at the hotel, if you would do so, they become too busy near the end of the day.

Item 2, oral questions.

ITEM NO. 2: ORAL QUESTIONS

Mrs. Sorensen.

Question 90-80(2): Massive Slaughter Of Caribou Herd

MRS. SORENSEN: I have a matter of some urgency. It concerns a radio report on the CBC national news this morning. My question is for the Minister of Renewable Resources. Mr. Minister, it is my understanding that there has been a massive slaughter of the Beverly herd as it has moved into Manitoba. It is alleged that there could have been up to 15,000 caribou slaughtered. Is the Minister aware of this report and if so, what measures does he plan to take with the Manitoba government to see that this disgusting slaughter stops immediately?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Mr. Nerysoo.

Partial Return To Question 90-80(2): Slaughter Of Caribou Herd

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: I am aware of the kill, or slaughter if you want to call it that, but I believe that the kill not only took place in Manitoba but also took place in Saskatchewan. I would not at this time be able to give a positive answer until I have probably had a meeting and found out the actual facts about the kill. I would then have to I think, have a discussion with the other Members, about the caribou herd involved and talk to possible solutions on it.

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

Question 91-80(2): Reply From Members' Services Board, Re Motion 14-80(2)

MR. FRASER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to know when the Members' Services Board, when we can expect a reply from the Members' Services Board to Motion 14-80(2), which I put on the floor on June 17th.

Return To Question 91-80(2): Reply From Members' Services Board, Re Motion 14-80(2)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Fraser, oral questions are to be directed to Executive Members, and I think an Executive Member really could not answer that for you but I know that the Members' Services Board does have the consideration of the motion which you passed on their agenda for the very next meeting, which will likely be within a couple of weeks time. Oral questions. The hon. Mr. Curley.

Question 92-80(2): Regarding Student List From Education

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Speaker, last week on June 12, I asked the Minister of Education if he was prepared to give me the list of students dismissed from the Yellowknife high school during this school year. Has the Minister got that answer yet, and is he prepared to give it to me before the fall session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Mr. Butters.

Partial Return To Question 26-80(2): Student Dismissals In Yellowknife; And Question 92-80(2): Regarding Student List From Education

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have had a response to the question. However, in view of the material contained in the answer, which I would say is of a personal and confidential nature regarding students and students' names and the reason for dismissal, I am not bringing it forward at this time. It will be reworded and presented in a manner which protects the reputation of the students who are so referred to in that document. It will not be available to the Member before this session terminates, obviously, and I will try and circulate it to him by giving the answer by mail before the October session and if it is satisfactory to the other Members, I will provide the Members with the information as an information item in the books at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Mrs. Sorensen.

Question 93-80(2): Priorities North Application To General Development Agreement

MRS. SORENSEN: A question to the Minister of Economic Development. It is my understanding that an incorporated group called Priorities North has placed an application before the Department of Economic Development under the general development agreement. I understand the application for funds has been rejected and I wonder if the Minister could explain why.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Mr. Braden.

Return To Question 93-80(2): Priorities North Application To General Development Agreement

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The application for funding under the general development agreement was deferred due to two major factors. The first is a lack of broad based community involvement, in particular the group had no indication of active participation by the city of Yellowknife. Second, although the program calls for a community planner, the Priorities North proposal had not indicated any expertise in this area. The only positions to be filled in their proposal were those of an executive director and one clerical staff.

Now, as I understand it, Mr. Len Jason is very active in the Priorities North group and has approached the Yellowknife city council with a brief, outlining the reasons for the deferral and three proposals to gain their consideration. The first is that the city get actively involved in Priorities North and the second proposal is that the city itself take on the proposal and hiring of the expertise as is being done in Inuvik.

The third option is that the Chamber of Commerce could take on the proposal and provide, through either of these, much more broad based community support. So, if the two problems as I outlined them can be resolved, all indications show that the application will be approved. As yet, as I understand it, no response has been received from the city government in Yellowknife, and it might be useful to note that the next general development agreement meeting is coming up next week.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions.

Item 3, questions and returns.

ITEM NO. 3: QUESTIONS AND RETURNS

I would ask the Deputy Speaker to take the chair for this.

DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Fraser): Item 3, questions and returns. Mr. MacQuarrie.

A Question Of Privilege

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise first on a question of privilege and then I have some written questions. Yesterday, when I asked the Minister of Education whether the Department of Education had sought the early termination of a contract with Duane Hendricks, a music teacher in Fort Smith, I quote from the record, the hon. Minister said "Mr. Speaker, the answer is no." I have information that Mr. Hendricks has in his possession a letter dated April 23, which was copied to him, a letter from the area superintendent to the regional superintendent requesting that he be terminated at the end of this school year.

He has in his possession, a copy of a letter sent from the regional superintendent to the regional director of the Fort Smith region affirming that decision and a third letter dated the same day from the regional director of the Fort Smith region to the director of Personnel. Not only is it Mr. Hendricks who tells me he has these letters in his possession, but I asked him to show them to another party in Fort Smith, who I then phoned and they confirmed that he has such letters in his possession. In view of that, the answer "no" would seem to be misleading. I am certain that our hon. Minister did not intend to mislead when he answered and so I would appreciate an explanation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. MacQuarrie, we are on Item 3, questions and returns. Is that your question?

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: That is a question of privilege because I felt the answer was misleading, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. The hon. Member from Inuvik, Mr. Butters.



Further Return To Question 85-80(2): Termination Of Teaching Contract In Fort Smith

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, in the record of the House for yesterday this question appears made by the hon. Member: "Could the Minister of Education tell this House whether the Department of Education sought the early termination of a teaching contract with Duane Hendricks, a music teacher in Fort Smith? Hon. Tom Butters: The answer is no."

As I make these remarks I would like to draw the Members' attention to the Rule 40(2) which says: An oral question shall be concisely and clearly put and shall refer only to a matter which may reasonably be assumed to be within the present knowledge of the Executive Member to whom it is directed. Later in the remarks of the hon. Member for Yellowknife Centre he provided a bit of information. He said and I quote: "I just wanted a bit of information. I was told by Mr. Hendricks that he was given a copy of a letter, the first indication that he had that there would be this kind of difficulty, a copy of a letter from the area superintendent to the regional superintendent which asked for his termination at the end of the school year."

Now these are regional matters and I obviously have no knowledge of their existence nor have I ever seen them. What I did see as this matter progressed, was a letter over the signature of the regional administrator for the Fort Smith region. I was not sent a copy but I saw it during the discussion of this whole matter. That is my knowledge of any documentation that Mr. Hendricks may have received.

Further Return To Question 87-80(2): Department Responsible For Terminating Contract

When I am referring to the Member's question with regard to the department, I may be immodest but when a Member seeks to attribute attitudes or initiatives to the department, I have responded to such questions or comments on the basis that the department's position or decisions are those either made by me solely or which I have made after full discussion and consideration of the matter with my Deputy Minister, Mr. Lewis. In Hendricks' case, Mr. Lewis and I had neither confirmed nor supported initiatives taken by the region. In fact it was due, in a large measure, to our desire to get more information on the matter to assist us in making our decision, that the Commissioner agreed to request...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Butters, could you slow down a bit please for the interpreters?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: In Hendricks' case, Mr. Lewis and I had neither confirmed nor supported initiatives being taken by the region: In fact it was due, in a large measure, to our desire to get more information on the matter to assist us in making our decision, that is, the department's decision, that the Commissioner agreed to request labour relations lawyer and expert, who fortunately was in Yellowknife at the time, John Bryden, to travel to Fort Smith on a fact finding mission to meet with all parties having interest or involvement in the dispute and provide an objective and up-to-date report.

Mr. Bryden, before accepting the assignment, requested that he be given an opportunity to work out a mutually acceptable agreement or arrangement between the principals of the two points of contention if he found that to be possible. The result of Mr. Bryden's visit was that a mutually satisfactory solution to the problem was developed by Mr. Bryden. This agreement was tabled in the House

by the Member yesterday. This agreement, as I mentioned, I had not seen until it was so tabled. So as far as the department is concerned, the matter is closed. Both parties having concerns that were in contention had decided on an amicable and mutually acceptable arrangement for concluding the problem.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Hon. Mr. Butters. Hon. Mr. MacQuarrie.

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would alert all Members to the Minister's answer. It would appear that if you ask whether a department has done such and such a thing, if we allow that interpretation to stand, it would mean simply the Minister or his director. I am not satisfied that that is what is meant, when Members ask whether a department had responsibility for such and such a thing.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, could you continue with Item 3?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: On a point of privilege. I take full responsibility for the department and therefore I cannot say it was my regional superintendent who did this or that. If an action occurs, I take the responsibility and the Member should recognize that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Butters. Hon. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Question 94-80(2): Termination Of R. Duane Hendricks

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: I will ask certain written questions and I simply wish to point out to the Minister, so that there will be no misunderstanding, that my questions are not aimed at trying to reinstate Mr. Hendricks. I agree that he signed an agreement that left him satisfied and therefore I will not be put off, that the kind of thing I am asking should go to the Northwest Territories Teachers' Association. My concern is not with having Mr. Hendricks reinstated but whether the department acted -- that means the department and its administrative officials -- acted responsibly in this matter. That is the thrust of my question.

(1) How much money, over and above normal termination costs was spent to secure the termination of Mr. Hendricks on May 1st? Please include the expenditure required to replace Mr. Hendricks during May and June.

(2) Why was the administration willing to spend this money in a year of restraint, to secure Mr. Hendricks' early termination when he was apparently willing to continue to the end of the school year, and even to continue on into 1980-81?

(3) What reasons, in addition to those cited to me by Mr. Hendricks, namely "inability to get along with the administration" and "differences in philosophy", does the department advance for seeking an early termination? If there are no other reasons, is the department's precipitate action not irresponsible in view of the fact that Mr. Hendricks was a veteran teacher in Fort Smith who had successfully passed his probationary year and in view of the fact that a former principal in Fort Smith actually asked Mr. Hendricks to return to Fort Smith in 1977 following an earlier year of teaching in the Northwest Territories? An administrator asked him to return.

(4) To what extent did the room to which Mr. Hendricks was assigned, apparently without consultation, a room whose features as a classroom were criticized by the chief of the safety division of the Northwest Territories, and by a federal environmental health officer, contribute to "his inability to get along with the administration"?



(5) From an educational point of view what impact did Mr. Hendricks' early termination have on the music programs in Fort Smith, and on the students in those programs?

(6) In view of the fact that Mr. Hendricks is regarded by many who know him as a uniquely talented musician and a committed and successful teacher, why did the department not at least take reasonable steps to keep him in the Northwest Territories in some capacity, especially since Mr. Hendricks has declared that he is interested in continuing to live and work in the North?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. The hon. Member from Inuvik, Mr. Butters.

Partial Return To Question 94-80(2): Termination Of R. Duane Hendricks

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I am answering, sir, as Minister of Education. Obviously because of the detail of the questions, the majority of them will have to be taken as notice and I will do that.

I would just like to say to remove any thought that the administration, or any action of the administration in this problem was related to Mr. Hendricks' inability to perform as a teacher, and if that innuendo or implication has been suggested by me, in not so stating otherwise, I would hereby wish to point out that Mr. Hendricks is a veteran teacher and he is very highly regarded and his competence in his field is very high. So he is well regarded. I want to make that very clear that there is no such attitude, and if I have to clarify it further or my Deputy Minister, this is not the case.

I would like to respond relative to the suggestion that Mr. Hendricks was of an attitude to stay on and I would wish to read a letter that Mr. Hendricks wrote on February 1. This was supplied to me by the department, and I think this would indicate that Mr. Hendricks was not happy with the situation in which he found himself at Fort Smith. He wrote: "Dear Mr. Clarkson: I hereby request that you accept my resignation without prejudice effective no later than April 1, 1980. If it is possible, I would request that the last full week of school before my resignation becomes effective be freed from teaching in order to complete the necessary 'clean-up' and administrative work, including collection of instruments and music, sending instruments out for repair, and so on. I also request that proper removal expenses be paid.

My time in the Fort Smith school system has for the most part been enjoyable, productive and worth while. My decision to resign is based on continuing philosophical differences with the administration over the past year. Be assured that I will continue to do my best during the remaining time."

Copies of that letter I have shown here went to the principal, Mr. K. Malanchuk, Mrs. W. Graves, principal of J.B. Tyrell School, Mary-Lee Butcher, chairman of the education committee, Don Brannigan, band parent committee, NWTTA executive and central executive.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Butters. I just wondered when replying to the hon. Member to his written questions, maybe some other Members would be interested in this most important matter and you could perhaps make some extra copies. Thank you, Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I will, sir.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Any further written questions? Mr. McCallum.

Return To Question 68-80(2): Burial Of Northerners In Montreal

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I do not have a written question. I have a reply to a question asked on June 16, by the Member from the High Arctic, Mr. Pudluk, regarding burials of northerners in Montreal. The question was asked, if I was aware of this practice where the records of northerners who died outside of the North, especially in the province of Quebec, or more specifically in Montreal I guess, where the records are kept of the burials for ten years and the records are destroyed and the grave is dug up and the practice is of placing other bodies in those particular areas.

I have this reply: This matter was brought to my attention some time ago when the hon. Member discussed the situation with our Baffin regional Social Services staff. Prior to this no one was aware of the situation.

Since the matter was brought to my attention, Social Services staff have tried to ensure that relatives of anyone who dies away from their home community are made aware of this policy. If families want to bring a body back to the home community for burial but are unable to pay the cost, the Department of Social Services provides financial assistance to those who are eligible.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. McCallum. Are there any further written questions? Item 3, questions and returns. Mr. Patterson.

Question 95-80(2): Customs Officers In The N.W.T.

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a written question for the Minister of Justice. Are there any customs officers presently located in the Northwest Territories? Do the RCMP have any responsibility for customs under the present police agreement? Does the Minister have any plans for aiding the provision of customs services, through the police agreement to communities in the Northwest Territories such as Frobisher Bay which has a significant need for customs services in order to aid commerce with Greenland and other foreign countries?

If I may Mr. Speaker, I have one other written question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. You may continue.

Question 96-80(2): Executive Review Of STEP Program

MR. PATTERSON: This is to the Executive. Has the Executive reviewed the STEP, Subsidized Term Employment Program with a view to possibly transferring responsibility for administering that program? If the review is not complete, then when will it be complete? While the review is under way, can applications still be approved under the STEP program? Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. The hon. Member from Inuvik, Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I will accept the first question as notice, sir, and provide a written reply.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Butters. Does anyone from the Executive care to answer the second written question? Mr. Braden.

Return To Question 96-80(2): Executive Review Of STEP Program

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All I can indicate with respect to STEP, is that it has been completed and unfortunately I have not had time to go over it with my staff. But, as I indicated in the House in the budget session, I would be reporting to the standing committee on finance which recommended a review and some specific changes. I will be doing that before the end of June.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson, are you satisfied?

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, my main concern in asking that question was whether or not the program is still alive pending this review.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. The hon. Member from Yellowknife North, Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in response to the Member's question, applications are being approved on an interim basis. We go through the financial management board of the Government of the Northwest Territories and approve applications as they come up. We are doing this on an interim basis until such time as we have formally approved changes, if any, in the STEP program. We will be rewriting the policy when we come to those changes.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Braden. Are there any further written questions or returns? The hon. Member from Rae-Lac la Martre, Mr. Wah-Shee.

Return To Question 55-80(2): Electrical Power At Kakisa Lake

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a return for the hon. Member from Mackenzie Liard on a question regarding electrical power to Kakisa Lake.

Both NCPC, Northern Canada Power Commission and Alberta Power were contacted in April and requested to provide information on alternative means of providing electrical power to Kakisa Lake and estimated costs. Both have indicated that this information will be provided to the Department of Local Government within the next two to three weeks. Alberta Power has developed and is costing a number of alternatives based on transmission lines. NCPC is basing cost estimates on a thermal electrical plant. The initial reaction from NCPC suggests that the costs of the thermal plant would be extremely high but a realistic assessment will be possible as soon as the cost estimates for the various alternatives are available.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Wah-Shee. Are there any further questions and returns?

Return To Question 79-80(2): Clean-Up Of Old Rankin Inlet Mine Site

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: I have a return for the hon. Member from Keewatin South, to a question regarding the clean-up of the old Rankin Inlet mine site. A proposal with an estimated cost of the clean-up will be prepared and negotiated with the Department of Indian Affairs. We are hopeful that considerable progress on the clean-up can be made this year. Funding will be provided by the Department of Indian Affairs. I have another one.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Wah-Shee. Please continue.

Return To Question 59-80(2): Community Service Complex In Baker Lake

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: I have a return for the hon. Member from Keewatin North regarding the community service complex, Baker Lake.

A community facility complex was proposed a couple of years ago. The proposal involved both a high capital cost, approximately \$3.5 million and an operating cost of approximately \$300,000 per year. Duplication of some existing facilities was involved. The regional office has entered into a dialogue with the community to develop a plan that realistically reflects community needs and priorities, and which will not place an unrealistic burden on the community to operate. Based on this dialogue, the regional office presented an outline of seven alternatives as a basis for discussion in December, 1979. These alternatives were presented again on May 28, 1980, with clarification on the need for community input.

The regional superintendent of Local Government will be in Baker Lake during the week of June 23, to consult with the hamlet council on other matters and will be available if the council wishes to discuss the complex at that time. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Hon. Mr. Wah-Shee. Item 3, questions and returns. Mr. Patterson.

Question 97-80(2): Baker Lake Plan For Community Complex, Estimate

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, this is a question for the Minister of Local Government again in connection with the Baker Lake community complex. Did the hamlet of Baker Lake not present the Department of Local Government, several years ago, with a plan for a community complex in Baker Lake costing approximately one third of the estimate arrived at by the Government of the Northwest Territories? Also, is it true that the hamlet of Baker Lake was told that it could not receive tenders itself for the construction of that complex, proposed by the hamlet of Baker Lake?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. The hon. Member from Yellowknife North, Mr. Braden. Do you want to answer that?

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: No.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Mr. Wah-Shee.

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: This is the return that I have received from Yellowknife, Mr. Speaker. If there is additional information or questions the hon. Member would like to pose to me, then I would be prepared to seek the answers.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Hon. Mr. Wah-Shee. Item 3, questions and returns. There being no more business on Item 3 -- Hon. Mr. Braden.

Return To Question 67-80(2): Amendments To Canada Oil And Gas Act

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a reply to Question 67-80(2) asked by Mrs. Sorensen, concerning proposed changes to the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act of Canada.

The proposed Oil and Gas Act has major ramifications for the Government of the Northwest Territories, the consequences of which are of great concern to me, both as Minister of Economic Development, and as Minister of Energy. Basically the proposal represents an entrenchment of federal control over the oil and gas sector in the Northwest Territories.

MRS. SORENSEN: Shame, shame, shame!

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: The proposal, which will probably be tabled this fall in the House of Commons, is a consolidation of measures contained in other federal acts and, more particularly, is a method of giving solid legal status to many of the oil and gas regulations now attached to the Territorial Lands Act.

Mr. Speaker, although we do not have access to the new proposal, we have reviewed the December 1977 proposal, which died on the order paper of the House of Commons, and I have no reason to believe that with the Liberal government back in power we can anticipate that this December 1977 proposal has changed very significantly in content.

The 1977 proposal called for total federal control...

MRS. SORENSEN: Shame, shame!



HON. GEORGE BRADEN: ...in many cases at the discretion of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, of the exploration development and production stages of the oil and gas industry, the total land regime, exploration permits, provisional leases and production licences. All this will be covered under the act, as well as royalty provisions and rates.

In addition to these concerns, Mr. Speaker, another basic concern of our government is that socio-economic factors will be taken into account in the issuance of oil and gas rights. Mr. Speaker, this adds further confusion in my mind to just what the federal government and DIAND are trying to do...

MRS. SORENSEN: Trying to sell us down the river.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: ...in this socio-economic area. They tell us on the one hand, "You have the mandate to negotiate. It is your responsibility," and then on the other hand they are entrenching this responsibility further in acts of the parliament of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, a further concern is in regard to resource revenue sharing. I believe that the measures which are outlined in the proposed changes to the act will set the tone for development and revenue mechanisms for the next 20 years. For the federal government to unilaterally develop this proposal without the slightest effort at consultation with the Northwest Territories is another example of the total disregard which the Government of Canada holds for institutions of government North of 60, native organizations who have an interest in resources and their development and generally our common desire to progress towards responsible government.

Mr. Speaker, I will be meeting with the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development later on next month and I will be asking my staff to find out as much as possible about the particulars of changes to the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act of Canada and while I will be making representations to the Minister, I can assure this House and the hon. Member from Yellowknife South, that if necessary our government will participate in any standing committee hearings in Ottawa which considers these proposed changes. We will be making representation as best we can, on behalf of the people of the North. Thank you.

---Applause

MRS. SORENSEN: Hear, hear!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Hon. Mr. Braden. Item 3, the hon. Member from Inuvik, Mr. Butters.

Return To Question 95-80(2): Customs Officers In The N.W.T.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Yes. I have information which relates to the written question from the hon. Member for Frobisher Bay. It would appear, and I just had this information passed to me, that senior people in Customs and Excise Canada, Don Longmuir and Fred Light, would be placing on a temporary and urgent basis, a position, a temporary position, in Frobisher in July. It would seem a proposal for a permanent agent is well advanced and awaiting ministerial approval.

---Applause

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Butters. The hon. Member from Rae-Lac la Martre, Hon. Mr. Wah-Shee.

Return To Question 37-80(2): Tuktoyaktuk Airport

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Mr. Speaker, I have a return for, I think it is Ms. Cournoyea. She asked me a question regarding Tuktoyaktuk airport. There has been no agreement to transfer operating responsibilities for the Tuktoyaktuk airport to the Government of the Northwest Territories from Transport Canada. Although such a transfer has been proposed by Transport Canada, we have formally requested clarification on a number of points before entering into further discussion and negotiation on this subject.

The most significant of these are: (1) the role of the Tuktoyaktuk airport. While serving the hamlet of Tuk and the resupply requirements of the United States Air Force, the primary role of this airport is to support Dome-Canmar resource activities. Such activities are of the type and are at a level considerably in excess of those normally conducted at a public airport facility. We therefore question whether we or the municipal level of government are under any obligation to become operationally involved.

(2) Operating funds for the total airport program come to this government through Transport Canada under arrangements presently causing a number of financial and administrative difficulties.

(3) There are serious problems in the original section of the newly extended runway which, if not corrected, could result in operating restrictions on aircraft using the Tuk airport. Further, if not corrected, these undulations would impose a serious capital cost to the operating authority in the next year or two.

Until the above and other points identified by us have been addressed by Transport Canada, it is not in the best interest of this government and the hamlet of Tuk to pursue the transfer and devolution of airport operating responsibilities at Tuk. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Hon. Mr. Wah-Shee. Item 3, questions and returns. Mr. McLaughlin.

Question 98-80(2): Agricultural Policy In N.W.T.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism. Does the department plan to amend any of its principles to the development of an agricultural policy and submit any of these changes in light of responses from farmers to this Assembly, when it reconvenes in Frobisher Bay? Further, would the department also reconsider its position regarding services into suggested farming areas because the proposal suggests leasing instead of homesteading and therefore the government might provide the same services, as for example, the province of Alberta does in its improvement districts?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. McLaughlin. Hon. Mr. Wah-Shee.

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Yes, on behalf of the hon. Member, the Minister of Economic Development and myself, will take the question under advisement and will provide an answer at the next session.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Hon. Mr. Wah-Shee. Item 3, any further questions and returns? If there are no further questions and returns, we will break for coffee for 15 minutes and return to questions if you so wish, Mr. Patterson. Thank you.

---SHORT RECESS



MR. SPEAKER: There is now a quorum, so we will reconvene. Are there further questions or returns from Ministers? Mr. Patterson.

Question 99-80(2): Socio-Economic Study On Water Supply, Frobisher Bay

MR. PATTERSON: A written question for the Minister of Local Government, Mr. Speaker. Is the Department of Local Government undertaking a study of the socio-economic impact of current and planned water and sewer projects in Frobisher Bay? If so, will that report be tabled in this House?

MR. SPEAKER: Other written questions. Returns from Ministers.

Item 4, petitions.

Item 5, tabling of documents.

Item 6, reports of standing and special committees. With respect to the question of reports, I have been informed by Mr. Stewart that he would like to report on NCPC during committee of the whole. So we will hold that until a little later.

Item 7, notices of motion.

ITEM NO. 7: NOTICES OF MOTION

Notices of motion. Mr. Patterson.

Notice Of Motion 33-80(2): Appreciation To Deputy Sergeant-At-Arms

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I will be requesting unanimous consent to deal with this motion later today. Now therefore, I move that this Assembly express to Captain Harry J. Mayne, C.D., Ret'd, its most sincere appreciation for the enthusiastic and efficient manner in which he has carried out the responsibilities of Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. We will just pause a moment here because I think there are a couple of others that have to be done. Are there other notices of motion? Mr. McLaughlin.

Notice Of Motion 34-80(2): Appreciation To Sergeant-At-Arms

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a couple of motions and I will be asking for unanimous consent at the appropriate time. Now therefore, I move that this Assembly express to Major David L. Sproule, C.D., S.L., its most sincere appreciation for the outstanding manner in which he has served as its Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms and subsequently as Sergeant-at-Arms.

MR. SPEAKER: Another?

Notice Of Motion 35-80(2): Appreciation To Legal Advisor

MR. McLAUGHLIN: My other motion is: Now therefore, I move that this Assembly express to Stien K. Lal its most sincere appreciation for the exemplary and dedicated manner in which he has carried out his responsibilities as Legal Advisor to this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Other notices of motion. Mr. Butters.

Notice Of Motion 36-80(2): Appreciation To Staff And Interpreters  
Of The Legislative Assembly

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I have not got it written down but I would like to give notice that this Assembly express to our interpreters and our hard working staff in the back room, our thanks for the excellent service they have provided us during the last ten days and our recognition that we have put upon them a task which is almost beyond human capability to achieve. I will move unanimous consent for that motion, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Other notices of motion?

Item 8, motions.

ITEM NO. 8: MOTIONS

We will deal with the unanimous consent motions first, Mr. Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, could I have unanimous consent to deal with the motion I gave notice of earlier?

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Proceed.

Motion 33-80(2): Appreciation To Deputy Sergeant-At-Arms

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS Captain H.J. Mayne, C.D., Ret'd, has during the years 1977 and 1978 and since November 13, 1979, served as Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms of this Assembly;

AND WHEREAS Captain Mayne on all occasions has carried out his responsibilities in an enthusiastic and efficient manner;

AND WHEREAS Captain Mayne will shortly be leaving the position of Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this Assembly express to Captain Harry J. Mayne, C.D., Ret'd, its most sincere appreciation for the enthusiastic and efficient manner in which he has carried out the responsibilities of Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms.

MR. SPEAKER: A seconder? Hon. Mr. Braden. To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion 33-80(2), Carried

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour please indicate by raising their hands. Down. Opposed. Carried.

---Carried

---Applause

Mr. McLaughlin.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, do I have unanimous consent at this time to move a motion?

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Proceed, please.

Motion 34-80(2): Appreciation To Sergeant-At-Arms

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS Major David A. Sproule, C.D., S.L., served this Assembly from October 16, 1978 to November 11, 1979, as Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms and has since then served as Sergeant-at-Arms;

AND WHEREAS he has served this Assembly in both capacities in an outstanding manner;

AND WHEREAS Major Sproule will shortly be leaving the position of Sergeant-at-Arms;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this Assembly express to Major David A. Sproule, C.D., S.L., its most sincere appreciation for the outstanding manner in which he has served it as Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms and subsequently as Sergeant-at-Arms.

MR. SPEAKER: Secondér? Mr. Fraser. To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion 34-80(2), Carried

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour please indicate by raising their hands. Down. Opposed. Carried.

---Carried

---Applause

Mr. McLaughlin.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: I have a second motion requiring unanimous consent regarding our Legal Advisor.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Motion 35-80(2): Appreciation To Legal Advisor

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS Stien K. Lal has since November 13, 1979 served as Legal Advisor to this Legislative Assembly;

AND WHEREAS throughout this period he has served this Assembly in an exemplary and dedicated manner;

AND WHEREAS Mr. Lal will shortly be leaving the position of Legal Advisor to this Assembly;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this Assembly express to Stien K. Lal its most sincere appreciation for the exemplary and dedicated manner in which he has carried out his responsibilities as Legal Advisor to this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Secunder? Mrs. Sorensen. To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion 35-80(2), Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour please indicate by raising their hands. Down. Opposed. Carried.

---Carried

---Applause

MR. FRASER: Speech, speech!

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent, Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: A request to move the motion relative to those other Members of the staff who have served this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Please proceed.

Motion 36-80(2): Appreciation To Staff And Interpreters  
Of The Legislative Assembly

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS this House has been superbly and superlatively served during this session at Baker Lake;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this Assembly convey our thanks to the Members of the Northwest Territories Interpreter Corps and to the Clerk of the Assembly and his new assistant, and to all the staff serving in his office, including his regular staff and those who have come on temporary duty from other branches of the government, and especially to the young Pages who have sat patiently with us these many long hours of debate and diatribe. We would wish to thank them, sir, for their untiring efforts and their dedicated service that has been provided to this House during this session.

MR. SPEAKER: Seconder? Mrs. Sorensen. To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion 36-80(2), Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour please indicate by raising their hands. Down. Opposed. Carried.

---Carried

---Applause

Other motions. We must deal with Motion 27-80(2), Home Owner Property Tax Relief. Mrs. Sorensen.

Motion 27-80(2): Home Owner Property Tax Relief

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker .

WHEREAS the Ninth Legislative Assembly endorsed, by motion, during the second session the principle that people should be assisted to become home owners in the Northwest Territories;

AND WHEREAS the Yukon government and some provincial governments have assistance programs which provide an incentive for home ownership;

AND WHEREAS the Northwest Territories housing task force which reviewed all aspects of housing in the Northwest Territories has recommended the home owners in the Northwest Territories receive a "property tax rebate";

AND WHEREAS there are several different means by which this Assembly and its administration can encourage home ownership through property tax relief, tax rebate, home ownership grant, tax credit, municipal grant and others;

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly recommend that the Executive Committee consider options for assistance and further recommend that following that review, implement a means to provide some property tax relief to home owners in the Northwest Territories.

This motion is moved by myself and seconded by the hon. Member from Mackenzie Liard, Nick Sibbeston.

MR. SPEAKER: Duly moved and seconded. To the motion, Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I think that this Assembly would like to see some assistance given to present home owners in the Northwest Territories. I would like to see this Legislature encourage wherever possible home ownership by northern people. As I said in the whereas clauses there are a number of ways that this Legislature can do that. Among them are capital funds for building assistance, outright home ownership grants, low interest on long-term loans and/or through assistance with property tax through tax rebates, tax credits, municipal tax grants. I am sure of course, there are many other ways or terms that one might use for the same thing.

Quotes From Members Of The Eighth Assembly

For the time being I would like to see this Legislature implement a means to provide some residential property tax relief to home owners in the Northwest Territories. Now, this suggestion is not new, the Eighth Assembly discussed a similar motion in January of 1979 which would have provided some tax relief and if Members will bear with me I would like to quote from the debate which took place in committee of the whole. The following is a quote: "It seems to me that we have really neglected those few who have tried to be independent and tried to follow what the government wanted them to do, to encourage private home ownership. Yet to be quite candid, anybody who owns his own home in the Northwest Territories is a sucker because everybody else is getting help but him. I am not sure that this is the best way of approaching the subject of some assistance to the individual home owners but inasmuch as it is the first thing that has come by way of motion in front of this House, I am prepared to support it. If it is not the right avenue then possibly the administration would be able to come back with some other ideas on how we might accomplish what we are really trying to do, and that is to give some assistance to the individual home owner in the Northwest Territories."



There was another speaker who took part in that debate in speaking to the Eighth Assembly's motion concerning property tax relief and he stated and I quote again: "Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to support the motion 100 per cent because I believe only a few of the settlements in the Northwest Territories, including the Arctic and the Mackenzie Valley, pay taxes." Mr. Speaker, these two speakers were Mr. Stewart and Mr. Fraser. So now I know I can get support for my motion from those two guys.

---Applause

#### Quotes From Members Of The Ninth Assembly

In rereading the debate which took place in this House on Monday, June 16th, concerning the holding in abeyance of property tax in Nunavut, I find that all the reasons to support my motion today have been stated already by my hon. colleagues from above the tree line. Tagak Curley, for instance, and I quote: "So I am urging the Members of the Assembly to get rid of this thing and carry on with the establishment of a better system which would serve the people with a much better attitude and a much better response to these kinds of things."

William Noah: "Last winter in Coral Harbour they were asking how, in what way was there a possibility that the oil and gas could be lowered, the price could be lowered, not only the oil but also food and in small communities if you have to pay property taxes this is going to hinder a lot of people."

Mr. Evaluarjuk: "Concerning the thought that the cost of living is high already I know we are paying twice and a half for the various things and if you include the property tax it would be just too much for anybody to handle in this part of the country, including property tax."

The hon. Mr. Patterson: "Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that I know how my constituents feel about this issue since the private home owners and private businesses in Frobisher Bay, and there are not all that many of them, are already extremely upset about rising property taxes."

Mr. Nerysoo: "Obviously the idea that was brought up today, like the rebate to the home owners, was probably an idea that nobody really had an opportunity to talk about. People in my constituency have the same problem. They are not really in favour of increases in taxes either, but what has happened is that I have really not been given the opportunity to present any kind of, as I said before, alternatives to this House."

Mr. Speaker, I have quoted enough from the Debates I think. What I have attempted to do is show that nearly everyone seems to be concerned about the high cost of property taxes and the need for incentives for home ownership. Mr. Nerysoo wanted the mandate to look at alternatives for assistance. My motion, Mr. Speaker, gives him and his colleagues on the Executive Committee that mandate.

#### Home Owner Grants In The Yukon And Provinces

Now I have done a bit of research on this issue. For instance, in the Yukon the private home owner does receive some relief from property tax in the form of a grant and the details are as follows, again in the Yukon for the first \$100 of tax paid, there is no grant. For \$100 to \$600 of tax paid, 50 per cent of that to a maximum of \$300 comes back as a grant. In B.C. all home owners receive a home owner grant of \$280. For those 65 and over, \$480 is granted. In Manitoba a basic \$225 comes back to the home owner in grant. In Saskatchewan one half of the general taxes to a maximum of \$230.



In conclusion then, Mr. Speaker, my research reveals that there are some 2000 home owners in the Northwest Territories and if we are to institute such a program we will have to find the money somewhere. However, we are in a tight money situation. We are all very aware of that. If we have to provide those 2000 home owners with a \$300 a year property tax rebate it would cost our government \$600,000 and that is a healthy amount. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of priority. If we say as we did during the second session that we believe this Legislature must find a way to encourage home ownership, then we must not just pay lip service to that notion, we must pay our money. We must put our money where our mouth is. I urge you to vote in favour of this motion and give our Executive Committee the mandate to look at options for assistance.

MR. SPEAKER: To the motion. The hon. Mr. Patterson,

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to speak in favour of the motion. I have one difficulty with that motion and it is simply this. This Assembly earlier this session voted to give to the private businesses and private home owners in the area known as Nunavut as defined in the ITC proposal, total tax relief. The motion called on the administration to hold the taxes in abeyance and this motion calls for some property tax relief. Now there is a parliamentary tradition whereby a motion shall not be made which seeks to negative another motion and I feel that it might be construed that this motion could be seen as trying to delimit the earlier motion concerning Nunavut. I do not wish to raise that objection now, however, because I am in support of this motion and I am going to propose an amendment solely to clarify that issue.

MR. SPEAKER: Proceed with it then, if you will, Mr. Patterson.

Amendment To Motion 27-80(2)

MR. PATTERSON: Yes. The amendment simply would expand upon the definition of "home owners in the Northwest Territories" to add the words "outside the area known as Nunavut as defined in the proposal of Inuit Tapirisat of Canada". May I speak to the amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: Read it to us again so we have it correctly.

MR. PATTERSON: Wherever the words "home owners in the Northwest Territories" appear in the motion I would add the words after the words "home owners in the Northwest Territories outside the area known as Nunavut as defined in the proposal of Inuit Tapirisat of Canada." I believe there are two places where "home owners in the Northwest Territories" -- three clauses where "home owners in the Northwest Territories" are referred to.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. I take it it would not come following "home owners," but "home owners in the Northwest Territories" then your phrase. Is there a seconder for the amendment? Mr. Curley. Is this a point of order?

MRS. SORENSEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would challenge the amendment on the fact that Nunavut is not a legal entity. I am a territorial legislator and I was referring to all home owners in the Northwest Territories and the amendment does change the intent of my motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, please. I will accept the amendment. I feel first of all that the way the amendment is phrased it does not create the kind of difficulty which Mrs. Sorensen feared with respect to recognition of Nunavut, but more importantly with respect to the acceptance of the amendment it is merely limiting the scope of application. It is not actually negating the principle but limiting the scope of application and therefore it is acceptable and of course those who cannot approve of it would vote against it. It was seconded by Mr. Curley, was it? To the amendment, Mr. Patterson.

Concerning Total Tax Relief In Nunavut

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I want to make it crystal clear again that I am in full support of this motion and I am in full support of the principle of giving assistance to private home owners and I addressed their problems in my reply to the Commissioner's Address and I have spoken about it many times before. So I am going to support the motion. The only reason I have suggested the amendment is so that our Executive will not be confused about our wishes and I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that during the debate on the motion concerning Nunavut I believe it was the Hon. Mr. Nerysoo who said that other measures such as tax relief, along the lines of what was recommended in the task force report on housing, should be considered before property taxes were totally held in abeyance. That suggestion of Mr. Nerysoo was not followed by this Assembly and the motion of Mr. Curley which would give total tax relief to residents in that area of the Northwest Territories was passed.

While I am in full support of the motion to give some property tax relief to home owners in the Northwest Territories, I think telling the administration on the one hand that we want taxes held in abeyance in Nunavut and a few days later that we want some property tax relief for home owners in the Northwest Territories would put them in a very difficult position. They would want to know does the Assembly want total tax relief in Nunavut or does it want some property tax relief in Nunavut and I think our instructions were clear that in the area known as Nunavut there was to be total tax relief. This motion, this amendment, therefore, seeks to clarify that motion to give respect and credence to the Assembly's earlier direction to the administration.

I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, that I certainly would not say for a moment that Nunavut is a legal entity. I recognize that its existence or possible existence will be the subject of debate later on in this House and the term is only used simply to provide a convenient way of describing the particular area north of the tree line that that motion sought to relieve.

I will also point out, Mr. Speaker, that some hon. Members from the Western Arctic complained during the debate on property tax relief in the area north of the tree line that it was not fair, that measures should be proposed for a specific area. I recall telling the Hon. Mr. Nerysoo and others including the hon. Mrs. Sorensen who spoke inviting them to make a motion and here is the motion and I am delighted to see it and I will support it but my amendment simply seeks to allow this new motion to live with the earlier motion that was passed by this Assembly. So that is why I proposed the amendment and I want it understood that in no way does it seek to undermine the motion but rather to clarify it. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: To the amendment. Mr. Stewart.

Municipal Tax Base In Frobisher Bay

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, personally I am prepared to support the amendment as long as the dangers of the amendment are noted by the mover and the seconder, inasmuch as although it is by way of motion that there shall be no taxes in a specified area, the decision for this still rests in part with the Executive and it may not become indeed a matter of fact. For areas such as Frobisher Bay that are municipalities on a municipal tax base and may even with the act wish to continue with their tax base to run the municipality, if you put these words in then I would suggest to you that the home owners in Frobisher Bay would not qualify for any deduction under this particular section. However, it is your area and if you do not feel you are putting yourself into a restrictive position I will support the motion.

MR. PATTERSON: We would not dare do that.

MR. SPEAKER: To the amendment. Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: I had the earlier motion as it was, before the amendment was introduced, and I would like to indicate that I will be supporting the motion but I would just like to speak to the amendment. I think my understanding is that it is not the practice of this Assembly to contravene other motions. I have no indication from the Executive Members that they would not comply with my motion that the property tax be held in abeyance in Nunavut. If I had that indication I probably would have made that clearer in this House but I think this motion is a good one and I intend to support it and certainly will have no problem with it as it is.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there others who wish to speak to the amendment? It now being 11:30 I will recess for lunch and we will pick up the motion when we come back.

---LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

MR. SPEAKER: We have a quorum so I will call the House to order. We have been dealing with Motion 27-80(2), Home Owner Property Tax Relief. Mr. Patterson.

Amendment To Motion 27-80(2), Withdrawn

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to withdraw my amendment if you will permit a few words of explanation.

MR. SPEAKER: First of all I will determine if that is acceptable to your seconder.

MR. CURLEY: It is acceptable to me.

MR. SPEAKER: Please, Mr. Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON: The reason for it is after our recess this morning I spoke to Commissioner Parker and also the leader of the elected Executive Committee, the Hon. Mr. Braden, and both these men informed me that they saw no difficulty in living with the earlier motion concerning abeyance of property taxes in the area north of the tree line and the present motion on the floor, if it should pass. So there being no problem and no confusion if both these motions co-exist, then there is no need for my amendment and accordingly that is why I am withdrawing it.

I did get Commissioner Parker's consent to announce that while obviously the Executive Committee has not had a chance to study the implications of the earlier motion, should they approve or carry out or wish to carry out the Assembly's wishes in both these motions and be able to do so there would be no problem with carrying out the instructions in both motions. That is why I am withdrawing the amendment. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment is withdrawn. The Hon. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Speaker, if I may just be allowed to elaborate a bit on what the hon. Member has indicated. In my discussions with him I indicated that the debate in the House has really stressed some very significant points and concerns and the Executive Committee would be thoroughly investigating the implications in terms of revenues, the implications in terms of municipal taxes and so on and that we would be taking these two motions seriously and investigating them. That is all I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: The question being called. Are you ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion 27-80(2), Carried

MR. SPEAKER: The motion: Now therefore, be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly recommend that the Executive Committee consider options for assistance and further recommend that following that review, implement a means to provide some property tax relief to home owners in the Northwest Territories. Duly moved and seconded. Do you wish to speak, Mr. Fraser? Apparently not. Those in favour of the motion please indicate by raising your hands. Down. Opposed. The motion is carried.

---Carried

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Speaker, let the record show the motion was carried unanimously.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Motion 29-80(2), Terms of Reference of Special Committee on Education. Mr. McLaughlin.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, there is an error in this. The motion was not moved by me but by Mr. Curley.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. Mr. Curley.

Motion 29-80(2): Terms Of Reference Of Special Committee On Education

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS a special committee on education has been established;

NOW THEREFORE, I move, seconded by the hon. Member from Pine Point, that the special committee on education's terms of reference, appendix "A" attached, be presented to this House for adoption.

Special committee on education of the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories, Terms of reference:

The special committee on education shall:

(a) The committee will inquire into current problems and public concerns about education including without limiting the generality of the foregoing:

- special problems of native students
- languages and education
- curriculum
- facilities
- quality of education
- grants and bursaries
- special education
- teacher training
- continuing and secondary education

(b) Review all aspects of existing legislation, policy and philosophy concerning education in the Northwest Territories and make recommendations to the Assembly for reform.

(c) To consult in all parts of the Northwest Territories, members of the public, local education authorities and interested groups through public hearings and other meetings, written and oral submissions and other appropriate means.

(d) To present to the Legislative Assembly a report and recommendations respecting education grants and bursaries at the fall session of 1980, and an interim report of its findings at the fall session of 1981 and a final report and recommendations to be made early in 1982.

Conduct of business:

1. The committee shall conduct its business in a manner approved by the Legislative Assembly.
2. The committee shall have access to such persons, papers and records as are necessary to its business.
3. The necessary administrative support shall be provided by the Legislative Assembly office.



4. Three Members of the education committee shall form a quorum.
5. The committee shall be provided through the appropriations with adequate funds to defray all expenses sufficient to enable it to function effectively including the hiring of its own staff.
6. The committee or individual Members may undertake such travel as is required to carry out its assigned responsibilities.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder for that motion? Mr. McLaughlin. Duly moved and seconded. To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion 29-80(2), Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. Those in favour of Motion 29-80(2), Terms of Reference of the Special Committee on Education, please indicate by raising your hands. Down. Opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Motion 30-80(2), Deferral of Norman Wells Pipeline. Mr. Sibbeston.

Changes To Motion 30-80(2)

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, since making the notice of motion a couple of days ago I have been able to come to some agreement with Mr. Braden in regard to the wording of the motion. I would like, if possible, to read the amended or changed motion. It is slightly different from my original motion and I am just wondering if I could proceed in that manner. The alternative, of course, is to go ahead with my original motion and have Mr. Braden amend it, but it would save some time if I could just read the changed motion.

MR. SPEAKER: If you will tell us what your proposed new motion reads, then I will put it to the House as to whether they would accept that as a replacement, Mr. Sibbeston. I would ask the Members to pay close attention.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, can I also just refrain from reading the "whereases" because Members will have had an opportunity to read that?

MR. SPEAKER: Are they the same?

MR. SIBBESTON: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: You will have to read them later if we accept the motion but indicate now where the changes would lie and I will put it to the Members as to whether they would accept that as a replacement.

MR. SIBBESTON: Now therefore, I move that the Assembly urge the Executive Committee to co-operate with the Dene...

MR. SPEAKER: As slowly as possible and perhaps pointing out where the changes have been made, Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: I will read it slowly when I get to the changed portion. Now therefore, I move that the Assembly urge the Executive Committee to co-operate with the Dene Nation and Metis Association of the Northwest Territories to explore with the federal government the possibility of deferring construction of the Norman Wells oil pipeline and more particularly deferring the regulatory process required to assess the feasibility of the Norman Wells pipeline to Zama, Alberta, until the following conditions are met: 1. That aboriginal rights negotiations between the Dene Nation and Metis Association and the federal government are started and sufficiently under way to the satisfaction of the Dene and Metis people.



MR. SPEAKER: That is essentially the change. I will put that to the Members then. We have allowed minor word changes where the substance was not changed. Perhaps there is some change of substance but if Members agree, keeping in mind, as Mr. Sibbeston said, that if there is not agreement then he will proceed with the original but probably will be faced with amendments. Is it agreed to accept the suggested changes that Mr. Sibbeston has indicated? Agreed?

---Agreed

All right. Please proceed with your motion from the beginning then, Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: Can I waive the reading of the "whereases"?

MR. SPEAKER: Please read them.

Motion 30-80(2): Deferral Of Norman Wells Pipeline

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS there is a growing consciousness and concern amongst all peoples in the Northwest Territories about the merits of large development projects which take resources from the North without proper benefit and compensation to residents of the Northwest Territories;

AND WHEREAS the Dene people living along the route of the proposed Norman Wells pipeline have expressed strong objections to the construction of the pipeline until their aboriginal rights negotiations are concluded;

AND WHEREAS most or all Dene chiefs in the Northwest Territories are firmly against the construction of the Norman Wells pipeline until a final resolution of their aboriginal rights negotiations with the federal government;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that the Assembly urge the Executive Committee to cooperate with the Dene Nation and Metis Association of the Northwest Territories to explore with the federal government the possibility of deferring construction of the Norman Wells oil pipeline and more particularly deferring the regulatory process required to assess the feasibility of the Norman Wells pipeline to Zama, Alberta, until the following conditions are met:

1. That aboriginal rights negotiations between the Dene Nation and Metis Association and the federal government are started and sufficiently under way to the satisfaction of the Dene and Metis people;
2. That an overall long-term plan for the development of non-renewable resources in the Northwest Territories is formulated;
3. That a northern based authority is planned or in place which can effectively control and regulate the development of non-renewable resources and which is able to represent and protect the interests of the people of the Northwest Territories;
4. That arrangements are concluded for receiving an identifiable share of revenues, royalties and corporate taxes generated by the development of non-renewable resources in the Northwest Territories.
5. That guarantees are made such that, with the depletion of northern energy resources, energy supplies will be available to northerners in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: Seconder? Mr. Curley. Duly moved and seconded. To the motion, Mr. Sibbeston.

Approval From The Dene And Metis People Necessary

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, I will centre my remarks only on the first condition and it is the condition that aboriginal rights negotiations are started and sufficiently under way to the satisfaction of Dene and Metis people. As regards all the other conditions, these conditions were taken from the federal government or the Executive position, the provision that they had taken when they met with the federal government a number of weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to begin by saying that I and a majority of my constituents are not against development. In fact a majority of the native people in my area are involved in some form of development already, many of them are involved in the construction of the Liard highway and people cannot develop in a vacuum. You need to have something in progress, some economic activity in order that people can develop their skills and develop their economic well-being by working in business opportunities. However, at the present time, people in my area where the pipeline may go are not quite ready for a project the size of the Norman Wells pipeline. The band council in Fort Simpson is only now talking about setting up an economic development committee with the idea of becoming involved in business ventures. The feeling is that it will be a number of years, perhaps three or four years before it will be in a position where they can take advantage, not just by working but by taking advantage of the business opportunities.

Imperial Oil's Plan To Make Fort Simpson A Service Centre

Fort Simpson is on the route of the Norman Wells pipeline and Imperial Oil officials have stated that Imperial Oil plans to make Simpson one of its service centres. If they do so there would be approximately seven or eight people who would live there in order to maintain the pipeline. I am aware that there has been some discussion locally in Fort Simpson about the idea of native people or band council becoming involved in say building the homes for the oil company or else building the office complex which the companies may use.

There have also been some discussions with Jean Marie River about the possibility of their little sawmill providing some of the timber that might be needed when the pipeline is being constructed. All of this will take a number of years and there will be some onus on Mr. Braden's department and Indian Affairs to help people get ready for this economic venture.

The other main reason why I would like if possible for the pipeline and the regulatory process to be delayed is because of the fact that land claim negotiations have just begun. I do sense this time, in the last few months, a real sincere desire to come to some settlement in the next few years. There is some pressure on the native leaders to come up with solutions or some final agreement. The pressure on the Dene Nation and the Metis Association to co-operate has been evident in the good working relationship that they have established in recent months.

We have all seen positive progress made by the native organizations and the Executive Committee in coming to some basic common understanding in the fight, in a sense, with Ottawa. So things are generally progressing quite well and I do sense a real optimism amongst the people in my area that if the native leaders work real hard that there could well be a land claim settlement in the next few years.

Mr. Speaker, should the federal government, despite the feelings that I have talked about in my area, and despite the fact that it seems that many people or all people in the North are not prepared to permit the pipeline to go ahead without certain conditions, should the federal government just go ahead anyway I think that there would be a lot of chaos. I do think that if the government goes ahead with the pipeline in the next year, let us say, that

all land claim negotiations, all aboriginal rights negotiations will simply come to a halt and all the energy of the native leaders will go towards fighting the pipeline. I do say that this would not be desirable and would be just very sad and unfortunate if this were to happen. If the federal government is really sincere about settling aboriginal rights with the Dene and Metis people they ought to defer the pipeline for a number of years yet.

#### Position Of Dene People In Mackenzie Liard

Some Dene and a few Metis people met in my area at a regional meeting in the early part of June, June 6 to 8, in Fort Simpson, as a result of that there was one motion regarding pipelines and I will just read the main text of the motion. It reads: Therefore be it resolved that the rights of the Dene be settled through negotiations with the federal government. Once a negotiated agreement has been reached and implemented with the rest of Canada, and that Dene rights are recognized in the constitution of Canada, and that the Dene have political, social and economic control over their lives, until such time there will be no development.

This is the position of the Dene chief and the Dene people in my area. At the meeting, and I was fortunate to be at that meeting where the pipeline matter was the number one topic on the three day discussions, I heard the Dene leaders say there that we have told you our feelings on the pipeline. We told Berger, and what we told Berger was we do not want a pipeline until aboriginal rights are settled. The people at the meeting said Berger did listen and made a report in 1977, just three years ago, saying no pipeline for at least ten years.

I heard chiefs say at that meeting has the government forgotten what Berger said. Does the government think that we have forgotten what we said? Do they think we are crazy? The people were really quite angry at the fact that it seems again they have to react to this whole question of a pipeline. They have gone through the process of turmoil and the process of telling Mr. Berger their feelings and they feel it is just unfair for them to again have to deal with that question.

#### Pipeline Should Be Deferred

So the feelings at that meeting were quite strong and definite that as far as they were concerned they did not want to hear about pipelines, they certainly do not want to hear about pipelines for at least the next seven years. So the position which I have stated here today is simply that the Executive co-operate with the Dene Nation and the Metis Association to explore the possibility of the government deferring the construction and also deferring the regulatory process to assess the possibility of a pipeline. The first condition says that they can go ahead only if aboriginal rights negotiations are under way and that the Dene and Metis people feel satisfied that their rights are protected, then in fact the Norman Wells pipeline can go ahead. So I do believe the position I have put forward here is a moderate position and not as tough a position as the native Dene people would like me to do.

So as I say it is a moderate position and I will no doubt be questioned as to why I have become a moderate and am seen to be perhaps selling out to the government and so forth but I am prepared to go back to Simpson and explain to the people that there is merit in compromising as far as I have. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: To the motion. Mr. Fraser.

MR. FRASER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have some points in the motion that I would like the mover to explain if he could. There are a few things he has said which might be in order but there are some things in this motion that possibly no one else knows anything about, and I doubt if he does. First of all Fort Simpson is not in the path of the pipeline, it is a long way from Fort Simpson; which he states in one of his whereas clauses. Secondly, when you talk about the chiefs in agreement, as stated in the whereas portion of the motion, Norman Wells has quite a few employed throughout Fort Simpson and we think entirely different to the mover of the motion.

#### Pipeline Needed For Employment

Mr. Speaker, I speak now for my constituents who are employed on the Norman Wells pipeline. I have 40 of them and they are working from the outlying settlements plus there are 50 other native people who are employed at Norman Wells who are from other settlements in the Territories such as Fort Simpson, Wrigley and all up and down the valley. Two weeks ago there were 90 natives employed at Norman Wells and I am sure that they would not agree with this motion in its context.

It is all very well for a Member to say no development but how are these people going to live? Who is going to feed these guys? The majority of them have families to look after and some of them with seven or eight kids. Has the Member figured out some way to feed them? The chiefs are all working, they all have jobs and are getting money from the government and most of them are retired, they do not work but before I could support a motion such as this, Mr. Speaker, I have to have some assurance that these people will be looked after, especially my constituents. Maybe the Member who is moving this motion who is so strong against a pipeline could tell me how 90 people with families are going to live?

Now, in a way I disagree with the pipeline but not in the words that are put in this motion; by no means. When he mentions the chiefs in his whereas clauses it is the chiefs he is using as a weapon, Mr. Speaker, which is to my thinking not the way it should be done. If he were to go out like I did and do a door-to-door survey of the people who are now working and who have been working in Norman Wells for a number of years, and if he were to go and do that right now, and I dare him to go down to Norman Wells and hand them this motion, I do not think he would come back.

#### Compensation For Resources

I agree that the pipeline should be delayed for a certain time until we are assured, and when I say "we" I mean the people of the Territories, not just the Dene Nation as they have rights they want settled and have been working on a long time, and I agree they have aboriginal rights and should have some benefit, but how about the rest of the people who have raised their children in this country, who were born and raised up here? Should they not be considered? If the federal government were to sit down with the Executive Members like they did in Ottawa and come up with some assurance that the Territories will be compensated for any resources that are taken out of the Territories, had this been done years ago when Yellowknife became a gold town, the people of Yellowknife would have been smart, they would have been rich today. All they would have had to do was say to the government, "We need something out of the resources that are going out of here. Give us a dollar an ounce or two dollars an ounce or even ten cents an ounce," they would have been sitting pretty today but that was never thought of.



I have to give Mr. Erasmus credit for thinking they should have some compensation for the resources that are going out of here. This pipeline that they are building now is only a small pipeline. The field at Norman Wells is only a small field. They go together. However, they are talking about 15 years supply of oil. That oil they tell me is going to join a pipeline at Zama city. That pipeline from Zama city connects up with Ontario and Quebec who are freezing to death. In 15 years time when that oil field is no more they will be shipping the same oil back to us at twice the cost in that same pipeline. There is no way you are going to get around that.

So we have to take a good look at this motion and the way it stands, the way the motion reads now I am a little bit leery whether I would support it. I would like to see some changes in it. The intent is there, but my feeling is that whether we like it or not, whether the chiefs like it or not, whether the people in the Territories like it or not, if the federal government says, "We are going ahead with that pipeline," we have nothing to fight them with. We have nothing and I think it is time that we did have some say as to resources that are going out of the Territories for years and years and will continue to go out of here unless we do something about it. What we can do I do not know. We have elected expertise in these chambers to look into the possibility of how we can do it, but I cannot blame them. They can go to Ottawa every weekend or every week, two or three times a month and bang their fists on the table in Ottawa. It is not going to do us or them any good until we get the right people that we can convince. Hopefully we could convince them, but we definitely should get something for the resources that are going out of here. If it is in the form of a written guarantee that we are going to get some benefit out of the oil that is going out of Norman Wells, well then I do not think there is any reason why they should go ahead with that pipeline, but first we should have that guarantee and this is what the people in Norman Wells feel, they feel that they should be getting something out of it in the long term before they go ahead with the pipeline.

Now there are some people who have been working at Imperial Oil for a number of years. There is no way you can talk them out of not building that pipeline. Whether it is Imperial Oil or whoever it is that has told them, that if there is no pipeline there is no work, it is as simple as that. I doubt it very much but what I would like to see in this motion is a date of when they could begin building the pipeline, not defer it like the motion says, to delay the construction of the Norman Wells pipeline to Zama city until the following conditions are met. The following conditions also mention some type of protection and some type of control of renewable resources but it does not say how we are going to get it.

#### People Need Some Type Of Assurance

I understand that Members of the Executive Committee made a trip to Ottawa to deal with this most important matter some time back. I was not aware of the Members going out until I heard it on the radio and they were already gone which I was not too happy about. It was just one of those things. I would like to make it clear right now that if Members of the Executive are dealing with a particular constituency, at least as a courtesy the Members should be notified. However, I could have had some information for them to take with them to Ottawa from people who are concerned and they are Dene people. They are not people off the street. They are the same type of people the mover of this motion is talking about in this motion and some of them are treaty Indians. They want some assurance like we want assurance that we are going to get something out of resources. They want assurance they are going to get some money to eat with after the pipeline is stopped. How are we going to give them that assurance? I cannot give it to them. I cannot say to them, "Well, it is better not to build a pipeline because we are going to get nothing out of it." I feel they are going to get nothing out of it if we fail to do something, but what can we do?

Mr. Speaker, I would like somebody in this House to tell us what measures they could take to assure the people in the Territories that they are going to get something out of this pipeline, not just work. Work is only there for two or three years and then it is gone, but you cannot tell people who are feeding a family that for some reason there are only two or three years work and it is not worth it. Tell them that. There is no way you can tell them that, at least I cannot and I would not even try it. So after saying all that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear what some of the Executive Members have to say who were in Ottawa discussing this most important matter with the Minister as to what assurance we are going to have to receive some benefits from this oil that is going out of the Territories, if there is any assurance that we are going to get any. We are in great danger if they go ahead with the pipeline without some assurance that we are going to get something out of it, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mrs. Sorensen.

Amendment To Motion 30-80(2)

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that this motion be referred to committee of the whole to be the second item on the order paper in committee of the whole.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved for referral to committee of the whole. Is there a seconder for that? Is there a seconder for that motion? Mr. Fraser.

MR. FRASER: No, Mr. Speaker. I am just a little bit afraid if it goes into committee of the whole we are not going to have time to discuss it. I would like to hear now what the Executive Members have to say.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. CURLEY: To the motion.

Amendment To Motion 30-80(2), Defeated

MR. SPEAKER: There is a motion to refer and Mrs. Sorensen will have a right to speak to it. You can debate it later, Mr. Fraser. I thought you were seconding. Is there a seconder to the motion to refer to committee of the whole? No seconder. Then the motion is lost.

---Defeated

Hon. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the hon. Member from Mackenzie Liard for his remarks and also the hon. Member from Mackenzie Great Bear for some very good comments on some of the immediate kinds of issues that are important with respect to his constituency and other areas. Just to clarify a couple of points that he did raise before I get into more detail, I believe the work that is taking place in Norman Wells right now is primarily related to some upgrading of the present facility and is not related to the expansion of the Norman Wells field.



Another point. He indicated serious concern about jobs and I want to indicate that I share that concern as well and particularly with respect to the pipeline project and the expansion of the field in Norman Wells. I understand from company officials that the work done at Norman Wells itself is going to be union work and although I have not had any answers yet from, direct answers yet from officials of Interprovincial Pipeline we were hoping the work on the pipeline project will be non-union but they have had no guarantees from the unions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as one who has had a lot of experience in this area I want to indicate to the hon. Member that the people of the Northwest Territories are not generally perceived by many of the major construction and trade unions in the South to be in a group which should have priority. That point was stated very explicitly by an official of Petrocan in Resolute Bay some weeks ago when I was up there and he was asked the question: "Will the pipeline and construction trade unions give northern residents priority on construction of the pipeline from the gas fields on Melville Island to Bridport Inlet?" The answer he had to give was, "No." So, Mr. Speaker with those opening points to the hon. Member I would like to go into a general discussion if I could as to what has been taking place. The Executive Committee met with the Dene Nation about two months ago and had some discussions about their aboriginal rights negotiations...

MR. SPEAKER: Excuse me, I would find that not to the motion. If we were in committee of the whole where there was a broader range in discussion that probably would be in order but you should speak to this particular motion.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: All right, Mr. Speaker. I want to indicate at the outset that I would urge Members to support this motion. The hon. Member from Mackenzie Liard has spoken to the first item in the list of conditions...

HON. TOM BUTTERS: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I guess it is a point of order on your ruling, Mr. Speaker. The motion in effect urges the Executive Committee to do something they have already done. I think it is very pertinent to the motion in view of the fact that the Minister is going to report on the progress of achieving the objective of the motion as before us.

MR. FRASER: Right on!

MR. SPEAKER: All right, your point is well taken, Mr. Butters. Mr. Braden, wherever it does state that you ought to be doing something, if you have already done something in that area it would be in order. Proceed.

Meeting With The Dene Nation And Metis Association

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to indicate briefly that we began discussions with the Dene Nation and the Metis Association concerning the proposed pipeline and expansion of the Norman Wells field about two months ago. In a series of meetings we determined that there were some areas where the Executive and the two organizations could not reach agreement.

However, sir, there were a number of areas where we felt there was general agreement between the three groups and we felt that we had sufficient consensus and agreement amongst ourselves to produce a joint paper and to enter into some discussions with the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development on the conditions contained in that paper.

I refer Members to a document which I tabled the other day in the House which contains the text of that one page paper. Now, we met in Ottawa with the Minister about two weeks ago and indicated to him that we were all trying to be very positive about development in the Northwest Territories and this development in particular. However, in this particular case, Mr. Speaker, we felt that because of the timetabling, because of the significance of an oil development, and because of some outstanding issues such as the settlement of native rights and also some direction from the Government of Canada as to where this territory was going to go constitutionally, there was a need to make a stand, a need to make a case, that until this development was desirable, until we could throw our support fully behind this development, we saw the need for the federal government to make some pretty tough decisions, and those decisions included getting under way with the negotiation of aboriginal rights with native people.

#### No Guarantee For Supply For Products In The Future

They did nothing. They did literally nothing in the Mackenzie Valley for two years. They have maintained that they have the authority to plan for the development of resources in the Northwest Territories. Mr. Speaker, since 1970 there has been no plan. We talked about the need for a northern based authority which could exercise some control. We talked about the need for resource and revenue sharing. We said it is really ironic that we are sitting on these vast reserves of energy and yet here we are at the end of the distribution line and we are paying the high cost and there is no guarantee for supply for products in the future.

Now, the Minister took these points very seriously and I want to report to this House that while he has not yet made a decision to proceed ahead with some serious analysis, some serious work and serious discussion to achieve some change in these issues, he is prepared to submit a document to cabinet in a few weeks asking for that mandate. I want to indicate to this House that I will again be in Ottawa to talk further with the Minister on the substance of that cabinet document and further developments as they are taking place in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. Speaker, if it is possible I would like to provide the House with some information regarding the Norman Wells project that we have developed in our government, and I believe it is information that is useful in the areas of royalties and revenues, particularly. So if I may proceed with that I think Members might find that very interesting.

My staff has indicated to me that since 1950 the excess profit, or economic rent income that Esso Resources has achieved is in the order of \$101,561,000. Since 1950 the federal share in 1980 dollars has been \$32,185,000. I want to indicate further that should this project proceed under the existing rules of the game, government revenues, and this is Government of the Northwest Territories revenues, will mainly stem from indirect taxation, fuel taxes, personal income tax, quarrying fees, stumpage fees and property taxes.

During the Norman Wells construction period Interprovincial Pipelines has estimated these indirect government revenues at \$700,000. Indirect revenues to the government during the construction pipeline phase will amount to only about \$540,000. In total, the Government of the Northwest Territories will receive from indirect taxation approximately \$1.2 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is revenue of \$1.2 million from an initial investment by the companies of \$375 million.

MR. SIBBESTON: Shame, shame! Terrible!

Receiving Little In Return For Depletion Of Resources

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: It is possible that direct sources of revenue will be marginal and that the Government of the Northwest Territories and its residents will receive little in return for depletion of their resource. In conclusion there exists a good possibility the Northwest Territories government would experience a net outflow of funds as a result of the project unless policy initiatives are undertaken to reverse this trend and to capture more of the possible revenue. Now, let me list off a few of the areas where we will have to spend money if this project proceeds. We see, for example, sir, that we will have to build a new school at Norman Wells.

MR. SIBBESTON: Shame!

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: We see for example that the provision of the support infrastructure may be severely taxed, service roads, construction and service, sewer and water, airport facilities, and other infrastructure requirements will probably require a significant investment for service levels to remain constant. We see an increase in manpower costs and training costs. We understand that the applicant is not prepared to undertake any major training initiatives prior to the construction phase so, Mr. Speaker, we will have to pay for that.

Manpower training and the provision of certain advisory services and assistance to residents and business are examples as I said of possible cost increases. We expect, sir, to have increases in social assistance and I want to make it clear that the experience with the Dome-Canmar activities on social assistance expenses within the Inuvik region justify this conclusion. The same conclusion was drawn with respect to studies done in Coppermine.

Unions In The N.W.T.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to point out that once those unions are here in the Northwest Territories, wages and salaries will increase, benefits to employees will increase and that will mean implications for this government. When the teamsters come in, sir, and start demanding \$15 or \$20 an hour for a truck driver, the union that represents civil servants who drive trucks for the Government of the Northwest Territories is going to come to the negotiating table and say the rate has been set with Norman Wells and we think we need parity.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned that should this project proceed under the existing rules of the game, we are going to be broke, just like they were broke in Alaska until the royalties and the revenues started flowing in in about 1978-79. Unfortunately, sir, we are not like Alaska. We do not have that option to benefit from the royalties and the revenues. As I believe it the government's game plan is as it was when the Mackenzie Valley pipeline was being considered. This is a game plan that goes back to the 1970's, sir, and what it would involve is increasing the operating deficit of the Government of the Northwest Territories to the minimum extent possible but not allow us to gain from significant revenues that this project will generate. With respect to those revenues, sir, I think it is fairly obvious the Government of Canada has a backlog of about \$14 billion and they want to pay it off. They see the North as an area they can develop when they choose to help in their balance of payments problems. Sir, I am not willing to let that happen. We are not here to pay for the mistakes of ten or 15 years of Liberal government in Canada.

Development Projects Proceeding In The N.W.T.

I want to point out further, Mr. Speaker, that the action of the Executive Committee should not be considered as an antidevelopment measure. I have a list here of projects that are proceeding in the Northwest Territories; the Polaris mine, Lupin gold property near Contwoyto Lake, Cadillac mine, Camlaren and Cullaton Lake, O'Brien mine in the Keewatin, Indigo mine which is preparing



to put the facility back in operation, Nanisivik, which has cost us over the last few years \$14 million, Amax, Canex Placer working on the Yukon border, the Beaufort Sea, uranium developments in the Keewatin, Aquitaine Drilling and another major project, the Arctic Pilot Project. Mr. Speaker, these developments are going ahead and in some cases we are assisting the developers, hiring local people to work, getting the developers to use northern business. We are not an antidevelopment Executive. We have chosen in this case a very significant development and we want the rules of the game changed so that real benefit comes to the people of the Northwest Territories.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is I know a very emotional issue in my part of the Northwest Territories. I know that because of the experience with the Mackenzie Valley project there is a certain measure of, I guess, hysteria at times which is associated with pipelines. I want to indicate, sir, that the government is not going to just stop with running down the federal government. We are prepared to work during the next year and to put together the best deal possible for northern people. We are prepared to work with John Munro and other federal officials. We are prepared to work with officials of the Dene Nation and the Metis Association, even the Chamber of Commerce.

Project Important To The N.W.T. And To Canada

So, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this project is very important for Canada. It is also very important for the people of the Northwest Territories. It may only be 25,000 barrels a day, but I want the Members of this House to recognize that once that transmission line is down the valley do not be surprised if other fields become economical to exploit and that is what Canada is looking at. Canada has a problem; they need oil. They had to almost beg Mexico for 50,000 barrels a day and they have this resource, this reserve sitting in the Northwest Territories. Do not let anybody fool you and say, "Well, it is just a little pipeline, only 25,000 barrels a day." They need this oil. Mr. Speaker, I think that the people of the Northwest Territories -- in fact, I believe the people of the Northwest Territories are willing to share with southern Canada our resources but as the rules of the game are set up we stand to gain for a couple of years on construction and then it will be back to the slow down in the economy. Perhaps it will pick up again in the future and we will go through the boom and the bust continually for the next two or three decades. So, Mr. Speaker, I would urge that Members support my colleague's motion. Thank you very much.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak in favour of the motion mainly because I think there is a profound promise over there with respect to the aboriginal rights of the native people and the development. I think Mr. Braden pretty well summarized the particular problems that are faced by the government and the relationship with the Government of Canada. I would just like to indicate the problem there that I may have with the motion. Although I do not totally agree that there should be one industry that would take over the overall plan for development, I think that kind of idea would have to be further debated in this House. If that were to come up I would expect it would be debated when the question of Nunavut is firmly on the floor and give all the Members of this House a chance to debate it. So I have a further problem with number three, particularly with respect to the northern based authority. I think that would be also difficult for me because the priorities in the Mackenzie area would not necessarily be the priorities of the Eastern Arctic. So on that basis, although I do support the motion, I would look forward to studying the question of the northern based authority very carefully before I would approve such a one. I only have these two main points to point out because in some parts of the North we do seem to have a preference to deal directly with Ottawa as if the federal government were to come some time in the future. So I would not go any further at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: To the motion, Mr. Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to briefly address some remarks to Mr. Fraser, wherever he is.

MR. SPEAKER: To the motion, Mr. Patterson.

Long-Term Benefits

MR. PATTERSON: Yes. I am pleased to speak in support of the motion. I was concerned here about Mr. Fraser's reservations. I do not really know how he is planning on voting, but I would just like to make some remarks for the record about what he said. My concern about what Mr. Fraser said was that, while I fully sympathize with the problems his constituents are facing right now, I would respectfully ask Mr. Fraser to take a longer-term look at the problem and to recognize that deferment of this project in the short term, although it may put employment hardships on his constituents, may also yield tremendous long-term benefits for their children and grandchildren in terms of a piece of action.

MR. FRASER: You tell them that.

MR. PATTERSON: I am telling them that. I am putting my remarks on the record. If I go to Norman Wells, I would like to have the opportunity...

MR. FRASER: You will not come back if you do.

MR. PATTERSON: ...to express those views. It is like everything else. When people are faced with the immediate prospect of leaving something that they have got, it is pretty hard for them, for anyone to ask them to give it up, but I think all Mr. Fraser was, in effect, saying was he is hopeful that this deferment and this discussion process does not take a long time. I think we all agree and we all sympathize with it and we all are very anxious for a speedy resolution of the Dene claim and a speedy resolution of these problems and the recommendations that Mr. Sibbeston's motion contains. But I would strongly urge Mr. Fraser that it is not going to help that process any if he is seen as a dissenter to this motion and if he is seen by the company as supporting the pipeline going ahead without any of these...

MR. SPEAKER: Slow down a little bit please, Mr. Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON: ...if he can be seen to support the pipeline going ahead without any of these other considerations being addressed. I think that one feature of this Assembly is that we are willing to compromise and we are struggling to achieve consensus. It means that everybody has to give and now it is Mr. Fraser's turn to give a little bit and his constituents, maybe to give a lot, but I would try and urge on him and on them that holding back a little bit may produce great dividends in the long run and maybe if we all can support this motion land claims can move rapidly. I am going to support it with these things in mind, not because I want to hurt any of Mr. Fraser's constituents, but you know I really think we have to look at the long-term aspect of this and a pipeline, as was well pointed out in the Berger Inquiry, does give a shot of stimulus to a local economy. How many jobs are going to be left behind when that facility is built? I think that is an important question. We have to force the federal government to deal with that. These sorts of guarantees that Mr. Sibbeston was talking about are the only hope we have got of preventing that from happening.

Planning On A Territorial-Wide Basis

I also think along with Mr. Curley that our debate on Nunavut, which is going to come up, may well force us to fundamentally reassess the feasibility of planning on a territorial-wide basis. So I think we will all agree that that ambition of being able to do things on a territorial-wide basis may be changed



or be rendered not so feasible by later events in this House. However, I have no hesitation in supporting the principles of this motion and I do urge all Members, including Mr. Fraser, to work towards the speedy resolution of this process by showing solidarity with the initiative taken by our Executive Committee to date. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: To the motion. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, the motion as the mover indicated is a very moderate one, a most moderate one from my colleague regarding development. He recognized in his supportive statement that the people in his constituency looked at development expectantly and would hope from that not only improved quality of life but a meaningful involvement in the development so that there can be a share of the development revenues of such resources as exist.

The mover also indicated that with the exception of the one subclause, the first one, it was pretty well those statements that were agreed to at a joint meeting between the Dene Nation and the Metis Association executive and the Executive of the Northwest Territories. I think one could almost suggest that the motion might say to continue to explore and that would indicate that there had been some very meaningful progress made in that area already.

I think that the objectives of the joint approach are readily understandable to the people of the Territories and I think they generally receive support of the people of the Territories. However, I have one caveat only and that is one area not discussed in this joint initiative which was that of timing. How long should the project be deferred? How long can we expect a deferral might be granted us? Obviously this is practising the art of the exercise in which we are involved; politics. What is possible in this current situation?

#### A Deferment Of A Limited Time Is Possible

I believe that a deferment of a limited time is possible. I believe that if there was good will and understanding on all parts, and that includes the North, the Government of Canada and the developer, that a great deal could be achieved. However, I think we must recollect the national situation in which our objectives seek to exist. As the Member, or as the hon. Minister pointed out, their trip to Ottawa came at a very unfortuitous time in that Mexico had just reneged on some 50,000 barrels of oil per day to be imported into Canada. Ironically, that is just about the amount that the Norman Wells line could pump, 50,000 barrels a day. Similarly too, the revenue to the Government of Canada I think as was mentioned was one million dollars per day which is some \$365 million annually. Again ironically that amount is almost the amount of money which is currently transferred to this government in O and M deficit grants and our capital requirements.

So we are a major recipient of many of the revenues that are currently accruing to Canada. As I say it is just interesting that the outgoing almost equals the incoming. However, I think the motion is a good one, the exploration must take place and it must take place with all possible haste. I think progress has been made to date and as I say I think I am optimistic that with a little bit of give and take a practical and realistic and positive solution to this problem can be achieved.

Now there is just one thing I would suggest to all Members who are going to support the motion, and I am sure it will receive the support of all Members, the second part calls for the deferment of the regulation process. As you know the regulatory process, EARP, the Environmental Assessment and Review Panel process has been deferred already one month by the hon. Minister of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development which will or could see that regulatory process beginning late in July.

I would suggest to you that if it is not possible to defer that process, and if the Minister determined to go ahead with that process, I think Members might expect, and I may be presuming here on the judgment of the Executive Committee, but I think Members might expect that their Executive Committee would determine to be present at those hearings. So it is possible that you may move a motion now and then find that between the adjournment of this session in Baker Lake and the reconvention of our meeting in Frobisher Bay in October, that the Executive Committee has made a presentation to the EARP process. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: I see there are others who wish to speak and it is coffee time so we will recess for coffee.

---SHORT RECESS

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize a quorum and call the session to order. To the motion, Mr. Noah.

MR. NOAH: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a comment to make regarding the motion which is quite long. I will support the motion but I would also like to state to the motion that was made in the North the Inuit and the white people have stated that they want jobs in the North and it is clear now that in about ten years, maybe after ten years there will be more jobs required and we have also heard that there are about 300 young people who will require, or who will need to get jobs maybe in less than ten years.

Now, this is very important to the young people and to us, to everybody in the North. We know it is important that we have to look at the future, like the pipeline, the major developments, and even if they start now, the major developments -- it seems like we are just selling our future. It is clear that the mining exploration or oil exploration seems to be rushed by people to start now. Even if we approve of this now, as I said before, it seems we have no future in the North. They seem to be just giving away our future and it would seem that we are just selling our future. If we start pipeline development or major development, that is. It is obvious now that we do not have much of a future, there will be no jobs for our young people and we will just seem to move to an empty space. After the land claims are settled, even though we do not approve of them now, maybe in future we would have a better place to live.

#### Negotiating Land Claims

Now, concerning land claims I would like to make a statement on the land claims because it is far off the motion that was made. Now, the land claims or they are negotiating with the federal government and the Inuit people and the native people and they have negotiated quite a few times up to now. If we are not going to get the land claims settled in ten or 15 years or over, it seems there will be no more jobs in the North, our jobs will be taken away. If we wait any longer, the oil exploration and mines, the minerals and oils, will be moved to the South instead of staying in the North.

It would be better if we held onto it as it is now and maybe in the future there will be better jobs and our children will have a better place to live. Right now I do not understand, maybe because I am not smart enough, but I cannot understand why the oil has to be taken down to the South instead of the North. I cannot understand why the minerals and oil have to be taken down to the South. In the North they seem to be our only future and they will provide more jobs in the North but if we give them away now it would seem like a very dumb thing to do and it would not help much for our future.

Have you ever thought that we should be able to do something in the North? I cannot understand why in the South like in Ottawa or somewhere, they are not the only people who should get that. Maybe if we get our own government in the North, that we will have to be responsible for, in the future.

What is the sense of having our own government when we do not have anything in our land? It seems that we, or Ottawa will administer the lands that do not have anything at all. I will support the motion and I do not think the pipeline should be built now, it would hurt our land and the animals, the wildlife and fish and mammals and it is dangerous. I also know in the Western Arctic that there are people who are living in the traditional way. I will support the motion and thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the motion. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I have two pieces of paper in my hand.

MR. FRASER: Give me one.

Who Is Running This Government

MRS. SORENSEN: One is a motion by Mr. Sibbeston and the other is the famous pink paper or the infamous pink paper or what is known as the pink paper of May 26th, 1980. This one is the government's position paper and this one is Mr. Sibbeston's position paper. Who is running this government? Is Mr. Sibbeston running this government or is the Executive running this government? We should be debating the Executive's position paper. This is the position of this government, not Mr. Sibbeston's motion. I see definite differences in the two papers and frankly Mr. Sibbeston's motion frightens me.

MR. FRASER: Hear, hear!

MR. SIBBESTON: I am flattered.

MRS. SORENSEN: The reason I am frightened is that the Executive has already made a commitment but no one knew about that commitment. This paper is the Executive position which had to be leaked and people in Yellowknife received it. This Assembly did not know what it contained. Now we find that Mr. Butters has said that Mr. Sibbeston's motion is exactly the government's position. He has suggested an amendment to it. I have to question how the Executive could make a commitment such as they made before they talked to this Legislative Assembly. There was no urgency, none whatsoever. We were meeting in Baker Lake. They could have come to us with their position and we could have helped them make the decision. This a consensus government and because there was no urgency to the matter they should have come to us.

MR. FRASER: Hear, hear!

MRS. SORENSEN: I, like Mr. Fraser, have no difficulty with most of Mr. Sibbeston's well worded motion. I must agree it takes quite a bit of the Executive position paper and rewords it into this motion. But it adds a few things, a few very important things. Now points two, three, four and five were all major concerns of mine when I spoke during the discussion of the estimates for the Department of Economic Development and I spoke strongly in support of taking a more provincial attitude and that is exactly what I see our Executive Committee doing. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly in favour of that. That is what they were doing with their position paper, that is exactly what they were doing, taking a more provincial attitude, standing up for our territorial rights. I believe that what they were doing was proper, but I believe they should have consulted with us first.

Development Is Inevitable

However, with respect to point number one I have to ask questions. I am uneasy and I need some assurances. Mr. Sibbeston wants the Executive Committee to explore with the federal government the possibility of deferring construction until land claims negotiations between the Dene and Metis and the federal government are started and sufficiently under way.

---Applause

It continues on to say: "...to the satisfaction of the Dene and the Metis people". And then he continues on to mention the four other conditions all of which I can wholeheartedly agree with, but, Mr. Speaker, what happens if the Dene decide they are not satisfied that their negotiations are going well? The Dene chiefs have already stated and it is here in the "whereas" clause that they are firmly against the construction of the Norman Wells pipeline until a

final resolution of their claims negotiations. "Final" to me could be ten years down the road. It could be 20 and knowing that, how can one of the conditions we as a government apply to the construction of this pipeline, be the fact that construction can go ahead only when the Dene and the Metis are satisfied with their progress? Everywhere else in the Northwest Territories and Mr. Braden listed the various projects in detail, land claims and development are progressing side by side. It is healthy. Development is inevitable. There is really no choice in the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MRS. SORENSEN: It has already been established in a civil court that land claims and aboriginal rights claims which have not yet been settled cannot stop development. Justice Mahoney in the Baker Lake case is an example of just that.

MR. PATTERSON: Shame!

MRS. SORENSEN: Development is upon us. Economic conditions in the South dictate that, as people have been predicting for some time now. As Mr. Braden said, Canada needs that Norman Wells oil. Canada needs that pipeline and Canada will come and get it.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Shame, shame!

MRS. SORENSEN: We are talking about 20 million Canadian people who have a national interest on their side. Sheer numbers alone dictate that this pipeline will go ahead if Canada wants it to go ahead and my friends, as Mr. Braden has said, Canada is in trouble. We have not taken that into consideration with this motion. Canada is in trouble. It has a huge deficit. Every barrel of oil that is imported into this country adds to that national deficit. As Mr. Braden said, Canada lost 50,000 barrels of oil it had expected to import from Mexico. Canadians may be faced with a shortage of supply this winter and next.

MR. CURLEY: Joe Clark goofed!

A Society Dictated By Economics

MRS. SORENSEN: It is unfortunate that our society is dictated by economics. I do not like it either, but if we continue to want cars, skidoos, heavy equipment, rifles, communications systems, oil heated homes, airplanes and all the other little necessities of life then there is a need to exploit the non-renewable resources. You are dreaming if you think you are going to be able to not exploit them and get away with it. Canadians are starting to get uncomfortable with the cry, "No development until land claims". I am certainly tired of it.

MR. PATTERSON: That is not what the motion says.

MRS. SORENSEN: If I could feel that in the five years since Berger began his inquiry concerning the building of a gas pipeline that the Dene people had used the time delay constructively...

HON. TOM BUTTERS: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Your point of order.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Would you ask the hon. Member to be seated while I speak? Mr. Speaker, would you instruct the hon. Member that she is not speaking to the motion? The motion is "to explore". There is nothing being said in the motion with regard to stopping development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

---Applause



MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Speaker, in the "whereas" clause it says, "And whereas most or all Dene chiefs in the Northwest Territories are firmly against the construction of the Norman Wells pipeline until a final resolution of their aboriginal rights negotiations with the federal government..."

MR. SPEAKER: Are there other comments on the point of order before I make a ruling? Mrs. Sorensen's comments are in order, although the motion states that it is exploring the possibility of delaying the construction until certain conditions are met. If those explorations were successful, then Mrs. Sorensen is pointing out what some of the implications would be and that certainly is relevant to the motion. Proceed, Mrs. Sorensen.

Making The Best Of Both Worlds

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Some of the comments I will be making may make some people feel uncomfortable, but I think they have to be said and I apologize if they do make people feel uncomfortable, but there are feelings that a lot of people have had for a long time and there are certainly feelings that, as I said, must be brought out into the open. As I said, if I could feel that in the five years since the Berger Inquiry, since the beginning of the Berger Inquiry concerning the building of a gas pipeline that the Dene people had used the time delay constructively, then I would be more apt to understand this request for a further delay, but I do not see any difference when I go into the communities in the western part of the Territories. People are forced to improve or change things only when what they presently have is no longer tolerable and as long as the government makes no demands on people in return for its assistance then the status quo is acceptable. Well, Mr. Speaker, the status quo is not suitable because life, economics, those 20 million people out there dictate and there are another hundred million across the North Pole viewing our strategic resources with extreme interest.

The Dene people of the Mackenzie have lost five years, five years in which intensive people development could have been taking place. I am not talking about turning Dene into white either. I am talking about Dene people who can relate to the real economic world, who while maintaining their own culture, understand and use the system to their best advantage. The government can only do so much for people. People at some point have to do for themselves. There is nothing wrong, Mr. Speaker, with making the best of both worlds, taking what is best from the industrial society and maintaining and nurturing what is best from the traditional society. I warned Mr. Sibbeston that this North is opening up and the cry, "No development until land claims" is just not acceptable any more.

MR. PATTERSON: We are not saying that.

MRS. SORENSEN: The only group which has made extensive progress is the Inuvialuit and it is because a number of people were willing to devote all their time to the drawing up of negotiations of the claims. I just do not have faith that if this pipeline is delayed we will see the Dene Nation begin and continue the intense work that is required to even put lines on a map. I may be wrong, Mr. Speaker, and I may be labelled because of these remarks but, Mr. Speaker, I am tired of the cry, "We are not ready for development" when I do not see anything being done to get ready. One can only fall for that line, and I think our Executive Committee if they approve of this motion, will have fallen for that line -- can only fall for that line a few times before it begins to aggravate.

Time Limits And Dates For Land Claims Settlements

Now, I want to see time limits and dates set for these land claim settlements. I want to see action like I see in the Western Arctic with the COPE claims and like I see in the Keewatin and the Baffin with Nunavut and with the ITC claim. I want to hear that progress is being made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having said all that, I think it is important that native peoples of the Northwest Territories receive an equitable settlement of aboriginal rights including, if you will, a majority share of real political power. Nevertheless, I cannot accede for that reason alone to the Dene position and the Dene chiefs have said it, the Dene position in respect of the Norman Wells pipeline. I respect the right of the Dene leadership to establish their position based on arguments which have been sincerely developed and I respect too, Mr. Sibbeston's right to support their position, however Mr. Sibbeston is a territorial legislator and he must look at the entire picture as Mr. Fraser has done. Mr. Sibbeston compares this pipeline to the Mackenzie Valley pipeline. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Norman Wells pipeline is not to me, a major development. In many terms this project is less than one tenth the size of the proposed Arctic Gas pipeline project. Its environment and socio-economic impacts will be insignificant by comparison.

MR. PATTERSON: How do you know?

MRS. SORENSEN: In view of this certainty of minimal impact, the Dene Nation would obviously not have to divert the major portion of its attention and resources from the settlement of aboriginal rights as they have claimed they might have to do. The federal government is unlikely to allow the selection of lands containing proven resources to be among those lands which native people may claim in any settlement. In lieu of such claims however, adequate financial compensation for project development can easily be accorded to the Dene, in a final aboriginal rights agreement.

This Norman Wells project will not precipitously run the field dry and leave the North without petroleum resources, as Mr. Noah has said. In fact, the project will increase output per day significantly at that well but at the same time it will prolong the life of the field by perhaps two decades. In addition there are strong indications of other oil deposits in the Mackenzie area which are approximately equal to the Norman Wells reserve. Considering these facts and others, it appears that the project could go safely ahead without jeopardizing long-term Dene interests. Mr. Speaker, there are several questions I have to ask. Will an enforced deliberate delay enable us to get organized and establish those institutions that will help us to derive maximum benefits from resource development or can these same efforts be conducted in tandem with the ongoing project thus enabling us to take advantage of present economic benefits and still wind up with the same results?

The Present Economic Situation In The Mackenzie Valley

We have not, in this motion, taken into account the present economic situation in the Mackenzie Valley. Our people are going to be hungry. They are going to be looking for jobs. Mr. Sibbeston's Hire North is soon to conclude its work and it has no further work on the way. Will an enforced deliberate delay enable us to bring about a condition of unity and political stability in the North with some dispatch, or rather will the pressure of ongoing projects propel us more quickly in that direction? An enforced deliberate delay of this project will not bring us substantially closer to the kind of control that the vast majorities of us northerners would like to have over our economy and as a consequence over our lives.

Indeed there are already other strong forces in the wind, and I am talking about those 20 million people down there who might be cold this winter or next winter. These strong forces will move satisfactorily towards that goal, and a thoughtless move at this point in time could even thrust us backward. I can agree that people are not yet ready for the Environmental Assessment and Review Panel hearings. I wish to make a presentation myself and do not feel that I will be ready until the fall. So I would agree that this Legislature ask for a delay in the EARP hearings.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, probably one of the most important points is that the resource ownership of the Norman Wells field is held by Esso Resources on a series of 21 year leases. The lease is due in 1989. It is renewable at the company's option. Under the lease the federal government receives a five per cent royalty and they own one third of the product. The two-thirds portion of this resource will never be owned by anyone else. Delaying the project will not erode Esso's legal rights in respect of this resource.

Mr. Speaker, I will have to speak against this motion not because I cannot agree with the majority of the points in the motion, although all the other points could force many years of delay as well, but because I am not prepared to commit myself to a delay which depends on, and I will quote "Negotiations getting started and sufficiently under way to the satisfaction of the Dene and Metis people" because those terms have not been defined for me. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: To the motion. Mr. Wah-Shee.

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say from the outset that I will support the motion.

---Applause

I believe that some of us who have been elected by our various constituencies have to come to a point where you really have to support certain principles.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear,hear!

#### Blame Lies In The Federal Court

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: I think these principles are very important, depending upon what you believe in. I think that if I was representing Yellowknife South I would still maintain and support this motion. I think that to start off, it would appear that the reason why there has been lack of progress regarding the aboriginal rights settlement in the Territories seems to be blamed on the native organizations. It would appear that ITC is contributing to that as well as the Dene Nation and COPE. Nothing really has been said thus far but that blame should really lie in the federal court. I think the federal government has been creating problems for the native organizations and I think this is one of the reasons why we have not had progress on claims for the last ten years.

Also I think it is quite clear that while we are talking about a delay of the pipeline, we are not talking about stopping the whole project. We are not talking about ten or 15 years. As I understand it, the Dene Nation, their original position was that perhaps we should consider seven years, but now I understand that it is coming down even to a period of 24 months which is a reasonable thing to ask, I feel.

I am also sick and tired of hearing this argument that the resources of the Territories have to be continuously developed in the interests of Canada, in the interests of the 22 million. What about the 46,000 people who live in the Northwest Territories? I think it is about time they got control of the development of the Territories and got some benefit from it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear,hear!

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: I think that is essentially the reason why we have this co-operation between ourselves and the Dene Nation because from my point of view Ottawa has no interest at all in seeing that the people of the Northwest Territories control their own resources in the Territories, in terms of the timing of development, the kinds of revenues they should have and so forth. So I think that is essentially the issue here. The issue is not antidevelopment. The issue is not stopping the pipeline. The issue essentially is that we as an Executive are recommending that this Legislature has to fight on behalf of the 46,000 people in the Territories, and we ought to have the right to have a say regarding the type of development that should occur, at what pace and what kind of participation involvement we want.

Interest Of All Residents Of N.W.T.

As far as the Executive is concerned, I am quite proud to be associated with the present Members on the Executive and I have no difficulty whatsoever in coming up with a recommendation of this type to fight on behalf of the people of the Northwest Territories and saying it is about time the people of the Territories got something out of the resource development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: So I think that if the hon. Member has some difficulty with one section of the motion, I think the most important part of this motion is section one, section two, section three, section four and section five. These are the principles on which we have held our discussions with the Dene Nation because we said that we, as a government, have to take the interest of all of the residents of the Territories and it does not really matter what your colour is or your background or culture.

We, in the Northwest Territories, are going to have to come to grips with resource development on our own terms. Obviously we are going to get some opposition from the federal government, and we anticipate that. Also I think it is essential that this Legislature and the Executive Committee, and as a government establish a working relationship and rapport with the native organizations.

We are asking the native organizations to support this Legislature. We are asking them to support the territorial government. We are asking them to support the present Executive Committee Members. All right. There has to be give and take on both sides. We cannot go over to the native organizations continuously and say "Well, sorry, this is the position, we cannot really compromise." To me we will not get anywhere. I think that there are compromises that have to be made with the Committee for Original Peoples Entitlement and the same thing would have to go with the ITC, but this is a give and take that has to take place. I really believe that we have started in the right direction. I think that we have to maintain that. But essentially what the struggle is and I remind the hon. Members to focus in on the motion here, is should the people of the Territories control the resources of the Territories? Why should we give up because the 22 million down south are going to say, "No" to us? If that is the case, who is going to pick up the fight for the people of the North? I leave that with you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: I would just at this point remind Members that there are a couple of other very contentious issues yet that we have to deal with. The time is 3:25. We are supposed to shut down at 6:00. Are there others who would wish to speak on this motion? Mr. Nerysoo.



The N.W.T. Should Be Given Guarantees

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As well at the outset I would like to say I am going to support this motion, that I think it was clear when I spoke to the people at the meeting in Yellowknife, that you yourself and the two Members from Yellowknife were at, I said I as well was tired of hearing from companies and suggestions being made from the federal government that we would continue to give preferences. I think that far more than that, this government and the people of the Northwest Territories should be given guarantees. That is the issue. I think that we should begin to look at that issue. We ourselves here in the West have been somewhat more fortunate if you want to call it, in that we have a deposit of oil in our midst and we have to protect not only our interests, but the interests of the people in the Eastern Arctic who in fact, have to have oil bought at world prices and that is pretty unfortunate. We have gone to the federal government saying we do not want the people of the Eastern Arctic to suffer or Alberta or the rest of Canada.

The other issue, do we delay the pipeline or a project of this nature on an issue of aboriginal rights? I think it is an important position because at some time we have to take a joint position on this issue and that issue has now come and that is an issue of debating whether or not we give away our fossil fuels without any guarantees at all. We have not got those guarantees. The blame as I hear from the hon. Member from Yellowknife South is that the Dene Nation has not done any work. I can challenge her on that issue because I was part of that organization. You will notice even today that a number of positions have been advertised to ensure that people are now working on creating more jobs in the communities, but that is an ongoing thing. I think this is an issue that we can all, I think, support and we should support it because for the first time we have found an issue we can at least say, "Let us support it and argue with the federal government." That is basically what I wanted to say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. McLaughlin.

Benefit To People Of N.W.T. Must Be Definite

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to start off by saying I support this motion. I am in favour of the efforts made by our Executive Committee to date. I said from the start and even when I campaigned for a seat in this House about the Norman Wells pipeline, if it was to go ahead, there had to be a distinct and definite benefit to people of the Northwest Territories as far as a guarantee of supply and a share of the royalties and profits. A guarantee of low cost supply to people, at least in the area where the refinement takes place right now, and any expanded refinement in that area that might take place and also a guarantee by the company that is operating that refinery and the expanded refinery and eventual pipeline to refine our resources in Alberta, that those resources might be delivered to us at Edmonton refinery gate prices if that was the price. I was also heartened by the Member from Yellowknife South's frequent references to "our government," "we the government," "this government of ours," and "the Government of the Northwest Territories," not only in her dissertation a few moments ago but during frequent items that came out during debates on various issues in this House. This is a long way from the debate on Thursday the 15th of November, 1979, when the Member from Yellowknife said and I quote: "I have great difficulty, Mr. Speaker, with the very first principle which states that the Government of the Northwest Territories is the senior government in the Northwest Territories. This is not a government. The Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs can disallow any ordinance, or way of making legislation up to a year after we pass it. This is not a government. This government's finances are determined as part of the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs budget. We do not negotiate on a government to government basis. This is not a government."

Now I think, even the fact that she referred to our government having to leak a paper, I take that as a left handed compliment that we do have a government and are a government. The main issue of what she said then: "This government's



finances are determined as part of the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs budget" is a key thing to this whole issue. It is the development of resources in the Northwest Territories which is the cornerstone to our constitutional development both economically and politically and the efforts made by our Executive Committee to date in this area can only be commended by me.

MRS. SORENSEN: Hear, hear! I agree.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: I think somewhere we have to take a stand. As chairman of the finance committee, very capable chairman that she is and does an excellent job and a lot of work for that committee, she said a few times that when we as a committee have wavered in our onslaught against the bureaucracy that we have to take a stand, we have got to start somewhere. Well, as far as I am concerned, Norman Wells is the place where we can take a stand and start somewhere right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. McCallum.

Exploring The Possibility Of Deferring The Pipeline

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong the debate on this. I simply want to say though that I, as a Member of the Executive, have no difficulty having the Legislative Assembly in session urge that I begin to explore, to co-operate with the Dene Nation and the Metis Association and then to explore what the federal government, the possibility of deferring the regulatory process which, of course, if it comes through will delay and defer the construction of the pipeline. I have no difficulty as well exploring that and saying that I was part of the group who went to Ottawa to explore with one Minister, one Minister only, Mr. Munro, of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, because I think that these are exploratory meetings. I would have to be involved with not only Mr. Munro but Mr. Lalonde, Mr. Roberts, Mr. MacEachen and all. I have no difficulty going down to Ottawa at the urging of this Assembly...

MR. SPEAKER: Slow down a little bit, Mr. McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I have no difficulty going down there to explore, that kind of meetings, with the possibility of deferring the pipeline based upon the five conditions that are enumerated here. Fortunately, when we go down the next time we will not only have the Dene Nation, the Metis Association, but we will have a Legislative Assembly agreeing on four main principles. When I as a part of the Executive, sat down with the people of the Dene Nation and the Metis Association there were other conditions that I wanted to lay down. There were other conditions that they wanted to put in a joint position. So they gave and I gave as other Members of the Executive did and "give" is a pretty good four letter word. There is a little bit of reciprocating going on in that particular word. It has connotations that people are able to be flexible and get along to develop a position.

The first time that I went to Ottawa I would have liked to have gone down with other conditions such as Mr. McLaughlin referred to, not only that energy supplies would be available to the North, but that we would get a preferential treatment in the price. I would have liked the mover of this motion to suggest as well that maybe we should have something there as well in terms of job training and a number of other conditions, but that is fine. There will come another time. I have no difficulty at all then, Mr. Speaker, in having again, what I take as a vote of confidence, as to what the Executive Committee are doing that Mr. Sibbeston moved. It was, I think, unanimously accepted that the Executive were moving forward and doing the right thing. Here again is another example. We have now

four things with three groups. I would like to get some more groups come together and we could come down and agree on other principles. You have to start from there. So I think, Mr. Speaker, that I obviously as a party to the Executive, as I am sure other Executive Members will agree, they will take this particular motion as another vote of confidence and feel very comfortable in going down and talking to maybe not only the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development but other ministers as well so I would urge you people, you know, getting together, "Tell us what to do, dad," and we are going.

MR. SPEAKER: To the motion. Mr. Stewart.

In Support Of The Executive Committee

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, as usual I will be extremely brief. The part one of this particular motion I have a great deal of difficulty with. However, the suggestion has been made by our Executive Committee people that we have put our faith in, have given them our support and we arrived at the same position literally on the hospital and they were able to convince me that they had a case. I am prepared to support this motion on the basis that, all right, let us try it. Other things have failed. We have not been getting along that well. Let us see if this method of approach will work but I want to assure the Assembly this has got to become a two way street. It cannot be all one sided all of the time and I am quite prepared to go along and try this new approach as long as it is a two way street and not one single avenue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Sibbeston wishes to speak again. If I recognize him that is right of last reply and will close debate. Does anyone else wish to speak?  
Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, the pot has certainly been stirred. I do recognize that she has a right to say these things. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate and I do feel that I guess Mrs. Sorensen is expressing a lot of the feelings held by the last territorial Assembly. I think we are beyond those days and I am very pleased people like Mr. Braden and other persons who are now on the Executive and who have other views, and Mr. Butters too, I should not forget him, who have a more enlightened, more compromised type of view, particularly their view towards native people.

Mr. Speaker, it seems like Mrs. Sorensen does not have a very optimistic view on what -- the possibility of us really affecting the government, affecting the decision of the government to delay or stop the pipeline for the time being. I for one do feel that if all the people in the North become united on this issue and state firmly to the federal government our position that this is going to be a tremendous amount of persuasive force to them and the federal government will definitely have to listen. Certainly if they eventually do decide to go ahead anyway I think there is going to be mass dissatisfaction and all sorts of things happening in the North to show our dissatisfaction to the rest of Canada.

#### A Firm Stand Must Be Taken On Land Claims

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that at this time the matter of aboriginal rights is not settled in -- anywhere in the North and particularly down the Mackenzie Valley. There has been no progress in the last few years. There is a major concern that no major development go and cross lands the Dene people really feel is theirs, or certainly they should not go ahead before some settlement is made.

Mr. Speaker, further I know the government, and I do know that if a pipeline is permitted to go ahead without the approval of the Dene people and Metis people, that there will be no onus on the federal government to take land claims negotiations very seriously. I know governments, I know them well enough to know that you do not get things done by writing nice letters and sending little telexes and so forth. The only way oftentimes a government will work is when a certain amount of confrontation is done, and I am of the strong opinion that unless we take a firm stand on this matter, take a firm stand that there be no pipeline until all these conditions are met, nothing is going to happen.

#### A New Enlightened Period

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the positive things that have been happening in the last few months, the good relations that have been established between the Executive and the Dene Nation and the Metis Association, is very good and I believe we are in what I would call an enlightened period. I do think the dark days are behind us when it seemed that everyone fought the Dene, the Metis and the white people, as well as the territorial government. We have had that for the last few years, there has been turmoil and a lot of energy has been expended. I think we have gone beyond that and I think a new enlightened period, or we are in a new enlightened period where there is much more co-operation and understanding. If this continues I do believe that a lot of the major problems in the North will be resolved.

I just urge Members to support the motion. Some of the Members showed concern about the one part of the conditions which is that the pipeline, the hearings only begin after aboriginal rights are under way to the satisfaction of native people. I do know that Mr. Erasmus, the president of the Dene Nation and Mr. Bourque, the president of the Metis Association, are reasonable people and I think this has been shown in their meetings with the Executive. They have come to some basic understanding which to me indicates that they are reasonable persons. Definitely that part puts the onus on the federal government to take land claim negotiations very seriously.

Approval For Pipeline Will Be Pressed For

If the federal government is serious about this, or if they do settle or do begin negotiations in earnest and in good faith, I did think that once negotiations reach a certain stage then the Dene Nation and the Metis Association will give approval to the pipeline. I have that hope and I do believe that there will be a certain amount of pressure on them to do so and I just honestly believe that the time will be reached when we will be able to conclude negotiations and build the pipeline.

MR. SPEAKER: Debate is concluded on Motion 30-80(2). I will read the resolution: Now therefore, I move that the Assembly urge the Executive Committee to co-operate with the Dene Nation and Metis Association of the Northwest Territories to explore with the federal government the possibility of deferring construction of the Norman Wells oil pipeline and more particularly deferring the regulatory process required to assess the feasibility of the Norman Wells pipeline to Zama, Alberta, until the following conditions are met:

1. That aboriginal rights negotiations between the Dene Nation and Metis Association and the federal government are started and sufficiently under way to the satisfaction of the Dene and native people;
2. That an overall long-term plan for the development of non-renewable resources in the Northwest Territories is formulated;
3. That a northern based authority is planned or in place which can effectively control and regulate the development of non-renewable resources and which is able to represent and protect the interests of the people of the Northwest Territories;
4. That arrangements are concluded for receiving an identifiable share of the revenues, royalties and corporate taxes generated by the development of non-renewable resources in the Northwest Territories;
5. That guarantees are made such that, with the depletion of northern energy resources, energy supplies will be available to northerners in the future. Those who are in favour of that motion please indicate by raising your hands.

MR. CURLEY: Recorded vote.

MR. SPEAKER: A recorded vote called for? Very well. Those who are in favour of the motion please stand.

Motion 30-80(2), Deferral Of Norman Wells Pipeline, Carried

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Mr. Evaluarjuk, Mr. Arlooktoo, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Appaqaq, Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Stewart, Mr. McCallum, Mr. Noah, Mr. Curley, Ms. Cournoyea, Mr. Nerysoo, Mr. Butters, Mr. Sibbeston, Mr. Wah-Shee and Mr. Braden.

MR. SPEAKER: Those who are opposed to the motion please stand.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Those who are abstaining please stand.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Mr. Fraser.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is carried.

---Carried

We have now come to 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

For the sake of the chairman, I believe the non-contentious announcement from NCPC would be in order and please, Mr. Minister responsible for House planning, how do you want to deal with other business listed on the order paper?

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have Bill 2-80(2) addressed as soon as possible and then go on to discussing the motion by Ms. Cournoyea.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The House will resolve into committee of the whole to discuss the business that is on the order paper in a manner -- Ms. Cournoyea. Is this a point of order?

MS. COURNOYEA: No. Mr. Nerysoo has asked if I would be willing to stand down the item I wished to discuss so they could deal with the bill that is left open to be discussed and I have agreed to that.

MR. SPEAKER: So the order then is agreed. So the chairman will handle the matters on the order paper in the order agreed to. Mr. Stewart.

MR. STEWART: A point of order. Would it be in keeping with our agreement that I proceed with the small item first before we carry on? I will be a very few minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: I will leave that to the chairman of the committee. I believe it will not involve much debate so I see that is probably agreeable among the Members. Mr. Fraser.

MR. FRASER: I think this matter that Mr. Stewart has should be dealt with in formal session.

MR. SPEAKER: Did we agree earlier that it would be in committee of the whole or was that a request on the part of Mr. Stewart? I will leave it to the Members. Mr. Stewart prefers committee of the whole. How many are agreed that it should be committee of the whole?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: We all agree if we can get someone else as chairman of committee of the whole.

---Laughter

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed that the NCPC report be given in committee of the whole?

---Agreed

That is the way it will be done. The House is now resolved into committee of the whole, with Mr. Fraser in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into committee of the whole for consideration of Report on the Northern Canada Power Commission; and Bill 2-80(2): Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance, No. 1, 1980-1981, with Mr. Fraser in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER REPORT ON THE NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION; AND BILL 2-80(2): SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, NO. 1, 1980-1981

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Being the last day of the session, we will break for 15 minutes for coffee.

---SHORT RECESS



THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Hello, hello! Whoever is in the chamber or in the coffee room let us get going. The Chair recognizes a quorum. According to the rules we are dealing with Item 9. I understand that the hon. Member from Hay River has an announcement to make. Normally we would have to deal with that under an item which is not even on here, other business. Is it the Members' wish we deal with the hon. Member from Hay River's information item?

---Agreed

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Because of the situation and the lateness of the hour I have reduced this report to a bare minimum and will be reporting in detail in caucus in Frobisher Bay. However, quickly, the report to the Assembly on the Northern Canada Power Commission.

Report On The Northern Canada Power Commission

On the board of directors at the present time is Mr. Jim Smith from Whitehorse who is the chairman of the board and he was appointed by the Minister. We have a Mr. Digby Hunt from Ottawa who was also appointed to the board by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. There is myself from Hay River, appointed by the Minister on the advice of the Northwest Territories Legislature. We have a Mrs. Hilda Watson from Mayo, Yukon who was recommended by the Yukon Legislature but has not been appointed and has been sitting as a non-voting member for five or six meetings. We also have a Mr. Bill Best from Vancouver who was recommended by the chairman of the board and his appointment has not been ratified yet by the Minister. Basically NCPC have been running with three people with a vote which meant, of course, that I had to attend the NCPC meeting last week or they could not have a quorum. On this matter they had several matters of importance running a large corporate body and I felt that my job was to go there rather than here earlier last week.

The financial picture of NCPC at the present time has improved over the last few years. The last financial report indicates a break-even situation as far as their books are concerned. There was a profit of approximately one million dollars made in the Yukon and an approximate loss of one million dollars in the Northwest Territories. It is obvious that the heavy debt load with the high interest rates, indicates federal assistance will be required if power rates are to be kept within reason when coupled with the ever increasing cost of oil. The future outlook as far as power rates are concerned is an ever increasing situation even if we do get federal assistance with regard to the heavy debt load, but if we are required to carry both the costs of the rising fuel as well as the debt load, the power rates in both of the Territories will reach a point of no return as far as I can see. So something has got to be done in this regard in the very near future.

With regard to the location of the NCPC headquarters, I can now advise the House that four sites in the Northwest Territories are now under in-depth study and that two locations outside of the Northwest Territories are being studied. This report has been restricted by the board policy with regard to the statements that I have made but I will make them in far greater detail and present a paper to the caucus at the fall session. I would, however, ask the House to consider the following now: As your appointee to the board of directors of NCPC, I have been accused of a possible conflict of interest in regard to the location of the NCPC headquarters. This is quite understandable, but most Members of this House who were to hold this position could be in the same position. To relieve the situation and to ensure input from the Northwest Territories in the matter of the location, I would propose a motion but you must realize in my situation now

sitting on the board of directors I have no vote there because I must declare a point of conflict. I am unable to debate the situation in the House because I am also in a similar situation of a point of conflict so I prepared a motion and if the Pages would quickly take these around, please, the motion has been translated. I make this motion in committee.

Motion To Consult With Assembly Re Location Of NCPC Headquarters

I move that this committee request the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to consult with or request advice of this Legislature before making his final decision as to the location of the Northern Canada Power Commission headquarters.

I make this motion so that every person who may have an ax to grind, if you like, or the matter will be brought out into the public and a decision then can be relayed to the Minister that will reflect the wishes of the Legislature.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Stewart. We will maybe just wait a minute until we get some of these papers that are being distributed. Yes, we have a committee motion by Mr. Stewart: I move that this committee request the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to consult with or request advice of this Legislature before making his final decision as to the location of NCPC headquarters.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): To the motion, Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: I would like to ask the mover of this motion, when he said a couple of locations had been studied, could you tell me which locations you are talking about?

MR. STEWART: The locations as I understand them are Fort Smith, Yellowknife, Hay River and Inuvik. Outside of the Territories, the locations being studied are Whitehorse, Yukon and Edmonton.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Stewart. Mr. Pudluk. Any further questions on the motion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Question is being called. All in favour? Down. Against? The motion is carried.

---Carried

We then move to Item 9 on the order paper, consideration in committee of the whole of bills: Agreements with COPE re Inuvialuit Land Rights Settlements, Motion 20-80(2). I am sorry. The mover of the motion has indicated that she would let it stand down to deal with Bill 2-80(2). Am I right, Ms. Cournoyea?

MS. COURNOYEA: Yes.

Bill 2-80(2): Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance, No. 1, 1980-1981

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. We will then move to Bill 2-80(2), An Ordinance Respecting Additional Expenditures for the Public Service for the Current Financial Year. Statement of purpose. The purpose of this bill is to provide for additional expenditures for the public service for the current financial year. Mr. Butters, have you any opening remarks on Bill 2-80(2)?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I have some remarks but I would ask the chairman of the financial management board to make the initial presentation as he has already done with the standing committee on finance.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. FRASER): Thank you, Hon. Mr. Butters. Mr. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of bringing forward this supplementary request which deals with the current fiscal year and as such then it is our first supplementary request for the year 1980-81, the purpose in bringing it forward is to draw to the attention of Members and to seek authority to spend money for three purposes. I will speak to the last one first because it is really a housekeeping matter and that is to change the spending levels in two revolving funds, that is stores funds for the operation of government warehouses. Experience has proven to us that we require spending authority increase for the public stores revolving fund in Yellowknife by \$25,000 to a total of \$200,000 and a reduction of the same amount in the public stores revolving fund in Hay River to \$100,000. As I have said, this is a housekeeping type of adjustment which has been brought on by experience we have gained in this area.

#### Baker Lake Land Use Court Case

The other two matters which are before you are connected to a certain extent. The first one proposes to provide \$30,000 to the hamlet of Baker Lake in order to assist it in meeting the cost of legal fees for the Baker Lake land use court case. The information that we have gathered after the motion was put at the last session requesting that this money be provided, the information we have gathered indicates that the hamlet of Baker Lake has either been reimbursed or no longer has indebtedness itself but, rather, that ITC has picked up the portion of debt that was Baker Lake's. I explained to the standing committee on finance that the outstanding debt for that court case was in the neighbourhood of \$50,000. The final figure cannot be arrived at just yet because of the processes of the court. The court officials are now taxing or making an assessment of the charges which they will allow or disallow but it is likely to mean that the outstanding debt will be approximately \$50,000 and the Executive Committee proposes to assist with a portion of those debts, those costs, to the extent of \$30,000.

#### Program Of Assistance For Municipalities

The second part of this is a proposal to increase the Executive allotment within the land claims secretariat to provide for a program of assistance to municipalities to permit them to research claims which have been or may be made in their areas, but with the one proviso, that the money must not and may not be used for court cases.

Just going back again to the Baker Lake situation, the Executive Committee has stated that it does not support in future the payment of funds for court cases and therefore this is seen to be a one time expenditure if the House agrees with it. I believe there will be others who will wish to speak to the details of these matters. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Parker. Seeing that Mrs. Sorensen is chairman of the finance committee, I am going to let her speak to this bill if she so wishes. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We discussed the bill in a standing committee on finance meeting earlier this week and simply could not come to a consensus with respect to a decision to recommend or not recommend approval of this money bill. We felt it should come to the floor for debate. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Executive, O And M, Land Claims Secretariat

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am not sure how to approach this but I feel I could offer an amendment to the procedure for using the \$30,000 that would be voted to the land claims secretariat and would perhaps save us from a long hassle. I would like to suggest what the amendment is and perhaps one of the Ministers could say whether or not it is an acceptable amendment, and if so, how he would go about doing it.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: What is it?

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: May I proceed with that?

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

Motion To Amend Executive, O And M, Land Claims Secretariat, Of Bill 2-80(2)

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: On page one under program Executive, subject operations and maintenance, activity land claims secretariat, supplementary estimate number one, \$30,000, I would change it to read: "To provide funding..."

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I am told you cannot amend financial bills. You can either reject it or allow it. I am sorry. Mr. Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the item of \$30,000 supplementary estimate number one to provide funding to those Northwest Territories communities which demonstrate a need for independent legal advice regarding the implications of land claim settlement proposals not...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I am sorry, I will have to finish with Mr. MacQuarrie first. I thought you were dealing with the same matter to see if his amendment is in order or not.

MR. PATTERSON: I am sorry.

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

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: What it would read if acceptable would be "To provide funding to the land claims secretariat to do research and seek legal advice on the implications of land claims settlements for northern communities that would be available on request from Northwest Territories communities", the idea being simply that they would not initiate such studies themselves and so on but would have the right to draw on advice and information from the land claims secretariat.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. I am going to have to ask the Legal Advisor if the amendment is in order. Mr. Lal.

Motion Ruled Out Of Order

LEGAL ADVISOR (Mr. Lal): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In view of the fact that this is a financial bill, this House does not have the authority to amend the purpose for which the funds are requested. The House has the authority either to accept or reject the proposal put forward to it by the Executive Committee but not to vary it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Lal. So the amendment is ruled out of order. Mr. Patterson.



Motion To Amend Executive, O And M, Land Claims Secretariat, Of Bill 2-80(2)

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, I have a motion that I believe is in order. I already read it once and I will read it again and the effect of the motion is that the \$30,000 for providing funding to those Northwest Territories communities which want independent legal advice, that that \$30,000 not be approved by this Assembly. My motion reads: I move that the item of \$30,000 in 1980-81 supplementary estimates number one, "To provide funding to those Northwest Territories communities which demonstrate a need for independent legal advice regarding the implications of land claim settlement proposals" not be approved by this Assembly.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. To the motion. Could we have a copy of that motion, Mr. Patterson? Mr. Patterson, to the motion.

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will give the reasons why I am making this motion. First of all, municipalities can fund their own independent legal advice. The motion does not prevent them from hiring lawyers and getting legal advice with their own funds. My view of the art of governing is that what we should do is use our funds to try and encourage things happening, which we want to see happening. I think we do not want to encourage this kind of thing happening, although the motion would not prevent it from happening. It simply would not encourage it by making public funds available.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the need for municipality and hamlet and settlement councils to have legal advice and to have their interests considered in the context of land claims proposals is important, but I think that is exactly one of the reasons for the existence of our land claims secretariat. Our land claims secretariat is established to represent the interests of all the people of the Northwest Territories, and this is a perfect example of an area where there may be interests different from those of the aboriginal people; that is the interests of the municipality.

I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that we have a body now existing, staffed with legal experts who can provide this advice, will provide this advice and are providing this advice now to municipalities who want help. I have learned that a legal adviser on the staff of the land claims secretariat is presently, at the time of this meeting, doing exactly that, giving advice to a community which requested that advice, and that is perfectly appropriate in my view.

Questioning The Professional Integrity of Public Servants

Now, some may say "Well, municipalities should be able to have their own lawyer, and they should be able to get independent legal advice", but as a member of the legal profession, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the lawyers who are public servants working for the land claims secretariat are quite capable of giving as good, if not better advice as an independent, a so-called independent lawyer might give, in that those people are specialists in this area of this highly complicated area of land claims, and anyone who is suggesting that a municipality needs their own lawyer is in fact questioning the integrity, the professional integrity of those public servants.

Lawyers are not people who are hired to advance, or to come up with a solution that meets the interests of the municipality. This request on the part of the Executive Committee, or brought forth by them, asks for research on the implication of land claim settlement proposals, and any good lawyer will be able to give that advice and it will be just as good advice as could be given should the municipality wish to hire its own lawyer. So, I am saying this is something our land claims secretariat, which has a quarter of a million dollar budget each year, already has the capability of doing and are doing. Now, another point, Mr. Chairman, is that this proposal has caused a great deal of concern on the part of native organizations. I know this through having discussed the matter, with ITC particularly.

Now, the problem is, Mr. Chairman, that we have just approved a sessional paper which says among other things that a dialogue should be started up between the native organizations and this government to, among other things, recommendation four part (d) "Identify areas and processes whereby outstanding issues relating to aboriginal rights and constitutional political development in the Northwest Territories could be resolved." My understanding is that there has been no consultation with the native organizations on this very important process that that Commissioner seeks to recommend to us.

In other words, the Executive has come up with an idea whereby one way of doing research on aboriginal rights would be to give municipalities the right to have independent legal advice. That process has not been discussed with the native organizations and my understanding is that they are not at all happy about this development. I warn Members of this Assembly, that since that consultation has not taken place and we do not have the support of the native organizations for this kind of development, this is going to result in a loss of confidence on the part of those organizations in this government, and this \$30,000 if it is approved will set us back. I would not call it a declaration of war, I perhaps would not go that strongly, but this is a threat, and we should not approve it at this time for that reason alone.

#### Municipalities Should Be Able To Seek Aid From The Government

So I guess in sum, Mr. Chairman, I am saying we already have a secretariat which can provide that kind of advice and is there to represent those interests and there is nothing to stop them from giving advice to municipalities who are, to some extent, creatures of this government. They should be able to seek aid from this government. The point is as well, Mr. Chairman, that the Baker Lake case must be regarded as a special one time situation and I would draw Member's attention to the fact that the Baker Lake case was a joint project, as Mr. Commissioner has said, was a joint venture between the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada and the hamlet of Baker Lake. What is proposed in this bill is a process that could well result in the challenging of claims and in interests being advanced which are adverse to those claimants. I am not saying municipalities do not have the right to do that, but I do not think this government should encourage that process. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. To the motion, Hon. Mr. MacQuarrie.

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. If the bill stands as is, then I would have to support Mr. Patterson's motion not to vote the money. Perhaps the government will consider withdrawing it and coming back with some other approach. In voting with Mr. Patterson, it is not that I am insensitive to the difficulties the municipalities are having. I believe that they are having serious problems. They are our creatures and we have an obligation to ensure that their concerns are adequately considered. So in voting along with Mr. Patterson, it is not that I feel that municipalities should be left adrift, left to their own resources. We have an obligation to them but like Mr. Patterson, I feel that it would be unwise to encourage independent action in this area but rather to support their actions which may be co-ordinated with our own policies. I recognize that the vote was probably a sincere attempt to be fair in that \$30,000 had been given to the hamlet of Baker Lake, but I really believe the Baker Lake case was a very special case. It is an historical case. It had implications that were important not only for the community of Baker Lake and the people in this area but for all people in the Northwest Territories and certainly our government, since it is representative of all peoples in the Northwest Territories. Therefore it was completely in accord with my thinking that we should have supported the people in that legal case. I do not think that it is necessary to try to redress some sort of imaginary need for balance by voting an equal amount for what is specifically outlined in this bill. I hope that the Executive will consider withdrawing and introducing some new approach. If not, I will vote against the \$30,000 expenditure. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. Mr. MacQuarrie. Mr. Parker.

COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, may I have the floor because I think I can be of some value here, some assistance?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Parker.

Executive Withdrawal Of Land Claims Secretariat Moneys

COMMISSIONER PARKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I interrupted your proceedings to speak as Commissioner having had consultation on this matter with Members of the Executive Committee and considering their advice together with the advice and information that has been brought forward during the standing committee on finance debate and other discussions that have taken place, I have come to the conclusion that the item under discussion, namely, \$30,000 for the land claims secretariat shall be withdrawn and that will leave outstanding for consideration or for continued consideration the \$30,000 for the Executive Committee secretariat, and the matter of the revolving funds.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to name perhaps two of the matters that led us all to this conclusion. The first is that in the debate on aboriginal rights, which was a long and detailed debate, one of the points that was agreed to was that the Executive Committee and the Hon. James Wah-Shee would review with the federal Minister the agreement that now exists between the territorial government and the Minister on the matter of land claims negotiations. Furthermore...

MS. COURNOYEA: On a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Point of order.

MS. COURNOYEA: Or privilege. I would like to correct the Commissioner on the paper. It says Mr. Wah-Shee will review with the native organizations the memorandum of understanding. It did not say with the government.

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

COMMISSIONER PARKER: I stand corrected. The government withdraws the \$30,000 from the bill for the purpose of reconsidering the policy which it tabled, Policy 80-2 and the possibility exists that the policy will be rewritten after further consideration and introduced at a later time.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Parker. In view of the item being withdrawn, the names that I have here of people who wanted speak, do you still want to speak to it? Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: I think I will speak in Inuktitut. (Translation) As far as land claims they have never even been dreamed about by the federal government in the territorial Assembly. Working towards a settlement of land claims...

Executive, O And M, Land Claims Secretariat, Withdrawn

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Do I understand the item has been withdrawn?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: That is right.

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: It was partly withdrawn to avoid a prolonged debate and if the item is no longer on the floor there is nothing to speak to and I would suggest that we move along.

MR. CURLEY: We have not voted on it.

Executive, O And M<sub>2</sub> Executive Committee Secretariat

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): According to the rules, Mr. Curley, we have nothing to speak to. The item has been withdrawn. Could I then direct your attention to the second last page under Executive Committee secretariat in the amount of \$30,000? Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will not speak to the supplementary estimates number one to the \$30,000 to provide funding to the hamlet of Baker Lake. I think this is certainly a good step and although the Member from Yellowknife South very generously asked the government to pay the whole cost of the court case expenditures incurred by the hamlet of Baker Lake...

MRS. SORENSEN: On a point of privilege. My motion, Mr. Chairman, said to help with the cost that the Baker Lake hamlet council had incurred because of the court case, not to pay the full cost.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Thank you for correcting me. I did not realize she was not as generous as I had thought she was.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Good try.

MR. CURLEY: I think in speaking to the motion, I would just like to advise the government that I do not think they should in any way attempt to expand that program to allow the other municipalities in the Northwest Territories as they have attempted to do in the other parts...

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: Point of order. I believe the discussion on this is not relevant any more. It has been withdrawn.

MR. CURLEY: Why do you not go to sleep?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thirty thousand dollars to Baker Lake. Thank you, Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: To the \$30,000. I will certainly vote for that and at the same time will not expect the government to attempt to expand it to other municipalities in the Northwest Territories.

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: He again is making remarks irrelevant to what is before us.

Executive, O And M, Executive Committee Secretariat, Agreed

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Let us get down to the subject here. We have got to get out of here some time today. Thank you, Mr. Curley. Executive Committee secretariat, \$30,000. Agreed?

---Agreed



Finance, Public Stores Revolving Fund, Agreed

We will turn the page and we have got Finance, public stores revolving fund. Agreed?

---Agreed

Now we go back to the bill, clause 2 interpretation. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 3, amount granted. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 4, purpose and effect of each item. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 5, lapsing of appropriations. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 6, transfer of money and accountable advances. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 7, coming into force. Agreed?

---Agreed

Schedule...

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: You have to correct the schedule.

MR. STEWART: The schedule has to be reduced by \$30,000.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The schedule, \$30,000. Agreed?

---Agreed

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Amended by \$30,000.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Revolving funds, zero. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 1, short title. Agreed?

---Agreed

Bill as a whole. Agreed?

---Agreed

Agreed that we report the bill ready for third reading as amended?

---Agreed

Thank you.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Come again?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Is it the wish of the committee that we proceed with Item 9, Motion 20-80(2)? Mr. Nerysoo.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: I would suggest we go into formal session to give the bill third reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

---Agreed

Shall I report progress, Mr. Nerysoo?

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: And then return to committee of the whole discussion.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Make up your mind.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF REPORT ON THE NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION; AND BILL 2-80(2); SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, NO. 1, 1980-1981

---

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

MR. FRASER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Your committee has been considering Bill 2-80(2) and would report that the bill is ready for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Fraser. Is it agreeable to the House to temporarily stand down the business -- just a moment, I had better sort it out here. Yes, we will temporarily stand down the business of the committee of the whole in order to move to third reading of bills and assent, Item 10, third reading of bills. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

ITEM NO. 10: THIRD READING OF BILLS

Mr. Butters.

Third Reading Of Bill 1-80(2): Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance, No. 2, 1979-1980

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 1-80(2), An Ordinance Respecting Additional Expenditures for the Public Service of the Northwest Territories for the Financial Year Ending the 31st Day of March 1980, be read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER. Moved by Mr. Butters. Seconder? Mr. McCallum. To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: The question being called. All those in favour please indicate by raising their hands. Down. Opposed. The bill is carried.

---Carried

Mr. Butters.

Third Reading Of Bill 2-80(2): Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance, No. 1, 1980-1981

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 2-80(2), An Ordinance Respecting Additional Expenditures for the Public Service for the Current Financial Year, be read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it required to say as amended or not?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I understood that the matter was withdrawn and therefore what remains on the table is just that item which Members were discussing, as Mr. Curley found out.

MR. SPEAKER: A seconder? Mr. Fraser. To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: The question being called. All those in favour please indicate by raising their hands. Down. Opposed. The bill is carried.

---Carried

Item 11, assent to bills.

ITEM NO. 11: ASSENT TO BILLS

Mr. Clerk, would you see whether the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories is prepared to give assent to these bills?

COMMISSIONER PARKER: Please be seated. As Commissioner of the Northwest Territories, I hereby assent to Bill 1-80(2) and Bill 2-80(2). Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated. The House, according to prior agreement, will now resolve once again into committee of the whole. Mr. Fraser.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into committee of the whole for consideration of Motion 20-80(2): Agreements with COPE Re Inuvialuit Land Rights Settlements; and Report of the Standing Committee on Finance, with Mr. Fraser in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER MOTION 20-80(2): AGREEMENTS WITH COPE RE INUVIALUIT LAND RIGHTS SETTLEMENTS; AND REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Now we have finished musical chairs, what is the wish of the committee? Motion 20-80(2), Agreements with COPE Re Inuvialuit Land Rights Settlements. Ms. Cournoyea, it is yours, do you care to comment?

Motion 20-80(2), Agreements With COPE Re Inuvialuit Land Rights Settlements

MS. COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I hope I can get a line of credit for holding off the business I brought before this House so other matters can be discussed.

---Applause

I feel that when we approach things that are of a more specific nature that the matter in itself gets bogged down with details that are very difficult to explain and really have no relationship to the motion that is put forth.

The position that I put forward, was to facilitate the request that this Assembly and the paper that was given and passed in recognition of the fact that COPE, the Committee for Original Peoples Entitlement has an agreement in principle and will be negotiating to a final agreement. The areas of principle that were outlined in the motion, are areas which we felt should be addressed as soon as possible with the Hon. James Wah-Shee.

However, it is 5:00 o'clock and I believe that the negotiations still, according to the organization, are between the federal government and the native associations, and the memorandum of understanding between the territorial government and the federal government continues to stand at this time. Therefore, I would be willing to stand down my motion to enable this Legislative Assembly to move to some items, I am told, that are very important to be discussed at this time and brought forward such as the finance committee report, and these reports are matters that relate definitely to the jurisdiction of this Legislative Assembly. So, I would be willing to further stand down discussion on the paper that I have before you now so we may go into the items that are properly under the jurisdiction of this territorial government.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms. Cournoyea. I am sure Members appreciate those kind words.

---Applause

Mr. House Leader. Have we a House leader? Mr. Nerysoo.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would wish at this time to deal with the priorities paper put forward by the standing committee on finance.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Did you say progress?

---Laughter

Thank you. Mrs. Sorensen.

#### Report Of The Standing Committee On Finance

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a few opening remarks and then will move a motion. There are two aspects to our committee report, the first is the recommendations concerning broad spending priorities. We have designated four areas. The second part of our report concerns 11 recommendations for action by the Executive Committee.

With respect to the broad spending priorities we identified, as I said, four areas of importance. They were economic development, job training, language and the Legislative Assembly. Many people have commented, not always kindly, in fact most often in ridicule, about the number of motions and questions requiring direct action of our administration made by the Ninth Assembly during the first and second sessions.

At all times, I as chairman of the finance committee have defended vigorously our right as a Legislature to make those motions and ask those questions because motions and questions do require action and I emphasize the word "action". Members could have put forth their ideas and concerns in speeches and in replies to the Commissioner's Address. However, we all know that there is no guarantee the government will act on those expressed ideas and concerns. In fact, I would imagine that few of our speeches are ever referred to once they become part of the record.

However, Mr. Chairman, motions and questions are referred to by the administration and even though some may be impossible to implement because of the many complicated factors, these motions are a statement which cannot be ignored. The number of motions and questions demonstrated the need for the Ninth Assembly to place its mark on this government and on its program and its services. The number of motions and questions, and there were over 135 of them at the first and second sessions, demonstrated the frustration and determination of the Ninth Assembly.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I was proud of the Ninth Assembly and I am still proud of this House, although I must say I was somewhat bruised at the tax abeyance proposal for Nunavut. I remember the December finance committee meeting at which Mr. Fraser said, "Lynda, why are we here? Do you not know we cannot change anything anyway?"



Well, Mr. Chairman, you should have been at our May meeting, in fact you were, a short five months later. Members would have detected a significant difference in you. The committee was there to do a job and all came prepared with recommendations and their own ideas of direction for the government, even Mr. Stewart. For three days we discussed, we negotiated, we argued and we consensed, yes Mr. Butters, we consensed. It was not only our ideas for spending priorities that were brought to the meeting. The Ninth Assembly's ideas, all of your ideas were there and they were discussed too. It was through those 135 motions and questions that all Members were able to take part in the finance committee's May meeting. Before the meeting, I took those 135 items and I categorized them. The main categories in the end were language and culture, northern resident employment and training, political developments and capital expenditures.

Foundation For 1981-82 Spending Priorities

Mr. Chairman, once we had concluded that exercise it became quite clear that we had a beginning; the foundation for 1981-82 spending priorities had already been laid and we simply translated those motions and questions, those expressions of concern, those feelings of frustration into words, into new direction, into the four recommendations for spending in 1981-82 and hopefully for the following few years after that.

Now, having said that, the finance committee realizes that shifting priorities from one area or issue to another in the wake of financial restraint is not going to be easy, particularly as some departments are having difficulty operating within their existing base as it is. There is no question that our government will have to continue to tighten its belt, to continue to negotiate increases in federal financing and to continue to look towards future resource revenue sharing or grants in lieu, for additional funds.

As a result of at least one motion, the abeyance of property tax in the area known as Nunavut, the finance committee is going to have serious difficulty when it comes to deciding what programs and services will have to experience cutbacks to make up for the \$1.1 million loss in anticipated revenue. We will of course deal with that when we get to it, perhaps we will find an easy solution but I would caution Members that motions which have grave financial implications should be discussed in the finance committee meetings.

If you have confidence in your committee, and I have no reason to think at this point that you do not, then I believe that all Members will agree that it is important that you allow your committee to review those recommendations first.

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: Hear, hear!

Motion That Assembly Recommend 1981-82 Spending Priorities To Executive Committee, Carried

MRS. SORENSEN: That concludes my comments, Mr. Chairman. I do have a motion. It states: On behalf of the finance committee, I move that this Assembly recommend to the Executive Committee the following government spending priorities for the year 1981-82. They are: Economic development, northern resident employment and training, language and the Legislative Assembly which would include political and constitutional development.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Question being called. All in favour? Down. Contrary? The motion is carried.

---Carried

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the input received from the standing committee on finance. I have reviewed their report in detail and I am just wondering if the House would want to hear some brief remarks on behalf of the government concerning the priorities that they perceive for 1981-82 or would the House prefer to consider additional items on the agenda?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Braden. Ms. Cournoyea.

MS. COURNOYEA: Well, Mr. Chairman, I did not think we would get the astounding response we got. The reason I put aside my motion was because I thought we would be having input on the job that this Assembly has as its first priority and that is setting priorities within its jurisdiction. It seems to me the first order of business is to deal with what we have got now and then you reach from there to the top. There were only three hands put up for this motion and I do not know if anybody listened to the motion. It seems to me our job at first is to take care of the matters we presently have within our jurisdiction and these matters that we deal with on the finance committee are very important. They may be mundane and not as romantic as constitutional development and aboriginal rights, but they are certainly items that every day people in the communities are asking about. In setting these priorities we would like to know if we are going in the right direction and I would like to hear from Mr. Braden, from the Executive Committee because the next meeting we have we will have to further work on next years budget. I am all for this Assembly being involved in furthering their ambitions constitutionally, but let us take care of our business we have at hand as well and dedicate just as much thought to that.

MR. PATTERSON: Hear, hear!

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms. Cournoyea. Hon. Mr. Braden.

Conditions And Directions Which Will Apply To Budget

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My remarks today will focus upon the conditions and direction which will apply to the development of our government's 1981-82 budget. I am delivering these remarks in my capacity as the chairman of the priorities and planning subcommittee of the Executive.

By way of explanation this subcommittee develops broad spending priorities for the government based upon input from the Legislative Assembly, the standing committee on finance and the government administration. Once the broad spending priorities have been formally approved by the Executive, detailed budget development work is done by government departments and the financial management board. This Legislative standing committee on finance will be involved in the future with an examination of the budget as it is being developed. I have been informed by the standing committee's chairman hon. Lynda Sorensen of this desire and we will develop a more formalized goal in the near future. Overall we hope to have by the end of this year, main estimates which have been developed in co-operation with the Legislature's finance committee. We hope to have main estimates which reflect to the maximum extent possible, the direction desired by this Assembly and the resources available to carry out this mandate.

With respect to the conditions we must consider in developing our main estimates, I want to discuss briefly two points. First, I am told we will again be facing another year of fiscal restraint. While we have not yet developed an agreeable fiscal framework respecting our deficit with the federal government I think we can assume that, while we must look within the Northwest Territories to raise revenue, there is a limit to the extent to which we can exercise this revenue generating authority. Our government is currently exploring with the federal government arrangements which will result in a greater Northwest Territories share of revenues collected by the Government of Canada. My colleague, the Hon. Tom Butters has briefed the Legislature's standing committee on finance on this subject and would be pleased to address this item in greater detail if required.

### Financial Implications Of Assembly Priorities

The second general point I wish to address concerns the vast range of legitimate priorities which Members have discussed during the past eight months. The government's review has identified, for example, a number of proposals which have major financial implications, both in terms of capital as well as operations and maintenance funding. Let me briefly list a few. In the broad area of housing, health and social assistance we have proposals for an area hospital at Cambridge Bay and a regional hospital in the Keewatin. In the broad area of human development we have proposals for a Keewatin regional high school which we have already responded to, a school gymnasium at Clyde River and the development and implementation of a native language program. Other proposals for upgrading our legal services, energy conservation programs and employment were also addressed by this House by individual Members during the past few months.

All of this to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Government of the Northwest Territories simply will not be able to address all the proposals put forward by Members, nor will the government be able to respond as thoroughly or to the extent required in those areas which will be priorities in our 1981-82 main estimates. I believe that the standing committee on finance has also recognized these conditions in the input we have received from them thus far.

Now on the matter of government priorities for the 1981-82 fiscal year I would like to briefly outline those areas where we feel greater emphasis is required. I would indicate to Members at this time that we are talking about broad goal areas. I do not have specific points to raise. However I will attempt to elaborate from time to time on the extent possible on the implications to programs and services either new or existing. Thus far, Mr. Chairman, the Executive has identified prior to receiving the standing committee's report three priority or goal areas. In response in large part to input from the Legislature we have determined that language and culture is the major thrust for the government to take in 1981-82. Generally we understand language and culture to include a number of objectives as their goals such as the preservation of northern history, culture and values, provision of education opportunities in the language and manner consistent with the needs of northern residents and encouragement or development of recreation opportunities, again consistent with the needs and tradition of northern residents.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Braden, I wonder if you could just slow down a little bit. Thank you.

### Political Development Identified As Priority

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Second, Mr. Chairman, we have identified political development as a priority area. In this particular goal area we see it necessary to further our efforts towards devolution of authority for provision of programs and services to local or regional institutions. Members will, of course, recognize that this initiative applies to many departments of the government, not just to the Department of Local Government. Earlier we perceived the need to continue emphasis placed by the previous Assembly on achieving major constitutional development for the Northwest Territories. I would ask Members to recognize that this responsibility is currently involving a great deal of work in association with Northwest Territories native groups, the Government of Canada and in some cases provincial governments. As discussions and negotiations become more complex we obviously have to seek the necessary resources and expertise. Other major goal areas which arise out of this priority include a review of assistance to tax based municipalities, increasing public knowledge of government programs and services and working in co-operation with the Legislative Assembly to further define its requirements in terms of funding and staff.

Resource Development Needed For Economic Base

Mr. Chairman, we have identified economic development as another priority area for the government. This general objective covers a number of goals including working further to evolve a diversified economic base and that is an economy which is based upon more than just government or non-renewable resource development. We need an economy which develops our renewable resource sector and our service sector. We need an economy which has some stability to avoid the boom and bust conditions which are associated more and more with government in northern non-renewable resource development. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the government will be placing greater emphasis on determining our renewable resources base and the necessary economic and environmental conditions for its development.

Secondly, the government will be seeking priority for the development of our tourism sector, an expansion of our small business sector to provide the ever increasing demand being made for goods and services in the North. In the non-renewable resource sector, the Executive proposes to give great priority to monitoring major development projects and attempting to ensure that northern concerns about employment, business opportunities, environmental and social impacts are considered by developers and the federal government.

Mr. Chairman, I regret I cannot be more specific at this time. The Executive has attempted to identify some broad priority areas and very much appreciates the support submitted by the Legislature's standing committee on finance. I want to assure this House that our objective for January 1981, when we go into the budget session is a set of main estimates which reflects to the maximum extent possible the goals and objectives brought forth by this House. I want to stress further that we seek to work co-operatively with the standing committee on finance during the summer and in the fall so that we end up with main estimates which can be considered effectively and efficiently in our House. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you very much, Mr. Braden.

---Applause

Do I hear progress? Mr. Nerysoo, did you have your hand up? I am sorry.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Yes, I did have something to deal with but we could adjourn if you wish to call an adjournment.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Before we recognize that, out of courtesy I would ask the chairman of the finance committee if she is satisfied or if she wishes to continue this discussion at Baker Lake or at our next session?

Other Recommendations To Be Considered At Frobisher Bay

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have consulted with the other committee Members and we are prepared to stand down recommendations one through to 11 and bring them forth at the Frobisher Bay session.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Mr. Noah.

MR. NOAH: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My colleagues are going to be leaving and I am glad that the people, the MLA's and staff could come to Baker Lake and I am happy to see that the Commissioner was here until the end of the session. I would like to thank you, Mr. Commissioner, and everybody else, all the MLA's, and I would like to thank you for being here and I hope that in the next few years, or in another year we could meet here again. We were very happy to have you in Baker Lake and when you are leaving tonight, there will probably be a few people going to the airport to see you off. When they were having dances we hope you had a good time. We were happy to have you here.

---Applause



THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Noah for those kind words. Mr. Nerysoo, did I hear you say progress?

MS. COURNOYEA: It had better be progress very soon.

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Progress.

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

MR. PATTERSON: No.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): It is not debatable. Mr. Wah-Shee, do you care to put that in the form of a motion that I report progress?

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Yes I do.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Patterson, to the motion.

MR. PATTERSON: I was just hoping that all we would do is get that police advisory commission recommended, that it be appointed so they can start their work and that is one item I am sure we can all agree on very quickly and I am also hoping we can do the same thing with the renewable resources training program which Members have now had plenty of time to consider. I hope these items would only take a short period of time and so I am going to vote against the motion because I have been anxiously awaiting for those items to come up on the order paper.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): To the motion. The motion is we report progress. All in favour. Down. Against. The motion is defeated.

I report progress. I am sorry, it was carried.

---Carried

MR. SPEAKER: This House is reconvened. Mr. Fraser.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF MOTION 20-80(2): AGREEMENTS WITH COPE RE INUVIALUIT LAND RIGHTS SETTLEMENT; AND REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

MR. FRASER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Your committee has been studying Motion 20-80(2), Agreements with COPE Re Inuvialuit Land Rights Settlements, and this was taken off for further discussion when we reconvene in Frobisher Bay. Also the Report of the Standing Committee on Finance, which was not completely finalized and that too, we will be discussing further when we reconvene. Thank you.

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

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Mr. Speaker, yes, as I think Members are well aware, your reception will take place in Club 64 commencing at 7:30 this evening and Members have information regarding travel arrangements.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, Mr. McLaughlin.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: I am aware that the Speaker might have something to say but I would like to speak personally and I would like, on behalf of all the Members, to thank the Member from Baker Lake for inviting us in the first place to attend a session in Baker Lake and to assure him that I had a very good time here. I am glad I came here. It is my first visit in the spring or summer to the Eastern Arctic and I enjoyed the hospitality of the people and I am very glad to have spent two weeks in this community.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: You stole my thunder, Mr. McLaughlin, but that is fine. Would you proceed please, Mr. Clerk?

Orders Of The Day

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Orders of the day, Wednesday, October 22, 1980, 2:30 o'clock p.m., at Frobisher Bay, Northwest Territories.

1. Commissioner's Address
2. Notices of Motion for First Reading of Bills
3. Tabling of Documents
4. Replies to Commissioner's Address
5. Oral Questions
6. Questions and Returns
7. Petitions
8. Tabling of Documents
9. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
10. Notices of Motion
11. Motions
12. Introduction of Bills for First Reading
13. Second Reading of Bills
14. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills, Recommendations to the Legislative Assembly and Other Matters: Motion 20-80(2); Sessional Paper 3-80(2); Information Items 1-80(2), 2-80(2), 4-80(2), 5-80(2), 6-80(2), 18-80(2); Report of the Standing Committee on Finance; Tabled Documents 6-80(2), 12-80(2); Sessional Paper 4-80(2)
15. Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER: I was not in tune at the very beginning. Do you have Address and replies on the order paper?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Those Members who are confused as to what is happening later in the evening, if you will remain behind momentarily afterward we can sort that out, where the reception is, the trip time to the airport and that sort of thing.

Certainly as Speaker of the Assembly I would like to take this opportunity to thank very much the people of Baker Lake for their warm hospitality during our stay here these past two weeks. It was a pleasure, not only for myself, but for all Members of the Assembly, a pleasure to have been here during this time.

ITEM NO. 12: ADJOURNMENT

This House now stand adjourned until 2:30 o'clock p.m., October 22, 1980, in Frobisher Bay.

---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