



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES  
**DEBATES**

**3rd Session**

**9th Assembly**

Official Report

**WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1980**

**Pages 661 to 703**

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

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

## Speaker

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Ipeelee Kilabuk  
Pangnirtung, N.W.T.  
X0A 0R0  
(Baffin Central)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 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  
Warrant Officer A. Theriault, C.D. (Ret'd)  
Frobisher Bay, N.W.T.  
X0A 0H0

## Legal Advisor

Mr. E. Johnson  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
X0E 1H0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

29 October 1980

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	661
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Tabled Document 16-80(2) Report of the Special Committee on Unity	662
Report of the Committee of the Whole of:	
- Tabled Document 16-80(2) Report of the Special Committee on Unity	702
Orders of the Day	703

FROBISHER BAY, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1980

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

ITEM NO. 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

SPEAKER (Hon. Don Stewart): As I indicated to the House yesterday I am asking at this time to delete:

Item 2, oral questions.

Item 3, questions and returns.

Item 4, petitions.

Item 5, tabling of documents.

Item 6, reports of standing and special committees.

Item 7, notices of motion.

Item 8, motions.

Item 9, introduction of bills for first reading.

Item 10, second reading of bills.

It is my intention to proceed into committee of the whole to deal with the unity paper. Do I have unanimous consent?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON: You have unanimous consent from me with the exception of Item 7 which I would request be included on the order paper for today.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson, you have the privilege of denying unanimous consent. Motions have also been deleted for today.

MR. PATTERSON: I give my consent to proceeding with all items of business except Item 7, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 7 has also been deleted and I am not prepared at this time to change my request. I think, with regard to notices of motion, when we have concluded the unity meeting you can ask to give notice and I am quite certain you can get unanimous consent to proceed.

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will give my consent and circulate the motion that I had hoped to make today for the benefit of Members and the press.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much. Recognizing unanimous consent this House will resolve into committee of the whole...

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Can I have some definition of what my friend means by "circulate"? I believe there is some provision for including a notice of motion and motion in the book that has been discussed and I would just like some clarification or what the hon. Member intends on doing and whether it is in keeping with the practice of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I thought he was going to give it to the Clerk to put it in the Members' book and so that Members can study it prior to him presenting the motion. Is that correct, Mr. Patterson?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, I will give a copy to the Clerk, Mr. Speaker, and I will also give copies to the Pages and ask them to distribute them to each Member now.

MR. SPEAKER: Actually it should be given to the Clerk who will have them put into your books, if you do not mind. Item 11, consideration in committee of the whole of bills, recommendations to the Legislative Assembly and other matters. We will resolve into committee of the whole to study the Report of the Special Committee on Unity, with Mr. Fraser in the chair.

ITEM NO. 11: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS, RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND OTHER MATTERS

---Legislative Assembly resolved into committee of the whole for consideration of Tabled Document 16-80(2): Report of the Special Committee on Unity, with Mr. Fraser in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER TABLED DOCUMENT 16-80(2): REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UNITY

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The committee will come to order to deal with the Report of the Special Committee on Unity to the third session of the Ninth Assembly at Frobisher Bay. Mr. Braden, a point of privilege.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: That is correct. I understand that the Legislature and this House agreed to have CBC carry this hearing live. I am just wondering what the lights and the television cameras are for. Does that have to do with radio? I do not mean to be difficult, I am just wondering what is going on here and perhaps someone should explain it to us.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Could someone explain these lights? I think they are for the Inukshuk program, Mr. Braden, and they can be turned off, I am advised. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: That is fine, I think that is a very worth-while endeavour I do not think anyone in the Executive has any problem with that. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): At ease. First I would like to call on Mr. MacQuarrie, the chairman of the unity committee, for his opening remarks on this report. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased that at last the Ninth Assembly is beginning its public debate on political and constitutional development in the Northwest Territories.

The first focus, but not at all the entire substance of this debate is the Report of the Special Committee on Unity, and with your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, and that of the Members of the Assembly, for the information of our wider audience both here in the chamber and across the Northwest Territories I would like to read the first five paragraphs, that is not pages for those who might be alarmed, but the first five paragraphs of the report and also the ten recommendations which the committee has formulated, not moving them for adoption at this time, but simply reading them for the information of various people. Is that agreeable, Mr. Chairman?

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

MR. MacQUARRIE: If I have understood our procedure correctly, Mr. Chairman, I will read that part of the report after which I believe we will invite witnesses into the House in order to enable them to comment on the report, but also to raise any other matters that they feel are relevant to the debate. As I understand it Members will then have an opportunity to question the witnesses and once all the witnesses have been heard and released then Members will be free to make general comments concerning the report and to question the committee on the report's contents. Then finally we will debate each of the report's recommendations. As I say, that is the procedure as I understand it and unless there is disagreement I will move ahead on that basis.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### Creation Of The Special Committee On Unity

MR. MacQUARRIE: The beginning of the report then says: "The special committee on unity was created by this Assembly on November 16, 1979. Its membership, Tagak Curley, Peter Fraser, Robert Sayine, Nick Sibbeston, and myself, was chosen to reflect the cultural composition of our territory, a fact which was not unimportant considering the nature of the task the committee was given.

"In the midst of uncertainty concerning political and constitutional development in the Northwest Territories, your committee was mandated to 'to try to determine the means by which a political consensus might be generated amongst the people of the Northwest Territories, and to make recommendations concerning this matter to the Assembly'.

"In carrying out its mandate, your committee met for discussions with leaders of the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada and its regional associations, with leaders of the Dene Nation, of the Metis Association of the Northwest Territories, and of the Committee for Original Peoples' Entitlement. It also met with the Minister for aboriginal rights and constitutional development, James Wah-Shee, and very informally with the Prime Minister's special representative for constitutional development, C.M. Drury. It received a small number of submissions, verbal and written, from other interested parties, including Members of this Assembly, and it perused those publications which are listed in Appendix A.

"Through its reading, its travels, and its discussions, the special committee on unity has been able to get its finger onto the pulse of northern politics. Its Members have become as well informed as it is possible for non-specialist representatives of the people to become, on the current political situation in the Northwest Territories.

"Being thus prepared, your committee met in Yellowknife from September 23-26 in order to discuss its findings, and to draw from them whatever conclusions it might."

At that meeting I might say then, Mr. Chairman, that your committee did reach certain conclusions and from them drew up ten recommendations and again for the information of our audience then I will read the recommendations.

Recommendations Of The Standing Committee On Unity

Recommendation one: "That this Assembly, recognizing the Dene, Metis and Inuit peoples within the Northwest Territories present boundaries, as well as a significant presence of 'others' either who were born in the Northwest Territories, or who have demonstrated a commitment to northern living by having resided here for five or more years, acknowledge that political and constitutional development in the Northwest Territories cannot proceed successfully without due attention being paid to the expressed interests of these communities of people."

Recommendation two: "That this Assembly formally express what has been implied in its previous motions dealing with aboriginal rights and constitutional development, namely that it regards the present geopolitical structure of the Northwest Territories, including the institutions and practices of government, to be an interim arrangement, subject to such change as may be negotiated by the leaders of the Northwest Territories peoples, and subsequently affirmed by the peoples themselves."

---Applause

Recommendation three: "That this Assembly declare as its objective in the area of political and constitutional development the establishment of stable, strong and effective government for all peoples of the Northwest Territories, founded upon the consent of the governed."

Recommendation four: "That this Assembly declare itself immediately to be receptive to the possibility of a major division of the present Northwest Territories into an eastern and a western territory, subject to the expressed will, by public debate and by referendum, of a majority of the people of the northeastern Arctic showing preference for the establishment of a new northeastern Arctic territory."

Recommendation five: "That this Assembly ask the federal government to conduct, subject to the ongoing concurrence of this Assembly, a referendum, not sooner than one year, and not later than two years, from this date, concerning the question of division of the Northwest Territories, and further:

- (a) That the referendum ask, in essence, the following question:
  - (i) Do you favour the establishment of a new territory in the northeastern Arctic, the assumption being that your community and its environs will be part of the new territory if it is established?
- (b) That this question be referred to residents of those communities of the northeastern Arctic which indicate by petition, five per cent of the population, that they would like to be polled; and
- (c) That all citizens residing in those communities to be polled, who are 18 years of age or older, and who have lived in the Northwest Territories for five or more years, be entitled to vote in this referendum."

Recommendation six: "That this Assembly make arrangements to conduct its own referendum on division if the federal government delays unduly, or absolutely refuses to act."

Recommendation seven: "That this Assembly ask the Executive Committee of the Government of the Northwest Territories to set up, subject to the approval of this Assembly, an independent body to prepare an objective study of the impact of division upon the Territories as a whole, and upon its several parts and their peoples, and to disseminate the information resulting from this study as widely as seems to be necessary well in advance of any public decision making; and further that this Assembly schedule debates on the question of division and on constitutional development generally, at least twice before the referendum."

Recommendation eight: "That this Assembly, if the referendum is answered affirmatively in sufficient northeastern Arctic communities to establish a viable northeastern Arctic territory, ask the Government of Canada to establish

such a territory independent of the present Northwest Territories, its government being the subject of negotiation between the Government of Canada and the people of said territory."

Recommendation nine: "That this Assembly immediately take the necessary steps to establish a constitutional development committee, comprised of five Members, and including the Minister for aboriginal rights and constitutional development, mandated to explore with the various peoples of the Northwest Territories who may wish to continue to remain in association with one another, and to reach with them if possible, agreement concerning the identification of processes and the creation of mechanisms for future political and constitutional development; and further, that this Assembly direct its constitutional development committee specifically to explore the possibility of holding a constitutional convention which would include representation from all peoples in the area defined above, as well as from this Assembly, and which would have as its primary aim the creation of a constitution for the largest and strongest possible geopolitical jurisdiction."

Recommendation ten: "That this Assembly select a delegation to deliver by hand to the Prime Minister, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the Minister responsible for federal-provincial affairs, and to a meeting of the federal parliament's standing committee on northern affairs, all such of the foregoing recommendations as may be approved by it."

#### A Situation That Demands Change

Those, Mr. Chairman, are the recommendations. I do not wish at this time to speak at length. I will have brief remarks, two or three minutes. I want to leave as much time as possible for others. We have had our time and discussion and presentation and we want to leave as much time to others as possible for their comments.

In considering finally then whether or not to adopt these recommendations your committee asks Members of this Assembly and again asks people right across the Northwest Territories to recognize two very important things: First, that there is a situation in the Northwest Territories which seems to demand change. There is strong dissatisfaction with the way things are and have been and this dissatisfaction is expressed on several fronts and it must be reckoned with. The direction and scope of change may be open to question but it seems to this committee that the maintenance of a complacent status quo is simply not an alternative.

MR. PATTERSON: Hear, hear!

MR. MacQUARRIE: Therefore, no one in the Territories should believe that the Report of the Special Committee on Unity is an unwarranted intrusion into still political waters. If these recommendations were not made it would be naive in the extreme I believe to suppose that the alternative is silence and contentment in the Northwest Territories. The real question facing this Assembly then seems to be whether the approach to change that is recommended by your committee in this report is the approach that should be followed or whether some other approach might be more desirable.

#### Recommendations Will Not Fully Satisfy Particular Parties Of Interest

The second thing that your committee would ask you to recognize from the start is that the recommendations we have proposed will not fully satisfy any of the particular parties of interest in the Northwest Territories, and we are sure that that will become apparent when the witnesses have the opportunity to comment on the report a little later.



Given the great diversity in the North, it is our opinion that there is simply no set of recommendations that would satisfy every demand of every party of interest since the demands in some cases are contradictory to one another, but despite any criticism which may be raised pertaining to the recommendations, your committee believes that its recommendations may be recommendations that will be able to draw the broadest support possible given the tremendously complex social situation with which they have had to deal.

Finally, as chairman, I would like to say that when your committee met at the end of September in splendid isolation and objectivity in a boardroom in Yellowknife, all committee Members present at each days meetings were able to agree on the details of all recommendations, but needless to say in addition to being territorial legislators all of us are members or natural representatives of parties of particular interest, and since that time, and I am sure for all Members in this House since the time that the committee's recommendations have been released, we have been subject to suggestions concerning the recommendations from particular parties of interest. That I am sure is a natural political development. Notwithstanding that, I am confident that in the ensuing debate that all committee Members, and I am sure also all Members of this Assembly, will do their outmost to support finally whatever they believe very deeply to be just and fair for all peoples in the Northwest Territories rather than what is merely profitable or expedient in the short term.

#### Representation From Various Groups

I look forward now to hearing from the various witnesses which will include the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, the Dene Nation, the Metis Association of the Northwest Territories, the Northwest Territories Association of Municipalities and our Members of Parliament for the Western Arctic and from Nunatsiaq. I regret that C.M. Drury will not be here because of illness. It would have been interesting to hear further comment from him about his thoughts on the approach to political development in the Northwest Territories and I also regret there will not be a representation from the Committee for Original Peoples' Entitlement and that is negligence on my part, I regret to say, which had left the executive of COPE feeling that they had insufficient time to comment on the proposals.

MR. PATTERSON: We have got Nellie Cournoyea.

MR. MacQUARRIE: With respect, Mr. Chairman, I now turn the proceedings back to you and I am ready to hear comments from the various groups.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. At one of the recent caucus meetings the caucus decided to set up a committee to determine what witnesses would be available when and who will represent them and the chairman of that committee is Mr. McLaughlin. If it is okay with the Members could we just hear from Mr. McLaughlin, who is first on the list. Mr. McLaughlin.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chairman, as instructed by the Members of this Assembly your committee made up of Mrs. Sorensen, Mr. Curley, Mr. Nerysoo and myself met to arrange for invitations to various groups and individuals to appear before this committee. In consultation with Members we propose that each group or individual will have the opportunity to make an initial presentation followed by questions from Members. Each party will have the opportunity to remain and hear the other presentations and will later have the chance to appear again to make a shorter presentation to clarify their positions and make comments about other presentations and once again Members would be able to ask questions of the witnesses. I understand that under the normal rules the individual Members would be allowed to recall witnesses for further appearances by getting agreement from your committee. I have also advised the witness groups that they can make use of the Pages to send notes to Members in order to communicate ideas or questions onto the floor. If Members will agree to this proposal I will then advise you of the groups who are now available to appear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

---Agreed

Mr. McLaughlin, maybe because of the statement that Mr. MacQuarrie made I think Ms. Cournoyea wants to say something about COPE. Is that true?

MS. COURNOYEA: A point of privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): You may sit down.

Groups Not In Attendance

MS. COURNOYEA: I would request that the context of the wording of the communication to the unity committee by those who are not attending for reasons as stated in their communications be read into the record.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms. Cournoyea. Mr. Patterson, are you going to read them into the record?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: I am not sure what Mr. Patterson is going to do, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chairman, I do not have the responses and telexes available but at an appropriate point later in the proceedings I could arrange to have that done.

MS. COURNOYEA: A point of privilege. I request that be done now.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I move we adjourn for ten minutes until we get them.

MR. CURLEY: Five minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Is it agreed? We will recess for ten minutes.

MR. CURLEY: Nay.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The Chair recognizes a quorum and I call the committee back to order. Mr. McLaughlin, have you your copy of the telex?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chairman, just to make things clear we sent a telex out to ITC, COPE, the Dene Nation, the Metis Association, the Association of Municipalities and both of the Members of Parliament for the Northwest Territories and we also sent by the fastest means possible a copy of the unity committee report to all of them.

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

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chairman, the telex from Mr. Drury we cannot find but it is a telex from his office saying that Mr. Drury could not be here due to reasons of health and he was sorry he could not be here. The actual telex from COPE is available as are all the other telexes which accept the invitation but I believe the Member from Western Arctic wants me just to read the COPE telex, is that correct?

MS. COURNOYEA: People who were invited but who are not here.

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

MS. COURNOYEA: The suggestion I made was any communication from people who are not attending be read.

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

Telex From The Committee For Original Peoples' Entitlement

MR. McLAUGHLIN: I am unable to read the actual telex from Mr. Drury but I have the telex from COPE and I will read it:

"To the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly: I have just received your invitation sent October 24 to attend a meeting of the committee of the whole scheduled to start five days from now to make a presentation on a report which I have not received. You must be aware that the time constraint imposed upon myself and the others you have invited has effectively precluded our meaningful participation. The unity committee undertook to send us their draft reports well ahead of this session in order that we have the opportunity to respond before anything is tabled at the Assembly. They have not done this. We appear to have again experienced consultations where we give but we never receive. I am distressed by your method of doing business. If you are truly seeking our effective involvement in the consideration of this issue, it should be delayed until the next session. If you choose to proceed with your proposed schedule COPE will not participate any further in this process." That is signed by Sam Raddi, COPE, Inuvik.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. McLaughlin. That was the wish of Ms. Cournoyea that it be read into the record. As a matter of courtesy and fairness to other Members of the unity committee I will ask for a response to the report. Mr. Sibbeston. Mr. Curley.

Future Of The Territories

MR. CURLEY: (Translation) Thank you. I will make my statement in Inuktitut. This has been expected for a long time now and the date is upon us and the recommendations will be discussed between the Inuit in the Northwest Territories and the people of the Northwest Territories staff must understand that we want the people to understand exactly what this is and the civil servants, say if the Northwest Territories splits, then everything would go haywire and nothing would work out. We were asked as a unity committee to look into the fact, the natives and non-natives and the Metis Association, what they felt about the future of the Territories and today we have presented this report as was expected.

The Northwest Territories residents, it was said they could not come to an agreement if there would be a split or not. I would like to make this clear that a lot of people think of the Northwest Territories as one and it is not working. We have tried to improve it and the people in the government say it is a good government but there is no representation of the people and they cannot consult with the people enough. I know this is not the only reason because the Northwest Territories is a vast country and so we in the unity committee have travelled extensively to look into this and it is stated in the report that the territorial government would set up as we in the Territories know, this government was given to us back in 1912 and this government was set up here and the people who have lived in this country were not asked to give consent or were not asked if they wanted this government or not.

So we come today during this Assembly and we have to ask to have one government for the territorial people and they are Inuit, Dene, Metis and non-native. Can this government be responsible for looking after all our people? There have been many different agreements, different developments and now we all know that we have to vote and decide on two governments. I think there has been no intention that two governments -- I was a Member of the committee and I would like to state that it is clear now that the territorial government and this Legislative Assembly now have to recognize our stateless position whether the Northwest Territories will split or not. I know it is not going to come to anything today, but the government, the Legislative Assembly will have to take this position. (Translation ends.)

#### Division Of The N.W.T. Should Not Be Delayed

I want to address very briefly as a Member of the unity committee the fact that I have always stated to the other Members on the committee that I would be openminded in debating the report of the unity committee. I was a minority as far as the Eastern Arctic was concerned. There was no other Member from the East, from this part of the area through the Keewatin and Central Arctic, so on that basis I had stated continually to the chairman that if there were any amendments proposed by the Members from the Eastern Arctic, representatives, I would be more receptive to support if it were more acceptable to the people in this part of the area, particularly in view of the fact that ITC came up with a strong resolution recently at Coppermine. After we have concluded the recommendations I will be more inclined that this Assembly immediately vote its support to the division question rather than delaying it. Delay means that if you ask the federal government to hold a referendum, you know, they may want to sit around for a number of years. You know, they may not want to act on it and the problem will become compounded further. The fact is I do not believe the Northwest Territories is going to be able to hold a referendum until such other legal requirements have been changed like the Northwest Territories Act. The Northwest Territories Assembly does not have an ordinance with respect to referendums. I think to hold a plebiscite to some extent but it would only deal with the particular ordinances that are already enacted, but I do not think the plebiscite itself would be substantial enough to create a major division for the people of the Northwest Territories.

#### Federal Intrusion In The N.W.T.

I am concerned that I have no problem at all with supporting many of the recommendations except for the referendum part because we are now after this Assembly continually expressing dissatisfaction with the federal intrusion in the Northwest Territories.

---Applause

I have continued to say to the people of the Northwest Territories, like when we are debating the question of the constitutional issue that the referendum terms of changing the constitution will infringe upon the provincial status and provincial powers. Today we are saying here in this recommendation I think we should change it, that the federal government should hold a referendum so it will make a decision for us. I think we should seriously look at that part and say to ourselves maybe this Assembly, because it is more representative than any of the previous Assemblies, is really the appropriate forum to make a commitment now and then hold a referendum if you want to substantiate that support from the people of the Territories. So I will urge the Members here to seriously consider putting in support for us rather than putting the referendum ahead because I think we would get into a very difficult situation.

#### Territorial Business

The other point is that we will put ourselves in a weakened position by asking the federal government to act for us when in fact the special representative of the Prime Minister recently did say that the business of the division question is really the business of the Territories. Now with this particular resolution or recommendation five we are saying to them, "We want you to make that decision for us and then if you do not make that decision we are going to go ahead and do it." But if we wait after a year, waiting for the federal government to hold a referendum and initiate that campaign and if they do not hold it, then we would be in a very bad situation. We would have to go back and fight and ask them to change the Northwest Territories Act so that it would allow us to hold a referendum. On that basis I think we should seriously consider that particular aspect of the proposed referendum guidelines and maybe delete it and replace it with the fact that this Assembly can now make a decision and then we will worry about the consultation. I think we have the capability, we have native organizations like ITC, the Dene Nation, who can have a lot of public discussion with the support of this Assembly. So, on that basis, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say we should seriously consider that we may have to amend that particular recommendation five so that it would be more reflective of the urgent circumstances and the situation we are in today. Thank you.

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

---Applause

I recognize Mr. Sibbeston as seconder of the motion.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a few words in Slavey first and then I will translate what I have said into English.

(Speaks in Slavey)

---Applause

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

#### Why The Special Committee On Unity Was Formed

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I will just interpret what I have said so far and I just have a few more comments to say. What we are dealing with today is dividing the Northwest Territories into two possible regions. We are talking about the way governments may be in the future in the North. The reason why the unity committee was set up was that there appeared to be dissatisfaction with this present government. When we became elected and began the sittings of the

Assembly last fall this was the dominant or main theme that was said by people who were elected. There was general dissatisfaction with this government. I know I was elected on the basis that there ought to be major changes in this government and from what I see the Inuit people were not very happy with this government and they instead were proposing Nunavut.

So really for the past year we have heard a great deal about Nunavut. We have not heard very much about the type of government that might be in our part of the North, but we have heard a lot about Nunavut. So the unity committee as a result of this dissatisfaction was set up and we have gone throughout the North. We have gone to every native organization in the North and we have talked to them about what type of government would they like in the North, what type of changes would they like. After hearing what they have said we made a report, we made recommendations and one of the main recommendations that we made is that people want changes to this government and particularly the Inuit people in the East, up in the Arctic want to set up Nunavut which is a territorial government for the people in that part of the North.

#### A Government Satisfactory To The Native People

But I want to say too that when we are talking about dividing the North we are not simply talking of Nunavut. We have to take into serious consideration what type of government is going to result or what kind of government we might have in the western part of the North.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIBBESTON: My feeling on the question of when and whether we should divide is that I think it is inevitable that eventually we may have to go our separate ways, but I feel that before we separate we should help one another. The Inuit people and the Dene and native people who are on this Assembly should help one another so that whatever forms of government we have in the future in the North, will be satisfactory to native people. As Members know in the western part of the North the Dene and the Metis people and other northern people are involved in the struggle against the federal government. The issue that is being focused upon is the Norman Wells pipeline and in order to win that struggle, in order to get certain concessions from the federal government we need the help of all people in the North and for this reason we have to hang on together until the issue is resolved.

Likewise, if you are talking of Nunavut and Nunavut is going to happen, we must begin thinking about the changes that are going to happen in the government in our part of the North and the native people will be seeking to make major changes. But in order to get changes we need the help of the Inuit people. So just generally my feeling is that we may have to go our separate ways in the future, but we should not go our separate ways until we have helped one another get things so that native people are satisfied.

There is also the matter of the boundaries. I can tell you that the people in my part of the North do not accept the tree line as the boundary between Nunavut and the other part of the North. It is a fact that Dene people go into the barren lands to hunt and to trap. So that matter of boundaries is something that has to be worked out before separation occurs.

(Speaks in Slavey)

I just said, Mr. Chairman, a few more things. I stress again the importance of continuing together, that this Legislative Assembly should continue to work together to resolve all the major issues that are confronting us in the North, both native people and non-native people. Once we have worked together for the next few years and resolved some of these major issues and have worked together to really take on and challenge the federal government, once we have done this, and once we have earned certain concessions, then we could go our separate ways, but at the moment we need to stick together in the North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. Very interesting.

---Laughter

Mr. Sayine.

Need To Work Together In The Territories

MR. SAYINE: Mr. Chairman, I guess I do not have too much to add to what Tagak Curley and what Mr. Sibbeston here have said already, but a year ago when I first got on this unity committee I have to admit that the last thing on my mind was Nunavut because I did not know anything about it at the time, but my main concern was I guess the whole structure of the government in the Territories. Especially the people I represent, they did not agree with the system of government, and this is one of the reasons why we have had, especially in the Western Arctic, where we had the Metis Association and the Dene Nation and the territorial government, we were all split to a certain period of time up to last year anyway. These were the things that I never agreed with and this is why I guess I have decided to run for this territorial Assembly.

I was not expecting to change things all by myself overnight, but I felt that more of our people should have input, especially into the territorial government. I have always felt that a lot of times when I was chief of Fort Resolution, and I was chief up to last spring, for two years, and I have always felt that when we went to the assemblies of the Dene Nation people were always saying, "Why should we look at this territorial government as our government? We do not want to recognize them." It is coming to the point where they were becoming further and further away from the territorial government. They were always trying to avoid meetings and everything else that the territorial government was doing. So, this was my main reason why I decided to get onto the unity committee and I felt that if we were going to have a territorial government, and we were going to have all these other organizations we would have to pull everything together and start working the right way instead of being a split territory.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

---Applause

MR. SAYINE: I guess we can call ourselves Canadians but in my mind this is what it was coming to. So, anyway this is one of the main reasons why I ran and also decided to get onto this unity committee because as I said I felt this was a lot of nonsense. To put it straight I think it is a lot of nonsense. Anyway going back to the report, since I was involved with setting it up, I suppose most of the things that are in there -- I guess before I would comment or get any deeper into it, since the committee was made up from this House here we should have it discussed more and get a lot more of the Members' ideas and whoever appears as witnesses, I would really like to go deeper into it before I make any comments on it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Sayine. I will now ask Mr. McLaughlin if he has priorities for witnesses.

Motion On Procedure For Appearance Of Witnesses On Unity

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In order to get the procedure down clearly and set I think it would be in order that I make a motion at this time that the procedure I outlined earlier should now be agreed on by Members as the procedure we will use during the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. McLaughlin. I am not sure how Members want to approach this. It is up to you. It makes no difference to me how you go about it, if you want to open the floor for general comments. Mr. Braden, have you a suggestion?

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Chairman, we have heard some remarks from almost all the Members of the unity committee except for you. You are a knowledgeable and experienced legislator in the Northwest Territories and you may wish to step down as chairman so that you can speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: You are the only remaining Member of the unity committee that we have not heard from.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Everything I am going to say has probably been said except for Mr. Sibbeston, I do not know what he was talking about, but I just hope he was not swearing at us because no one else can understand. What I would have to say has already been said by the other Members and I think we will just leave it at that.

I am still not sure how the Members want to deal with this, if they want to open the floor for general comments or have the witnesses come forward. Mr. Butters, have you a suggestion?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, we have invited witnesses especially to appear on this date to advise us of their thoughts and comments on the unity paper and I suggest, sir, that we should move directly into this situation whereby the witnesses would appear before us and we could hear from them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Is it agreed that we call the witnesses to appear before us and we could hear from them?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Is it agreed that we call the witnesses in and in order and have them appear before this House? Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Thank you. Mr. McLaughlin.

Motion On Procedure For Appearance Of Witnesses On Unity, Carried

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chairman, is it understood then that there is agreement among the Members to follow the procedure which I outlined to the Members previously and which I also did outline to the witnesses who were going to appear before us? Is there agreement on that?

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

---Carried



MR. McLAUGHLIN: I would advise the committee now that the members of ITC and the Metis Association arrived yesterday and they have agreed to appear today. The other groups have not yet arrived. The ITC delegation headed by the president, Mr. Michael Amarook, has agreed to be the first witnesses and if it is agreed, Mr. Chairman, I think you should call them in first.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Is it agreed that we call ITC in as the first witnesses? Is it agreed?

---Agreed

First of all we will have a 15 minute recess for coffee and then call the witnesses in.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): We have a quorum. Is it the wish of the Members to call the witnesses to the witness stand? Agreed.

---Agreed

Would you see that the witnesses come in? Mr. Patterson, do you have a comment?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. On a point of privilege, I have received a number of complaints during the break that people who are here in the gallery anxious to hear the debate, do not have equipment to permit them to hear the translated version and this is a serious problem that I would like to have resolved before we continue.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Patterson, I am advised we have 100 extra units here now and they have all been taken. In order for us to get more, I think we would have to shut down for two days until we get some in.  
Mr. Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, maybe consideration should be given to having consecutive translation available since the reason we came to Frobisher Bay was so, that the public through the media and by attending here, could hear this important debate and we are cutting off half the Members from the public.

---Applause

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): What can we do about it? I am advised the only other way we could do it is to have the interpreters sit at the table here and translate over the speakers. If that is the wish of the other Members, I am open. Any further comments? Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I understand from past experience that it is a very difficult task for the interpreter corps to go through the process that is being proposed. I am wondering now if it would be possible to set up another room here where we could have perhaps a system hooked into some speakers so that guests and other visitors could hear what is going on.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Any further suggestions as to how we could solve this problem? Mr. Patterson, how do you propose we could solve this problem?

MR. PATTERSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I understand this debate, which is an historical debate is being broadcast live on the media and the listening public too is deprived of the benefit of what Inuit or non-Inuit or "other" Members might be saying if they do not understand that language. It would assist the listening public throughout the Northwest Territories if we had -- it will be troublesome, but if we have consecutive translation available. That is what I would suggest, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. McLaughlin, any further comments?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chairman, I was under the understanding that translation was occurring -- not as Mr. Patterson stressed it. Okay, fine.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I am told CBC is doing a summary in the other languages when they can but apparently they are having trouble keeping up with the translation. I am open to any further suggestions as to how we can solve this. Mr. Patterson, I am afraid you will have to put that in the form of a motion for the benefit of the other Members if you want to continue with your suggestion. Mr. Patterson.

Motion To Have Appropriate Translation After Each Speaker On Unity

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would move then that in order that the public fully understand this debate, that interpretation be provided through the House public address system consecutively, that is, in the appropriate language after each speaker has spoken.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): To the motion. Do I hear question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The question being called. The motion is...

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I recognize there is a problem and I wonder whether we could have some kind of comment from Aimo Nookiguak or his group if they can handle it. I do not see him. I see Mr. Braden talking to somebody there but shall we say yes, we are going to supply them, if we cannot?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. Mr. McCallum. Hon. Mr. Braden, have you any suggestion?

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have briefly consulted with members of the interpreter corps and while they indicate that they can plug into the system as you have it set up here it will perhaps double the amount of time that we have allotted for each group of witnesses. If the hon. Member from Frobisher Bay is concerned about having a debate which everybody can hear and understand once we get into the unity report we will have to presumably carry on this practice. So, as opposed to two or two and a half days, we can probably look to continuing on this discussion for a much longer period.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. Mr. Braden. Mr. Patterson, to the motion.

Everyone Must Participate In Debate

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I am afraid that many people seem quite content with the designation of two official languages in the Northwest Territories, English and French, but in fact the reality is that there are particularly in this part of the world, a majority of people whose first language is not English and they are here in this meeting place and they are listening throughout the Northwest Territories and they are I am sure anxious to hear what everyone says. It is going to cause problems. That is one of the reasons why I believe that the Territories must divide. We have an incredible communications problem, but let us not slough it off by saying it will take more time for everyone to understand. We are here so that all of the people, not just those who understand English, all the people can participate in this debate and I am afraid I feel it is a point of principle with me and I will vote in favour of the motion even if it does take a long time. Maybe it will take years to resolve this question, but it is more important than perhaps anything else we will be dealing with. So I am not afraid of spending more time so that someone else can understand. Thank you.

Motion To Have Appropriate Translation After Each Speaker On Unity, Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. To the motion. Any further discussion? Question has already been called. All in favour? Down. Against? Abstentions? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Mr. Curley, did you want to comment on the motion?

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask you to read the motion because I did not get to know what we voted for but I will let it go.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. I understand the motion -- Mr. Patterson, can you read that motion again?

MR. PATTERSON: The effect of it, Mr. Chairman, is simply that I have suggested that we take the necessary time to provide consecutive translation following the speaker.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. This would mean we may have to recess and get the interpreters lined up. I wonder if somebody could find out whether the interpreters are prepared to do this translation and how long it would take for them to set up. Mr. Wah-Shee.

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it from the motion, from the hon. Member from Frobisher Bay, he has said that the system be set up after this particular meeting and I interpret that as after today's proceedings, so the system will be in place for tomorrow, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Wah-Shee. Was that the intent of your motion, Mr. Patterson?

MR. PATTERSON: No.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The intent of your motion is that we recess and set up the translation now. Is that right?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Will somebody find out from the interpreters how long it would take them to set up? Mr. McLaughlin.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chairman, the interpreters would not have to set anything up, one of them could sit beside you and then give a verbatim translation over the same mike you are using or another mike beside you, the problem is it would take twice as long but there is nothing required to be set up.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you very much. Will the Sergeant-at-Arms see we have an interpreter here sitting at the table and we can proceed with the report. I have to apologize to the witnesses for the slight delay. I think we are now ready to go. Maybe you could identify yourselves for the Members, the witnesses sitting at the head witness table, Mr. Michael Amarook, president of ITC, am I right?

MR. AMAROOK: (Translation) The...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Excuse me, but Mr. McLaughlin.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: I thought we would still get the simultaneous translation as is normally done so that at least Members in the House and those people who do have them could get the actual instantaneous translation and then the translation would be done again afterward.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I am told they cannot run two systems. They either do it this way or the other way and the other way was voted on, this was voted on and the motion was passed so we have to do it the way we are going to do it now. Mr. Curley.

Problem Is Not Interpreters

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, although I understand the concern of the Member from Frobisher Bay, to try and provide a unilingual service throughout the whole Territories, if we are going to do that then we should really consider doing it in Slavey, doing it in the Western Arctic dialect and so on because we should

not just be doing it for one segment of the population. On that basis I can understand, I think the interpreters can have this particular problem, but I would have to say to the Assembly staff, and the Speaker is the one who should make available what you call those translators, they should see they are available. I had to lend mine to someone else because we are short. It is not the interpreters' problem, I think it is the whole set up here and this business of the House has not taken that into consideration, the fact that those kinds of things should be available. I do not know. I am totally confused right now.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): We are not blaming the interpreters. It is just that the motion reads we have this type of translation and the motion was passed so I have no alternative but to go ahead. If you want to make another motion that is up to you but we have to go with that motion that was dealt with and passed and we have this type of translation and that is all I can do. I am open to any suggestions. I am also told Mr. Curley, that they brought over 100 extra units for this and that is quite a few extra units to be brought in just for this. They are trying to get more from Montreal, I think they are on the phone now trying to get more but how successful they will be and how soon we can get them is another thing but the word is going out now. Mr. Curley, go ahead.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, again I am really speaking on the principle that without having an official language policy of this government, to try and continue to satisfy everyone, I do not think we can do it, I think we will just have to proceed with the business of the House as we were supposed to do rather than trying to satisfy somebody else. We have work to do here and we should go on with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CURLEY: If some of us do not understand then some of us will have to try a little harder to get the information out by other means. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): How do you propose to go about this motion?

MR. CURLEY: I would suggest that the mover of the motion withdraw the motion.

---Applause

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

MR. PATTERSON: May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that at the very least we should make every effort to permit those persons who are present today here to understand the debate. It may be possible that people are using these recording devices who can pass them on to the unilingual people here who cannot do without them and looking around there may be a handful of people here today.

Motion To Rescind Motion To Have Appropriate Translation After Each Speaker  
On Unity, Carried

I have learned that the CBC is attempting to summarize what has been said and in view of my colleague from the Keewatin's comment that he feels this would unduly slow things down I will withdraw my motion but I would urge that we make every effort to at least make these translating devices available to members of the public because we spent a tremendous amount of money to come over here so that people in my constituency who do not speak English could listen to what is happening and now they are telling me they are shut out. I feel distressed about it but I will withdraw the motion but I expect things to be in better shape tomorrow. Thank you.

---Carried

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

MR. CURLEY: I have one more comment and I appreciate the Member's problem. I see maybe 50 civil servants sitting along the table over there and some of them do not have to have those units; if they are assistants to the Ministers, they should have the sets. The rest of them I think they are just having a pleasure trip here and they do not have to have them so why not give them to the people out there.

MR. SIBBESTON: Right.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): A point well taken and I think maybe we should just take inventory and see how many people really need these sets and if they are needed elsewhere. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: This is being broadcast throughout the Northwest Territories and I move we adjourn for 15 minutes and sort the situation out.

---Laughter

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Is it agreed? It was moved that we recess for 15 minutes and get this sorted out and then come back. Thank you.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The committee will come to order. Just before -- I think we are missing one witness. Maybe somebody could go and alert him. While we are waiting for the witness, the Chair recognizes the two MP's, Mr. Ittinuar and Mr. Nickerson in the gallery.

---Applause

There we are, the lost is found, we have the president of ITC, Inuit Tapirisat of Canada back in the chair. I would just like to make a couple of short remarks before we proceed with the witnesses. I will ask all Members and the witnesses if they are going to speak, would they speak right into the mike, speak closely to the mike and when you are making a comment or a reply would you please talk slowly for the benefit of the interpreters. We have to slow down so they can translate. Thank you very much. We will now recognize the president from ITC, Michael Amarook for your opening comments please.

---Applause

MR. AMAROOK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A few of us will be making comments with regard to the Nunavut proposal and we will be giving you information items and John Amagoalik will be first on the list.

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

#### Assembly Could Slow Down Nunavut

MR. AMAGOALIK: (Translation) Can you hear me? I would like to thank the Assembly for allowing us to do our presentation today. First of all, we would like to clarify that we are not here to find out if the Assembly opposes the creation of Nunavut. The only thing I guess we are afraid of is that this Assembly might slow down the process of Nunavut. I would also like to clarify, and I want it understood, that the official speakers, the Inuit of the Northwest Territories, we are the spokesmen and representatives of the Inuit in the Territories, and sometimes we are a bit hard core, hard-nosed at times in making statements but this is the only way that others will pay attention to us and we will be presenting, when we have had concrete statements that they are not paid attention to too much, and if the ITC is telling us how to be hard-nosed it would not be the same today.

I would like to say that land claims and Nunavut are two different issues but they necessarily go hand in hand. We view the settlement of land claims as a relatively short-term solution and we see Nunavut as a long-term solution to our problems and in that respect it is even more important than the settlement of land claims.

We are convinced that the Alaska settlement would not have worked and if it had not been created. Home rule in Greenland is starting to work even without the settlement of the native claims. We suspect that the reverse would not be so successful. We also feel that the James Bay agreement would work much better today if the people had been given more than a token regional government which has no teeth and which is being ignored by the Quebec provincial government.

#### Governments Must Agree In Principle

(Translation) Now, the ITC had a general assembly meeting at Coppermine and they debated a resolution with respect to the creation of Nunavut territory with its own territorial government. The resolution affirmed the ITC commitment to such an end and called upon the Government of Canada and the Legislative Assembly to indicate agreement in principle.

Needless to say, the resolution passed unanimously. The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development responding to the resolution on behalf of the Government of Canada has agreed to bring the question of Nunavut before the

federal cabinet. We seek your support in making a large step forward in the political evolution of the North, that is the creation of Nunavut.

In the course of this address, we would like to address three matters that are of concern to all of us: The rationale for Nunavut; the relationship between Nunavut and the political evolution of the parts of the existing Northwest Territories that are outside Nunavut; and the process of creating Nunavut. We shall speak to the first matter mentioned. What is the rationale for Nunavut?

#### Rationale For Nunavut

We would like to quote some of the remarks made by Thomas Suluk, then ITC land claims project director, during his address to this Assembly in February, 1980 at Yellowknife. I am quoting Thomas Suluk during his address to this Assembly in February, 1980 at Yellowknife: "I turn now to the question of political change. When the people of Nunavut seek to criticize the inadequacies of government, they focus their criticism on Ottawa and Yellowknife. This, of course, very seldom entails criticism of the individuals who formulate policy in Ottawa and Yellowknife. The motives of the people involved are not questioned. Rather, the criticism goes to the location and structure of the government institutions in which these people work.

Criticism of Ottawa is not a pastime confined to the people of Nunavut. Southern Canadians, as well as other northerners, indulge in this popular sport. While the very visible federal role in the North, a role that all here today would agree is sometimes heavy-handed, may make Ottawa a somewhat more popular target in the North than elsewhere, regional grumbling over the policies of the central government is an enduring feature of Canadian federalism. This kind of grumbling is not always a bad thing; it helps to bring about compromises over the conflicting interests of well-defined regional groupings of Canadians. Criticism of Ottawa is entirely consistent with strong attachment to the Canadian confederation.

#### Political Allegiance A Matter Of Heart

The criticism reserved for Yellowknife by the people of Nunavut is of a different order. I will not go into detail as to all the factors that have contributed to the alienation from Yellowknife that is felt by the Inuit and non-Inuit residents of Nunavut. Any list of factors would include and go beyond the following; physical remoteness, climate, landscape, economy, language, culture, history, and dissatisfaction with the quality of government services. It is sufficient to say that the people of Nunavut do not identify with the Government of the Northwest Territories or its capital in the way that other Canadians have developed collective loyalties to the provincial units in which they live. When all is said and done, political allegiance is a matter of the heart. The people of Nunavut feel and value an allegiance to Canada. The people of Nunavut hope to bring about the creation of Nunavut government that will similarly encompass and express their loyalties at the territorial and, some day, provincial level."

This quote contains three very important facts. First of all, political allegiance is, first and foremost, a matter of the heart. Secondly, the existing Northwest Territories cannot claim the heartfelt political allegiance of the people who live within its boundaries. Thirdly, the political allegiance of the people of Nunavut focuses naturally on a new Nunavut territory with its own territorial government. Each of these three ideas warrant some discussion.



Political allegiance is, first and foremost, a matter of the heart. Who among us would disagree with this fundamental tenet of democratic thought? And who among us would disagree that political boundaries drawn in opposition to this tenet, either intentionally or unintentionally, have been an age old cause of confusion, strife and unhappiness in the family of man? Surely, it is axiomatic in any democratically organized and democratically motivated society that political boundaries must conform to popular feelings of identity, popular feelings of community.

Do the existing Northwest Territories claim the heartfelt political allegiance of the peoples who live within its boundaries? Any objective test would answer the question in the negative. In the never ending debate over political development that has taken place inside the existing Northwest Territories over the past five or six years, very few, if any, passionate testimonials have been heard on behalf of the Northwest Territories as a political unit; very few, if any, praises have been sung. Certainly, the results of recent efforts to take the pulse of political life in the existing Northwest Territories -- the Report of the Special Representative on Constitutional Development in the Northwest Territories and the Report of the Special Committee on Unity of the Legislative Assembly, to mention only two -- have shown the body politic to be in rather indifferent form.

#### Congratulations To Unity Committee

I would like at this time to congratulate the Members of the unity committee for having the courage to face hard facts with intelligent conclusions.

---Applause

It should be pointed out that the unity committee probably saw the same things as Drury did but, unlike Drury, had the courage to accept the political realities of the North and to recommend some realistic solutions. Now I do not agree too often with Mr. Charles Lynch, but I think his suggestion that Drury's report belongs in the nearest snowbank is a most appropriate one.

Is there any amount or depth of genuine enthusiasm for maintaining the governmental status quo within the political unit of the Northwest Territories or even for maintaining the political unit of the Northwest Territories itself? The answer is self-evident.

#### Lack Of Commitment In N.W.T.

It is perhaps painful for some people to contemplate the lack of emotional commitment on the part of the peoples of the Northwest Territories to the political unit in which they live. Even the most cursory review of the history of the Northwest Territories, however, should remove any sense of surprise at this fact. Right from the moment of creation, more than 100 years ago, the Northwest Territories have served as a stopgap measure for the provision of public administration in advance of the emergence of more long-term political units. Alberta and Saskatchewan emerged as distinct political units a long time ago; Nunavut is going through its birth pains at this time. There is nothing alarming about the lack of emotional commitment to the existing Northwest Territories. In the final analysis, this situation cannot be attributed to the actions or omissions of any individual, group or system of public administration. This situation merely reflects the inappropriateness of the existing Northwest Territories as a long-term political

unit. The Northwest Territories did not come into existence on the basis of a popular political consensus or with the expectation that its boundaries would ever define a popular political consensus. The creation of Nunavut in accordance with the popular political allegiance of its people would not represent a failure in a process toward self government, but rather a logical step, indeed a necessary step, in the fulfillment of such a process.

#### Inuit Associations Support Nunavut

The people of Nunavut look to a new Nunavut territory as an effective vehicle for their political, economic and social aspirations. The evidence in favour of this observation is surely persuasive. Inuit Tapirisat of Canada has publicly advocated the creation of a Nunavut territory for more than five years. The three regional Inuit organizations -- the Kitikmeot Inuit Association, the Keewatin Inuit Association, and the Baffin Inuit Association -- have consistently supported Nunavut. Mr. Peter Ittinuar, Member of Parliament for Nunatsiaq has been a vocal advocate for Nunavut. The Members of this Legislative Assembly from the Eastern Arctic constituencies have formed a caucus known informally as the Nunavut caucus. The Baffin Regional Council has expressed support for Nunavut. I understand that delegates at the most recent meeting of the Baffin Regional Council expressed certain concerns about when the process of creating Nunavut should commence and the level of public consultation accompanying such a process; there is no conflict, however, between the statements of Baffin Regional Council and the creation of Nunavut.

We would like to digress for a moment to clarify two points which seem to have been the subject of somewhat confused comment by a number of public figures in the past few months. First of all, ITC has never suggested that support in principle for the creation of Nunavut means support for the contents of the document entitled "Political Development in Nunavut" that came out of its 1979 annual general assembly in Igloolik. The resolution authorizing release of the document specifically indicated that the document was intended to spark public discussion and that its contents did not restrict ITC policy. Inuit Tapirisat of Canada hoped both to encourage public debate on Nunavut and to signal the depth of ITC commitment to Nunavut. Secondly, ITC has never argued that the creation of a Nunavut territory could be achieved overnight. Rather, ITC has sought support in principle for the creation of a Nunavut territory and has believed that consensus on the desirability of Nunavut would be coloured by a process by which the many questions relating to timing, transitional arrangements, boundaries, etc., could be answered. Such a process, of course, would necessarily be accompanied by extensive and continuing public consultation with governments, organizations, communities and individuals having an interest.

#### Unanimity Of Support

We have made some brief comments about the range of support for the creation of Nunavut among organizations and individuals acting in a representative capacity for the people of Nunavut. We believe that the near unanimity of support for Nunavut among the representatives of the people of Nunavut reflects a wider fact: Near unanimity of support among the people of Nunavut. Our belief is not altogether surprising, of course. It is hard to imagine a situation where almost all the leaders among the people of Nunavut would be saying one thing and the people would be feeling another. This kind of discrepancy would be unusual in any circumstance; it would be practically unthinkable in an area where consensus plays a key role in the political culture.

While the press cannot always be relied upon to express the views of a population, we think it is significant that the three newspapers that circulate in Nunavut; Nunatsiaq News, Iglaaq and News of the North, have expressed support for the creation of Nunavut.

We do not hesitate to say that the vast majority of the people of Nunavut favour the creation of a Nunavut territory with its own territorial government. Nor do we hesitate to challenge those who disagree with our belief to identify an objective basis for such disagreement. All of you have travelled in Nunavut as Members of the Legislative Assembly, and many of you have visited Nunavut for personal reasons. Forget for a moment the understandable expressions of concern sometimes voiced as to timing, transitional arrangements, etc., regarding the creation of Nunavut. Do any of you seriously doubt that the overwhelming majority of people living in Nunavut, Inuit and non-Inuit alike, support the principle of Nunavut? Do any of you seriously doubt that the people of Frobisher Bay and Pond Inlet feel that their political future should give them more in common with the people of Gjoa Haven and Chesterfield Inlet than the people of Hay River and Pine Point?

MR. SULUK: (Translation) We would like now to speak to the second matter raised at the beginning of this address...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): If you will address the Chair, I will recognize you and then it is of record. Mr. Thomas Suluk, please.

#### Relationship Between Nunavut And Political Evolution

MR. SULUK: (Translation) Thank you. We would now like to speak to the second matter raised at the beginning of this address: The relationship between Nunavut and the political evolution of the parts of the existing Northwest Territories that are outside Nunavut. There seems to be a feeling in some quarters that discussion about Nunavut undercuts the ability of the Government of the Northwest Territories to obtain concessions from Ottawa in the form of greater legislative, administrative and fiscal powers on behalf of all the people of the existing Northwest Territories. The proponents of this viewpoint feel further that discussion of Nunavut should either be dropped or postponed. We respect this opinion as a genuinely held assessment of the political realities that exist between any territorial government based in the North and the federal government. At the same time, we are forced to disagree with it in several key respects.

First of all, this approach seems to view the question of popular political allegiance as of little importance. This is a fundamental mistake. The people of Nunavut are hopeful that Nunavut could go a long way to protecting and enhancing the distinct qualities of their land and the human life it supports. Surely, this is a positive, healthy goal. It is difficult to see how common antipathy towards the federal government could serve as the basis of a popular political allegiance that would be capable of supplanting the positive, healthy goal of Nunavut. It is antagonistic to the theory and practice of Canadian federalism to define political units according to a common adversary.

Secondly, it is somewhat unrealistic to think that maintaining the existing boundaries of the Northwest Territories will automatically hasten the transfer of additional responsibilities from Ottawa. Any argument based on population size is of very limited persuasiveness. The Yukon Territory, with a far smaller population than the Northwest Territories, has always been treated by Ottawa as closer to the assumption of provincial-type powers. Rather, it is the ability of a government to discharge responsibilities effectively that should ultimately dictate the level of responsibilities that it receives. As long as the existing Northwest Territories is incapable of resolving its own internal debate on its political future, the federal government will be averse to transferring any further major responsibilities. This aversion is rooted in a fair amount of logic. Why transfer responsibilities to a political unit that does not know what it is or where it is going? As long as the question of Nunavut remains up in the air the internal debate about the political evolution of the existing Northwest Territories will remain unresolved.

Nunavut Would Avoid Deadlock Of Aboriginal Rights Negotiations

The creation of Nunavut and, more immediately, consensus as to its desirability in principle, could go a long way to avoiding the deadlock that is threatening to paralyse political institutions within the existing Northwest Territories and to paralyse the equally important progress of aboriginal rights negotiations. (Translation ends.)

The creation of Nunavut and more importantly the consensus with respect to its desirability in principle, goes a long way to avoiding the deadlock that is threatening to paralyse political institutions within the existing Northwest Territories and to paralyse the equally important progress of aboriginal rights negotiations. Here I would like to emphasize that we must make our departures while we can still shake hands. If a decision is deferred for later the departure may not be too pleasant. The process of creating Nunavut could also prove valuable in opening up a constructive dialogue with the federal government about the level of responsibilities that territorial governments should enjoy and the timetables that should be followed in their assumption of additional responsibilities. Such a dialogue would almost inevitably be assisted by the drafting and debates of federal legislation creating Nunavut.

In short, we submit that the creation of Nunavut would be at least to hasten transfer of responsibilities from Ottawa as to impede them. How can Ottawa be expected to have a great deal of confidence in things as they are now?

People Free To Decide

We would like to stress as emphatically as we are able that we do not consider the creation of Nunavut to be inimical to the interests of the people of the existing Northwest Territories who live outside Nunavut. We are sure that we speak for all the people of Nunavut when we express our hope that political development in the balance of the existing Northwest Territories takes place in a way satisfactory to its residents. Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, as the representative organization speaking for one of Canada's original peoples, is particularly hopeful that political development in the balance of the existing Northwest Territories proceeds in a way acceptable to the Dene Nation and the Metis. We are reluctant to make forecasts or offer suggestions as to where political development should lead the people of that part of the existing Northwest Territories outside Nunavut; we feel strongly that the people of the area should be free to make the necessary decisions. At the same time, we are confident in saying that the creation of Nunavut will remove an important obstacle to the resolution of political questions in the balance of the existing Northwest Territories by allowing the people of that area to concentrate on their own political future.

Here we would like to suggest that the Minister of aboriginal rights confine his activities to his own backyard where his abilities can best be utilized. Creation of Nunavut will in no way sever the close links that exist between the people of Nunavut and the other people of the existing Northwest Territories. All governments that exist north of the 60th parallel will have a continuing interest in working together as equals on a variety of issues. We would hope that the creation of Nunavut would soon be followed by the establishment of a federation of northern territories that could co-operate at the administrative and, perhaps in some areas, the legislative levels and that could make joint presentations to the federal government on matters of mutual concern, and here, Mr. Chairman, I would like your permission to turn over the remainder of this speech to the president of ITC. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Suluk. Mr. Michael Amarook.

MR. AMAROOK: (Translation) Thank you. We come finally, Mr. Chairman, to the last matter that we indicated at the beginning of our address that we would like to discuss, that is, the process of creating Nunavut.

### Creation Of Nunavut

In commenting on this matter, we trust that you will remember that ITC is advocating the creation of a Nunavut territory that would conform in its organization and operation to the well established practices and constraints of territorial public administration. Certainly, everyone here is familiar enough with those. Eventually, ITC would like to see a Nunavut territory follow the precedents that already exist in Canadian constitutional history in order to evolve into a Nunavut province. The amount of time required for such an evolution would, of course, depend on many factors. The important point to recognize is that ITC is talking about territorial government in the sense well known to Canadians in general and northerners in particular. The political institutions sought are fully compatible with all the first principles of Canadian federalism. The people of Nunavut want to live in a political unit well within Canadian constitutional experience.

We think it is also important that we remember, as the Hon. John Munro pointed out as recently as two weeks ago at Coppermine, that the Government of Canada and the parliament of Canada retain final discretion about the creation of Nunavut and, for that matter, political development in any other part of the existing Northwest Territories. Having said this, however, we think it is obvious that ITC, this Legislative Assembly and other representative organizations will have a great deal of influence on the decisions that the federal government makes in this matter.

### Organizations Should Agree In Principle To Creation Of Nunavut

It is for this reason that we would hope that ITC, the Legislative Assembly and other representative organizations would both agree to the principle of the creation of Nunavut and co-operate together in a process that leads to that creation. We do not underestimate the difficulties that will be encountered in the process. Questions of timing, transitional arrangements, boundaries, all have to be dealt with in a way that satisfies the aspirations of the peoples involved and does so in a way that minimizes any impact on businesses -- I apologize -- we repeat: We do not underestimate the difficulties that will be encountered in the process; we are more aware, however, of the difficulties that would flow from a failure to initiate a process.

We have had the opportunity of reviewing the motion proposed by Mr. Dennis Patterson, the Member from Frobisher Bay. Adoption of this motion would do a great deal for the people of Nunavut. We support the contents of this motion and urge all Members of this Assembly to vote for it. It is time for common sense and a bit of boldness to prevail. Ladies and gentlemen, we invite you to join us in making history. Thank you for your attention.

--Applause

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you very much, Mr. Amarook. I think before we go into a question period which I am sure some of the Members would like to ask questions of the witnesses we will have a 15 minute recess for coffee.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The Chair recognizes a quorum. At this time I would like to thank these witnesses for a very good presentation that was made to the Assembly. I am sure some of the Members will have some straightforward, strong questions to put to you, so I throw it open to the House. Members may ask questions now of the witnesses and I will be taking your names down. Mr. Evaluarjuk.

MR. EVALUARJUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank the witnesses that have been able to come here. It is beginning to be realized by everybody that we should be helping each other the way we meet. Sometimes I am sorry that I am not able to attend because we usually have some other business to do. The thing that really concerns me when they say maybe somebody made a mistake, he should be corrected. He mentioned the deferral when he said that somebody did not like the deferral, something that was mentioned about a deferral. When I was a member of the BRC they mentioned something about a deferral so I would like to talk about it now. They did not mention the Inuit Tapirisat to be deferred. Concerning the postponement of Nunavut, there is a report written and this report, it was asked this should be postponed because the ITC were informed and they may be involved with Nunavut. There has been public awareness in the Baffin region and for this reason this was brought up.

I am going to quote from this paper here that the BRC assembly accepted this in 1980. It mentions that the BRC, Baffin Regional Council, informed the Legislative Assembly -- we were discussing the unity committee prior to consulting the unity committee. The members of the Baffin Regional Council thought that the communities were not involved in the discussion of the split of the Northwest Territories. If the members felt that the separation of the Northwest Territories should consult with the communities and prior to an election of the Legislative Assembly this motion 14 was heard so as to agree with the communities to have input before any further decision was taken. I thought this was quite important for people who wanted to participate in this discussion. Prior to any premature decision I would like that this proposal for Nunavut, I do not want to see a lot of time in support of it, pardon me, this report.

#### The Tree Line Boundary

I have a comment, a question. Has there been actually any change as far as the Nunavut proposal around the tree line or if we are splitting up the Northwest Territories, is the boundary still going to be the tree line or is there another plan now? The Dene spokesman has stated that they were unhappy about splitting the Territories, about the idea of splitting the Territories through the tree line because they consider that their hunting area. After many discussions now that we, the native people, have stated that there should be involvement by the native people. How do the Dene of the Northwest Territories below the tree line feel about this? Would they be seeking their own political entity as well? I am concerned about the potential so I am not against this proposal but I would like a clarification on this. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Evaluarjuk. Mr. Michael Amarook, would you care to answer that question if there is one there?

MR. AMAROOK: Mr. Suluk will answer.

MR. SULUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Firstly, Mr. Evaluarjuk, I would like to clarify to you this idea of the proposal because of the Baffin Regional Council residents. We have only -- those people who are here with their institutions or non-native have stated that Nunavut means if the Territories split there would be less power and in unity there is strength. The other thing is we are not going to waste power. We are trying to save it. Government, the territorial government and its people are not conveying through their ideas because the Dene and Inuit are directed to the -- the other thing, these people here have said that the Territories will be split and there will be less power because there is less population. We were saying that this is not true and we said we disagreed with this idea that we oppose those people.

---Applause

People Do Not Want To Wait Any Longer For A Settlement

We are not saying that to the Baffin Regional Council. The question concerning the involvement of Inuit as stated earlier, the proposal of Nunavut was brought up at Igloolik, it was an introduction to this discussion. So we are in the process now of beginning this. It seems like in the past the Inuit ideals of harmony were not listened to and native people were leaving them behind like somebody had left this world. We are dealing with the specific problem and the Dene reply, we have not done -- this whole process would have been delayed. We know our people and I know a lot of people do not want to wait for this anymore. They do not want to wait any longer for a settlement. I would like to pose two questions: firstly, considering the boundaries of Nunavut to the tree line, this has not changed and has never changed. We know that once Nunavut is created, the federal government agrees to this idea, we would then deal with specific issues as to the exact boundaries of Nunavut besides, you know, the boundaries may be different but there has been the tree line and portions of the area below the tree line, for example, around Eskimo Point for instance, that people have moved and they have lived in this area. These would be decided upon in the future and argued.

Concerning the political entity, concerning the people have said, as I have said earlier, maybe the people in that area will listen to us and come into the area. I regret that it is kind of late but at least we all know that this is coming and we are tired of waiting.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Suluk. Does that answer your question, Mr. Evaluarjuk? I have Mr. Arlooktoo.

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I would just like to make a comment for my constituency, Cape Dorset, and also one from Lake Harbour. My people, while the ITC is negotiating land claims, we have agreed to it, and in the future. I could not understand it before but now it is becoming clear to me and I am being supported by my people. I am happy to see that we will be supporting the land claims, when you negotiate land claims, and this business of the boundary, whatever you want will be supported by the people who voted for me, but I would like to ask you a question. The first time you proposed Nunavut, the people met in Lake Harbour regarding that issue but at the time -- say if my daughter married a white person they would have to go south. It is stated that way in the Dene and Metis proposals, now without specifically stating which, giving you full support, I do not really know how it could be proposed but that is my question, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you very much, Mr. Arlooktoo. Do one of you care to answer that? Mr. Suluk.

Nunavut Is Not Land Claims

MR. SULUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You must know by now, you must have been informed by now that the first piece of the Nunavut proposal, some of them are still in line with some of the proposals we are making now but it must be understood that the Nunavut government is separate from the government, from the government running the business, and that is what we are stating today. At the present time it is a political issue and it is for the white people and the Metis and anybody concerned in the Territories. We are not talking about land claims.

As to the mixture of people who might be in this paper, it is not stated what kind of ethnic groups there will be, it is just stated in there, land claims. We are dealing here with two issues and the proposal forming the Nunavut government, as this House will hear, they are quite similar and it looks like a creation of this body. Your question relates to another area regarding interchange marriages, for those who marry and this may create problems in dealing with this issue but we will be dealing with it at our discussions in Rankin Inlet. We are aware not many people are not really opposed to it but there has been much discussion and we are dealing with the more basic things. For those who marry a native, or marry a non-native and vice versa, we have not come up with any solutions yet.

We have spoken at Eskimo Point about the polar bear quota, and there were many people who were unhappy, the natives, because they are not allowed to get polar bear tags. At this time with our government, we are given licences but if we were to form our own government these would not be considered at all, they would be forgotten about but in time we will be dealing with this and reach a specific understanding. Those who marry among natives, and this will depend on how the man is, and also there are the descendants of the descendants. At this time I cannot answer you directly but we will deal with this issue on the problem with those kinds of marriages. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Suluk. Mr. Patterson.

Consultation With Communities On Boundary Question

MR. PATTERSON: This is a question that results in part from Mr. Evaluarjuk's concerns. ITC, you have asked us for an immediate indication of support for division of the Northwest Territories because you feel it is urgent that support be given now, particularly to help with the land claims discussions, and yet Mr. Evaluarjuk is concerned also that there be a time or an opportunity for communities to be consulted on the boundary question to be discussed with the representatives of the Dene Nation and other concerned persons in other parts of the Northwest Territories. What I would like to know is would ITC be satisfied if support came from this Legislative Assembly here in Frobisher Bay, support for the principle of division; by that I mean, by support in principle a motion that would not make a final decision now but would allow time for consulting the communities and discussing the boundary and preparing a plan for implementing division that is acceptable to everyone in the Northwest Territories. Would ITC be satisfied if we were to make a motion giving support in principle for division, as there seems to be universal agreement on that, and would you be content to participate in a process which would consult the communities further and discuss the boundary before we make a final decision in this Assembly? Would that be acceptable I would like to ask?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Do I understand your question that ITC make a motion? Could you perhaps rephrase the question again? I did not get the question.



Asking Assembly To Support Division In Principle

MR. PATTERSON: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. I am wondering, as ITC has come here and asked us for support for the principle of division or support for division. I am asking if we, the Legislative Assembly support division in principle, that is, say this is the direction we all agree we should go but we need some time to discuss the boundary and consult fully with the public, if we were to make a motion supporting division in principle now and reserving our final decision until these details have been worked out and community consultation which is satisfactory to everyone has taken place, would ITC be happy with that kind of motion coming from this Assembly? Because I am proposing to make a motion for support in principle for division. Would you be satisfied with us going that far at this point?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: I think a motion accepting the principle of division coming from this Assembly would result in the federal government not really having any choice but to accept the idea. I think for this reason we would be satisfied if this Assembly was to accept division in principle. We think it would be pretty well impossible to reverse the process from there. The process has started and in our prepared speech this afternoon we pointed out that we realized that the creation of Nunavut would not happen overnight but consultation and further negotiations about time, the transitional arrangements and boundaries have to be dealt with. We realize that this will take time but we feel it is absolutely necessary at this time for this Assembly to declare itself prepared to accept division in principle. I think that is all we really need and I think from then on the process will take care of itself.

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Amagoalik. Are there any further questions to the witnesses? Mr. Noah.

The West Is Afraid Of Losing Resources

MR. NOAH: (Translation) I do not have a direct question to the ITC but I do agree with them because I am from Nunatsiak and I support it. My comment is directed concerning the non-native associations. In the past, maybe about ten years ago, most of the people in the Mackenzie district were ahead of us in dealing with the political aspects -- ten years ago. In that ten years we have progressed very much and have given this much consideration and we began dealing with the land claims in the Keewatin and Baffin and other regions. This has been a hard task for us and much work has been done in the regions, and in our areas, Keewatin, the Central Arctic and the Baffin. The people are well aware now of what is happening because they had land claims and had fieldworkers, ITC had fieldworkers in all the regions. There has been much speculation and they are prepared to go into negotiations to go into this. I think the drawback now that if the Northwest Territories were to split at the tree line, the people of the Keewatin and Baffin will take on non-renewable resources and economically this is very beneficial and it will reflect our communities in the North, in Nunavut, as in Yellowknife where there is a mining company. If we do get Nunavut maybe there will be less employment within the tree line. I know for a fact many have thought about this and it has been considered very much by the Members of the Legislative Assembly because when we prosper, employment will tend to come this way. Some people are worried that this may happen and the Western Arctic may lose some of the resources in this area if we were to split. This is going to be postponed.

Remember we are in agreement with the Western Arctic people, the non-native people, and we are both in agreement in principle but I think we are going to continue to waste time while we are trying to deal with these situations. I think we should take on these responsibilities and begin to run, basically, the

economy because there has been gold found, there are oil fields that have been found in the Baffin region. I think some people are worried about the fact that much of these non-renewable resources are in Nunavut. The federal and territorial governments are worried about this and they are going to continue to look for ways to hold on to these. I am in full support of ITC in their proposal to split the Northwest Territories and I know in the Keewatin the tree line is very close, it runs through the Keewatin and my people's feelings, I am going to continue to talk for the feelings of my people. I will continue to support my people as well as the Legislative Assembly and as well as the ITC people I would like us to all work together. Thank you.

---Applause

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

Federation Of Northern Territories

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have two general questions that I would like to ask the guests here today. I do not expect detailed answers. First, Mr. Chairman, on page 13 of the address given by the ITC delegation it states: "We would hope that the creation of Nunavut would soon be followed by the establishment of a federation of northern territories that could co-operate at the administrative and, perhaps in some areas, the legislative levels and that could make joint presentations to the federal government on matters of mutual concern." Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if any of the guests we have here today from ITC would care to just comment briefly on what they mean by a federation of northern territories.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. Mr. Braden. Mr. Suluk, just before you answer that question I would like the Members to stick to questions to the witnesses if they will. We have a pretty lengthy program ahead of us and if you would just restrict comments to later but ask questions of the witnesses. Thank you. Mr. Suluk.

MR. SULUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In reference to Mr. Braden's question regarding the establishment of a federation of northern territories, etc., etc., our feeling is that if Nunavut should become a reality our intention is that since we had gone with and had co-operated to some extent with the West, whether it be -- it may not be much -- whether it be Dene, Metis or otherwise, our hope is that since we had been united for such a long time regardless of whether it has been unintentional or beyond our control, that even if we should become two territories by reason of the fact that we have been united previously we expect a lot of areas in which we could co-operate here through the establishment of this kind of body, a federation of northern territories.

Now we know that the Yukon does not have much to do with the Northwest Territories at the moment, but the situation that would be happening in the Northwest Territories or in the two territories would be of a different nature. Because they had been united in the past, even if they should separate, we would expect that we would not have any hard feelings in trying to co-operate with each other. In other words, we would continue to want to have consultation in our longer-range struggle to try and get more power or responsibilities from the federal government. Our idea here is that we would not want to try and tackle the federal government alone. We would want to do it with the other territory which would be created using the assumption that two is better than one. When the federal government has to deal with two governments, even if they are just two territories, I think our voices would be a lot stronger. So the actual aim does not necessarily have to be it, but we hope that we would continue to co-operate. I think that is understood, that should be clear.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Suluk. Supplementary, Hon. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had another question which is related to the more specific points and comments which the ITC delegation may have about the unity report. However I think I will pass on that and no doubt someone else may want to bring that up. Thank you very much.

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

Use Of The Term "Nunavut"

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have a question but before I get into it I would like to comment on the recent resolution that ITC passed in Coppermine, the "whereas" part, particularly number five and I would just like to read it for the information of the Members here. It says: "And whereas the people of Nunavut seek to create a Nunavut government which will benefit all the people of Nunavut by conforming with the general principles of Canadian federalism and by building on well established forms of territorial public administration." Now I am sure the Members from the West will have an opportunity to read the particular resolution which was passed unanimously by the ITC delegation in Coppermine. I would like to ask the members of the ITC delegation whether -- in their view why, if they have any concerns with respect to the free use of the Western Arctic Members, particularly Members from Yellowknife who would not like to see the words "Nunavut territory" be used? Could you have any understanding why you think they are having such a problem with the term "Nunavut" when in fact the resolution says they will conform to the forms of Canadian federalism?

The other point I have in mind is the resolution part of the ITC resolution number five and I quote and it says: "Inuit Tapirisat of Canada demonstrates its willingness to discuss the factors of timing, mechanics, boundaries, jurisdiction and finances related to the creation of the Nunavut territory with the Government of Canada, the parliament of Canada, the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories, the Dene Nation and others who have a genuine and relevant interest." So my question to you is, could you tell me if you have a reason, why you think they have such a problem with using the words "Nunavut territory"?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Curley. Mr. Suluk, do you want to answer that question?

Nunavut, Our Land

MR. SULUK: John Amagoalik is going to add on to my comment. Is that okay? Personally I do not have any knowledge as to why people would worry about the name of the eastern territory since it is going to be our territory anyway or since it is going to be the responsibility of the people of the new territory to name their territory regardless of whether the federal government or people in the West say, "Well, we do not like that name because there is too much connotation on 'our land'." I think that is just a little bit of, for lack of a better term, prejudice or a way of getting back at us. Well, I am prepared to overlook it myself personally as incidental. The issue is in our minds to get Nunavut for a territory of our own. That is the issue. The issue is not what kind of a name the new territory would have. We just put the name arbitrarily, Nunavut, our land, to foster discussion as we say. If people want to worry about the name for us, fine. As far as we are concerned we have no problem with that. Mr. Amagoalik will add to that, as I mentioned.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Suluk. Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: My addition is very small. I guess sometimes I have a problem using the word "Eskimo". It sticks in my throat and, you know, I guess that is the same thing. Sometimes people are afraid of words but Nunavut was just used for lack of a better word.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Amagoalik. Mr. Nerysoo.

Creation Of Two Territories

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just a question on the actual -- in your opinion the actual decision of division is not necessarily the creation of one new territory, but in fact two territories?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. Mr. Nerysoo. Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: We would hope that the division of the existing Northwest Territories, we would hope it would result in the creation of two territories. You know, the people in this part of Canada have decided to form a new political unit and once that is done we would hope that the people of the rest of the Territories would get together and form their own political unit, so I think it is only logical to assume that once Nunavut is created that not very far behind would be the creation of a new territory in the Mackenzie Valley.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Amagoalik. Mr. Kilabuk.

Referendum On Nunavut

MR. KILABUK: (Translation) Mr. Chairman, representatives of ITC, I wish to say I am delighted you are present. I have praised the ITC in the past for their Inuit nationality. I have a question to these people. Do you feel that the residents of the Territories will be given a referendum on the creation of Nunavut this year?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Kilabuk. Mr. Suluk.

MR. SULUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I heard that the unity committee, your unity committee had suggested that the people from Nunavut, members from Nunavut -- I am not sure how it is used -- that the unity committee has recommended a government referendum and they should have their own referendum. For instance, the Western Arctic people can come up with their own petition and I really ask the question whether the people in the Western Arctic would want a referendum or only the people in the Eastern Arctic on Nunavut or does it have to reflect on the population of the Territories as a whole?

We favour on the question of the referendum, as to the creation of a new territory, but who would be eligible to be part of the referendum? There is also the question of what would be in the referendum. We have talked about this and we believe that the communities in the Eastern Arctic who would like to see a Northwest Territories with regional government, they could ask for a referendum on the question of what type of administrative support or how they would be looked after administratively. It would take longer if we were to include the Territories in the referendum issue as I know there are four ethnic groups, Dene, Metis, COPE and others, classified as others and they have not come to any consensus themselves yet. I feel they would be a stumbling block in the creation of the territory when it comes to a question of referendums. They themselves can determine what kind of a territory they would have for themselves and I think we should be looking at that ourselves. John Amagoalik would also like to speak to the question on the referendum.

Referendum Should Be Restricted Only To Nunavut

MR. AMAGOALIK: (Translation) As a supplementary, perhaps you remember that May, 1980, last May, this last spring that the province of Quebec held a referendum as to whether to separate from Canada or not. If we are going to have a referendum, I think we would favour, even if we did not hold a referendum -- if we had a referendum on the creation of Nunavut we would propose only to have people within the Nunavut territory to be eligible for the referendum. It would be the same as Quebec, when Quebec held its referendum. It would be somewhat similar to the national elections when the referendum came up in the province of Quebec, only the people of Quebec were eligible to vote and I would propose the same thing for the new territory. Do you understand that?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Does that answer your question, Mr. Kilabuk?

MR. KILABUK: (Translation) Yes. They answered promptly and I was afraid of them holding a referendum in our territory.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you very much. Do the witnesses have copies of the unity report? I am just wondering if you had copies. If you have copies, that is fine. I have Mr. Butters next on the list.

Timeframe For The Creation Of Nunavut

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I notice my colleague to my left has not completed his question so I would be happy to give him the floor until he has done so.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the delegation from ITC for a very straightforward presentation. I have a very brief question which relates to a statement appearing in the document that we heard today and I would just like to read it, read from the statement that was provided us, and the text says: "ITC has never argued that the creation of Nunavut territory could be achieved overnight. Rather, ITC has sought support in principle for the creation of a Nunavut territory and has believed that consensus on the desirability of Nunavut would be followed by a process by which the many questions relating to timing, transitional arrangements, boundaries, etc., could be answered. Such a process of course would necessarily be accompanied by extensive and continuing public consultation with governments, organizations, communities and individuals having an interest." My question is, sir, what timeframe do members of the delegation put on this process? If it cannot be achieved overnight, how fast do they think it might come about in view of the criteria they have provided us in their representation?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Butters. Would one of you witnesses care to answer? Mr. Suluk?

MR. SULUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Okay, I guess I have to be truthful. To be quite frank, although we understand that the process which you just quoted will have to be followed, we recognize that, yet we recognize that we have pretty well already on our own, gone through this exercise. So as far as we are concerned the process that we would see on our part just needs some finishing touches and if possible, all we would probably need to do is for you or the territorial Legislative Assembly to agree to it and get down to the business at hand.

Process Should Begin Immediately

Now, with reference to the timing, as recommended by the unity committee, starting the process by referendum in not more than a year, or not more than two years; in other words, within the process of referendum or otherwise to be initiated after one year and not less than two years. To be quite frank, our concern was that if a sort of hazy decision is reached here it is our assessment that the

process of starting the referendum in one year would be delayed further. Also, to be quite frank, our people no longer have the privilege of being patient. So, we would like to start this process preferably immediately after this Legislative Assembly, the process of getting the mechanism going after this Assembly rather than waiting for one more year or in the next Assembly meeting to decide on the mechanics of it. We would hope that in view of the fact we will be entering into negotiations with the federal government probably next month, that we want some assurance that some kind of progress and decision is going to be made. So, I suppose our answer is that we are concerned that more delaying tactics might be instituted.

Now, I had a bit of concern, a concern on the principle, agreeing to this only in principle and to agree to this in principle does not necessarily mean that the process will get started according to the timeframe as recommended by the unity committee. So I think that we would not be too concerned about the details as long as the first major question, whether to divide the Territories, is made by the government and interested groups, if they will be able to take appropriate steps to pressure or lobby a body which would be responsible for initiating the process.

So, although we do not have a specific timeframe I guess at the least we are quite prepared to support and accept the recommendation of the unity committee as stated in their report. I imagine that we would have to get a definite answer, a definite assurance that this process once started will not be relegated to another Drury-like commission or another study because if that is done, by the time we get around to it the term of this Assembly will probably end and the term of the present federal government will come to an end. Then we would have to go through the whole process again.

Now, what we fear as leaders is that if our people say -- can we use four letter words? Well, okay, but if our people say let us forget about those guys here, let us forget about the Legislative Assembly and go on our own since they cannot seem to make any concrete decisions, that is what we are afraid of. Our preference is that we not get into that situation. So, I think my comments are self-explanatory.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Suluk. Mr. Pudluk.

#### Concern Over The Arctic Islands

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This report and the presentation, I am not opposed to it and concerning the split of the Territories I do not really have any comment on but if Nunavut is created in time I have heard that part of it in the Arctic -- my concern is the islands, the Arctic islands and there are many non-renewable resources; gas projects and exploration going on. So, if the federal government agrees to the proposal for Nunavut will there be any infringement of any exploration happening in the Arctic islands? For example, the routes that are to be used by ships, are you going to be including all those Arctic islands in your proposal, in your proposal for Nunavut? That is my question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Pudluk. Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: (Translation) The Arctic islands -- your question has been asked before whether the proposal includes the Arctic islands because the communities are Inuit people and it is part of it, but concerning the exploration projects we would say that with the creation of Nunavut, being given provincial status, the federal government has very strict jurisdiction over the non-renewable resources. Does that clarify your question?

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Yes.

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

### Political Development In Nunavut

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I feel that I must rise to Mr. Curley's earlier challenge, I often do that, about so-called Yellowknife Members being upset with the name Nunavut. I will first say that Yellowknife Members have no objection whatsoever, Mr. Chairman, to the word Nunavut. Certainly if the North divides and Mr. Suluk and Mr. Amagoalik you say when the North divides, certainly whatever name you choose to call your new territory would be perfectly acceptable to all Yellowknife Members, in fact, all Members from the West. Now, the confusion has been, I think in what is meant when you say or when we say Nunavut. To me, and I only speak for myself, it has meant more than just a name; it is a specific proposal. That proposal is called political development in Nunavut.

Now, on page seven of your presentation to us today and I will quote, you say: "...ITC has never suggested that support in principle for the creation of Nunavut means support for the contents of a document entitled 'Political Development in Nunavut' that came out of its 1979 annual general meeting at Igloolik. The resolution authorizing release of the document specifically indicated that the document was intended to spark public discussion and that its contents did not restrict ITC policy."

My question is this, am I to understand that when you speak of Nunavut you speak more of a concept, self-government you mentioned public government here today, than the actual proposal which has been released called "Political Development in Nunavut" because of your need to further consult with the people in the communities, because you really had not developed in any great detail this public government?

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

### Willing To Negotiate

MR. SULUK: Just an initial comment. I am happy to see that for a change it seems to be felt that we have provided too much detail because in the past it has always been the charge of, not the territorial government but the federal government that we do not provide enough details. Now this time we provided details, specific details and it seems to be felt that they are too specific. I know we cannot satisfy everybody, but in reference to the quote on page seven in which you just mentioned that support in principle of Nunavut does not necessarily mean supporting the contents, now I do not know how much the actual ingredients of the proposal had been read through and through, but it was our understanding that whatever we come up with, whether it be the most logical and the most acceptable type of proposal, somebody will always disagree with it. In recognition of this we felt that we would be more than willing to discuss the contents, to defend the contents or to amend or negotiate other types.

We have already talked about ITC's intention and the need to discuss the actual ingredients of the proposal. Now I can understand that we have not got around to it yet because we are talking about the actual principles. So I can only answer you that for once we have a very specific proposal. Does that not prove that we are more than willing to be public, open, open to discussion, open to negotiation and whatever else? We have already recognized that we will probably have to negotiate if Nunavut comes about and is agreed to, we will probably have to negotiate the items with the present government and with the federal government. We accept that. We have no difficulty with that. We are quite prepared to perhaps -- the people who would negotiate the actual ingredients of this would be Members of the Eastern Arctic or the councillors or MLA's from the eastern part who might presumably form the government. They would probably negotiate with people across the table. I do not know the process, but does that answer your question in some ways?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Suluk. Does that answer your question?

MRS. SORENSEN: Would you not agree though that it will be difficult for this Legislative Assembly to agree to supporting something in principle when it is not really sure what the content of that proposal will be in the end?

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

MR. SULUK: John Amagoalik will answer that. I would just like to comment that this document had been public for almost over a year and I cannot see any reason why people or government have not taken it seriously. Why use the excuse now that they have not read it? If they had taken us seriously then they would have done their homework. Now I give it to John Amagoalik, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Suluk. Mr. Amagoalik.

#### Nunavut Is A Very Specific Proposal

MR. AMAGOALIK: First of all I would like to say that the document entitled "Political Development in Nunavut" came about because, as Thomas Suluk pointed out, the federal government always insisted that we must come up with more detailed proposals and that document was the result of that. It is by no means a final document. I think the concept of Nunavut has been really started from almost nothing and has been growing and growing over the past years and slowly things are starting to come together. I do not think people should be overly concerned about what kind of institutions we are going to come up with in this part of Canada because we have been saying for years and years we are not proposing an ethnic state. Every citizen who meets certain residency requirements will have all the same rights, obligations and responsibilities. We are determined that the institutions which will be formed will conform with the Canadian experience. We will respect all rights of Canadian citizens, so I really do not see what the concern is.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Amagoalik. Mrs. Sorensen, have you a supplementary?

#### Assembly Is In Need Of More Details

MRS. SORENSEN: Yes. My concern is that what you seem to be saying is that you have really not developed in any great detail what it is you mean by the Nunavut government because you wish to do some more consulting, because there is the outstanding issue of boundaries and timing and all the other things that you have mentioned. So my problem is because this Assembly requires that kind of information to lend its support, that it will find it difficult in the end to do that without some indication of what your ideas of the boundaries could be and how you intend to pay for your government, your new government, what the relationship will be between land claims land that will be set aside for Inuit within your new government, to the new government that is set up which will be public government. These are all very serious and important questions to this Legislative Assembly and I just feel that you might be backtracking on your proposal some way.

MR. CURLEY: Shame! Why do you not go home?

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

MR. SULUK: I find it almost impossible to believe that the MLA for Yellowknife still does not know our position because as far as the boundaries are concerned we have already stated the tree line more or less, subject to negotiation, of course. I thought that was pretty clear. As far as how we are going to pay for the government I think anybody with a grade three or four or five education would know that the financial arrangements will have to be negotiated, but I tend to think that you are using the money as if it will belong, all of it, to



the territory in the West, as if it all belonged there. I would tend to think of it as a negotiating strategy on your part, being a Member of the West, but it has already been clear in our minds that following all logic the smaller the territory the less cost, the less money they will receive from the federal government, so I really cannot understand why you would question us on it because any guy or gal with an elementary education can understand that.

---Applause

I would have thought that you had a bit more education. But regardless, I do not want to get into a situation of aggravation. However, I would just like to state that I cannot see any area in which we have backtracked so perhaps you might wish to clarify your statement later on.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Suluk. Would you like to clarify your backtracking, Mrs. Sorensen?

---Laughter

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you. You have clarified very well. You have not backtracked from your proposal.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. I have Mr. Appaqaq, a question to the witnesses.

Inclusion Of The Belcher Islands

MR. APPAQAQ: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman and ITC delegates, for being able to attend here. I do not have a specific question to the ITC witnesses, but I wanted to add that in my constituency they have often talked about this Nunavut proposal. I do not want you to think that just because the Northwest Territories may be splitting up, that I do not want to be left behind in the Belcher Islands because this has been -- this has important implications too. I want to become closer to the political entity. I support this splitting up of the Northwest Territories and I will give you an example. I cannot be one jurisdiction without knowing that area. For example, I have heard that the federal government has included very knowledgeable people and it seems like these people have this education, but they have never seen or are dealing with things they know little about. My jurisdiction does not lie within the tree line and I have no say over it. I cannot go over there and say I am an experienced person on this. I have stated this because I am in support, because I also feel that the Northwest Territories is so vast anyway, too vast for one government.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I think the question is, are you going to include the Belcher Islands in your Nunavut proposal? Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: (Translation) I do not think it is a question that I can answer but to answer it, we are going to -- it is a part of the Northwest Territories and it will be included. I do not think there will be any disagreement with this between Ottawa -- the officials in Ottawa and discussion of that, about the Belcher Islands. The Ontario and Manitoba and the Quebec governments were talking about taking over jurisdiction of those islands and we talked about the Belcher Islands.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Amagoalik. Mr. Stewart.

Boundary Definition Will Be A Problem

HON. DON STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Nunavut proposal and the splitting of the Territories I do not think is going to be opposed too strongly in the West as a proposition. However, having said that, I think the problem is going to arise when we try and define the boundary. I am certain that the people in my area will not accept the tree line.

MR. CURLEY: How about you?

HON. DON STEWART: I think this is going to be the major stumbling block and it is all right to say we can do this by negotiation but I am not sure it is negotiable from the western viewpoint. How do you intend or what is your proposal to resolve that problem? That boundary, in my mind, is going to be the most difficult part of the whole proposal.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I think they answered that question once already, that negotiations would start but go ahead, Mr. Suluk, perhaps you can tell him again.

MR. SULUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It seems that we have one thing in common. As far as you are concerned, the boundary, the tree line is not negotiable but as far as we are concerned, the Inuit in the Keewatin are concerned, as probably those in the Central Arctic are concerned, although at the moment I am only going to speak for Keewatin and especially for the community closest to the tree line which is Eskimo Point, my home town, perhaps you are forgetting that we have had what were commonly referred to as the Caribou Eskimos who were living pretty well close to the tree line. Now, I understand that a long time ago some native Indians, whether they are Cree or Chipewyan, I do not know, had in the past have made excursions to parts of the treeless area in the Keewatin but as far as the Inuit are concerned it is no contest. Since we are the principal users of the area immediately close to Eskimo Point, and also to the boundary -- of course, we are quite willing to try and negotiate it but I think that in this area you are not going to see the Inuit budge on it.

So, if you are already stating your negotiating position I am advising you that there is no way that the Inuit would allow the extension of the western part of the Territories -- perhaps it would be incidental since this is more of an aboriginal rights element or claim, since it is in that area. In this regard as far as the Inuit or the Dene or the Metis in the western part are concerned, it is not the business of the territorial government, it is the business of the Inuit and the Dene and the Metis to sort it out with the federal government, and not with the territorial government as far as we are concerned. It does not even play into this.

Boundary Should Not Be A Stumbling Block

On the other side of it regarding the political boundary, I think it is quite clear where the possible boundaries might be and perhaps a few areas might overlap into the tree line and perhaps a few areas of the boundary might overlap outside of it. So, I really do not see why the boundary should become a stumbling block unless you do it intentionally.

MR. CURLEY: Hear, hear!

MR. SULUK: In trying to use or get the Dene and the Inuit to fight or aggravate each other.

MR. CURLEY: Hear, hear!

MR. SULUK: That would probably be in your interest but as far as we are concerned we have said it is no business of the territorial government or Assembly, it is an aboriginal rights question and we will deal with it with the federal government.

MR. CURLEY: We will deal with it.

MR. SULUK: I think you are going beyond your own mandate.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Suluk. Mr. Wah-Shee. I am sorry, Mr. Stewart. Is there a supplementary?

HON. DON STEWART: It appears that any time anybody brings up a point that does not suit, by innuendo and sneering remarks, on the reason for a person to bring up a point, I do not think will do anybody any good. What I am trying to do is find out how you are going to solve that particular problem because I think it will be, and I just point it out to you, because that will be the major opposition from the West and I know that and that is all I have said. I am not prepared to accept any innuendo from anybody sitting in these chambers that I am doing it for an ulterior motive and I am not prepared to accept that kind of answer.

MR. CURLEY: Ha, ha, ha!

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

MR. AMAGOALIK: I agree with Mr. Stewart that if it is me and him negotiating it, it might be very difficult. Negotiations between politicians are always very difficult but if we were to pick out some people in our communities then you pick out some people in your communities and we put them in a room I am sure they would come up with an agreement much faster than we would.

MR. CURLEY: Maybe not you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Amagoalik. I have Mr. Wah-Shee.

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: I do not have any questions, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Wah-Shee. I have next on the list, Mr. Sibbeston.

Problems With Setting Up A New Government

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the leaders of the ITC a number of questions. It concerns me that there seems to be such a drive towards getting Nunavut, there is such a drive to set up a territorial government and in this new government you will have a commissioner and I suppose many appointed government officials. Are you just not going to give yourselves more problems than you have now? At least now we have a Commissioner who is not power hungry and we have elected people running departments.

MR. CURLEY: Why not go over to the other side?

---Laughter

MR. SIBBESTON: During the course of the years we have devolved power to the people and setting up a new territorial government, do you not think the federal government is going to make it very difficult for you to function? They will put in a lot of federal government civil servants and you will be stuck with a worse government than there is there now, or do you think the government will just hand you over the power and say "Okay, you Inuit, you have this territory and you go to it"?

MR. CURLEY: A public government.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I do not know if there is a question there or not, but Mr. Suluk, or does someone care to respond? For your information this will be the last speaker because we must close before 6:00 o'clock because the CBC goes off the air and so we may have one more speaker after this Mr. Suluk and we will continue again tomorrow.

MR. SULUK: I will gladly answer that. First of all, in regard to the point where the federal government or we, or the government could create difficulties for us, I think it works both ways. We too can create some difficulties. That is the first point. We could probably create a lot more difficulties than you think. It is only because we are moderating our people that we have reached this far.

Dealing With Only One Government

Secondly, with regard to difficulties again, the second point I would like to raise is that at least we would not have to be constantly worrying about two governments. This time we would only be worrying about one government, the federal government. At the moment we have to fight both the Yellowknife based government and also the federal government, who are more or less allies as far as we are concerned. So, if we eliminate one of them as far as we are concerned it does not matter to us how long we fight the federal government. At least we will have one body to deal with now rather than two bodies. So, for the moment I think that should be sufficient.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Suluk. I just want to correct myself. I said we were shutting down because of the CBC.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: That is much better.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): CBC has this on live and they will shut their equipment down at 6:00 o'clock. We announced that this would be live on the air and maybe some of the people listening in at the other settlements would not like to miss any of this valuable debate.

MR. CURLEY: You are wasting time.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): At this time I would like to report progress.

MR. CURLEY: Nay, nay, nay.

MR. SIBBESTON: A supplementary.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Do you want to take the chair, Mr. Curley?

MR. CURLEY: It is not 6:00 o'clock yet.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): If you have a short supplementary question, Mr. Sibbeston, go ahead.

Control Of Natural Resources

MR. SIBBESTON: Another thing I notice in the Nunavut proposal is that there is nothing said about the control of natural resources. Is that an area that concerns the Inuit people or do they think they will just be happy if they can have Nunavut as a territorial government without any control of natural resources? I ask this question because the matter of control of natural resources is a major issue with us now in the North and it is having a very direct effect on the native people in our part of the North where the Dene and Metis people are trying to stop the Norman Wells pipeline. Because we do not have control over natural resources we are stuck perhaps with having to put up with it if the federal government insists on building the pipeline. I was just wondering has any great thought been given to this area or will you be so happy to get the territorial government that you are not too concerned about the control of natural resources.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. Mr. Suluk.

MR. SULUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all the hon. Member is quite correct in that the territorial governments do not have responsibility or power over natural resources, and we have said that we would pretty well follow the general principles. So, in recognition of the fact that the Territories do not have control over natural resources that is the only reason why we have not included it in there because we probably would not get it anyway. However, we did say in our presentation that the Nunavut government would be more vocal than this present government or Executive in Yellowknife to defend us, to defend the people of Nunavut against unnatural development, so to speak. So we would rather put our trust on the new territorial government, the Nunavut government than we could ever put on the Yellowknife government and anyway, I do not think I can afford to answer you too much because I do not care to.

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

Land Claims Settlement And Political Settlement

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would first of all like to again correct some of the concerns that the western Members have. You know, really for the benefit of the ITC delegation their problem is not so much the boundary or the new territory. Their problem really is the land claims settlement and they would not like to see the land claims settlement along beside the political settlement. It will be equally as strong as the other part, so that is where the problem really is. They are against the native settlement and on that basis they are saying to you, "It is going to be very difficult to negotiate a boundary." It may be difficult for them because they do not have the background of the work we are prepared to do. They have never been in the minority position like we are. The Member from Hay River would know that there is no chance of organizations to come to this level and that the boundary will be a problem for them because of the land claims, economic aspects and other forms of this settlement. I would like you to indicate to them that the land claims aspect is really something else. I do not think they were too sure if that is the case. We would be required to disclose our strategy because as far as we are concerned this is the business between us and the federal government. We are pretty well okay on that area, so I think that should be sufficient for the time being.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Curley. The time being 6:00 o'clock, I will report progress. Just before I leave the chair I would like to thank the witnesses. We will be continuing this debate on unity tomorrow right after the opening at 1:00 o'clock, if we get unanimous consent and maybe some of the Members still have questions to ask of you, so be in the chambers tomorrow at 1:00 o'clock and we will ask you back in again possibly. Thank you very much.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Fraser.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF TABLED DOCUMENT 16-80(2): REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UNITY

MR. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been considering the Report of the Special Committee on Unity and wishes to report progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Fraser. Mr. Clerk, are there any announcements?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): There will be a caucus meeting on Friday, October 31st at 9:30 a.m., in the Ukkivik students residence.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day, please.

ITEM NO. 12: ORDERS OF THE DAY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Orders of the day, October 30, 1980, 1:00 o'clock p.m., at the Gordon Robertson Education Centre.

1. Prayer
2. Oral Questions
3. Questions and Returns
4. Petitions
5. Tabling of Documents
6. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
7. Notices of Motion
8. Motions
9. Introduction of Bills for First Reading
10. Second Reading of Bills
11. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills, Recommendations to the Legislative Assembly and Other Matters: Tabled Document 16-80(2); Motion 20-80(2); Information Items 1-80(2), 2-80(2), 4-80(2), 5-80(2), 6-80(2), 18-80(2); Tabled Documents 6-80(2), 12-80(2); Bills 3-80(2), 13-80(2), 7-80(2), 8-80(2), 9-80(2), 10-80(2), 12-80(2)
12. Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. This House stands adjourned until 1:00 o'clock p.m., October 30, 1980, at the Gordon Robertson Education Centre.

---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