



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES
DEBATES

3rd Session

9th Assembly

Official Report

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1980

Pages 750 to 812

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

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

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

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

Mr. Peter C. Fraser, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 23
Norman Wells, N.W.T.
X0E0V0
(Mackenzie Great Bear)
(Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Nick G. Sibbeston, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 560
Fort Simpson, N.W.T.
X0E0N0
(Mackenzie Liard)

Ms. Nellie J. Cournoyea, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1184
Inuvik, N.W.T.
X0E0T0
(Western Arctic)

Mr. Bruce McLaughlin, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 555
Pine Point, N.W.T.
X0E0W0
(Pine Point)

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

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

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

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

31 October 1980

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	750
Notices of Motion	750
Motions	751
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Tabled Document 16-80(2) Report of the Special Committee on Unity	752
Report of the Committee of the Whole of:	
- Tabled Document 16-80(2) Report of the Special Committee on Unity	811
Orders of the Day	812

FROBISHER BAY, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 31, 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): Again is it the will of the House to continue with the unity paper this morning?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask unanimous consent to set down on the orders of the day, Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. Do I have unanimous consent?

MR. CURLEY: Nay.

MR. PATTERSON: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: Did I hear nay? I have a nay.

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 NO. 7: NOTICES OF MOTION

Mr. Patterson.

Notice Of Motion 50-80(2): Creation Of An Arctic Territory

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to give notice that on Monday, November 3, 1980, I will move, seconded by the Member from Keewatin South:

Now therefore be it resolved as follows:

(1) That the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories declare its commitment in principle for the creation of a new Arctic territory to be called Nunavut with its own territorial government;

- (2) That the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories call upon the Government of Canada to declare its commitment in principle for the creation of a new Arctic territory to be called Nunavut with its own territorial government;
- (3) That the Legislative Assembly support further investigation, discussion, public consultation and negotiation about such matters affecting and accompanying the creation of a new Arctic territory to be called Nunavut as timing, transitional arrangements, boundaries, jurisdictions, finances, aboriginal rights negotiations and the reform of the Canadian constitution;
- (4) That the Legislative Assembly support such further investigation, discussion, public consultation and negotiation being carried out with the full involvement of the people of Nunavut and their representative organizations and institutions and with the Government of Canada;

And be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly recommend to the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories as follows:

- (1) That a Member of the Executive Committee be made the minister for Nunavut;
- (2) That the minister for Nunavut be given responsibility for the conduct of further investigation, discussion, public consultation and negotiation about matters affecting and accompanying the creation of a new Arctic territory to be called Nunavut;
- (3) That the minister for Nunavut be instructed to discharge this responsibility in a way that will lead to the creation of a new Arctic territory to be called Nunavut;
- (4) That the minister for Nunavut be given adequate financial and human resources to carry out this responsibility;
- (5) That the present Minister for aboriginal rights and constitutional development concentrate his efforts on promoting the political, economic and social aspirations of the people who live in the parts of the existing Northwest Territories that are outside the proposed new Arctic territory to be called Nunavut;
- (6) That the minister for Nunavut and the present Minister for aboriginal rights and constitutional development work together on issues of mutual concern and interest to the people of Nunavut and the people who live in the parts of the Northwest Territories that are outside the proposed new territory to be called Nunavut, particularly issues of mutual concern and interest that arise with respect to such matters affecting and accompanying the creation of Nunavut as timing, transitional arrangements, boundaries, ongoing co-operation among separate governmental structures, aboriginal rights negotiations and reform of the Canadian constitution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Item 8, motions.

ITEM NO. 8: MOTIONS

There are four motions that could be handled today. Motion 44-80(2), Mr. Curley, do you wish to proceed?

MR. CURLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 46-80(2), Mr. Fraser, do you wish to proceed?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Pudluk, Motion 47-80(2). Do you wish to proceed with that at this time? Mr. Pudluk is not here. Motion 49-80(2), Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: I will stand it down, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Item 9, introduction of bills for first reading.

Item 10, second reading of bills. There are no bills for second reading.

Item 11, consideration in committee of the whole of bills, recommendations to the Legislative Assembly and other matters.

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

The Assembly will go into committee of the whole to continue the study of the unity paper, with Mr. Fraser in the chair.

---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. We are still dealing with the Report of the Special Committee on Unity. According to my list after Dave Nickerson we have Mr. Peter Ittinuar. I wonder if Peter Ittinuar, Member of Parliament for Nunatsiaq is present to give his presentation to this Assembly. Would the Sergeant-at-Arms see that he is seated at the witness table? I would like to welcome you to this Assembly. Are you prepared at this time for your presentation to the Assembly?

Presentation Of Member Of Parliament For Nunatsiaq

MR. ITTINUAR: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I will not keep you but it is a pleasure and an honour for me to be here, Mr. Chairman. I will not attempt to advise this Assembly on the Report of the Special Committee on Unity, as I believe that that is this Assembly's job. Perhaps as the hon. Member from Hay River put it so succinctly yesterday we will then find out whether the Assembly is coming or going. I will merely state this preface to my remarks by stating my unequivocal support for division of the Territories and the realization of the concept of Nunavut.

---Applause

(Translation) What I was trying to say is I am not trying to advise the Assembly and I thank them for allowing me to speak but on the first subject I am in support of the division of the Northwest Territories and I am in full support of the Nunavut proposal. (Translation ends.)

This week the Assembly has begun debate on the most crucial and critical question in the North today and I say that that should go without saying. The question I believe this Assembly should ask as far as most people in the Northwest Territories is: Do we accept the challenges offered by this opportunity to evolve into a truly responsive political unit or will we be content to modify the present system without dramatically altering the structure? In Ottawa and elsewhere the implication that Nunavut will be an ethnic state, quote and unquote, involved in guiding people and I believe such fear is unfounded. Recognition of linguistic and cultural factors in deciding the boundaries of political entities has precedence in many countries the world over. The principle of self-determination of peoples within nation states is supported by the United Nations, a covenant which was ratified by Canada in 1967 relates particularly to this motion.

Boundaries Based On Linguistic And Cultural Values

Canada, the country as we know it, was originally conceived in terms of two founding nations in Upper and Lower Canada. I think in this chamber we all know how fallacious the two-nations concept is. I mention it only to emphasize the territorial boundaries based on linguistic and cultural values and a natural community of interest are at the very heart of Canada's formation. There is

nothing new or radical about taking linguistic and cultural factors into account in setting territorial boundaries. I want to add that there is nothing particularly new or radical about the idea of dividing the Territories either. As the previous Speaker, the hon. Member of Parliament for the Western Arctic mentioned yesterday, there was a bill on the order paper in the federal parliament 17 years ago advocating territorial division.

The principle of division has also been affirmed in the creation of the electoral district of Nunatsiaq although this may be a minor factor. The commission on electoral boundaries which created Nunatsiaq stated that a boundary based on geographical size, shape and the community of interest of the inhabitants was of a more lasting nature than temporary considerations of small population and communication and transportation problems. There are problems, of course, but they must be solved in any case. The most important question is who will solve them and how?

The struggle for more direct control over our government structure is the major emphasis for Nunavut. This is not something to be feared but I believe to be applauded just as we applaud the struggle for democratic ideals anywhere. Two of the essential elements of democracy are the freedom to make choices and the responsibility of implementing those choices wisely. For me and for the Inuit in the North, the creation of Nunavut will be an exciting venture in democracy. There are many arguments to be made in favour of creating a Nunavut territory and I will not pretend to be either expert nor a veteran in these matters. For the sake of brevity I will concentrate on two: One argument is based on the difficulties with the present political situation in the Territories. The other is based on our relationship with the federal government.

Problems With Present System Of Government In The North

The problems of the present system of government in the North have been well documented. Residents complain that procedures are inflexible and complicated, that there are too many competing institutional structures and that government bodies are not responsive to their needs but I will have comments about that. However, the lack of wholehearted support for the present forms of government should not be misconstrued as apathy towards political matters. There are some serious obstacles to effective Inuit participation in existing governmental structures, language difficulties and incongruous electoral procedures and structures are factors which immediately come to mind. In the Eastern Arctic and elsewhere there is a high rate of participation in non-governmental Inuit organizations such as the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada and its affiliates, for instance, the Inuit Development Corporation, the Inuit committee on national issues, etc., which are doing an effective job of representing Inuit concerns. However, at the present time these organizations have little power to implement their positions although that is rapidly changing as this Assembly has witnessed.

The ideal situation would be one in which Inuit participation in the political life in the Territories through the governmental structures with the authority to implement their decisions -- the problems of administering the Eastern Arctic from Yellowknife are quite evident or perhaps self-evident. The distance from the centre of government and differences in physical environment, economy, language, culture and history all contribute inevitably to a sense of alienation and communication difficulties. I can name specific examples of the problem within the area of communications but perhaps we can reserve that for later.

Nunavut A Promising Alternative

The Nunavut proposal offers a promising alternative to the present situation. The Nunavut proposal advocates that the new territory be granted provincial-type powers over a period of transition leading to formal provincial status or perhaps semiprovincial status. In addition, the local and regional governmental structures would be determined by the new government so that institutions and the operation of government reflect the character of the people living in the area. The provincial-type powers which Nunavut seeks over education, housing, mining, control of the administration of justice, wildlife management and input into the character of local government and other serious matters are critical to the lives and well-being of the people of the Eastern Arctic.

These statements are semimotherhood but I believe in the context of what I said earlier in my preface I think I should qualify it. Because of the small population and relative homogeneity of Nunavut and in fact its manageable size, it can go alone as a territory but the population and growth and proliferation of structures determined outside the territory will make it more and more difficult for people to have any influence on shaping their own institutions. They would be unfortunate if we ended up running institutions we had no part in creating.

Control Over Resource Development

No one can deny that the people of the Northwest Territories have some common problems in terms of our relationship with the federal government. For instance, there are the related issues of participation in constitutional revision and control over resource development and both members of the Western Arctic and Eastern Arctic are in the same boat. As things are now we are at the mercy of the federal government's plans or lack of them in terms of resource development. This is of continuing concern to me as one who feels that the Northwest Territories should have at least partial control over resource development in the Northwest Territories.

--Applause

The federal government currently claims ownership and control over non-renewable resources in the North or what is known as Canada lands as was evidenced in the latest budget. The government's national energy program announced Tuesday last of this week offers an example of how the federal government sets our priorities for us. In the energy document the government says and I quote: "Canada may not need its resources in the North until the 1990's but there may be merit in using Arctic oil in Canada to relieve pressure on Alberta's resources", which means Alberta can profit now by exporting gas to the United States.

Similarly, the document says, and I quote again: "In the case of natural gas, the need for Arctic gas in Canadian markets may not arise for many years yet we should press ahead with exploration so that Canadians will know that a secure safety net of oil and gas is available for the future." I wonder where the Territories safety net for the future is in the federal government's plan. While the provinces of Canada engage in constitutional wrangles over the control of resources, the Territories have no voice in the proceedings nor do they have a seat at the table. There are other constitutional questions the Territories should participate in, matters concerning aboriginal rights, education, health, social services, criminal justice and the Territories should certainly have a say in areas of mobility rights and in areas of amendments to the constitution.

Key To Effective Political Participation

The division of the Territories would not preclude co-operation on matters on which our interests coincide. I believe that the creation of a new territory would give us a stronger position to deal with the federal government. Issues and priorities would be more easily articulated in both territories and I

believe important differences in terms of geography and all the other differences, language and so on, would not stand in the way of unanimity. Furthermore, the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada has said that the division would free people in both areas to concentrate on their own political future. I have made this statement before with regard to the Inuit but I believe it applies to all the people of the Eastern Arctic. The key to sustained and effective political participation by Eastern Arctic residents does not lie in further elaboration and consolidation of existing structures, not in tinkering with existing mechanisms for decision making, it lies I believe in the formal constitutional recognition of our fundamental right to determine our own future and to develop the institutions and procedures most appropriate to the expression of our concerns.

Mr. Chairman, I have not come here to reflect on the inadequacies of the Assembly, far be it, it has done a very good job, a most excellent job especially when one considers the inherent difficulties of administering an area of such vast size and with such linguistic and cultural diversity. Perhaps a division of the Territories will make the task of governing the North a little easier. That concludes my remarks, Mr. Chairman.

(Translation) Thank you for listening to me. I wanted to say that I wanted to support Nunavut and division and as long as I am a Member of Parliament I will support it all the time. Thank you.

---Applause

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you very much, Mr. Ittinuar, for the presentation. There will be a question period now and the Members probably want to ask you some questions but before we go into the question period I would like to recognize a couple of distinguished guests in the chambers. Mr. Neil Faulkner, assistant deputy minister of Indian Affairs in Ottawa.

---Applause

Mr. Bob Hornal, regional director for Indian Affairs in Yellowknife.

---Applause

Thank you. If we have any questions for the witness I am sure he is prepared to answer questions on his presentation. Mr. Noah.

MR. NOAH: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. While we were questioning the witness yesterday, what is his name, Dave Nickerson, he was saying or he seemed to be saying that he knew our future. I would like to know what he thinks about what Dave Nickerson said for example about the Progressive Conservatives, we would like to find out how the potatoes were growing and he stopped right in the middle. Maybe in trying to make an igloo out of snow it will be difficult but now he will be trying that and I would like to know if they understand that in the first stages.

Federal Government's Understanding Of Nunavut

Also, the people in Ottawa, the federal government when they are speaking about Nunavut how are they progressing into that, are they supporting or not supporting the proposal? I would also like to know for example the northerners and the natives, more likely the Inuit people, how are we thought about; for example, we know in parts of the world, people from all over the world sometimes they kill each other in order to take whatever belongs to the other person. Have you thought about this saying maybe we will go to war because of that proposal for the natives? We would like to know if we are thought of as being in that situation. We are not like that, us Inuit are not like that, even though there are different things in the world that are happening, other people that come into our territory, they will continue coming to our territory and they are always welcome. I want to know if this has been thought about and has there been any discussion about us welcoming other people.

We seem to be misunderstood by other people, if we go through with the Nunavut proposal, if the Nunavut people think we are like the others in going to war or things like that. We are for the Nunavut proposal. We think we can handle the government and we think we can go ahead in handling this territory. We want to know if this is understood by the federal government or by the other people. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Noah. I do not know if there was a question there but Mr. Ittinuar, would you like to respond to that?

Nunavut Concept Is Well Known By Parliament

MR. ITTINUAR: (Translation) It is kind of hard to answer. Maybe Joe Clark, if they are going to be growing potatoes in the snow, perhaps they could go ahead and we will not mind them. The Nunavut concept by the federal government is well known by parliament, the different parties in the House of Commons, but my party and the others, the Liberal and Conservative parties, have different ideas about Nunavut and we have different ideas about Nunavut. Prime Minister Trudeau and the Minister of Indian Affairs, Mr. Munro, they know about the Nunavut proposal and they have stated to me that -- he said that the Assembly, the Speaker is the speaker for him and he said whatever they say he will follow up and talk about it to parliament. That is what he stated to me before but I do not know if he was telling the truth or not but maybe some people know better than me.

So, in that case when I talked to him, when I mentioned to him about the Nunavut proposal, and I talked to Mr. Nickerson also about it in the privy council we have been trying to talk to them about the Northwest Territories but sometimes Mr. Nickerson talks about it, he thinks about it differently, he has different views. It has been understood and it is known by parliament but some people might think that they would be against the idea but the concept of the Inuit be known, their views known, I have not heard anything about them, against the wishes of the Inuit, nothing has been mentioned to me before but the concept of being against Nunavut. When the Dene want something they are always refused, maybe that is how the federal government is going to think about the proposal of Nunavut. Maybe they will say no and that is my view but they know that Nunavut is in line with the development of Canada. It is the youngest part of the country and some parts of the Northwest Territories have not grown yet, it is not a province yet. I do not know if it will be a province but the Nunavut concept is known by the parliament of Canada in some way. If you have heard that when they are talking about constitutional development and the process in the House, they seem to have passed over the heads of the Legislative Assembly when they were talking about the constitution and the budget, they have not heard from the Legislative Assembly. They were thinking mostly about the minerals of the Northwest Territories but I know they are trying to understand about the Nunavut, the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada appearing and the others and they applauded for them and agree in general.

Now, Mr. Munro is Minister of Indian Affairs and he said he would have to hear from the Legislative Assembly first before opening up negotiations, he would want to find out what the views of the House are. I am not the boss so I just tried to tell him my views and I have other business to do. So, does that sort of answer your question?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Ittinuar. I have next, Mr. Curley.

Land Claims Settlement Is Not Evil

MR. CURLEY: (Translation) Thank you Mr. Ittinuar, for appearing before the Assembly and for giving your presentation to your constituency, those who have elected you. Prior to our adjournment yesterday, and I want to say that I want to thank Mr. Nickerson for appearing as a witness yesterday, and he can come across much more intelligently than those across the table, the rest of the Members from Yellowknife, and I will ask you in English for the Yellowknife Members, but we the Eastern Arctic are almost in the process of gaining control administratively and it will not be blocked by the Members from Yellowknife and

the Members from Yellowknife stated before when you gain your own government that will be governing the Inuit.

The questions that were directed, the government would be dealing with the native people and also looking at the status of land claims and if we have a native government, then there is a fear of having very little power in the Northwest Territories and they are dealing with governing their own affairs and looking after their wildlife and other programs. This was asked by the Member from Yellowknife yesterday. I wonder if you agreed with the speaker yesterday. Perhaps the question from Yellowknife is answered if there is a split in the Territories the opportunities for overseeing education, wildlife and other programs, that was answered. (Translation ends.)

The Member from Yellowknife South was trying to put in our minds the idea that the land claims settlement was something evil, something that was not acceptable to the people in the North. She mentioned and I quote she said, "I am just throwing this out for you to pick up on. I wonder if it has ever occurred to you that the federal government may be concentrating in the interests of the national interest, turning the Northwest Territories into a huge native reserve which would come under federal jurisdiction and in so doing phase out the territorial government." She knows. I do not think the federal government is going to do that. I think the federal government in good faith is trying to negotiate the aboriginal rights settlement. I think Mr. Ittinuar who has worked for the ITC has worked for the aboriginal rights settlement, has settled in the North because it is a great economic stimulus which would lead to self-determination for those people and I do not agree and I want you to correct me that in the settling of land claims it would not necessarily mean creating reserves in the Territories.

Endangering Native Land Claims Process

Then she went on to point out the fact that there is some danger with that kind of thing and I want to have your assurance whether or not the native land claims would be endangered in the North by splitting the various groups into regions because the land claims settlement in my mind is an accepted entity as far as the territorial government structure is concerned. Could you respond to some of the things she said so we may understand a little more clearly what these two issues really are?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Curley. Maybe before I have Mr. Mr. Ittinuar respond I would like to recognize the Arab up in the crowd up there who has come for our oil maybe.

---Applause

Thank you. Mr. Ittinuar.

Idea Of Reserve Is Nonsense

MR. ITTINUAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Maybe the Arabs are spying on us. With all due respect to the Member of Yellowknife South and the previous speaker, the Member from the Keewatin South, the idea of a huge reserve in the North in my view is utter nonsense and I believe also that kind of discussion in Ottawa should be considered utter nonsense.

MR. CURLEY: Hear, hear!

MR. ITTINUAR: Both at the standing committee level and in private talks with the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and others, the idea of Nunavut is a realistic and honest effort for evolution of the Northwest Territories politically. They have been receptive to this idea and I have as far as Mr. Curley's comments are concerned, I can only echo those sentiments. I think most things have been said clearly and my comments earlier speak for themselves. I doubt very much that the federal government would ever want to consider another reserve because of their history of treaties and reservations with the Dene, with all due respect, with the Indian people of Canada. For once and there are precedents for this, for instance the home rule of Greenland, the James Bay agreement, the Alaska agreement. These agreements merely set the stage for an equitable settlement which would conform with this day and age in terms of relations. I do not believe there is any cause for concern that there will ever be a huge reserve in the Territories. As Mr. Curley pointed out, the splitting of the Territories would only allow the people of the Eastern Arctic to manage their affairs more realistically and in manageable proportions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Ittinuar. I wonder if when you are replying you could just get a little closer to your mike. Some people are having a little trouble picking you up. I have Mrs. Sorensen next on the list.

Referendum On The Issue Of Division

MRS. SORENSEN: Yes, thank you. Mr. Ittinuar, the unity committee has recommended that there be a referendum on the issue of division. They have also recommended that only the people in the northeastern Arctic would vote and further that communities would vote only if they petitioned to do so. I wonder if you could comment on all three of those recommendations.

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

MR. ITTINUAR: I did not catch the third thing.

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

MRS. SORENSEN: That only communities within the northeastern Arctic would vote if they petitioned to do so, people within those communities would vote only if they petitioned to do so.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mrs. Sorensen, is there a question there?

MRS. SORENSEN: The question is would you comment on all three of those recommendations.

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

A Referendum Unnecessary

MR. ITTINUAR: As in many areas and issues I take my direction from the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada and all its subsidiaries and affiliates. On the question of a referendum, I believe the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada said that they would be quite willing to take part in a referendum if this had to be done, although it was my personal belief that we do not need a referendum to realize the pervasive uniformity of the concept of Nunavut. I believe you yourself or rather the Member from Yellowknife South knows very well that people of the Eastern Arctic are collectively in favour of Nunavut. A referendum would perhaps recognize the process, but on all three of those recommendations I would not be afraid to have a referendum at all in the Eastern Arctic. I have faith in the people there.

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

MRS. SORENSEN: I think that it is pretty obvious that the people of the West are going to be concerned about not being able to vote. At least there are indications that that will arise. So what I am attempting to get you to respond to is would you consider that the vote be taken throughout the Northwest Territories with a residency clause? Would you consider that acceptable?

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

MR. ITTINUAR: Well, if you remember the Quebec referendum the problem was in the wording of the question. As we are all aware, I think the outcome would be at least 80 per cent in favour in the proposed Nunavut area and in all frankness it would be a melting pot of confusion perhaps and there would be different opinions about the division and the concept of Nunavut and the political evolution of the Northwest Territories. So you would have a very clear distinct line of opinion both geographically and in terms of residence. Again if those three recommendations you mentioned are required for all communities in the Northwest Territories this may change the picture or alter the picture slightly, but again I would not be afraid to have a referendum throughout the Territories. It would not mean much because the residents of the Territories who are proposing Nunavut on their behalf really do not need the consent or non-consent of residents of the Western Arctic, but if this is a formal procedure, so be it.

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

The Wish Of The People Of The Eastern Arctic

MR. MACQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would certainly agree with earlier remarks of Mr. Ittinuar that there is no harm and nothing new in the recognition of ethnic and linguistic factors in determining political boundaries and that self-determination. The principle of self-determination certainly seems to lend itself to support for the Inuit people of the Eastern Arctic having a territory of their own if that is what they wish. So far as I am concerned the way is open for that to happen. As some have mentioned, it is not necessarily so that the federal government sees the way open but as far as I am concerned the way is unquestionably open, provided that is what the people of the Eastern Arctic want, and you did say that just a moment ago, that there is no doubt in your mind right now that that is what the people -- and I suppose we are talking about the majority of the people in the Eastern Arctic -- want. Could you tell me how that knowledge has come to your mind? Why can you say unequivocally that that is what the majority of the people of the Eastern Arctic want?

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

MR. ITTINUAR: Mr. Chairman, I did not go out and do an informal referendum as Mr. Nickerson did with the Western Arctic, but I do know as an Inuk that having travelled some in the Eastern Arctic and having talked with residents of different communities as well as leaders that this idea is pervasive, it is universal. There is, as the witness yesterday, who is the representative of the Inuit Tapirisat said who has great knowledge about the idea of residence, as I say, if you wish a referendum, so be it. If that would appease your minds, so be it, but for those who are Inuit or permanent residents of the Eastern Arctic there is no question. How I come to that conclusion maybe to you is questionable but I can tell you unequivocally that to the residents of the Eastern Arctic that is without question.

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

MR. MACQUARRIE: I certainly was not questioning the validity of how you came to the conclusion, the question was asked sincerely; I want to know what enables you to feel that way -- for those of us who are trying...

THE INTERPRETER: We are having a technical problem.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Excuse me but we are having problems with the equipment. Maybe we could take a 15 minute recess for coffee. How is that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The committee will come to order. The Chair recognizes a quorum and we will continue with the questions of the witness. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Cautious Approach In Dividing Territories

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Ittinuar, for those of us who are trying very sincerely to understand, and that does include certain Members from Yellowknife, trying to understand the extent of support for this separate territory and who from time to time encounter contrary opinions among people in the Eastern Arctic, I would appreciate it very much if you could offer us some guidance. For instance there seems to be a very cautious approach from the Baffin Regional Council with respect to dividing the Territories, and also in various conversations from time to time I have had Inuit people tell me that they would not want to divide the Territories -- and that is not many people -- tell me that they would not want to divide the Territories. But for those who are sincerely trying to understand, can you give us some guidance on how we should understand that?

MR. CURLEY: Move over.

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

MR. MacQUARRIE: I did not ask a certain Member from Keewatin South for an answer. I asked Mr. Ittinuar.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. If Mr. Ittinuar could answer that please.

MR. ITTINUAR: Mr. Chairman, I believe the most appropriate way that Mr. MacQuarrie could find out is by asking Members of the Eastern Arctic caucus.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ITTINUAR: That is the most immediate answer I would give. Secondly, he mentioned the Baffin Regional Council and I had thought that this council's mandate was to handle issues pertaining to local matters in which they would collectively decide or have a consensus on how to maintain and operate municipal affairs with the existing local government programs in the Territories today. I did not know that they would have a mandate to consider constitutional or political matters pertaining to the involvement of politics in the Territories today.

People Do Not Oppose Nunavut

As for the gist of your comments about the generality of decisions and the idea of Nunavut, well, I said before that my direction from the Inuit have always been one and the same. I have never met any who directly opposed Nunavut and I always considered the idea, and under the guidance of the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, we would be quite willing to undertake the proposition. As I said before your normal recourse for the opinions of the total Eastern Arctic would be to ask the Members of the Eastern Arctic caucus.

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

MR. MacQUARRIE: Just one final question if I may then. In your statements you did say that people ought to have freedom to make choices, and I certainly agree with that statement. You also said you would not be opposed to a referendum. I am pleased to hear that and I presume it would be on the understanding that it were conducted with sufficient dispatch and a decision were made during the period of time that this Assembly and this federal government are in office; is that correct?

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

MR. ITTINUAR: Could the hon. Member clarify that question please?

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

MR. MacQUARRIE: Mr. Ittinuar did say that he would find a referendum acceptable, but that was not his choice. He felt it was not necessary but he also said he did not object at all. I am presuming that he does not object providing that that referendum were carried out with sufficient dispatch, that it were completed during the term of this Assembly being in office and during the time of the present federal parliament so that a decision was made and would not have to be started up all over again with the introduction of new assemblies and parliaments.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The question is, Mr. MacQuarrie?

MR. MacQUARRIE: Is that the condition under which he could accept a referendum?

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

Referendum Would Raise Questions

MR. ITTINUAR: First of all, I must state that it is my belief that this Legislative Assembly has the motivation to settle that question during its term. Secondly, as I said before, a referendum would raise questions about the referendum itself, not merely about the outcome but, as you say, how it will be dispatched and carried out. As you witnessed last year, the Quebec referendum was debatable to say the least. Now statistical analyses are not always such that they are favourable in everybody's opinion and perhaps it might be the outcome with a referendum up north. However, it is a simple question and I just feel that it might more complicate it if you try to word the referendum in such a manner. I might suggest that the Western Arctic have a referendum itself in trying to decide its own political future, but I believe that during the term of this Assembly these questions will be settled and I would not hesitate to have a referendum tomorrow in the Eastern Arctic if that was the case.

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

HON. DON STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The question I had in mind has been answered. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Are there any further questions of the witness? Mr. Braden.

Resistance To Dividing N.W.T.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask Mr. Ittinuar for some commentary on a question that I asked Mr. Nickerson yesterday. I think he was in the room at the time but I will rephrase the question very briefly.

I am concerned that while there may be a few politicians and bureaucrats in Ottawa who may be receptive to the idea of division, there are a lot of others who are looking at the Northwest Territories as some kind of preserve or an ace up their sleeve in the constitutional talks with the provinces as it is and an area of Canada where there are proven and potential reserves of oil, gas and minerals. I am concerned that there may be resistance, even though this Assembly and the people of the Northwest Territories will through referendum say that we want to divide. My question to you, Mr. Ittinuar, is can you comment on that? Do you feel that there is resistance or am I wrong? Do you think that the federal politicians and federal bureaucrats will be receptive?

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

MR. ITTINUAR: It would not be realistic for me to say there is no resistance. That is realistic in every political situation in the world. There are federal politicians very receptive to the idea and I know members of all parties, the Conservatives, the Liberals and the NDP's who are very receptive to the idea of division of the Territories and the idea of Nunavut and for the political evolution of the Western Arctic. I also know members who are receptive to the idea of resource jurisdiction by the territorial government over natural resources, but I also know people who are fairly adamant about the present status quo and the maintenance of that status quo but how it divides at the federal level, at least in the House of Commons, is something that we do not know yet, certainly we on the hill do not know and I have not made that kind of an opinion or sought a consensus as to who is for and who is against.

Civil Servants In Position Of Influence

At the bureaucratic level, I do not believe civil servants should have the authority nor the mandate to decide whether or not the Territories should be divided but unfortunately they are in a position of influence and certainly in a position to push paper whereby a minister can be influenced to say one way or the other which is unfortunate but that is the case. So, at this point I cannot say one way or the other whether the ideas of the unity committee, the idea of division and the idea of Nunavut and jurisdiction over natural resources is heavy-handed. I guess that answers your question, I do not know.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Ittinuar. Are there any further questions of the witness? There being no further questions I would like to thank Peter Ittinuar for appearing before us this morning and giving us his presentation and answering questions. Thank you very much, Mr. Ittinuar.

---Applause

MR. ITTINUAR: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): At this time I would like to ask Mr. Bruce McLaughlin, chairman of the committee who is preparing the witnesses, who you have next on the list, Mr. McLaughlin?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: The Dene Nation and the Metis Association have requested -- they will make a joint presentation together and then both parties will remain to field questions because they feel their presentation is interrelated in some aspects. If they are not ready to go immediately Mayor Mike Ballantyne has indicated that the Association of Municipalities could go in their place.

MR. SIBBESTON: Sure.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: I do not think the Metis and the Dene expect it to go until 2:00 o'clock and may not be ready to go right now.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. That being the case I would ask Mr. Ballantyne -- or is the Metis Association and the Dene Nation prepared to appear?

MR. SIBBESTON: No.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I see Mr. Sibbeston shaking his head but I do not know what that means. Mr. McLaughlin, is Mr. Ballantyne prepared to present his presentation? Would the Sergeant-at-Arms bring Mr. Ballantyne to the witness table please?

We have at the witness table Mr. Ballantyne, who is the mayor of Yellowknife whom I guess everybody knows. Also vice president of the Association of Municipalities. Mr. Ballantyne. Mrs. Sorensen, a point of privilege?

Questions Must Be Asked And Answered

MRS. SORENSEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. One of the things that I have noticed, Mr. Chairman, is that every time I ask a tough question and every time I bring out an issue that I believe we should deal with in this House I am called hysterical, I am called paranoid and many times I am called even worse names than that. I am prepared to take that as much as I can take it, but what I want to ask is why are we so afraid of getting these questions out onto the floor? I think they have to be asked and I think they have to be answered and I think this is the proper forum to ask and answer those kinds of questions. I simply must say that I have been elected to ask these questions. I have been elected to bring out all sides of the story and I have been elected to bring out and seek information and I am not prepared to be slandered for that any more in this House. I am just not prepared for that. I am not prepared to be slandered for doing what I see as my job as a territorial legislator. I serve notice right now that I do not intend to stop, that the tactics that have been used calling me racist and attributing motives to the kinds of questions that I am asking -- I am just not prepared to stop asking questions because of that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Curley, is this a point of privilege?

MR. CURLEY: Privilege, Mr. Speaker. If she is accusing certain Members as part of the Eastern Arctic group, if she is indicating to some Members that she is being treated as she has indicated then she should be clear and I believe that we in the Eastern Arctic caucus, Eastern Arctic representatives have abided by the rules and we will respect the rules and if she thinks the chairman of the committee has not been sticking to the rules she should actually challenge the Chair.

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

MRS. SORENSEN: That is exactly what I have just done. I have served notice on this House that if I am abused any further I will challenge.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. We do not want to start a general debate now. We have a witness in the chair. Could we continue with the presentation of the witness? Mr. Ballantyne.

Presentation Of The Association Of Municipalities

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It seems that my comments were made at a rather controversial time and I hope we can generate some debate from my comments also.

Mr. Chairman, it is indeed an honour for the Association of Municipalities to be asked to address the Legislative Assembly. It is proper that the deliberations of the possible division of the Northwest Territories are taking place in the Eastern Arctic here in the town of Frobisher Bay. The possible division of the Northwest Territories is a very serious matter and the consequences must be carefully weighed before any final decision is made. The political, social and economic ramifications must be fully understood before we embark upon a course that will be very difficult to change. The Association of Municipalities can agree that in the long-term division is perhaps inevitable. Administratively it makes a lot of sense. However, we have some very serious concerns and I would like to address them here. At this point I might add that in no way are we attempting to tell the people of the Eastern Arctic how to run their affairs, but we feel that together in the Northwest Territories, the consequences of decisions made here will affect us all. I think in all fairness that the concerns we have should be addressed.

Timing May Be Premature

The next statement I am about to make I am sure Mr. Curley later will have a comment to make about it but none the less at this time there is some feeling that the timing might be a little premature. This aspect has been debated and there is certain disagreement I am quite aware such as the eastern caucus, about this concern but it is my feeling and the feeling of some of us that perhaps at this stage of our political evolution we might be stronger in dealing with Ottawa, with large corporations as one political unit. I know the argument has been made that we might not have been as successful as we wanted to have been in the past as an entity but I think it is something that should be considered and something that should be addressed by this Assembly in their deliberations.

We also believe that there are options that should be considered before we make this decision. I realize that the objects have been looked at, but I think that at this particular point in time we should not preclude any options and these deliberations will take place over a period of time. I think during the course of these deliberations all options should be explored. This has been mentioned a couple of times already, but if the Territories are divided the location of the border could be a contentious issue. That is something obviously that can be decided through negotiation but I guess we are all aware that that is a problem and before the whole question of division is ultimately resolved that is one problem that will have to be decided.

Another problem that I have and I am not quite sure how at this point it has been addressed, I suppose as the debate continues it might be brought up, but there is a concern that has been expressed to me by a number of people in the Western Arctic of what will happen to the Arctic islands if there is division. There is a fear, I think a valid fear that the federal government would like to keep that under their control. Now again because we are not privy to all the negotiations that have taken place perhaps this problem has been addressed and perhaps later on somebody could explain to me the way it has been addressed but it is a consideration. I think firstly and very importantly that a mechanism must be established where all the people of the Northwest Territories are kept informed and are permitted to fully state their views on the whole question of division. If the Northwest Territories are divided it affects not only the people of the Eastern Arctic, but would have a very large impact on the people of the Western Arctic as well.

Residency Clause Difficult

I think at this point in time with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the Report of the Special Committee on Unity which is presently before the Assembly. If I could go through it briefly, I realize that there have been many people speaking before me and many of the points I may bring up have already been brought before you so I will attempt to be brief and to bring to you at this point in time some of our concerns. Recommendation one, I think Mr. Nickerson yesterday expressed the concern with the five year residency clause. This is a difficult one. I understand the feelings of the people who do not want major decisions that affect full time residents of the Northwest Territories to be made by transients. I suppose whether or not five years is the proper length of time I am not disagreeing with the philosophy. There should be some...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Ballantyne, would you just slow down? You are going too fast for the interpreters. Thank you.

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you very much. I have a habit of speaking quickly at times. I think where I left off was that the actual time is rather an arbitrary time and perhaps it is a reasonable length of time but it is something that perhaps also can be looked at.

To go on to recommendation two, I would imagine that if there is a final resolution of this affair that in fact what we have now will be perceived to have been an interim agreement. I imagine that is de facto. The concept of changes being negotiated by the leaders of the people of the Territories and affirmed by the peoples is a basic premise that should be followed. 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." I think we can all agree with that as a basic principle.

Concept Of Referendum Is A Good One

Your committee recommendation four, the concept of referendum, I think is a good concept and the concept of public debate also is a good concept. I am not quite sure what the mechanism will be for that public debate, number one, and secondly I would like a little bit of clarification on if a public debate will be facilitated in the western part of the Northwest Territories as well as the East. I think the whole concept of a referendum, whether or not the referendum should be limited to people in the Eastern Arctic is a difficult one. There are very, very good points being made that people in the Eastern Arctic are most affected and therefore they should decide their own destiny. On the other hand I firmly believe there should be some mechanism for the people other than the Eastern Arctic to express their views. I am not sure what that mechanism could be, but it bears some thought because ultimately no matter what the resolution of this debate is, if there is a division of the Northwest Territories, I think it is very important that the peoples of the Northwest Territories still co-operate. I think even if there was a division that the East and the West would find it very advantageous to co-operate so that a mechanism that can alleviate the fears and allow the people of the Western Arctic to present their views I think would be a very worth-while concept.

Recommendation five, the concept of referendum, I think we can agree is a good method to find out what the people actually believe. If it is agreed that there will be a referendum, if the federal government will not undertake it, then we see no problem with the territorial government undertaking it.

Ramifications Should Be Objectively Studied

I think recommendation seven is a very important one. As I said in my opening address, I realize that there are people in the Eastern Arctic who are impatient, who have been waiting for a long time, who want something resolved and they want it resolved quickly, but I still think that at this time it is wise and prudent to have a body such as is suggested in your recommendation seven to objectively study the ramifications of division. I think a short delay at this time would be in everybody's interest so that we all can understand, we can all respond to the various consequences of a major decision such as this. So I would ask the people of the Eastern Arctic to have a little patience, a little bit more patience and allow an objective body to look at the ramifications of this.

Committee recommendation nine, I am afraid it is a little bit too exotic for me. I am not quite sure what is envisioned here. Perhaps Mr. MacQuarrie later on could enlighten me. As I understand it, the subject we are discussing here and the mandate of the unity committee, and I could be wrong, but it would be

to look at the possibility of division but I suppose the mandate was broader than that. If Mr. MacQuarrie could explain to me how various peoples might or might not remain in association with one another, I am having a bit of a problem with that as a recommendation. So, very briefly then we have not had much time to study this document. The various communities and the Association of Municipalities have not got together to study and to discuss at great lengths the impact of division.

Comprehensive Position On Division Not Yet Developed

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the Association of Municipalities has not at this time developed a comprehensive position on division. We intend to consult with the people of our municipalities to gain their views. We trust that more information about the ramifications of division will be forthcoming and I believe that with a thorough knowledge of the facts and in the spirit of co-operation and good will, I am sure that the political development of the Northwest Territories will proceed in a way that will benefit all the people living in the North. Thank you very much for your patience.

---Applause

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

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. I certainly agree that whatever happens, we should strive to achieve the good will and co-operation of all the peoples of the Northwest Territories. I am interested in your suggestion that we should not preclude any options. Particularly I am very much looking forward to hearing from the Dene and Metis Associations, but I think it might be fair to say that there may not be the same consensus existing in the western Northwest Territories as to what the next step is going to be in terms of political development. There may be more of an urgency felt from the people of the eastern Northwest Territories. I think you have said that and you have asked us to be patient. Now, what I would like to know is are you suggesting that there should be no developments...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Could you just slow down please? I think you are perhaps a little ways from your mike and the interpreters are giving me a signal here.

THE INTERPRETER: We are presently experiencing technical difficulties again.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I guess it is the equipment. Could we maybe just hold off for a couple of minutes and get it corrected? We will take a five minute recess.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Can we call the committee to order? I think we have the problem resolved for the time being.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: If you are asking permission, no.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Patterson. I wonder if you could start over. I think they had a little trouble picking up the first part of your question. Mr. Patterson.

Eastern Arctic Impatient For Change

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will try and make it as simple as possible. I think you are saying, Mr. Ballantyne, that you feel that the eastern, the people of the eastern part of the Northwest Territories are impatient for change and I think that that is true. It seems to me that the people of the western part of the Northwest Territories may not be as certain as to what the next step should be. I think they too want change but they may not be quite as unified as I think the people of the East are on just what that step should be, and we are calling for the creation of a new territorial form of government initially.

What I would like to know is, you said, we should not preclude any options. What I am really wondering is this: Are you saying that there should be, even if the people of the eastern part of the Northwest Territories seem to know what they want, that no decision should be made by those people until the western part of the Northwest Territories decides what its political future should be?

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

Division Will Also Affect Western Arctic

MR. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Patterson, I do not think I was saying that. What I was saying was that at this point in time the issue of division of the Territories is before us. What I was saying is that before we make a major decision which will have immense consequences to the Territories, that we should very, very carefully study what those ramifications would be. I am not saying at this time that the people of the Eastern Arctic should wait until decisions are made in the Western Arctic, I am not saying that at all. What I am saying is that this decision, if there is a decision to divide, de facto, the people in the Western Arctic are also affected. So I guess what I am asking for is a little patience, a little prudence so that we will all know exactly what will be the net benefit, loss, either/or of this decision.

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

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have a supplementary question if I may. Mr. Ballantyne, you may know that my own feelings, that I am going to persuade the rest of the Assembly before this debate is over, are that we are at least now ready to make a decision in principle without committing ourselves to the final form of this new territory. I am going to suggest that we can make a decision in principle which would still leave time for full public consultation in all parts of the Northwest Territories and which would also permit the kind of study that you mentioned which I called for I believe the first time I spoke after being elected. I agree that there should be a study of the impact of division and perhaps the cost as one of the factors we should look at. However, what I am asking you is, you said in the beginning of your remarks that you felt division was -- I think you used the words "perhaps the inevitable" -- and would you feel that a decision by this Assembly in principle would seriously preclude other options, and I guess by implication I am asking you do you really think that a united Territories is still a serious option?

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

MR. BALLANTYNE: Mr. Patterson, to answer the first question I have some problem, I guess with the concept of establishing a general principle after that principle has been decided, after the fact to establish whether or not it is viable. It would seem to me, and this is only my opinion, and it merely may be a procedural thing, but if one establishes a principle that the Assembly would look at the possibility of division, then after the information has been gathered which would support that, to my way of doing things, at that time, I would establish the principle of division and I suppose that is the way my mind works. It seems there should be some sort of logical sequence.

Must Understand Rationale For Wanting Division

The second question you asked is a difficult one. I realize that there is a school of thought that says that the territorial government can improve its services, it can respond more effectively to the aspirations of the people in the Eastern Arctic, and I also read ITC's Nunavut position paper where they say that it is not possible that the mechanism is going to work. Myself, at this point in time, at the beginning of this debate, I have not yet made up my mind. In my mind I am not 100 per cent convinced that a unified territory will not work. I realize that many people here in the East say it will not. I think that during the process of the debate, I think that the rationale for believing that it will not will have to be brought forward so that those of us who are not sure at this point in time will better understand the rationale for wanting division.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. The time being 11:30 o'clock we will recess until 2:00 p.m. Thank you very much.

---LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The Chair recognizes a quorum and we will continue with the questions for Mr. Ballantyne. I have on the list Mr. Patterson. Just while Mr. Patterson is getting seated I have Bruce McLaughlin on the list.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question to Mr. Ballantyne, I would like to lead with a small comment. I had a question for Mr. Merritt the other day while the ITC was here that the...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): We have problems here. The red light is flashing. Okay, I guess we are all right. The red light means you are in business. Sorry, we are experiencing some difficulty with the sound system. We will try again, Mr. McLaughlin.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: My question when ITC was here a couple of days ago was to Mr. Merritt about the specific lines that would be drawn for political boundaries in the proposed Nunavut, would not necessarily correspond with the political boundaries and would not necessarily correspond with the land claims and aboriginal rights boundaries and the use of the land.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. McLaughlin, we are having trouble again. Sorry about that. We will give it another try.

Possible Boundaries Of Nunavut

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Just to make sure that all the Members got the interpretation I will start again then. To the question I had the other day to the ITC delegation, answered by Mr. Merritt, his answer was basically that there was the possibility that the Nunavut territory political boundaries would not be exactly along the same lines as the land claims and aboriginal rights boundary. There could be overlaps and possible differences in the boundary lines between the land used by different aboriginal rights groups. I think that addresses the concern that the people in my constituency would have with the Nunavut proposal for a separate political territory.

I think most of them are resigned, maybe not necessarily in favour in all cases, but I think resigned to the fact that there are aboriginal rights and land negotiations going on with COPE and the ITC and the Dene and that this is a negotiation between the federal group and the land and aboriginal rights claimants groups. I do not think there is a big fear on the part of most people that the land and, in some cases, some of the minerals under the land would belong to the claimants. I think there would be a fear amongst people living in the Mackenzie area and in this case I do mean the District of Mackenzie, that part of the Mackenzie area would be included in the political Nunavut. I do not think there is any fear that it would be in the land claims Nunavut, that the land use and rights and some of the mineral rights would take that land away from some uses that other developers and people in the Mackenzie area and so on might want to use that land for. I think that is understood and pretty well agreed to, though in a lot of cases reluctantly. There is a fear of having a political jurisdiction that would take the northern part of the District of Mackenzie above the tree line away from the District of Mackenzie which would basically be what would be left over of the Northwest Territories after Nunavut left or whatever name would then be given to that territory. I would like to ask Mr. Ballantyne if that is the general feeling of the municipalities remaining basically in the District of Mackenzie of the Northwest Territories.

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

Consultation On Division Needed

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I really think in all honesty it is very difficult to answer that because the full question of a division of the Territories has not been formally discussed and debated I know in our council. I am not sure if it has been in yours. I know that I think Mr. Nickerson did a survey. I think Mrs. Sorensen might have also had a survey and there are some people who say, "Sure, we can split the Territories," and other people say, "No". I do not think we have really looked at what it means at this point in time. I do not think it would be right for me or for any politician right now in the West at least to try to ascertain, unless there is some kind of consulting process, exactly what the feelings of people in the West are. So I, Mr. McLaughlin, could not honestly answer you at this point in time.

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

Fears Re Political Boundaries In The West

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Just to follow up on that, Mr. Chairman, the point I think I was trying to specifically address was maybe Mr. Ballantyne's comments about a plebiscite being held in the Territories on the issue in which everyone could vote. It is my feeling that people in the West would support a division of the Territories which would be the Keewatin and the Baffin regions, though I think they would be reluctant to have a political division which would include the Central Arctic and the Western Arctic constituency areas. I know that may bother my friends from the Western Arctic and Central Arctic constituencies, but I want to make clear that I do not think people are afraid of the land claims so much as they are of the political boundaries being along that line. You would have areas being shared by three or four different groups which would be problem enough, let alone being in two different political jurisdictions as well.

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

MR. BALLANTYNE: I am still not clear exactly what you are asking of me. What I think you are saying is you are asking me if the people in Yellowknife and the other municipalities are making a separation between land claims and this particular division of the Northwest Territories. To answer that I think that, speaking specifically of people in Yellowknife and the people I had discussions with, the feeling is, I think, that the land claims process would have to go forward and have to be resolved for everybody because until land claims are resolved I do not think any of the people in the Territories have the opportunity to achieve the sort of things they want.

No Opportunity To Express Views

What I perceive to be the possible fear of division of the Territories, again there has been no consolidated feeling because there has been no process to really ask people what their fears are. There really has been in the West up to this point no attempt made by the association, by the council, by anybody to explain to people in the West what does it mean, division of the Territories, what effect will it have on municipalities, what effect could it possibly have on our relationships with other jurisdictions. I think until those questions are answered and the people have an opportunity to express their views I would again hesitate to predict what they feel but I think there is a separation between the two processes. Is that what you are asking?

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

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Right. I am trying to get to your point on the plebiscite which you thought might involve everyone in the Territories to be sure what they feel. My question is, if you were to ask people in the Mackenzie region about political separation of the Territories which did not include the Central Arctic and the Western Arctic areas along the coastline, above the tree line, I think they would go along with it. But I think you would find a great deal of reluctance for them to support one which would basically cut the District of Mackenzie off from access to the Arctic because of having to go through a separate territorial political jurisdiction. I do not think they would be too upset with accepting the actual land claims in that area and I think that is the difference that any kind of a plebiscite would have to address.

Political Boundary Could Cut Off Resources

If there was a territorial plebiscite it might have to be a two step thing, one approving the idea of people in the Eastern Arctic wanting to have their own government due to the geographic and different ethnic traditions. I am sure personally that I am in favour of that but as far as the political boundary and where it would actually be, that concerns me because I would hate to see the District of Mackenzie being left without financial and resource situation to support them in future if they were cut off from the Beaufort Sea, the oil and gas. I think that is a real concern of some of those people and I think it would have to be addressed. There is no sense in skirting around it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. McLaughlin. Mr. Ballantyne, was there a question there?

MR. BALLANTYNE: I think it was something of a token question that Mr. McLaughlin was posing to me. I agree possibly that is a concern which definitely would have to be addressed but until, as I said, more information is documented I would not like to predict what the feelings of people in the Western Arctic would be and that is what I am saying.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. I am just wondering if Mr. Patterson was through with his questions when we broke for lunch or whether he was still asking questions. Were you through with your questions, Mr. Patterson?

MR. PATTERSON: Maybe I could ask another question, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Ballantyne, you seem to be making quite a bit out of a concern that there be a study of the implications of division and particularly you mentioned the impact on municipalities. You do acknowledge that the proposal presented by the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, which certainly has in large part resulted in this debate coming to a head now, simply calls for the creation of another territory along the model of the existing territorial form of public government. If you do accept that that is the model, it will not pose all that many questions or surprises for municipalities will it? We understand the territorial government quite well already, do we not?

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

Actual Model Of Proposal Not Difficult To Comprehend

MR. BALLANTYNE: I am aware of the format that is being proposed. I think the question I would ask is if two similar systems are going to be as effective as one. I suppose if you take your rationale a little bit further ultimately we could break into four or five areas using a similar system. I am not too sure what the breakthrough efficiency point is of a system. As I said earlier it is very likely that administratively in the long term it is logical to divide the Territories, but I am not 100 per cent convinced of that at this point. I would like to see more indications that that is so before I can honestly fully accept this proposal, but I would agree with Mr. Patterson that the actual

model which is being proposed really would not be that difficult for any of us to comprehend or grasp. I am not arguing with that part of it. I am just asking for a little bit more proof of whether or not it is really necessary to do it. That is what I am asking right now.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. I have next Ms. Cournoyea on the list.

MS. COURNOYEA: Mr. Ballantyne, I do not know what credibility your association has as a legitimate body. I do not understand that the Association of Municipalities would not have at some time discussed the idea of division, for the fact that this idea has been around for some time, and certainly they have members in this part of the country. Now, when you say that there should be communications and people should understand, as a person myself in communications I find that if you look at this Legislative Assembly itself, many people sitting around this table seem to think they have more powers than they actually have and they do not realize and understand the limitation of this Assembly. To go further down the line we still have a problem at the municipal level where many, many people do not understand exactly what stage of control and power they have. The only time that you get into a position that someone wants to do something about it is when they try and make the efforts to effect change and then, collectively, want to move ahead and try and get the control over the things and the decision making that are important to them, rather than the administration of handling things after all the decisions are made.

Understanding The Aspirations

It seems to me in the division of the Northwest Territories there has been a great deal of thought about Nunavut or division, if you do not want to use the word. I do not understand how you could say that there had been a Utopian kind of situation where people would really care in the West to understand the aspirations of the East. When you are in the remotest areas you always have to fight the larger centres who have many, many more sophisticated people, who have the ability to cut into different systems. But I cannot see how you feel that you can put forward the idea that anyone in the Mackenzie Valley would really take the time to understand, to even make a decision. The only people that will put that effort forth are the ones that are affected. While I agree with you to a certain extent that communications and understanding are important, how do you propose that an educational process can be put into place that would allow a division to even begin taking place? It seems to me whenever we hear, let us have another study, let us look at it again and let us include people who are not really affected, how would you propose to do that? How would you carry that educational process and not allow people to use it as a stalling tactic?

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

MR. BALLANTYNE: I think it is a very valid question Ms. Cournoyea has put to me. I guess I will start off with the credibility of the organization. I have been with the organization for a year and I suppose that is something other people outside would have to answer. If for any reason the organization does not have credibility, it behooves us to improve its credibility.

Apathy Among Those Affected

As far as your second question, unfortunately what one finds, I think anywhere, is a certain amount of apathy and a good percentage of people really do not take the time to investigate things which might have important effects on their lives. It is an important thing, a facet of life here in the Territories and throughout the whole country I would say. I would say that there always is a danger when people are trying to effect some form of positive change. They feel stymied and they feel there are stalling tactics in order to frustrate them in their legitimate aspirations, but I think that there are ways that people could be made aware.

Depending, of course, on how this Assembly deals with the position paper put forward by the special committee on unity, I have no way of knowing now if any or all of the proposals put forward by the committee would be adopted, but one scenario if some of the suggestions are put forward, they are operating under some general principles, is how an education process could go forward. I think for myself as division became inevitable it would be the responsibility of our organization and individual municipalities really to get the information to the people. I mean it might be that everybody in the West supports the concept.

I really do not know and I am a little bit hesitant now -- Mr. Nickerson mentioned this yesterday -- there is a fine line between when one is a leader and when one is getting so far ahead of your followers you cannot see them any more. I think it is a good point and it is not dodging the issue, but I think there is a responsibility on the municipalities to do a lot of that education process. It is an ongoing thing. I think that if it is done properly I think it would be very positive. The fact that it has not been done, probably in the past, I do not think is a good reason to say, "Well, it has never worked in the past and we will not try it any more. To hell with it." I do not know if that answers your question, Ms. Cournoyea.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. Ms. Cournoyea, are you finished?

Resource Sharing May Take Years.

MS. COURNOYEA: Well, I do not think that the real issue was addressed. What I did want to bring it down to is that people who are right now and at this time handling levels of government, many of them do not even know what control they have. At the same time many comments have come around this floor, they talk about offshore resource development and sharing of offshore resources. Well, I will say to you that if you are going to wait until the time that the Northwest Territories gets the offshore and access to many things that even the provinces do not have, then you might as well be telling us you are not going to deal with the matter at all because these are all the kinds of concerns that are coming up. These are the kinds of things that will never be settled in a long, long time. Division is possible, but offshore resource sharing and even inland sharing is something that may take years.

So why not just say, "Well, we do not agree with it because basically at this point in time you are not going to get offshore resources and it will take a long time before you get the land issue settled as well"? So, to me when those issues are brought up it is like an indirect way of saying you are not going to get it because what is true is what is fact and the fact is what is possible to get. To put these way-out things and concerns is valid, but if it means that you have to wait on that, then you might as well say no.

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

MR. BALLANTYNE: Mr. Chairman, again I think it puts it in the form of a statement rather than as a question. It becomes very complex. I do not think I am saying that either we get everything or we get nothing. I say there is a very complex area in there which I do not think anybody here has all the answers to, so I think we have to look at what areas of jurisdiction can go forward with division. What statutes do we have to deal with? Do we have to change the Northwest Territories Act?

Delineation Of Problems Necessary

There is a myriad of very complicated things we have to do. I am not saying that we hold out for everything and get it all at one time. I am saying let us delineate the problems that face us, the issues that we have to grasp and in some form of logical, orderly manner proceed to solve them. What I feel here and probably very rightfully again is a sense of frustration. It is the same sense of frustration I felt travelling in a lot of other countries in the world where they say, "Well, God damn it, it is not working. Let us get something fast now, you know, because we do not like what is happening." What oftentimes happens is in that effort to do something quickly the end result is not what you wanted. It is weak, it has flaws, has frailties and can be destroyed. I think it is something everybody here has to look at, not to jump too quickly.

I know you have frustrations. It has been many years but the possibility is there, it is coming, the political climate in the Northwest Territories is changing and there are also some opportunities for people to achieve the sort of political ends that they want. I am saying let us not jump off the deep end immediately. Let us look at the whole thing, all of us collectively and figure out how we can best manage it. Again I am not sure if I am answering your question, but there are so many non-specific things here it is very difficult to be specific about individual comments.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. I will just remind you again for the interpreters to slow down a bit. You forget yourself. Thank you. Mr. MacQuarrie, please.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all -- I will have a couple of questions in a moment -- but Mr. Ballantyne this morning did term one of the unity committee's recommendation, number nine, as being exotic. I think yourself, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Sibbeston, Mr. Sayine, Mr. Curley and myself would not like that word being associated with something that we had produced.

Agreement On Political Development

This morning Mr. Patterson said that in his opinion there was no agreement amongst the people of the Western Arctic as to what the next step should be where political development is concerned, Mr. Ballantyne. Is it your opinion that he is wrong when he says that? Do you feel that we in the Western Arctic are all agreed as to what should be happening?

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

MR. BALLANTYNE: Mr. Chairman, could you repeat that? I missed the beginning of that one. Could you repeat that again, please?

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, Mr. Ballantyne. Mr. Patterson said this morning that it was his opinion that there was no agreement amongst the people of the Western Arctic as to what the next step should be as far as political development is concerned. I am asking, do you think he is wrong in that? Do you think that there is evident agreement among the people of the Western Arctic as to what the next step should be?

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

MR. BALLANTYNE: No. I would agree with his statement that in the Western Arctic there are obviously many issues that ought to be resolved, the Dene and Metis land claims are carrying on, the COPE land claims are carrying on and I am not quite sure if COPE is considered to be part of the Western or Eastern Arctic at this particular point in time. There is I think at this point no consensus really of how the Western Arctic should be going.

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

Recommendation Is Not Exotic

MR. MacQUARRIE: In which case then, Mr. Ballantyne, I cannot at all agree with you that recommendation nine is exotic because it is aimed at trying to find a means whereby people who wish to remain in association with one another -- and that presumably is the people of the Western Arctic -- will be able to reach some agreement as to what the next step should be. I would suggest, Mr. Ballantyne, if that kind of arrangement had been made eight or nine years ago in the Northwest Territories that we might not be now faced with the prospect of division. I am sure if that kind of recommendation had been introduced that many years ago someone might have said it was exotic, but I just do not think it is at all. Could you comment, please?

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

MR. BALLANTYNE: One thing I would like to say is the adjective "exotic" is not necessarily a negative concept. It can be considered a positive one. I guess, Mr. MacQuarrie, that is the problem I have with the second part of your recommendation. It is to me a little bit too specific at this point in time to say that its primary aim is the creation of a constitution for the largest and strongest possible geopolitical jurisdiction. I guess we may be getting a little hung up here in semantics and I think I see what you are intending with this recommendation. I guess until some of the Dene land claims and Dene position has been clarified somewhat I am not quite sure actually how that will all work together, but I see what you are getting at and I see the necessity for addressing that very problem.

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

Determination Of Viability Of Proposal

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I accept it up to that point. I agree these all need more talk so that everybody does understand precisely what is meant, but that was the general idea behind that recommendation. You did say in your presentation, Mr. Ballantyne, that it needs to be determined whether what is proposed by the Inuit Tapirisat and other people of the Eastern Arctic, that is, a separate Eastern Arctic territory, that it needs to be determined whether it is viable. Could I ask you who, in your opinion, should make that determination as to whether it is viable or not?

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

MR. BALLANTYNE: It would seem to me that the medium, right now, where we would get into this problem is, as was said, with the Legislative Assembly. It would seem to me at this point in time to be the responsibility of the Assembly to put together the necessary apparatus to determine the viability of division, as I said earlier the positive and negative aspects. So, to answer your question I would say that it seems that the Assembly has taken this problem by the horns and I would say it is the responsibility...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I think we have lost the translating system here again. Excuse me.

THE INTERPRETER: Hold on a minute.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): It is back on.

THE INTERPRETER: Okay, go ahead.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I am sorry, Mr. Ballantyne.

Prime Responsibility Lies With Legislature

MR. BALLANTYNE: If I could add to that, Mr. MacQuarrie, at the moment it seems that really the only organization in the Northwest Territories, or the only institution that is representative of all the peoples of the Northwest Territories is the Legislative Assembly. It would seem to me that that organization should have the prime responsibility with input from native groups, the Government of the Northwest Territories, or whatever group or individuals it deems necessary, in order to gather the information necessary to determine the viability of division.

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

MR. MacQUARRIE: I could agree in a sense that the kind of institution such as this Assembly may have an obligation to provide the kind of information which may seem to be necessary for people to make a decision, but when I asked who is to determine ultimately whether the territory would be viable, I could not agree then that it should be this Assembly.

MR. CURLEY: Ottawa.

MR. MacQUARRIE: I am reminded of a time when Premier Castro in Cuba was challenged by those who felt he had made a wrong move in displacing the Americans and American influence, because these people pointed to him and said, "Aha, your standard of living is much lower than it was." Castro's reply was, "It may be bitter wine that we drink but it is wine that we have made ourselves." And to him that was of utmost importance.

MR. CURLEY: Was he a communist?

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, he is, as a matter of fact, and I do not think he is ashamed of that. So, it appears to me that finally it is those people who are considering taking that step who have to decide. You may point out to them that the territory may be weak, it may not be as large as they think it is going to be, it may not have the jurisdictions that they think it is going to have, but once that is pointed out, it seems to me at any rate, it is up to the people who want to take this step to decide whether they should take it or not and not someone else. That is what I mean by who is to determine whether it is viable, finally.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. Is there a question there, Mr. Ballantyne?

Dissemination Of Information

MR. BALLANTYNE: Mr. MacQuarrie, I did not take your question far enough. I was referring to the responsibility of the Legislative Assembly to develop the apparatus to disseminate the information. Obviously and ultimately the people involved ought to make a decision but the problem I have at this particular time is one I think that will take more thought on my behalf and probably for many others. It is the same problem that was evident when Quebec wanted to leave confederation; there was some debate at that time about whether only the people in Quebec should vote in the referendum or should the people of Canada be allowed to vote in the referendum. We all know the end result of that because the referendum was turned down, but there was a chance that there might have been a subsequent referendum in the rest of Canada. It is a tough question. The way I see it, at this particular point in time I say I will need more reflection before I can come up with a definitive answer, but it is probable that the people affected in the East should vote in a referendum but only if the people in the West, through other mechanisms, have full opportunity to make their views known. Until I can actually see those mechanisms I cannot wholeheartedly at this point support the concept of a referendum only in the East.

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

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, as you outlined it, I can agree to that kind of approach as well. One other statement you made is that the rationale for believing that continued association, that is a unified territory, will not work, has to be brought forward. In a sense you are putting the onus on people who want to change this situation to demonstrate and prove why it ought to be changed. I think in that there is an assumption that the situation that presently exists is the one that ought to exist, that the relationship that exists now is in the nature of a planned and voluntary contract. Of course if that were true, then I could agree that people who want to change that must be called on to show cause as to why it ought to be changed or altered.

Relationship Is Involuntary And Unplanned

However, I cannot agree that the same thing necessarily exists for what might be called random associations. In other words, if a relationship exists that is involuntary and unplanned -- and in my opinion that is essentially the kind of relationship that exists among the peoples of the Northwest Territories at the present time -- if that situation exists, then if there is a significant group within the larger area with readily identifiable characteristics who decide that a separate territory is viable, if they are generally agreed that that is the case, then why should not someone else show cause as to why they should not be free?

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

MR. BALLANTYNE: I do not think I said that the people in the Eastern Arctic, that it is their responsibility to show cause. As I understand it, one of your recommendations would be some form of objective group who would study the whole question of division and make objective recommendations back to the Assembly. I agree with you that it is very difficult for the people most affected to be constantly asked to prove that it is not working when in their own feeling it just is not working. I agree with you on that but I am saying that if that recommendation which the unity committee has put forward, that perhaps if there is such a thing as an objective group in the Northwest Territories, which I do not know -- perhaps we could come up with some comments on that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. One more supplementary?

HON. DON STEWART: A point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Stewart, on a point of order.

Discussion Is Personal Viewpoint

HON. DON STEWART: This discussion is very interesting but the witness is representing the Association of Municipalities. He has presented his paper and has represented that the municipalities have not taken a stand, so all we are really getting is not the feelings of the association, we are getting his personal viewpoint. I do not see that we are gaining anything by this. The Association of Municipalities has given us their position. Certainly the comments are fine but we can waste all afternoon, and I suggest to you that all we are getting is Mr. Ballantyne's conclusions and not the association's conclusions because they have not had time to study the question.

---Applause

If that is what you want that is fine but that is not what we want and I think we are wasting our time.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): A point well taken.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: A point of order. Mr. Chairman, I think the question, or the concern is very well taken but it seems we have invited people to appear before us and give us the best thoughts they have. It would seem that we are now entering into a debate with each of the witnesses that appear or who have come to discuss these matters with us. I suggest we should ask questions clarifying points they have made but leave it at that, then leave the debate until the witnesses have completed their presentations and we can get down to examining the question ourselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. MACQUARRIE: I suppose in the nature of a point of order, I would suggest that witnesses, in that case, should only make statements on which they would agree to be challenged because I feel that I am in no position to sit here and enable someone else to make statements and yet I am not supposed to respond. I could not accept that situation, but I can accept the general point of Mr. Stewart. So let us hope the witnesses would only make statements on which they would be ready to be questioned.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. There being no further questions for the witness -- Mr. Appaqaq.

Delay Is Costly In Loss Of Work

MR. APPAQAQ: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Ballantyne has given us an expression and has answered some questions but I do not like his answers. Some of the things he has stated I am not in support of, especially on the proposal of Nunavut, because he wants to wait. At the beginning when the ITC were here as witnesses, I heard them say they were getting tired of waiting for it to get going. We are exactly in the same position as ITC, but I thought I understood that this was just the opening, what the ITC suggested for the business of the splitting of the Northwest Territories. It should be agreed to in general and it will be worked on later on. I heard them say they would be consulting with the people as to whether they were in favour of the splitting of the Northwest Territories or not. I believe after the agreement, this agreement on the splitting of the Northwest Territories -- I think that should be done first and then everything would go according to the plans. I think you are thinking that the government feels that if there is to be a splitting of the Northwest Territories that the territorial government figures they will not have any jobs in the North but that is not the way it is.

I feel that if they defer it again -- I feel I want this done before the end of my lifetime. If this talk is going to be deferred there will be millions of dollars lost in work when it could have been used resourcefully. I have no questions of Mr. Ballantyne but that is the statement I wanted to make. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

---Applause

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Appaqaq. We will be discussing the unity report in detail and have a chance to make comments. Maybe we should just get on with the other two speakers that we have. Then we can discuss and comment on the unity report whenever we are through with the witnesses. So if there are no further questions for Mr. Ballantyne, I suggest if it is the wish of the House that you continue with the other two speakers. Mr. Curley, did you have a question or a comment?

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to be given the same opportunity as the hon. Members from the West have had given to question this honourable gentleman from Yellowknife.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Proceed, Mr. Curley.

Political Ability Has Developed In Communities

MR. CURLEY: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Mike Ballantyne's concern seems to be let us not rush, let us not make the decision too hastily. You have to realize that those of us who have been struggling very hard in the Eastern Arctic have waited a long, long time. For the last 12 or 15 years we have been struggling to develop the political abilities of the communities in this area, as well as the Keewatin and Central Arctic, to the position that we can bring them to this House today.

I think you should recognize the fact that you have not commented on the clear division immediately that exists in this House, the West versus the East. This is a significant sign that we can no longer associate with each other and I am not speaking of the ethnic line. The thing is I am speaking about the fact that we have no real working ability, and I think the hon. Member from Yellowknife South would agree with that, a mutual respect that we cannot agree on many of the things in terms of the East and West relationship. I am not suggesting this at all. I have never used that word at all. This is the first time I am using it but the question today is, should the East decide for itself in terms of division. You seem to be saying to me that the western part, the Western Arctic should also take part in terms of the division of the Territories. My question is: Would you want us to see anything blocking progress in terms of constitutional development in the Western Arctic, do you want provincial powers in the Western Arctic or want to remain and continue to remain with the status quo? I do not think you are going to get the support of the Eastern Arctic Members. So how then could you justify the position that can be made with all the people throughout the Territories? I would like you to explain that a little bit.

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

East And West Still Very Much Tied Together

MR. BALLANTYNE: Yes. I think Mr. Curley and I have a different way of proceeding. Mr. Curley I guess already has made the split in his mind between the East and West. I see the existing reality today is the Territories is not split and what I see is not two separate entities. I see something significant happening in the East that has dramatic impact in the West so I do not see how it is possible to make decisions in one part without recognizing that you totally change everything in the other part at the same time. So what I am saying is that in order to proceed in a logical, reasonable manner I would say we all have to be part of this, to minimize the bad effects that division could possibly have and to look at positive aspects of continuing working together if we do decide to divide. I think Mr. Curley has made up his mind. I say "I" at this point -- that is not quite true. I am not speaking just of myself now. I am saying, people in the Western Arctic. I think in Mr. Nickerson's little pamphlet it was half and half. I say we should be careful not to make that separation too soon because, as I said, we are still very much tied together and movement on one side affects the other side and there is really at this point no way around that then unless we are very careful.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. Any further questions? Hon. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, just briefly, I do not have a copy of the presentation made by the Northwest Territories Association of Municipalities, but did I understand the vice president to say this morning that the association saw division of the Territories as inevitable? Was that statement part of its presentation?

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

MR. BALLANTYNE: I think the exact quotation is, "perhaps inevitable". It might seem like a nice safe way of putting it, "perhaps inevitable". At this particular period of time it seems there is a feeling of many people for both reasons of administrative -- for reasons of I guess a different concept of how people want to go, that perhaps it could be inevitable. I really do not know. You know, in the long term I could be talking five to 50 years. I do not know, but there may be logical reasons why somewhere along the line because of the vast areas we are talking about that it might be divided, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. Supplementary, Hon. Mr. Butters.

Discussion By City Of Yellowknife Officials

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Supplementary. Do I also understand that the city of Yellowknife of which Mayor Ballantyne is the senior official has never discussed formally or in committee the question of division?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. Mr. Butters. Mr. Ballantyne.

MR. BALLANTYNE: That is correct. Until this time when all things are coming together it has not been discussed. Now that it is being debated here in the Legislative Assembly it will be, but up to this time it has not been discussed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. I am sorry, Mr. Curley. I wonder if you are through with questioning the witness. I thought you had your hand up. Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I asked for the same opportunity the Members from the West had. My question, another question I have is, Mr. Ballantyne, you have no problem in dealing with the Government of the Northwest Territories. You can just walk down the street to any departmental head that you want to meet and you have access to every Minister of the Executive Committee running a department. So I can see, I can understand today the fact that there is no need to rush. You have no problems. Your city council has an urgent request that has something to do with the Local Government department, so you can just send down a delegation or pick up a phone and not have to spend any money speaking to the Minister responsible for Local Government. Or when you have a direct matter related to economic matters of the local city of Yellowknife you can just phone your friends here, your good friend George Braden, have lunch with him or something and try to come to an agreement with him.

Then with respect to the educational problems of the local Yellowknife school board or something like that, if they have a major problem you can just ask Mr. Butters for supper and invite him during that hour to deal with the problems the students are facing in Yellowknife. Then another major problem might be related to the Housing Corporation so you can just ask the hon. Member from Fort Smith, Mr. Arnold McCallum, for an evening chat in your house to deal with those kinds of things. So I can understand that. Then when you deal with the matter of a major financial problem with the city of Yellowknife, you can make an appointment the next day with the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories and go to his office and try and maybe settle the financial arrangements which you and your city council have been negotiating.

No Direct Access To Government.

So I can understand, Mr. Ballantyne, that you are telling us there is no need to rush. Everything is not that bad. Let us calm down a little bit. But I want you to understand, Mr. Ballantyne, we do not have that kind of access. I, as a Member of the Legislative Assembly, do not even have direct access to the Minister and the convenience that you have. So what you are telling me and what you are trying to say to me is, do not rush because you are rushing too quickly. It is really very inappropriate and does not at all respect the real situation in the East. So on that basis I would suggest to you the fact that we may be rushing into making a decision is really not the correct one. I think you should really seriously consider the difficulty that we have in even getting the kind of services the government is supposed to provide to us in this part of the area. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Curley. Could we hold our comments for later and then ask questions? In this way we might get through today. Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have asked for the same opportunities as the other Members of the Western Arctic have had in dealing with the honourable gentleman. I would like to be treated as such.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Curley. I think most Members asked a question and we will get a chance to comment on these presentations after we are through with the witnesses. Then we can comment on any of the witnesses or call them back if we have to ask them questions. Next on the list is Mr. Butters.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, a point of privilege.

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

MR. CURLEY: I asked a question, I asked the honourable gentleman whether or not he in fact has difficulty -- or was I wrong in suggesting that he had no difficulty -- gaining access to the Ministers responsible for certain departments. I think he should have an opportunity to respond to that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you.

MR. SIBBESTON: A point of privilege, sir.

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

MR. SIBBESTON: On a point of privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): State your point of privilege.

MR. SIBBESTON: My point of privilege is that Mr. Curley is not dealing with the witness. The witness is a representative of the Association of Municipalities and it appears his questioning is getting into the area of Mr. Ballantyne's personal behaviour in such manner as whether he had dinner with Mr. Braden in Yellowknife. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a motion which would be to thank Mr. Ballantyne for his presence and get the Dene Nation and Metis Association as witnesses before us here today. I should say further that members of the Metis Association and Dene Nation have been here since Tuesday and they now wish to make their presentation. Time is running out. I think in all fairness and courtesy to them we ought to ask them to come forward now.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. Is that a motion, did you say it was a motion?

MR. SIBBESTON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): To the motion. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: He rose on a point of personal privilege and you should rule as to whether he had one or not. It is my opinion that he did not but I would leave that judgment to yourself. I do not think he had the floor to make a motion, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): A point well taken Mr. MacQuarrie. Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. I think the Member had a point of order when he rose on a point of order not a point of privilege. I would urge Members that if they are going to ask questions of the witness they direct questions to the witness and at this time I cannot accept the motion as it was a point of order. If there are any further questions of the witness I have a list of names here I am going to have to deal with prior to recognizing other Members. I have your names down here. What are the hands up for now, Mr. Curley? Is it a point of order or a point of privilege?

Point Of Privilege Restated

MR. CURLEY: My point of privilege has not been dealt with. I asked the witness here, recognizing him as the mayor of the city of Yellowknife, whether he in fact had difficulty gaining access to the Ministers responsible. That question has not been dealt with as yet. He is representing the municipality and I asked him if he, in fact, had any difficulty. I would like to be given the same privilege as the other Members have in being given an opportunity for this gentleman to answer the question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The question is if you have access to the Ministers. Do you care to respond?

MR. BALLANTYNE: Obviously there are certain advantages and disadvantages I might add to having the government right in our municipality. It is not always as easy as Mr. Curley may perceive. In fact, one of our major problems besides the fact that Mr. McCallum will not come over for dinner...

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: You are a terrible cook.

MR. BALLANTYNE: One of the major problems is that most of our Ministers seem to spend a lot of time in the Eastern Arctic.

---Laughter

MR. CURLEY: Newfoundland.

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

MR. BALLANTYNE: A further point. I would say one advantage that is open to Mr. Curley and to Members of the eastern caucus which is better than having access to a minister, they have an opportunity to become a minister if they so desire. There are two ministerial positions now open. Thank you.

---Laughter

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. I have Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: No, sir, I am finished with my questions.

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

MS. COURNOYEA: In respect to the suggestion made by Mr. Sibbeston I will not ask Yellowknife if they should not be involved in decision making because they have a vested interest in losing half their political budget for the East. So I will not ask my question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame!

---Applause

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

MR. SIBBESTON: Finally.

---Laughter

MR. CURLEY: Again.

Motion To Thank Witness And Move To Further Presentations On Unity, Carried

MR. SIBBESTON: I make a motion that we thank Mr. Ballantyne for his presentation and that we ask the Dene Nation and the Metis Association, if they still have patience with us to come forward and say a few words. I do not know, they might get mad.

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

MR. MacQUARRIE: It would be relevant to the motion in my opinion to first determine if anyone else has questions they would like to ask of Mr. Ballantyne.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame!

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Any further questions? Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: Come on get on with it for God's sake. We should have finished this long ago.

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

---Carried

Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne.

---Applause

Is it the wish then that we bring the Dene Nation and the Metis Association to the witness table?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Would the Sergeant-at-Arms see that the witnesses are seated at the witness table? I would like to welcome the witnesses. Frank T'Seleie, chief from Fort Good Hope representing the Dene Nation, and John T'Seleie from Fort Good Hope, of the Dene Nation, and George Tuccaro of the Metis Association.

---Applause

Which one of you wants to start off with the presentation?

MR. TUCCARO: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask I guess the permission of this Assembly if it is okay that I present the Metis Association's presentation, then the presentation from the Dene Nation could follow. Then we would both be agreeable to a question and answer period following the delivery of both presentations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): That is the way we have been treating all the other witnesses. You will both make your presentations and then it will be open for questioning to both sides, is that right?

MR. TUCCARO: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Is that agreed? Just a moment, Mr. Tuccaro, perhaps you heard me telling the other witnesses that you have to speak close to the mike and speak slow for the benefit of the interpreters. Carry on.

Presentation Of Metis Association

MR. TUCCARO: Ladies and gentlemen, my name is George Tuccaro and I speak to this Assembly on behalf of the Metis Association.

The Metis Association of the Northwest Territories is pleased to be given this opportunity to respond to the Report of the Special Committee on Unity and what we see is a step in the right direction. The past years the Metis Association has attempted to resolve many differences between its organization and territorial government. We were politely given answers that we will look into the matter, or we are looking at the problem seriously. We are happy to see that the Legislative Assembly has changed its attitude from the previous Assembly and is now doing more to co-operate with native organizations throughout the North to resolve northern political problems.

The Metis Association of the Northwest Territories along with other native associations welcome the change of attitude of the Legislative Assembly and their Executive Committee. Our association has had serious discussions with the Executive Committee on a number of important issues, one of which is the Norman Wells pipeline. We are pleased that we have been able to come to an understanding on such an issue. We recognize the adopted motions which offer your recognition of aboriginal rights and acknowledging that aboriginal rights settlements can have important implications for political and constitutional development. On page two of the unity report it says and I quote: "The leaders of native associations in the Northwest Territories, although they may have different objectives have this in common: They are dissatisfied with the political status quo."

Separation Weakened Both Groups

The Metis Association knows this all too well but they too have experience with separate developments for the Dene Nation. We recognize there were differences and as a result of those differences chose to go our own way. We learned that others with interests separate from those of the Metis Association and the Dene Nation could take advantage of our separation. To use us against of course the Dene and vice versa. What we lost sight of in separating was that we had much in common and more reasons to stay together than separate when we realized that separately both groups were weakened and unable to pursue common goals such as the settlement of aboriginal rights and claims without the help and support of the Dene.

Some people may say that this is all very well for the Metis and Dene to say, those people are related by blood, often share a common language, live in the same communities, and use the land together. We recognize this special relationship between the Metis and the Dene. What we believe all the aboriginal peoples of the Northwest Territories share is a set of common values, a special relationship to the land, a unique vulnerability in facing rapid social change and industrial development, prior to the settlement and implementation of aboriginal claims.

Because of our experience, we are concerned that a division of the Territories at this point in our common histories could well be taken advantage of by others who may try to emphasize our differences and exploit our separation to turn us

against each other for their own ends. This Assembly must not only discuss the real grievances that have turned the attention of all of us to the unfairness of governing the Nunavut territory from Yellowknife, but also must debate the potential disadvantage to all aboriginal people of total separation at this time.

This association endorses the general concept of the unity committee in doing away with these status quo governments in the Northwest Territories as being open to future changes. It is possible that the splitting of the North is inevitable. Generally speaking, Metis people have lived with the present structure of government. However, we do feel that major changes are needed to better reflect our needs and aspirations. Before the people of the Northwest Territories area asked to make the decision whether to stay together or no, this Legislative Assembly has the responsibility to explore and debate all reasonable alternatives to total separation. The Metis people do not at this time know what these alternatives are.

Resolution Of Issues Before Separation

We see the situation like that of a married couple that are not getting along. They may initially choose to sleep in separate beds and if they find that this too is not acceptable, then they may choose to sleep in separate rooms, but at the same time choose to maintain the household. Should they find that this arrangement is unacceptable, they then may choose total separation. I use this story, because it was told by the Premier René Levesque of Quebec to illustrate the evolution of the Quebec position on separation from the rest of Canada. However, our association believes that we should not consider separation until many of the issues which we are faced with as native people are resolved. We must use the majority position that we presently enjoy on this Legislative Assembly to our advantage.

We look to the Inuit Members to support us to achieve such goals in the West before you separate. The Metis Association and the Dene Nation are presently involved in a major struggle with the federal government over the Norman Wells oil pipeline. The federal government wants to build a pipeline on native lands and take northern resources without even settling our aboriginal rights. We look to this Legislative Assembly to support us in resolving the dispute with the federal government.

Also, we in the western part of the Northwest Territories foresee many great problems in achieving our goal of changing this government so it is satisfactory to the Dene and Metis people. There is presently a government which is firmly established which will be difficult to change. There are many non-native people in the West who do not want to see the present government changed. We will need the support of the Inuit people to make these changes.

We are also concerned about the boundary which the Nunavut proposal suggests. Definitely we do not agree that it should be the tree line. We will want to come to an agreement on this matter before we give the Nunavut proposal our final blessing or support. So, as you can see, there are many matters that must be resolved before we are able to consider separation. We should only consider separation after all of us -- native people in the West and those in the East -- are secure and have assured our successful futures.

Definition Of A Northerner

We would like to comment on each of the ten recommendations so that you are aware of how this association feels toward these specific findings. We feel that it is now time for all people of the Northwest Territories to once and for all determine the true meaning of a northerner. In past years we have had many varying definitions of this character and possibly through further debates and public forums we can achieve a consensus of what is a northerner. We as native people already know that we are northerners because we have roots from "time immemorial". Any uncertainty concerns non-native people who have come to the North to live. We believe that a definition of a northerner which includes residency in the North of five years is a good beginning. Past experience has indicated that many "others", as it pertained in that report to the

newcomer to the North, really had no intention of remaining in the North; their visits average only two or three years. Such people we also feel should not have the right to determine the fundamental shape of northern society.

We are in total agreement for the present geopolitical structure of the Northwest Territories, including the institutions and practices of government, to be an interim arrangement. We also are in agreement that this Assembly should make a strong commitment not to seek or impose on any community of people a type of government that is not wanted.

The Metis Association of the Northwest Territories has mixed feelings regarding the fourth recommendation, that this Assembly declare itself 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. It may be that such a division is inevitable, but as we stated, there are many things to be worked out before we go our separate ways. We in this day and age find ourselves moving too fast in the direction of change for the sake of change. We must be sure that when we move the clock ahead that we know what we are getting into. There is no doubt that many studies have been taken into account because of this. There were times in our history when we wished we could turn back the clock. Especially in the area of the signing of agreements hastily.

Referendum Should Concern All People Of N.W.T.

We already see a referendum being talked about. A referendum, if it is to be, should concern all people of the Northwest Territories for the reason that it will affect everyone in the North in the area of royalties derived from industry, the settlement of aboriginal rights and the political and constitutional development of the North. A referendum should not be held until all other avenues have been satisfactorily challenged, such as agreement of boundaries. Should a referendum become necessary, we agree that this Assembly make arrangements to conduct its own referendum should the federal government absolutely refuse to act.

We totally agree that the people of the Northwest Territories should receive information regarding the impact of division upon the Territories as a whole.

We agree with the findings of the special committee on unity that because of the small numbers of people in the Northwest Territories and because of the relative strength of the federal government with whom the North's people must deal in political and economic affairs, it is in the best interests of all native people at least in the Western Arctic, if not throughout the territory, to try to remain together at least until we have achieved a just and equitable aboriginal rights settlement. We feel that a split at this time would jeopardize this.

The Metis Association of the Northwest Territories is in agreement with the set-up of a constitutional development committee comprising of five members, including the Minister of aboriginal rights and constitutional development, and that the initiative in the area of political and constitutional development should be with the Assembly as a whole and not with its Executive Committee.

Association Must Work Together To Achieve Goals

The last recommendation has our endorsement regarding a delegation including native associations to deliver by hand to the Prime Minister, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and other federal officials, the recommendations approved and supported by the people of the Northwest Territories. Only now the native peoples of the Northwest Territories are on the threshold of gaining their rightful place in society of the Northwest Territories. In order to achieve our goals we must all work together as native associations.

A split of the Territories at this time would set back progress made to date. We feel that the concept of a separate territory known as "Nunavut" is inevitable, and we support the aspirations of the Inuit in seeking self-determination. However, we also feel that the split should occur at a time when it is most beneficial and agreeable to all people of the North.

In concluding, the president of the Metis Association, Mr. Jim Bourque, offers his apology to this Assembly for not being able to attend this important exercise. However, he fully supports a more meaningful and responsive government needed to achieve the goal of sound political and constitutional development in the Northwest Territories. Thank you. With that we would like to turn the mike over to the Dene Nation.

---Applause

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Tuccaro. They tell me that coffee is ready so we will take a 15 minute recess for coffee. Then we will come back.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The Chair recognizes a quorum. Have you another witness at the witness table?

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: Mr. Chairman, hon. Members of the Legislative Assembly, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Frank T'Seleie.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Have you another member you wish to bring to the table before you start? One of you is missing there. Here he comes. Sorry about that, Mr. T'Seleie, proceed with your presentation.

Presentation Of The Dene Nation

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: My name is Frank T'Seleie. I am the chief of the Fort Good Hope Dene Band and I am here today on behalf of the Dene Nation. Mr. Chairman, I would like to proceed in my own language for the presentation if you would allow me that liberty.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. T'Seleie. Proceed.

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: (Speaks in Slavey.)

At the outset it must be made clear to everyone that the Dene Nation regards the debate of the Report of the Special Committee on Unity as a matter of major significance to native people of the North. There are a number of reasons why we attach such importance to this matter. Partly it is due to the fact the native people, the Dene, the Metis and the Inuit, form a clear majority of the total population of the Northwest Territories. This is true of the West, as well as the East. Partly it is due to the fact that the Dene Nation has for a long time considered that the Western Arctic, the homeland of the Dene, should be a separate political jurisdiction which we call Denendeh, with the powers and the means to make and carry out political decisions based on the values and culture of the Dene. And partly it is due to the fact that the report of the unity committee fails to deal with the major issues confronting people in the North. The report, by focusing attention on Nunavut, fails to address the very real factors that have long been at work, in both the Eastern and Western Arctic, calling for the creation of two new political jurisdictions. This statement will deal with all these things, but first let us determine how we will conduct ourselves.

Southern Governments Are Poor Examples

From the very beginning, let us make up our minds not to copy the weak and pitiful example before us in southern Canada where the federal and provincial governments are tearing the country and their people apart on every issue that comes before them from the constitution to energy, to control of exports, to taxation and to practically everything that touches the lives of their people. Even though they are the ones who are colonizing us at present, and even though they are the ones attempting to plunder our resources and threatening the lives of our people, we cannot help but feel sorry for them and particularly sorry for the people they are supposed to represent. Those governments are a shameful spectacle putting on an embarrassing performance with the whole world watching. Perhaps, and we say this with a great deal of conviction, even though the report of the unity committee contains as many potentially divisive elements for people in the North as any of the issues facing governments in southern Canada, we will be able to resolve the issue in a manner that will set an example for those poor people to follow.

In stating the report of the unity committee contains potentially divisive elements, we do not want anyone to think that this is harmful and cannot, in fact, be very productive. Nor, do we think that we should not deal with things that can divide us. Practically anything of any consequence can be divisive. But, the Dene Nation believes, and has proven, together with the Metis Association, that those things that can divide and weaken us, if dealt with properly, can also serve to unite us and make everyone stronger.

Future Generations Will Judge The Native People Of Today

To describe this, it is necessary to go back to what was said at the beginning; that part of the reason for the significance of this report is the fact that native people form a majority of the population of the Northwest Territories. Because we have this majority, it is we, as native people, the Dene, the Metis and the Inuit, who will bear the major responsibility for the outcome, for the results whether they are good or bad. Since this is the case, it is we who have to deal with the hard, tough questions that are all wrapped up in this issue. Future generations will rightly place judgment on us, the native people, for the way we handle this matter. The results of our determinations will be felt by generations of our people long into the future and they must judge us, not the federal government, the territorial government or some other outside force for the positions they find themselves in many years from now. It is our hope that future generations will be able to look back on us with pride and dignity and say that we were able to make a leap from being foolish politicians seeking short-term opportunities to being wise statesmen building the foundation for a secure future for all native people. We are determined, so far as it is possible for us to do so, but in the distant future our people will be able to say that we, the present Dene, Metis and Inuit generation, were finally able to throw off the strangling yoke of colonialism and launch the long, hard struggle for self-determination; that we were able to conquer not just the physical aspects of colonialism, but the mental strait jacket that has enabled the colonizers to depend on us to rule ourselves in a way that serves their interests.

This can be done! In the past, Ottawa and the corporations were always able to play the Metis Association off against the Dene Nation. By these little divide and conquer games they were able to pit native people against native people until we finally got together and started to tell each other that we were being used; that while we are busy fighting each other, the oil companies, gas companies, mining companies, pipeline companies and all kinds of other corporations are stealing our resources right from under our noses; that while we cannot form a collective alliance to protect our aboriginal rights and negotiate a settlement, they already have a collective alliance working with Ottawa that enables the corporations and the federal government to trample all over us. In recognizing that we were being used against each other, we started to develop ways of overcoming the things that divided us.

Learning To Work Together

From this starting point the Dene Nation and the Metis Association began to work together and we are now busy developing an alliance that keeps getting stronger every time we tackle an issue that used to keep us apart. To this point we have not developed the same kind of alliance with the Inuit primarily because we have two historically different homelands, and, until now, the real meaning of a powerful, united force has not been as clear. Nor, have we really been able to forge an alliance with non-native northerners, although there are many indications that this is not only possible and desirable, but that it is beginning to develop.

What all of us have to recognize here is the reality that there are non-native northerners who want to live and work in this vast land along with us. It is not in our interests, or in theirs, to fight against each other. We should take the lead in extending our alliance to include these people. There is, after all, a great deal of room up here; we have vast resources if we use them wisely and there is no reason why we cannot live and work and develop this part of the world side by side. Our own history and experience has shown that the surest way to defeat our goal of using our resources wisely is to allow forces outside the North to control them. By controlling our resources the South controls us, native as well as non-native northerners. They are counting on us to hang on to our colonial past. This way with division between all northerners a settlement of aboriginal rights may be reached, but, the settlement will be an illusion because the power will be in the South and all northerners will become more dependent than ever while getting blamed for everything that goes wrong.

Territorial Government A Colonial Government

One way all northern people can make sure we all hang onto our colonial status is by failing to recognize the present Government of the Northwest Territories for not what it actually is, a truly colonial government. The report of the unity committee appears to recognize this since it describes how the present territorial government came into being without anyone in the North demanding what we now have, much less having any say in it. The truth is that Ottawa established the original regime up here and made changes that they wanted to make in exactly the same manner, and for the same reasons, as the old British colonial office used to govern her colonies around the world.

Because of this, the Dene Nation has never recognized the present territorial government as our government. We have participated in it because we feel it can assist us in bringing about the kind of changes we require. These changes are designed to provide the Dene with the power and the means to fulfil our legitimate nationalist goals. Furthermore, the changes we seek will protect the rights of non-native northerners who choose to live and work and make their homes in the North. We are not selfish; we are a sharing people but we are not fools either and will not allow the aims of the aboriginal nationalist movement to be blocked by non-natives. In addition, we do not think our non-native neighbours want to be used by colonial forces for this purpose.

By the same token, we do not intend to be used to block the very legitimate nationalist aims of the Inuit. We know that the Inuit require their own government for their own nationalist goals just as much as the Dene. The Dene and the Inuit both have aboriginal rights; we both have national goals; and we both require our own forms of government to realize these things. Our only concern in this regard is that both the Dene and the Inuit have the power we will need so that we do not wind up with a government that cannot govern. This is what we already have in the present set-up and we certainly do not want it for ourselves.

Transfer Of Control The Real Issue

This brings us to another reason why the Dene Nation feels the report and the debate on it is of such significance, namely, that we decided several years ago that there should be a separate political jurisdiction in the Western Arctic. However, we soon recognized that Denendeh would be meaningless, in fact it would be harmful, without the powers and the means to enact and implement political decisions. What good would it do us to have a government that had no regulatory powers, no planning authority and no means of implementing plans even if we did have the authority? All we would be able to do would be to have a northern native debating society and possibly decide on little things like who we would give the garbage contracts to. So we would have the power to decide on garbage contracts while Ottawa decided whether to give our oil to Esso or Dome; we would

have the power to decide on road maintenance contracts while Ottawa decided whether to give our mineral deposits to Cominco or Noranda; and we would have the power to decide on where our cemeteries should be located while people all over the world talked about the high alcoholism and suicide rate of native people in the North.

What we, in the Dene Nation, are talking about here is, of course, control. The real issue for everyone in the North is not a simple matter of dividing the Territories. The real issue that is before us is the transfer of control from the South to the North whether we create one, two, or half a dozen separate political jurisdictions. Let us get this one basic fact through our heads before we go any further. Power does not exist in a vacuum. It always rests someplace and those who have it do not give it up easily. The power we need is presently held in the hands of the federal government in Ottawa. They know something that it seems we have to learn. What Ottawa knows is that if we can keep the North divided, if they can continue to pit one group against the other, they will be able to reach a settlement with all native groups without transferring any real power and authority. The importance of this cannot be overstated. Unless the entire North is able to come together and unite to force the federal government to transfer the powers that are required to escape the bonds of colonialism no group will get any of these powers for itself. Our choice is to fight together or hang separately!

Deeply Rooted Nationalist Movements

This gets us to the third reason for the Dene Nation's concern about this debate. By focusing so much of its attention on Nunavut the report fails to address the long-standing factors that work, in both the Eastern and Western Arctic, calling for the creation of two new political jurisdictions. By failing to address these factors and by focusing so narrowly on Nunavut, the report not only ignores major issues like the transfer of power and control but does not even consider the things that can be done with existing powers and the things we should be striving for immediately. Let us just glance at a few of these factors and place them in their proper context in order to make this point very clear.

It has been stated many times the Western Arctic is the traditional homeland of the descendants of the Dene and some Inuit, while the Eastern Arctic is the traditional homeland of the Inuit. We all have at least one thing in common, we are aboriginal people. Again, as has been stated, the creation of Denendeh has been the subject of a long discussion in the West just as Nunavut has been in the East. What matters here is the fact that Denendeh and Nunavut cannot be treated as recent, newly adopted notions. Both are the result of deeply rooted nationalist movements.

A very hard lesson of history, one that those in power seldom learn, is that nationalist movements do not grow out of thin air; they are not imported from the outside like a bag of flour, and they simply cannot be crushed and will not wither away. The reason for this is that nationalist movements are really a peoples' fight for survival. Unless this is recognized and dealt with properly it is easy to reduce the motivation behind nationalism to a desire to simply get a bigger piece of the action rather than determining what the action is.

Approached in this way the entire question of mining, for example, can be dealt with by making deals to get jobs for native people in the mines without even considering the larger issues such as who will control, who will benefit, how will operations be conducted, and whether or not a certain mine or mines should even be opened. The point is, for those who are not struggling for their survival these issues may not be all that important, but for those who are struggling for their survival as a people they are life and death matters.

Dene And Inuit Must Be Treated Equally

The deeply ingrained strength of a nationalist movement is due to the well known fact that the North consisted of two founding aboriginal peoples long before the coming of the Europeans. The Dene and the Inuit never did use the same territory. There always was a spiritual and cultural division which resulted in occupying and using different homelands. Colonialism is a comparatively recent thing in both our histories and has failed in its attempt to take away our respective national identities, our cultures and our values. By focusing so steadfastly on Nunavut the report glosses over this historical reality consequently perpetuating a characteristic of colonialism, namely paying some attention to the wishes of one native group without dealing with the rights of either. The result of this, if native groups allow it to happen, is to divide and rule all native people. The main factor at work here is that the Dene in the West and the Inuit in the East must insist that both be recognized, that our rights be recognized, and that we be treated equally as aboriginal people even though we are different nations.

Other things the report totally ignores because, we assume, of its focus on Nunavut, simply cannot be allowed to slide by without some comment. If there is to be a division, what happens to the present civil service? Do they all remain mainly in Yellowknife all serving the Western Arctic or do some of them go to the East? Surely with the governments as the largest single employer in the Northwest Territories we should at least expect the report to provide that kind of information that would give people some idea of the alternatives in this area.

In another area there should be some information about what a government in the East and a government in the West could expect to do regarding matters like available powers, whether additional powers can be obtained before division and, if so, what kind of powers? We should have an idea of available revenues and controls on those revenues. What is required in order to carry out existing programs plus the transfer of additional programs that are needed?

In short, recommendation seven on page 11 of the report pertaining to the impact of division should have been conducted in advance of preparing any recommendations. For the committee to recommend that steps be taken to prepare for division prior to studying the impact of division simply boggles our minds. It is like deciding that you are going to do something without having any idea at all of the consequences. The reason we, in the Dene Nation, are concerned about this is that we adopted the concept of Denendeh only after a lot of detailed work had gone into gathering the information required. Even then we have not pressed the issue because we still have a tremendous amount of work to do before the right decisions can be made. Our people have not spent all these years in a nationalist struggle only to get caught in a trap we have set for ourselves.

Establishment Of A Unity Committee Could Become An Escape Hatch

Aside from the report itself, we must take into account the things that the government responsible for the special committee on unity is doing in related areas. It is important to do this simply because if we focus all our attention on the unity committee's report we will not be pushing the present government to do the things it can do but is not doing. Establishing a unity committee could easily become an escape hatch whereby the present government exercises very little of its existing authority and people get lulled into the idea that we are waiting for something to happen some time in the future because we are all busy talking about the unity report.

This is known as getting steered off in the wrong direction and the Dene Nation knows this is happening already. Furthermore, we are prepared to give specific illustrations. Keeping in mind that everyone knows that the powers of the territorial government are limited, legislative powers are severely restricted, there is no means at their disposal to use normal regulatory and control measures to govern resource activities and the power to tax resource revenues is non-existent. Besides that, the formal direct link with Ottawa is through the Commissioner who is an appointee of the federal government and there is no mechanism at all for dealing with the provinces. In short, we are, in every sense of the word, a colony.

That is the dark side but the bright side is that Members of the territorial government have been elected by the people of the Northwest Territories and it is their job to represent us. We, in the Dene Nation, believe this can only be done by the government taking the lead in forcing our way out of colonialism. This is the direction we want to steer the territorial government into taking.

Executive Members At Constitutional Conference

One specific illustration is the conduct of the territorial government to date on the constitutional debate. Members of the Executive Committee allowed themselves to be treated as though they did not exist at the constitutional conference last spring, all during the federal-provincial talks this summer and at the constitutional conference this fall. It was your job, as the elected representatives of the people of the Northwest Territories to stand up and shout to the whole world that we refuse to be treated in this fashion; that it is an insult to say we will be represented by a department of the federal government; that you have a moral and political obligation to represent our people at these talks and that you will take the lead in ensuring that the provisions of any new constitutional arrangements made without our representation simply will not apply in the Northwest Territories. To take any less a stand is to signify that we do not really mind being colonized.

Even though the territorial government does not have direct regulatory control over resource developments you do have tools and mechanisms you can use to force companies to respect our integrity and, in doing so, will force Ottawa to start handing over control. Whenever a mine or oilfield opens up or whenever someone builds a pipeline they demand things from this government and it is within your power to say, "No". When they want roads, schools, water systems and other infrastructure required for any large operation you can say, "No". You can say and should say, "We refuse to be used as a token instrument for our own colonization." When they want land use permits required for petroleum or mineral exploration activities you should refuse them on the grounds that to the extent they are granted, these things take away from future potential income and will not be considered until such time as we have the control required in the North rather than in Ottawa.

Control Must Come With Development

This is the reason why the Dene Nation has taken the stand it has in opposition to the pipeline and oilfield expansion at Norman Wells and similar types of large scale development projects. It has nothing to do with being against development. Anyone who has been listening to what we have been saying knows perfectly well that we are not against development and, if anything, we are actually pushing hard for development. But tied into our pro-development stance is the fact that we know that if developments are going to benefit us it is absolutely essential that we have control.

The benefits of development go to those who exercise control and everyone else is left to pick up the pieces. It is really very simple. Imperial Oil knows this; the federal and provincial governments know this; and the Dene Nation knows it and is willing to fight for control as an absolutely essential element in our long-term nationalist struggle. Much to our disappointment we have had to drag the territorial government along kicking and screaming like a reluctant child into this fight.

---Applause

Certainly the Executive Committee went to Ottawa with us and talked to the Minister about the matter. Certainly they were part of drawing up five points as prior conditions to agreeing to the pipeline and certainly the spokesman for the Executive Committee testified against the pipeline at the EARP and National Energy Board hearings. But none of these things can be considered as providing strong, tough leadership against colonialism around this and related issues.

---Applause

No Development Until Aboriginal Rights Are Settled

What this government should have been doing, and can still do, is leading the anti-colonialist struggle by pursuing a deliberate policy of no development until aboriginal rights are settled and control is transferred. The struggle can and must take the form of hard interventions opposing all applications, fighting issues in the courts, tough public statements and head-on confrontations with the federal government plus using every tool at their disposal to frustrate developers.

---Applause

This should be done to as large an extent as possible as a united body of elected representatives of northern people and those Members who refuse to support this stance should be publicly identified as supporters of colonial powers. Many of you might cringe at the prospect of this kind of a strategy. To those of you who are inclined to reject it we can only ask what other alternative do you have except to remain on your knees begging someone to hand over their power to you? The point here is that we have a choice as to whether we meekly accept the constraints imposed on us by our colonizers or seize the initiative and act in such a way that we will break the shackles. As far as the Dene Nation is concerned we did not participate in the last election to choose people willing to go along with rules imposed on us by our oppressors.

Two Paths To Follow

Beyond this, there are ways native organizations can work with the territorial government that will help to shift powers to the North as well as to create a basis for both Nunavut and Denendeh. The Dene Nation suggests there are two parallel paths to follow.

One path is in the area of making the present jurisdiction more relevant to the North as it now exists. There are many things that can be done in this respect. For example, there is no reason why many government departments located in the West cannot be shifted; not just to one central government enclave in the East either, but to the communities where they should be located. In the West, the Dene Nation is only too willing to sit down and plan the decentralization and transfer of government functions out to our communities. In addition, we should be working now on the question of borders to be ready for the time when the Territories are divided.

The other path to follow is to use the present Government of the Northwest Territories as an active instrument in bringing about the fairest possible settlement of aboriginal rights along with transferring powers to the North. For example, the territorial government should be pushing for control of forestry, something we have already initiated and then transferring this control to the communities through the Dene Nation. We should be working together on a comprehensive economic development plan in both the East and the West. As a matter of fact, the Dene Nation made a clear detailed proposal to this government regarding this very matter nearly six weeks ago and, to date, it has not had a response.

The list could go on but the point should, by now, have been made. The Dene Nation is definitely not arguing for maintaining the status quo. What we are saying is that change is needed but we need to make decisions on these changes in a way that will enable us to deal with the causes of our problems instead of just the symptoms. In this case, it means that we have to concentrate, as northern people, on going out and actively seeking power and deciding how we are going to use it as a prerequisite to dividing ourselves. Beyond this, we insist there are things that we can do and should be doing with the territorial government. The things, while they will not solve all our problems, have the potential of bringing us closer to our goals.

Finally, the Dene Nation wants to make it very clear that we feel it is time the people in the East placed at least two Members on the Executive Committee. Doing so will make us all stronger initially and this, in turn, will hasten making both Nunavut and Denendeh a long cherished reality that will be able to do what so many of us have wanted for so long. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

---Applause

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. T'Seleie. I just wondered if on page three, paragraph five, that was left out when you read the presentation. Was there a reason for leaving it out or did you just maybe miss it? That is for the record. I was just wondering if it was overlooked or was there a reason to leave it out or do you want to read it into the record?

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: I think we are prepared to take questions now, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Thank you, Mr. T'Seleie for your presentation and we are open for Members to ask questions of the witnesses. Mr. Sibbeston.

Support For Denendeh

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank the members of the Dene Nation and also the Metis Association for giving an excellent presentation. I am sure that the views so expressed will have a major influence on the people who are on this Assembly, particularly the people of the Eastern Arctic. If it has made you consider some of the things that are brought out by the Dene and Metis people I guess we will have made some progress in understanding one another between the West and the East. I want to ask Mr. T'Seleie, I take it Mr. T'Seleie, you are the chief of the Fort Good Hope Band Council, and you talked today about your hope or aspirations for a government in the western part of the North and you called it Denendeh. How much support do you think there is for Denendeh in your part of the North?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: The idea has been discussed for a long time and we are not locked into one proposal in Denendeh, but open to other kinds of proposals. As far as support is concerned, there is a lot of support for the idea of Denendeh, not only in the North but also in the South.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. T'Seleie. Does that answer your question, Mr. Sibbeston?

MR. SIBBESTON: It does give me an idea of the extent of support. Another question that I have is that one of the major aspects of your talks was to say, in essence, that perhaps this Assembly or perhaps this territorial government is not doing enough in the struggle as it were for responsible government or control of the resources in the North. You talked about having to take the territorial government somewhat reluctantly into the whole discussion and debate about the control of resources in the North and you feel that this government should have been for instance at the constitutional conference in Ottawa. You are really taking a hard line and are really speaking loud and clear as you say for the whole world to hear. Is it your feeling that this Assembly and this government is not taking as tough a stand as they could possibly on behalf of the people of the North?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. Mr. T'Seleie.

Not Enough Support From The Legislative Assembly

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: My name is John T'Seleie. I am a member of the band council in Fort Good Hope. I think I could speak with some authority on the issues that affect communities, and I think when Nick Sibbeston refers to the territorial Assembly not doing all that it can to take control from Ottawa, there is one specific example that I can give on the Norman Wells pipeline issue. I think you all know that under the present arrangements that the Norman Wells pipeline is not in our interests to support and when the Assembly had its session in Baker Lake, the Member for Mackenzie Great Bear, Mr. Peter Fraser, abstained from the vote.

MR. SIBBESTON: Shame, shame!

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: A lot of people back home were not satisfied with that. If this government is going to have any kind of credibility, if it is going to be a responsible government, that type of thing has to change.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. T'Seleie. Are there any further questions? Are there any further questions of the witnesses? Mr. MacQuarrie.

ITC Being Used By Outside Organizations

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the report, the implication seems to be that if the ITC pressures very quickly for division that this would be damaging to the native cause generally in the Northwest Territories, and the implication is that anyone who either advocates or assists in that division would be damaging the cause of native peoples in the Northwest Territories. I am wondering then, is the report suggesting that in wanting division that the ITC is being used by some individual or organization or institution and, if so, who is that who is using them?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. Are any of the witnesses prepared to answer that?

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: I missed the question, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Would you repeat the question, Mr. MacQuarrie?

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes. The suggestion seems to be made, at least, as I read the report, that the ITC in wanting division is actually going to damage the development of native peoples in the Northwest Territories and it seems to me that there is an implication then that somebody is using the ITC in making them ask for this, or promoting it. If the Dene feel that is the case I would ask that they identify who that is.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: I am unclear as to what the question is.

MR. SIBBESTON: Forget it.

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: I do not think I have to answer that. However, the Dene do have discussions with ITC and it is an organization that represents the people in the Arctic, in the North, and I do not think it is an organization that allows itself to be used.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. T'Seleie. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Course Of Action To Be Taken

MR. MacQUARRIE: If I could ask another then, Mr. Chairman, because I see that I could be in the very difficult position of having accusations levelled trying to undermine things when that is not my intention at all. So I just want to be as clear as possible. What would the Dene Nation recommend then to this Assembly that we do with respect to ITC's very determined request for Nunavut? Is the Dene Nation suggesting that I as a Member should vote against that request? I see I am just unclear as to which way I ought to move because I could see myself being condemned as -- I do not know -- someone who is opposed to native interests, no matter which way I go and that is a no-win situation, so I would just like to clarify it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: The idea of the unity committee I think was a good one and I think it was a step in the right direction but I have some reservations about how the unity committee conducted its work. When we first heard about the unity committee we were pretty glad that something was being done here but I do not think that the unity committee talked to quite enough people and perhaps that is part of the reason for the confusion that is kind of hanging in the air today. I think one direction that some of us see would be a way to achieve some type of consensus is to start discussions on residency.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. T'Seleie. I do not think you answered the question. I am not sure. Mr. MacQuarrie, maybe you could ask the question again.

MR. MacQUARRIE: I feel I will accept that answer. I believe it does not answer the specific question that I asked, but I would like to go on to one more thing, if I may. The report of the Dene Nation seems to call very strongly for this government to take a lead in doing a number of things that would bring greater strength and greater benefits to the people of the North, and yet I am not sure that the Dene Nation recognizes fully the legitimacy of this government and so I am a little confused about that because I can see that the government would run the risk of doing things that it may be accused of having no right to do. So is the paper -- does it indicate a recognition of this government and the desire that this government takes a lead in those things?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: I think your first question, I should say that the Dene Nation agrees in principle to the rights of the Inuit to develop their national territory and their national government without outside interference.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. T'Seleie. Mr. Curley.

Dene Nation Supporting The Concept Of Two Separate Territories

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think he partly answered the question in the last part, but some time last year, September 13, 1979, on the Inuit CBC news, as the president of the Dene Nation did say the Dene Nation supports the concept of two separate provinces and I quote, "Each with strong native rights in the Northwest Territories". Georges Erasmus said the latest proposal from the Inuit Tapirisat is not a new idea but one that should be seriously considered by Ottawa. I want to ask you has Georges Erasmus who is still the president of the Dene Nation changed his position on that?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Curley. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: This idea of two separate territories has been in all the time, I think that we agreed to do it in principle and Mr. Erasmus' position I do not think has changed at all but it might be best directed at him, that question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. T'Seleie. Any further questions? Hon. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I have a question to Mr. Tuccaro, the representative of the Metis Association. Examining the presentation given by Mr. Tuccaro on behalf of the association, I note that and I have counted them, at least on seven occasions the Metis Association's brief expresses a concern about separation at this time. It says in one place, "This Legislative Assembly has responsibility to explore and debate all reasonable alternatives to total separation." As I say, there are about seven specific and particular references to the matter of division and a concern that a movement in that area at this time is one of haste. On page five of the presentation I have underlined the sentence: "There are many matters that must be resolved before we are able to consider separation." I wonder if the witness might give us some indication of what those many matters or a few of those many matters are.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thanks, Hon. Mr. Butters. Mr. Tuccaro.

Control Over Development Of Renewable Resources

MR. TUCCARO: Okay. I would like to point out to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the people at this gathering that I was asked to pass on the message from the president of the Metis Association, Mr. Jim Bourque, who unfortunately could not be here at this important exercise as I mentioned in my presentation. The question of the many matters that I am sure Mr. Bourque was thinking about when we put our presentation together are the matters before the Metis people at this time and that is of course the control of northern development, development of renewable and non-renewable resources in the Northwest Territories and the Norman Wells/Zama, Alberta pipeline and the National Energy Board was uppermost in his mind and that was the one matter that I am sure he was thinking about.

The other is, of course, the matter of boundary which, of course, has to -- I think that whole question has to be dealt with. I do not think the Metis Association is in a hurry to be able to deal with the question of boundaries when there are more significant happenings to the Metis people in the Western Arctic at this time.

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

Metis Association Concerned Over Division

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Yes, I think it does, but I just would ask the witness if I am correct in seeing in their presentation a very real concern of the Metis Association that division, a movement to division in the near future, would be resisted by the Metis Association and members of that body?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. Mr. Butters. Mr. Tuccaro.

MR. TUCCARO: I am sorry, Mr. Butters. Could you run that by me one more time?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, just to receive an indication from the witness that the concern which I drew to the attention of the committee, that is, the reference on at least seven occasions that the Metis Association was concerned about the question of division at this time remains a major concern of the association and one which they would probably continue to put forward and publicize.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. Mr. Butters. Mr. Tuccaro.

MR. TUCCARO: You would need Mr. Bourque to be able to discuss the whole matter at length. I think to spend a little more time with the Indian people to discuss the matter of separation and the problems that may be created because of separation.

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

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I must say I am very happy to hear from the Dene Nation and the Metis Association because ever since we have been talking about this issue since the Assembly first began to sit, people have been saying, "But what about the Dene Nation? Where are they going to fit into all this?" And I am glad you have been able to come here and tell us what you think. I am having some real problems, however, and I say this sincerely, understanding just what you feel we should do from here.

A Question Of Land Claims

Maybe I will just explain what I see as a fundamental problem. Mr. Tuccaro's presentation covered the importance of achieving a just and equitable aboriginal rights settlement and page eight says: "We should try to remain together at least until this happens." The Dene Nation presentation too calls on everyone to recognize that there is an aboriginal rights claim going on in all parts of the Northwest Territories involving the Inuit and the Dene people and we should remain supportive, we should support, both peoples should support each other. This is fine and I feel that no one from the eastern territory would disagree with that. In fact on the Norman Wells issue which Members from the East supported Mr. Sibbeston on, I think we felt guided by him and he in turn was expressing some of your concerns even though we did not really understand the issue or feel we had a right, a particular right to say what should happen. What I am getting around to is this. Another native organization has come to us at the same meeting and told us, "We too want support from this Assembly for our aboriginal rights negotiations," and what they told us is, "We are at a crucial stage in our negotiations. A key part of our whole negotiating position is the creation of a new territory. We want your support now."

Support From The East

I can feel some of the frustrations Mr. MacQuarrie stresses. If we do not support ITC now we will be letting them down and it seems that the Dene Nation feels that ITC should be asking for their own government, not just a weak territorial government, but their own government, but that is what ITC wants.

They feel that it is a modest proposal that will be accepted by the federal government and will lead to accelerated progress on settlement of land claims and yet the Metis presentation in particular says, "We have to wait to decide the division question until we have achieved land claims settlements." Well, ITC says, "Before we can even negotiate we want a commitment of this Assembly to division." So I guess the bottom line of it is this, that you would support the principle of division but you want at least in the near future support for many of your concerns and I think we are prepared to give that support, at least those of us from the East. I am not an Inuk. We are prepared to give you that support as long as we are part of this government. Hopefully that will not be very much longer though and I am asking you for your support in principle, are you prepared to give it now and are you prepared to see the Assembly make a decision in principle now and work out the details? I would agree with the Executive Committee participation from eastern Members during the life of this Assembly. Is that going too fast?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You are really asking a couple of things and where do we go from here? The Dene Nation is prepared to discuss things like the borders, many, many things that have to be worked out yet, and if we were to create a boundary, wherever that may be, I do not think there would be any problem recognizing the right of the Inuit and then the boundary in the West and we hope likewise it would be vice versa.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. T'Seleie. I do not know if the question has been answered. Mr. Patterson.

A Decision In Principle Should Be Made

MR. PATTERSON: I would like to know specifically, Mr. Chairman, if the representatives from the Metis Association and the Dene Nation feel that it would be acceptable to make a decision in principle, we can at least chart a course, a general direction. We do not know precisely where it will take us, we do not know where the border will be but I feel confident that there is enough land that that question can be worked out harmoniously and satisfactorily. It may take a couple of years, but can I take it that you would not be opposed to a decision in principle at this point in time for division, since the Dene Nation too wants a homeland of some kind and its own form of government at some point. Can we agree that the principle of division is inevitable and something we can at least decide on now?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: I think whatever motion is introduced, just in principle or with everything worked out in it, we would be concerned on the type of motion that is put forward because with Denendeh we are asking for just about exactly the same thing. On the question of the borders the Dene Nation are prepared to discuss it, and the overlapping claims in my part with COPE and I think we are ready to negotiate in a friendly way keeping certain principles in mind.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I think the question is are the Dene Nation in favour of a division of the Territories at this time, would they be in agreement with an agreement in principle and hold off with the boundaries for a later date? I think that is the question. Is that the question, Mr. Patterson?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: I think the Dene Nation is willing to go along with the division of the North in principle.

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

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, and in fact I am happy with that answer, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

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

Principle Of Division

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: The question I was going to ask has been answered but I think I would like to continue with the question Mr. Patterson went into and that is, is it then your position that the actual decision on division should be one not necessarily invited now but one which we should continue working on? The other thing is, if your position in principle, that the decision, or the principle decision should be adopted but not supporting one, whether it is the East or West.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Nerysoo. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: I am sorry, I did not understand the question.

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

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Is it your position in principle that you support the division of the Northwest Territories, however, is it further your principle that at this time that that position does not in fact support one, I guess territory, as to the two divided together? Can I put it that way, the creating of two territories?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: I would think that it would be up to some type of negotiation.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Is that the answer, Mr. T'Seleie?

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Nerysoo, are you happy with that answer?

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Just further to that, and in reply to a position on division, the principle of division was answered yes and I just wanted to know whether it was the position of the Dene Nation that at this time whether or not they had in fact chosen a name and those names were in fact as in your presentation, the names you are supporting at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. T'Seleie.

Equal Consideration Must Be Given

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: The major points in that part of the presentation has to do with some type of equal treatment. You know, not the thing that is good for the West, that is not necessarily good for the West but there has to be equality on both sides I think.

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: May I add for Richard Nerysoo that whatever motions that may come forward from this Assembly should not only address Nunavut but also Denendeh which is the proposal that the Dene Nation has been discussing for quite some time and I think that is what John is referring to, that it be given equal consideration by this Assembly.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. T'Seleie. The question is that the ITC gave notice of a motion today that they want this Assembly -- Mr. Patterson, perhaps if he could explain the motion, and I think that is what we are dealing with, the motion that ITC wanted division and I think the question was are you in support of it. Is that the question, Mr. Nerysoo?

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: No, actually the replies were okay.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Are there any further questions for the witnesses? Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: It has always been my understanding, and correct me if I am wrong, that the Dene Nation was behind COPE and the ITC in its negotiations with the federal government because the Dene Nation refused to separate the land claims from the political and constitutional claim in its land claim deliberations. COPE was prepared to negotiate land claims first and then move into, at some later time, political and constitutional talks. ITC appears to be willing to do that, to talk about political development separately from the land claims issue and while we agree that the two are very closely related it seems to me that what you are now saying is hold off ITC, hold off COPE until we reach the state you are at, and I wonder if that is fair. They have done their work, they have proceeded with their negotiations and now they are ready and willing to move forward and now suddenly the Dene Nation is saying slow down. Could you comment on that please?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Mr. T'Seleie.

Principles On Approaching The Question Of Division

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: The Dene Nation agreed in principle to the right of the Inuit to develop their own territory in their own homeland. However, there are some things that must still be looked at and worked out and I think that we have to start discussing laying down principles on how to approach the whole question of division.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. T'Seleie. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Are you as the Dene Nation now at a point where you are now willing to discuss land claims first and then some type of political and constitutional development second with the federal government?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: Could you repeat the question?

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

MRS. SORENSEN: Is the Dene Nation at the point now where it is willing to accept the aboriginal rights separately from government or political and constitutional development?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: No.

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

MRS. SORENSEN: The answer was no?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The answer was no.

A Longer Delay In Negotiations

MRS. SORENSEN: So, there is going to be longer delay with respect to negotiations than I had anticipated because it seems to me that that is what the federal government has been saying, that it is quite prepared to negotiate aboriginal

claims but that constitutional and political development must be discussed with all the people in the North. So, it seems to me that you are going to delay that discussion significantly if you are not prepared to agree to that fundamental principle and therefore, if you are asking ITC to wait for you to catch up to develop your claim to the point where you are ready to develop your government as well then we may be looking at a lengthy time.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: We are prepared to begin negotiations in certain areas. We have a clear understanding of what our provisions are. If you say it is going to take a long time I think it is too.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. T'Seleie. Mr. Nerysoo.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Just a couple of comments and I would like to ask some questions with regard to a number of issues. I think there has been an indication by members of the Dene Nation and the leaders of the Dene Nation that they are in fact preparing to go and negotiate, is that not true?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Nerysoo. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: Yes, it is.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Just further, is it not true that you have had difficulty the last three and a half years in fact in achieving funding for the organizations?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: Yes, there has been some difficulty.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. T'Seleie. Mr. Curley.

Need For Economic Opportunities

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, what we would like the Dene Nation to understand is ITC's position and that is after considering the possible areas that can be achieved in the near future, we have concluded, ITC has concluded, that it is not possible to gain political control for one ethnic group like the Inuit people, we cannot achieve that. So, on that basis, as a Canadian citizen, ITC is pushing ahead for the division of the Territories including all the other members of the public in that part of the Eastern Arctic.

So what we want you to understand is that at the same time they will be negotiating aboriginal rights issues because we need the economic opportunities, we need economic stimulus, we need progress that the people can run it, such as the preserving of culture, cultural programs as well as maybe some parts of the educational areas. These we can achieve and the federal government I believe is willing to sit down and negotiate. Native organizations themselves, Dene, COPE and ITC, all of them between them cannot make a final agreement because it is the federal government that is going to have to pay and we are going to have to do the negotiations on behalf of them. What I would like you to understand is that we believe the division issue -- I am not sure whether or not the Eastern Arctic would be able to continue its support for the West and that is where the possible problem is. If you do not support our position today, how can you expect us to support your position later? That is the thing that we can get into. We realize it is going to take maybe a couple of years to get the real mechanics of the division under way, but once this Assembly has made the decision, like John Amagoalik said yesterday, they would be quite prepared to give it to the government, give them the division issue and they will continue to deal with the aboriginal rights negotiations. So, do you not feel that if you ask us to delay the division of the Territories that you would lose support from the Eastern Arctic? Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Curley. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: I guess that would be up to negotiation.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. T'Seleie. Any further questions? Mr. Sibbeston.

Disadvantages Of The Dene People

MR. SIBBESTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will just say a few words in Slavey and then I will ask my question in English.

(Speaks in Slavey.)

Mr. Chairman, I just went over briefly in Slavey the position of the Dene Nation as outlined in the pages. It seems that the Dene people in our part of the North do aspire to have a territory which they are proposing to call Denendeh, which means land of the people and this paper I see as a plea, a request to the Inuit to consider some things before they rush off on their own. I guess the Dene people in some ways have had perhaps more and tougher experiences with the government. For the Dene people it seems like it is a tougher struggle to have self-determination. It is tougher because there are more white people in our area of the North so it is not just simply like the Inuit here where they are the large majority and are able to bring about their aspirations without too much resistance. In our part of the North for native people it is generally tough because we are at a great disadvantage and I pointed out how our representatives of the Dene Nation are perhaps at a bit of a disadvantage partly because their first language is Dene and they have to try to give answers and talk in English. That is the kind of disadvantage that Dene people have always had to put up with and so I wish people would understand that. It is not just that easy, you know, to deal with government and because oftentimes native people are not able to talk English very well, people are at a disadvantage. I also take the Dene Nation's position to be that the Inuit before they rush off ought to consider a number of issues they should get settled away first.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Curley, a point of privilege.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, we were advised today we should stick to the questions directed at the witnesses so that we would have an opportunity to debate the whole issue of the Report of the Special Committee on Unity and the hon. Member is going on debating the whole report already.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Curley. The point is well taken. Mr. Sibbeston, get to the question.

Dene Nation Position On Division

MR. SIBBESTON: I would just like to hear from the Dene Nation representatives again, their position. I take it you are not against the Inuit eventually setting up Nunavut, but are you saying that before they do they ought to really think of some things? What is your experience regarding control of natural resources and this sort of thing? Are you just saying to the Inuit people that they ought to get these things straightened out before they take off with their Nunavut territory?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. Are you asking a question or telling them?

MR. SIBBESTON: Asking a question. I do not appreciate your smart comments.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Get down to the question.

MR. SIBBESTON: You ought to get off the chair. It was a simple and straight question. My question to the Dene Nation reps here is are they saying that Inuit people ought to take a number of things into consideration before they rush off? Is that a question or not?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. To the question, Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: We are saying here we have nothing against the Inuit creating their own type of government. There are no problems there. However, we have a lot of things that have to be worked out, like I think when division occurs, the Dene Nation is willing to sit down with ITC and work out certain principles in approaching this whole thing.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. T'Seleie. Mr. Wah-Shee.

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The issue that we are dealing with at the present time is regarding the recommendations on the unity committee. One of the recommendations within the unity committee report specifically states that the creation of a new territory which will be called Nunavut, that the decision -- what it is is that we are going to be creating two territories and I guess this is what the committee report fails to indicate. I think the report indicates that Nunavut as a separate territory should be created, but I think the issue here is that we are creating two territories. I do not think anybody in this House will dispute that.

Dene Participation In The Creation Of Two Territories

Also within the recommendations that in creating these two territories the recommendations specifically state that only the Eastern Arctic communities should make that decision, that a referendum should be held and that the Inuit people and others residing within those communities should take a vote whether such a territory should be created. I do not think we dispute the fact that the legitimate concerns of the residents of those particular areas within those communities have legitimate aspirations. I think that the Dene Nation has indicated that they are in support of the Inuit people, that it is a legitimate concern and that it is not just yesterday that they came up with such a proposal. The idea of having a separate territory has been discussed for the last six years I believe or so. So the report recommends that a referendum be held and that only residents within those areas should make a decision in the creation of two separate territories. So my question is directed at Chief Frank T'Seleie. Do the Dene people, the Dene Nation, do the Dene people feel that in creating two territories you call the other one Denendeh, do the Dene people feel that they would like to participate in the creation of two territories? That is my question and also participate in making the decision of two separate territories?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. Mr. Wah-Shee. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: Oh, yes. Two territories being created would certainly -- we would want to be involved directly. How we do it is another thing, but there are things like the borders have to be discussed, overlapping areas, the

whole question of non-renewable resources, royalties and that kind of stuff has still got to be addressed in the overlapping areas. We are having a difficult time getting the Government of Canada to agree to get to the negotiating table and, for example, the federal government agrees in principle to the Dene having the right to a certain amount of land, even if we were to get an agreement to something like that in principle, then we can start working out the details. If two territories are created I think we should reserve the right to oppose any development that would hurt the Dene.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. T'Seleie. Hon. Mr. Butters.

Amount Of Time Needed To Achieve Division

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to the representatives of the Dene Nation, especially related to, I guess one would say, timing. I go to the presentation that was made by Chief Frank T'Seleie where on page five he says: "The real issue for everyone in the North is not a simple matter of dividing the territories. The real issue that is before us is the transfer of control from the South to the North whether we create one, two, or half a dozen separate political jurisdictions." I would like to just go over to page ten and I think this is a continuing reference, he continues on this page and says: "The Dene Nation is definitely not arguing for maintaining the status quo. What we are saying is that change is needed but we need to make decisions on these changes in a way that will enable us to deal with the causes of our problems instead of just the symptoms." This is the last part: "In this case, it means that we have to concentrate, as northern people, on going out and actively seeking power and deciding how we are going to use it as a prerequisite to dividing ourselves." So, how much time does Chief T'Seleie believe would be required to achieve that prerequisite of division which is the "going out and actively seeking power"?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Butters. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: I think the issue we are dealing with here is control and even if we were to create two territories it would not do any of us any good to have two territories that are powerless over the decisions that are made in Ottawa.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Butters, does that answer your question?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I guess I asked the witness how long they thought it may take to achieve that situation and that control but I realize it is probably a question no one can really answer.

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

Dene Nation Does Not Agree With The Inuit Strategy

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have just been trying, I have really been trying to understand what the particular concerns of the Dene Nation are, and I have put together a few references from the presentation. I note that your proposal on page four talks about "our own forms of government to realize these things, national goals", and further on, "Our only concern in this regard is that both the Dene and the Inuit have the power we will need so that we do not wind up with a government that cannot govern. This is what we already have in the present set-up..." that is the present territorial government, "...and we certainly do not want it for ourselves." There is one mention even of foolish politicians seeking short-term opportunities on page two. Then, on page six the unity committee report is criticized for paying some attention to the wishes of one native group without dealing with the rights of others and goes on to say "this will perpetuate a characteristic of colonialism."

I think what all these things considered together really mean is that the Dene Nation does not agree with the Inuit strategy of asking for a territorial form of government and instead is urging the ITC and the members beyond the tree line to consider going for more, going for power over resource development, going for the issue of transfer of control from south to north. I guess what I am saying is that, that those are really the issues you want us to take more time to address. It is really an issue of strategy is it not? The ITC and all Members of this House I am sure have all agreed that we must wrest control from the federal government and we must have provincial status and powers and perhaps more than that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Your question?

MR. PATTERSON: My question is the real point of issue between the Dene and the Inuit is how that route or goal is attained, and you are really in this presentation asking serious questions about the strategy of the people from beyond the tree line. Is not that really what we are talking about here?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Mr. T'Seleie.

Major Concerns Of People In Communities

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: Yes, I think that is what we are talking about. Mr. Chairman, if I could expand on that, you see I come from Fort Good Hope and I live there and over the last few years we have been working at getting more control over our lives, and there is a real movement there for people to gain more control of things like education, housing, and that is where people's major concerns are, in those areas. The majority of people are concerned about those types of things. I think that the big part of this debate that is going on today is a direct result of the work that we ourselves have done and it is going to be a while, the way I see it it is going to be a while before people are willing to deal with issues that seem to be far away.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. T'Seleie. Any further questions? Mr. Noah.

Motion To Thank Witnesses On Unity, Carried

MR. NOAH: (Translation) Mr. Chairman, I have a motion on the presentation. I would move that I would like to thank the Dene Nation and the Metis Association, to thank them and let them go as the report is self-explanatory. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Noah. If there are no further questions, we will thank the Dene Nation and the Metis Association for their presentation. Was that a motion, Mr. Noah?

MR. NOAH: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): We have a motion on the floor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

---Carried

Thank you very much and I thank you again.

---Applause

MR. MacQUARRIE: A point of privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): A point of privilege, Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: I waited until what I felt was the first opportunity afterward and that is that simply on page six of the submission it does say "By focusing so steadfastly on Nunavut the report glosses over this historical reality consequently perpetuating a characteristic of colonialism, namely, paying some attention to the wishes of one native group without dealing with the rights of either." And on two counts I appeal with respect to privilege, one that I sincerely feel that recommendations one, two, three, seven, nine and ten all have relevance to all native people in the Northwest Territories and that recommendation nine -- I think it is not just numbers that matter -- but recommendation nine does recommend means for Dene, Metis and non-natives to address all political questions without imposition of any kind. Also with respect to the matter of colonialism, I can only say that I sincerely do not feel that I am a conscious agent of colonialism. I cannot speak for other Members but I believe that other Members would feel that way as well.

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

MR. MacQUARRIE: A motion if I may.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Did you want to make a motion?

MR. MacQUARRIE: If I may, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Proceed.

Motion To Have ITC Witnesses On Unity Return

MR. MacQUARRIE: I would move that the ITC delegation be asked to return momentarily for perhaps a brief response and then one or two questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MS. COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman.

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

MS. COURNOYEA: I thought the House committee had already decided in what order these people were going to be placed and certainly if Mr. MacQuarrie wants to ask the ITC back and then others would have to be asked for an equal presentation as well, and I get a little tired of people reading the same thing off a piece of paper time and time again. I can read and we all read the report and the thing is we just keep going on and on. I appreciate the work but we have already made that decision according to Mr. McLaughlin on how these people will be dealt with.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms. Cournoyea. To the motion.
Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: I believe, and I am not sure but I believe that all delegations have appeared and I believe that it was part of the agreed upon rules that others could be called back later for comment if that was agreeable to the House. I am not saying that it ought to be done because I am saying it should be done, but I made a motion which will rely upon the majority of the House.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I have forgotten your name.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Smith.

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Not only do you not have any bounce but you keep forgetting names. Mr. McLaughlin is not here and I wonder if other Members of that steering committee could set not only Ms. Cournoyea but myself and maybe others straight as to what really is going on. Was there an arrangement made whereby these people or groups of people who were invited to address this House on constitutional matters, political matters and/or the unity committee report, whereby they were asked to come in a second time? Is there anybody within that group?

MR. MacQUARRIE: While they are searching if I may have a moment.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. MacQuarrie. The Clerk is having some difficulty here. Just one moment.

MR. MacQUARRIE: May I explain further?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. MacQuarrie, we are just having a problem with your motion here right now. Thank you. Mr. Curley, to the motion.

Permitting Witnesses To Reappear

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, as I recall we discussed briefly what the arrangement would be, the groups would desire to come back in again. We really did not set up a system where they would come back in again, we did not really establish guidelines, but what Mr. McLaughlin, as he discussed with me, what we did discuss with the ITC representatives was that if they had any concerns and questions with respect to other presentations that they would pass messages to appropriate Members or to their MLA's so they could ask questions on behalf of them. That was my understanding. The other point that I did indicate was that if the House, according to its rules permits them back in again that is permitted as far as I am concerned, as I understand it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): You are Member of committee, are you not, Mr. Curley?

MR. CURLEY: Yes, I am.

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

MR. MacQUARRIE: Is the motion in order?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The motion is in order.

MR. MacQUARRIE: If the Members are concerned about someone coming back to give a reply, I am not so concerned about that. It is just that Members of this House have been left in a situation where whatever they do now with respect to the question of division they will be damned if they do, and damned if they do not, and frankly as an individual I will be damned if I am going to be left in that situation. I would like the opportunity to ask ITC whether, in supporting them, I would be undermining the cause of native peoples in the Northwest Territories.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): To the motion. Mr. Patterson.

Opportunities Available To Other Witnesses

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, just very briefly I had expected or had thought we discussed the possibility of groups returning briefly. I think we have taken an awful lot of time and I agree with Ms. Cournoyea that we do not want lengthy submissions but we must remember that ITC when they appeared did not have the benefit of having heard the other submissions. I understand or am informed that they would be prepared to make brief comments now or on Monday. I would be very interested because I agree with Mr. MacQuarrie that there are some further questions we might have and, of course, the same opportunity should be made available to any of the other witnesses as well, providing it is brief so I will support the motion. I am not afraid of that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. If I might just read what the chairman said about the witnesses appearing on page 419: "Each party will have the opportunity to remain and hear the other presentations and will later have a 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." Those were the instructions we got from the chairman of the committee that was set up by the caucus. To the motion. Mr. Smith.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Turkey! Mr. Chairman, I submit then if that was the request made of the various individuals and/or groups, then I suggest you do not need the motion. I raise the question as to what was asked of these people, the witnesses. You have identified that. Surely now then you do not need a motion to ask them to come in. I sat as the Members have for three days in rapt attention and listened to the questioning and the positions put forward by the various people, the witnesses who came here. If in fact they had been asked, had been told they will be able to come back, I do not see the necessity to go through the motion. If you allow the motion, I will vote against it. I think we should go on and talk about the unity committee's report.

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

Motion To Extend Hours Of Sitting, Defeated.

MRS. SORENSEN: I move to extend the time beyond the usual sitting hours so that we can consider this further.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mrs. Sorensen, before I can accept your motion we have a motion on the floor. If the mover decides to withdraw that motion, we will deal with yours.

MRS. SORENSEN: It is out of order.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The motion is still there. Mrs. Sorensen made a motion now that we extend the sitting hours.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): It is not debatable.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): It is not debatable. Question. Do I hear question? The motion is that we extend the sitting hours. All in favour? Against? The motion is defeated.

---Defeated

The time being 6:00 o'clock, we will recognize the clock and report progress.

MR. MacQUARRIE: May I make that motion again on Monday?

Motion To Have ITC Witnesses On Unity Return, Ruled Out Of Order.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): It is out of order.

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.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Will we sit tomorrow?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: Under the power that has been given me by the Assembly for the debate, this House will sit tomorrow between the hours of 2:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m.

---Applause

Mr. Clerk, are there any announcements?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Yes, Mr. Speaker. A number of Members, 11 in total, have indicated their desire to go on a charter trip to Allen Island on Sunday. This will be leaving at 10:00 a.m. Transportation to the airport will be in front of the hotel at 9:30 or shortly before that time. The trip is expected to return in mid to late afternoon. Box lunches will be supplied.

There will be a finance committee meeting Monday, November 3rd at 9:00 a.m., in the Brown Building committee room. Caucus meeting at 9:30 a.m., Tuesday, November 4th, Ukkivik students residence. The bus will be at the hotel at 9:15 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, would you give us the orders of the day?

ITEM NO. 12: ORDERS OF THE DAY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Orders of the day, November 1, 1980, 2:00 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: This House stands adjourned until 2:00 o'clock p.m., November 1, 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