



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES
DEBATES

3rd Session

9th Assembly

Official Report

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1980

Pages 813 to 839

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Speaker

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Officers

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

Clerk Assistant
Mr. D.M. Hamilton
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0

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

Legal Advisor

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 November 1980

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	813
Questions and Returns	813
Notices of Motion	814
Motions	815
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Tabled Document 16-80(2) Report of the Special Committee on Unity	816
Report of the Committee of the Whole of:	
- Tabled Document 16-80(2) Report of the Special Committee on Unity	838
Orders of the Day	838

FROBISHER BAY, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 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): Do I have unanimous consent to set aside Items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 from the orders of the day?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: I hear no nays.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, would you check outside to see if there is another star in the East because we just had another miracle.

---Laughter

MR. SPEAKER: We will resolve into committee of the whole to continue consideration of the unity paper with Mr. Pudluk. A point of privilege or order, Mr. Noah.

MR. NOAH: (Translation) You did not hear me and I said nay.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, I do not have my translator. Mr. Noah, I am sorry, if you said nay I did not hear you. So, we will continue with the orders of the day.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I knew there was not a star.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 2, oral questions.

Item 3, questions and returns. Written questions and returns.

ITEM NO. 3: QUESTIONS AND RETURNS

Return To Question 149-80(2): Construction Of Porches By Housing Corporation

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Stop the music, Mr. Speaker. I have a return, Mr. Speaker, to written Question 149-80(2), asked by the hon. Mr. MacQuarrie, concerning the construction of porches for houses by the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation.

In accordance with the direction received from the Legislative Assembly the corporation considered porch construction throughout the Territories to be a priority item and the following provisions were made:

Two programs were selected for reduction because they would affect the delivery of new housing units. Reduction of rehabilitation under section 43 of the CMHC regulations was able to divert \$200,000 worth of funds from that source and reduction of upgrading and utility hookups, the same amount of money, so we were able to identify a total of \$400,000. This particular amount of money was then put into the six district offices and then turned over to various associations within those districts. Work has been and is progressing in the building of porches all across the Territories in all districts.

The corporation accepted the direction of the Legislative Assembly to mean that porches were to be built on all units presently without porches throughout the Territories. The most efficient manner to carry out this instruction, in the opinion of the corporation, was to provide the funding, as I said, to the districts and to have the housing associations who hire local labour, do the work. We did think about providing materials but we felt again it would be better if the associations were able to do the actual work and we would then be able to control the quality and the efficiency of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Are there any further returns or written questions?

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Mr. Speaker, I have a return.

MR. SPEAKER: Proceed, please.

Return To Question 120-80(2): Satellite Service Small Communities

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: In answer to a question asked by Mr. Curley on October 23, 1980, on satellite radio and TV services:

Five communities are scheduled to receive satellite radio and TV services in 1981-82 under the government's northern communications program. They are Repulse Bay, Clyde River, Broughton Island, Lake Harbour and Lac la Martre. Servicing of the five communities, like Whale Cove, with populations between 150 and 250, will begin in 1982-83 at the latest. The cost per site is about \$50,000.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Are there any further returns?

Item 4, petitions.

Item 5, tabling of documents.

Item 6, reports of standing and special committees.

Item 7, notices of motion. Mr. Noah.

ITEM NO. 7: NOTICES OF MOTION

Notice Of Motion 51-80(2): Bell Canada Office For Keewatin

MR. NOAH: (Translation) Mr. Speaker, I intend to move the following on November 3rd: I move, seconded by the Member for Keewatin South that this Legislative Assembly, through the Executive Committee, request Bell Canada to open a business office in the Keewatin.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Noah. Ms. Cournoyea.

Notice Of Motion 52-80(2): Amendments To Liquor Ordinance

MS. COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on Tuesday, November 4, I shall move the following motion: Now therefore, I move, seconded by Tagak Curley, that this House urge the administration to bring forth appropriate legislation, at the next session of this Assembly, to:

1. Amend subsection 87(1) of the Liquor Ordinance raising the penalty to an individual for a first offence to an amount not exceeding \$5000 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 12 months or to both, and for a subsequent or second offence to a fine not exceeding \$10,000 or to imprisonment not exceeding 24 months or to both;
2. Amend subsection 87(2) of the Liquor Ordinance raising the penalty to an incorporated company for a first offence to an amount not exceeding \$5000, and for a second or subsequent offence to a fine not exceeding \$10,000;
3. Amend the Liquor Ordinance by incorporating a provision providing immunity from conviction for peace officers on duty or other persons acting under instructions or authority of a peace officer, for purchasing liquor from a person not authorized to sell the same, for the purpose of detecting a known or suspected offender against the Liquor Ordinance.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Any further notices of motion? Mr. Sibbeston.

Notice Of Motion 53-80(2): Minister Of Indian Affairs To Appear As Witness

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice that on November 6, I will move the following motion: I move that this Legislative Assembly request the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs to appear as a witness before the Legislative Assembly during the next session in Yellowknife to discuss among other things, the following matters which are of utmost importance to the people of the North:

1. Norman Wells Imperial Oil expansion and pipeline;
2. Report on progress made to date on aboriginal claims of various native groups in the Northwest Territories;
3. Constitutional development for the Northwest Territories;
4. Question of division. Does the federal government support division of the Northwest Territories?
5. NCPC;
6. Government of the Northwest Territories financial arrangements with the federal government including revenue sharing;
7. Long-term non-renewable resources development plan.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. Notices of motion.

Item 8, motions.

ITEM NO. 8: MOTIONS

I understand there are Motions 44-80(2), 46-80(2), 47-80(2) and 49-80(2). There are four motions to be dealt with today. Do you wish to proceed with them at this time? Motion 44-80(2) is your motion, Mr. Curley. Do you want to proceed with it now or are you prepared to set it aside?

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Speaker, I prefer to stand it down for another day.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 46-80(2) is a motion by Mr. Fraser which has not been distributed yet. I believe there was an error in it, a typographical error that had to be corrected before it is put in the book. Mr. Fraser, what is your desire on this?

MR. FRASER: I will stand it down, Mr. Speaker.

Mk. SPEAKER: Motion 47-80(2), we have the same problem. It has not been retyped. It is Mr. Pudluk's motion. Are you prepared to set it aside for today?

MR. PUDLUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 49-80(2), Mrs. Sorensen's motion. Are you prepared to set it aside, Mrs. Sorensen?

MRS. SORENSEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 9 on the order paper, introduction of bills for first reading. There are none.

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

I have been going by what I thought was the wish of the House to go straight into committee of the whole. Evidently that is not what the committee wishes. The Chair then will go back to the full orders of the day from here on in will not go through asking for unanimous consent. We will automatically go to the orders of the day.

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

We will go into committee of the whole with Mr. Pudluk in the chair, to consider the Report of the Special Committee on Unity.

---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. Pudluk 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. Pudluk): (Translation) I call the committee to order. This is concerning the unity committee report, do you wish to discuss it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, did we resolve the matter of the witnesses and will the witnesses be given a second opportunity to speak this afternoon?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Do you mind if the witnesses from yesterday continue today? Mr. Stewart.

Motion To Have ITC Witnesses On Unity Return, Carried

HON. DON STEWART: Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding that those who made presentations would have a chance to return. On the closing of proceedings last night there was a motion on the floor I believe to recall ITC. I would so move again this afternoon that the ITC delegation be requested to attend Assembly once more.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) The motion is in order. To the motion, Hon. Mr. McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I understood, Mr. Chairman, yesterday such a motion was ruled out of order. It was not necessary, that these people had already been requested to come in. I do not see the need for going through a motion. They have been asked to come in. Why bother? Invite the people in. That is your prerogative and let us get on.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Carried

THE CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Will we invite the representatives of ITC to the witness table now?

---Agreed

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Would the Sergeant-at-Arms please escort them into the House? Following the motion that was made yesterday are you agreed that you should discuss with them in a short version, with those people that are here at the witness table, Thomas Suluk, John Amagoalik and Allen Maghagak. You will be able to ask these witnesses any kind of questions you want. First of all, the witnesses probably should make their presentation first. After that you can question them. Do you have any presentation before you are being questioned? We would like...

MR. AMAGOALIK: (Translation) Yes, we would. Yesterday we were busy trying to hear other people so we have a few comments to them.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) You can go ahead. Any one of you can go ahead.

MR. CURLEY: (Translation) Mr. Chairman, maybe you could write down the names of the speakers, everybody at the table.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) John Amagoalik is the first one.

MR. AMAGOALIK: (Translation) We want to make a short presentation on yesterday's debate, discussion, and the other day mostly yesterday. (Translation ends.)

When the Dene Nation was at this witness table Mr. Sibbeston was questioning them and he kept using the phrase "Before they rush off" referring to us. I believe those were an unfortunate choice of words and for this reason. We were invited to the Hallowe'en party last night so I attended and two or three civil servants, half-cut I might add, came to me and said "Why are you people rushing off?"

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it will do anything or add anything to the debate we would have referring to what would happen outside the particular ropes of this particular hall. I do not think it is necessary to go into discussing what people were doing last night. We are discussing about events that occurred within this House and I would take exception to the remarks, the unfortunate choice of words that Mr. Amagoalik is using now in talking about things that occurred outside the House. I think we should confine it to what goes on within these ropes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. McCallum. Do you agree that we do not discuss what happened?

MR. AMAGOALIK: (Translation) I was only saying it to make you understand while you are here at the Assembly this is not the only place where we have been heard during discussions so on my choice of words I just want to inform you. People outside this Assembly have to be informed also. (Translation ends.)

I was just trying to demonstrate to you people that what is said here has an effect on the outside and people should pay attention to what they say.

Concerning A Referendum

Now, I would like to say a few words about the question of a referendum to decide this question. It seems to me that ever since René Levesque got in power in Quebec the country seems to be on a referendum spree, you know, and every time a question comes up people want to answer it by referendum. I do not have anything against this democratic process but it would seem to me to be unnecessary to answer what seems to be very clearcut issues. Now, if the question of division, if there were serious questions about it then I would have to agree that a referendum would be necessary, but I do not think there is any question, I think most people have now accepted the reality that the Northwest Territories cannot remain the way they are, and I would think that a referendum would be sort of an exercise in futility.

Now, there have been suggestions that a referendum should be held within Nunavut and there have also been suggestions that a referendum should be held for all of the people of the Northwest Territories. We want to make it clear that we are not opposing the referendum idea because we are afraid of it, we are confident that if a referendum was held soon, we probably would win it by a landslide. So, it is not because we are afraid of it that we question the value of it.

Now, in connection with the suggestion that all the people of the Northwest Territories should vote in a referendum, I suppose if people want to do that strongly, I suppose we cannot stop them, but I think it is only fair to let you know that if a referendum took place and all the people of the Northwest Territories took part in it, we would have very serious reservations about -- I do not think we would be bound by the decision if the whole of the Northwest Territories was allowed to vote on the referendum. Now, if a referendum is to be held within Nunavut, within the tree line, we feel that it should be done soon. Let us not wait a year, and I would even suggest that if a referendum was to take place it should take place next spring or next summer, and I think that is all I have at the moment but Thomas Suluk has other issues he would like to deal with.

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

Knowing Plans For The Future

MR. SULUK: (Translation) Mr. Chairman, first of all I will make a few comments in English, or rather Inuktitut first concerning the western people, the people outside the Nunavut territory concerning most people, the Association of Municipalities whose chairman is the mayor, and also the Dene Nation and the Metis Association to put them together. Also it seems discussing whatever they are speaking about first of all concerning mostly how they want to slow down the process saying that we were in too much of a hurry and that we should wait. Trying to go through the long process that is what I wanted to say in Inuktitut. We all know what we are planning for in the future and we know our future now and we all know what we want. We cannot go back to the past and that was the first thing I wanted to say. (Translation ends.)

There are a few things we have to address, there is no way of getting around them and we might as well say them regardless of what the consequences will be. Now, this is our last opportunity I suppose for presenting the depth of our convictions on the course we have set for ourselves.

I would like to make a reference or a comment and issue a statement of policy on behalf of the Inuit and on behalf of the board of directors of ITC, including the regions, the regional associations on the policy which we have adopted and which I will now reiterate. First of all, regarding the question of the West and on the presentations and comments, made by the hon. Members from across the table, on Nunavut, including the representatives of the Dene Nation and the Metis Association and the Association of Municipalities, yesterday and the day before, I believe I would like to focus on the reference made by the Association of Municipalities requesting that we in the East, particularly the Inuit, hold on to their frustrations. I would like to state categorically that we do not, will not and cannot accept this. We have had our frustrations for a very long time. We have reached this point in time at considerable cost. You may remember that the original position of the Inuit three years ago as adopted by the former land claims commission at a general conference here in Frobisher Bay said that the Inuit shall have the right to form their own government along Inuit political circles. I would like you to underline the words "Inuit political circles". It is obvious that this call for a Nunavut territory is not an Inuit political system. So, we have already made one large compromise, and we have done it at considerable cost, both you may remember within the organization of ITC.

You may remember that close to a couple of years ago the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada dissolved the land claims commission. We have gone through a period of very difficult times and we have not reached this point in time in order to go through another situation like this. So, I would just like to say with reference to this particular one about holding on to our frustrations, I would just like to emphasize that this is completely unacceptable.

Not A Viable Relationship

Now with reference to the West, and here I will be walking a very thin line, but I think I have to. There was some reference made to a trial marriage. As far as we are concerned we have already gone through the stages of living in separate beds and living in separate rooms and we have now decided that that is not viable, the marriage is not viable regarding the West.

MR. PATTERSON: There never was a marriage.

MR. SULUK: I would have to point out very strongly that with all due respect to the Dene Nation and to the Metis Association and to other non-native people in the West, we cannot see any viable direction in the West. When we were asked to bide our time and work together, although we have no difficulty in agreeing to the principle of a struggle, yet I think our paths will now have to part and with all due respect to the people in the West which include the Dene and the Metis and the non-native people, we believe that the strategy that they have adopted is the wrong one, not necessarily the strategy but we have reached a point in time in which we would have to say goodbye and in which we would have to tell them, "Do not go away mad, just go." So, therefore, in reply to the presentations made by the three groups, the Association of Municipalities, the Dene Nation and the Metis Association we would have to say that we will go our own way and we might as well accept this fact, and we will be able to clarify certain points in the question and answer session.

Reverting Back To The Old Days

Finally, the last point I would like to mention and bring out to you at this time is that at the general assembly of the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada held at Coppermine we were given three alternatives. The first alternative we were given was the approach which we can take in which it states should we forget about this, forget about everything, forget about our struggle, in effect dissolving ITC, dissolving the regional associations, dissolving land claims, right down to the bottom including councils, regional bodies, various advisory bodies and so on. We were given a choice, should we forget about this whole thing and do things the way we used to do when the non-Inuit people first came. I am referring now to the RCMP, to traders, to Anglican missionaries, to Roman Catholic missionaries and the first group of people to come into the Inuit land where we originally did not do anything, we just listened, we did not try to talk back, and whether to get back to this approach, and I think it was significant that nobody, not one single person voted for that.

Then, we were given a second alternative, whether to adopt and continue the course of action which we have tried which is with reference to land claims, aboriginal rights, to negotiate and in reference to this Nunavut government whether to try and do it through such things as the present territorial Assembly and through other means, through the democratic system as established in Canada. I think if I remember correctly just a little bit of the majority, just a little bit over 50 per cent voted for this.

The third alternative was to say forget about the approach that we have been using. Forget about the governments, forget about the processes, let us go ahead and form our own government. I think it was significant that although people did not really vote on this, with respect to the second alternative, a significant amount of people abstained from voting for the present course on which we have charted ourselves, so I would like to just close my comments and say that we have adopted the course for a separate Nunavut territory with our eyes wide open. We know the consequences, but I think people should remember that at least we have something that we can work towards whether it takes ten or 15 years, at least it is something which is attainable and which we will do all we can to keep this process in the way in which we have decided to adopt.

No Further Delays Accepted

Now, I think that if the decision on the Nunavut territory is put off or if there is a badly split vote and assuming that somehow the decision for division manages to squeak through and it has been decided that the process would be lengthened, I would think that we would seriously have to consider whether to adopt a more hard-line position.

Finally, with respect to the points I have just made, we do not see in the foreseeable future the West resolving their future and it is for these reasons in our assessment of the situation over in the West that we cannot and will not accept any further delays. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. AMAGOALIK: (Translation) I just want to take the time to say that we have always felt that the Nunatsiak development and I think everybody knows the Members have been on the Assembly for three or four years and regarding a Dene Nation, those people who are willing to support -- I would just like to clarify that none of that proposal, we are not just going to turn around and run away. We are not going to do that. Assuming Nunavut has been accepted in principle, it is not our intention to turn around and run away and never look back. That is not our intention at all. We have said right from the beginning that when Nunavut was accepted in principle, we intend to carry on the consultation that is necessary and we intend to support the Dene Nation and other native organizations in Canada, as much as we can.

---Applause

This Assembly has three years life left in it. I am sure the Eastern Arctic Members will continue to sit on the Assembly and will support the Dene Nation when they are called upon to do so. So I do not see any great difficulty in or any great danger in something like this being accepted. So I hope that the people will understand that even though we are saying the trial marriage has not worked, that does not mean that we cannot continue to be friends. I think there will always be a smile between Nunavut and Yellowknife.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Amagoalik. What about Allen Maghagak? If you have any comments, just go ahead.

Stoppage Of Resource Development

MR. MAGHAGAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There has been some discussion on the referendum and the recommendations of the unity report. As the senior adviser to the Nunavut claims executive committee, I would not hesitate to recommend a stalemate or stoppage of all resource development in Nunavut leading up to the day of the referendum because we are confident that we will be able to get our wish to set up a Nunavut government. The committee has asked me and native organizations such as the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada as sort of being seen publicly as the culprits in the stalemate of resource development. So I think a decision has to be made by this Assembly that this Legislative Assembly start accepting responsibilities for the decisions that they make. And also that in the areas of transition which have been discussed certainly a recommendation from this Assembly is going to take some time before the federal government tables their document on the creation of a Nunavut territory. During that process we will -- not only ITC, but this Assembly also, various organizations such as the Dene Nation, the Metis Association -- go through the process of public consultation and at the same time work out the details of some concerns that were voiced by the Dene Nation where the boundary is going to be. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Maghagak. There are some questions coming up. First of all Mr. MacQuarrie has a question.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yesterday I expressed concern that I did want to question because in the Dene Nation's paper there was an implication that some third party or parties were promoting division in the interests of trying to divide and rule, and that that was undermining the development of native peoples. Now I think I need not ask the question. The remarks that were made by the delegation today seem to me to say very clearly that in asking for division the ITC delegation is utterly confident that it is not being used by anyone at all, but is making a clear expression of its own desires, and so I think that I need not put that question now. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, hon. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Support For The Unity Committee Report

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all I would like to say that I have three or four questions that I would like to pose to them, to the witnesses. I do not have the probing mind of some of the legal people in this Assembly so I will come down to be very brief and to the point and I think the questions that I would ask would require only a yes or no and upon hearing the comments that the witnesses have said today, I anticipate that the answer to the questions will be affirmative so that all I want to do is reinforce it. Before I ask those questions though, Mr. Chairman, I get the distinct impression that of the committee report that is, the unity committee's report, that the ITC are against it, the Dene Nation is against the report, and the unity committee had an Inuk on the committee and it had two Dene, both who I think espoused separate particular jurisdictions, two new areas. So I guess in my mind now the committee's report is a report then of two people, the Metis representative and the English Canadian. So of five people I would suggest the report then becomes -- a Scot Canadian, I beg your pardon.

---Laughter

It then becomes a minority report. The two questions I have to ask of the witnesses and again I think a simple yes or no answer will suffice for my particular needs, Mr. Chairman. In view of the positions then put forth by other witnesses that have appeared before this committee is it still the position of ITC that the boundaries of the proposed territory Nunavut remain as stated by Mr. Suluk? I beg your pardon, I do not pronounce your name properly.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: That being the first question and the second question was going to ask of the president of ITC but he is not here: In the opening remarks of Mr. Suluk he indicated that Mr. Wah-Shee should stay in the West and confine himself to activities there or words to that effect. However, in the printed document that was passed to Members there was no reference to that statement. So, my question is, and as I say I want to put this to Mr. Amarook, the president of ITC, is that the position of ITC or is that simply a statement of Mr. Suluk?

Voting In A Referendum

A fourth question is does the ITC agree that a referendum should be held and again, yes or no? Finally, again a yes or no, does the ITC feel that the people of the Northwest Territories should vote in a referendum, yes or no to all four?

MR. CURLEY: The Quebec referendum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: We seem to have an echo over there. Do you want to ask a question? He has a terrible disease, hoof and mouth. If he wants to speak or ask a question fine and I think the only time he ever opens his mouth is to change his socks.

---Laughter

Mr. Chairman, I will take the answer, just four quick yes or no replies to those four questions.

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

MR. AMAGOALIK: I think a straight yes or no answer is unfair.

MR. CURLEY: Hear, hear!

MR. AMAGOALIK: With regard to the Report of the Special Committee on Unity, we are not against it. As we indicated in our opening address we agree with the thrust of that report.

MR. PATTERSON: Hear, hear!

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. I did not ask that question of the witnesses whether they were in agreement with the report, I simply asked four questions and I simply made a statement.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. McCallum.

MR. AMAGOALIK: If Mr. McCallum thinks these kinds of questions can be answered yes or no then the departments he is responsible for are in trouble.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: That is a good opinion.

MR. CURLEY: He is really in trouble!

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I will come back and reply to that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Let us have it one at a time, okay? John Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: With reference to Michael Amarook, he has other commitments back in Ottawa and for that reason he is not appearing before us today so you might consider us the designated hitters. The third question I believe was do we agree with the idea of a referendum. As I tried to indicate earlier I think the answer to that is yes and no. Number four, it is the same, yes and no, and that is all I can say.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Amagoalik. Did you get the answers to your questions, Mr. McCallum?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes and no.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: You have got to be kidding!

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Nick Sibbeston is next.

Inuit Members On The Executive Committee

MR. SIBBESTON: I would just like to ask the witnesses whether they see any merit in having some Inuit Members sit on the Executive Committee and, if so, what role should they have on the Executive Committee?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you. Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: That is not really a question for us to answer. We can say that we think it would be a good idea, and I think Members of the Eastern Arctic caucus are starting to realize that but I would have to leave that question to them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Amagoalik. Mr. Curley, did you want to make a statement? I thought I saw you with your hand raised.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am just trying to correct the hon. Member's question, we are not dealing with the Executive Committee membership and I think Mr. Amagoalik handled it very well.

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

Congratulations To The Unity Committee

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to briefly mention that I do not feel that the Dene and the ITC, even in their general position, went against the report of the unity committee or rejected it or disagreed with it. I did not feel that from listening to the witnesses and for my part after having had some time to consider everything that has happened in this most interesting week, I feel very strongly that we should congratulate Mr. MacQuarrie and all the Members of his committee for doing an excellent job in a short time with a very difficult question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: Now, there may be wrinkles here and there that we will iron out in the next few days, but I want to say right now that I do not reject the report and I do not think the delegations have said that either. I do not think there was a big split on the unity committee and I do not think it is a minority report and I am tired of hearing this divisive sort of commentary.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: What do you think we have been talking about for three days?

MR. PATTERSON: Let us talk about what we agreed on, Mr. McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I wish I had played hockey with you. You sure know how to stickhandle.

MR. CURLEY: Why do you not go home?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Why do you not?

MR. CURLEY: I am home.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Go on!

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Just a moment. Are you asking a question or making a statement? I think now we are on a question period, not a statement period. Are you going to ask a question or make a statement? Go ahead.

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is just that when other Members make statements one feels compelled to state something and I will leave my statements until later. I did have a question. What I wanted to ask the delegation from ITC is this: In response to the Dene position, is there not really an awful lot of agreement on everything that the Dene have said? Do you not agree with everything they said with the exception of the timing of the division question? Is that not the only issue? I am not asking you to accept their boundary ideas, but in general the thrust of their comments, was ITC not in agreement with all of those positions except the question of timing of a decision on division?

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

A Different Approach

MR. SULUK: I would want to point out that in principle we are in the same boat. It is in the approaches that we are different and that is the only difference we feel. In principle we have no disagreement at all, in fact they are more vocal than we are with respect to their rights and their difficulties because they have been in a difficult situation longer than we have. Theirs go back over 100 years and ours is just recent. So, I was trying to point out that we in the Eastern Arctic, the Inuit that is, have a chance of avoiding repetition of what happened with other native peoples in Canada. So, it is in approaches that we are different but not in principle. Does that answer your question?

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Suluk. Mr. Noah, did you want to ask a question?

Alternatives To Division Of The Territories

MR. NOAH: (Translation) Mr. Chairman, I have a question to the witnesses from ITC. I have heard comments on postponement and particularly the splitting up of the Territories and if they held a referendum in the Northwest Territories and if in the referendum the question for split was lost, what would the administration do because the Northwest Territories is a very large country and we have been looking at it as a whole and in the world it is a very large area? How will we shape the future and move towards provincial status where we have a premier and how will the government deal with the whole situation because the Northwest Territories -- what alternatives are there? For example, the division of the regions, will that be the same or will there be alterations, and for instance we have the Keewatin, Central Arctic and Baffin? Will maybe these regions be split and be formed into local governments in the referendum question if the referendum on division was against it? Have you any considerations on that?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Have you an answer to that?

MR. SULUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are uncertain about how it would be, it is not certain if the Northwest Territories became a province eventually, in the future. If we are using this present government system, and that is for certain, we do not have much say at this time. We cannot really look that far into the future and there are developments which we must also do on natural resources and on other regions, but we would have to deal with these many issues. When you look at the Northwest Territories, when they obtain provincial status and work into the Canadian federation, it may cause a lot of problems if the Territories were not split because it is a large country. We in the Eastern Arctic, we are more aware of the issues and concerns and we would expect to see division and of course, we would like to first maybe obtain provincial status. Concerning the regions, the regions in this area were covered by regional government they do not need to conform to the Inuit -- for example we live in the three main regions. It is very difficult to answer that question but that is the best I can say it.

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

Accepting The Consequences Of Referendum

MR. AMAGOALIK: (Translation) If I could add to that statement I would say that if there was a referendum people who lived in Nunavut, if we win the referendum we would have to accept the consequences of the referendum, whether it is for or against. So we will follow the results and if the people outside of Nunavut are against it I do not think we can really expect them to tell us what to do when we are dealing with the issues here.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you. Mr. Fraser.

MR. FRASER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have some questions of ITC. I do not know if they are able to answer, if they are that far advanced. If everything goes the way your plans are now, I notice your presentation was to the point and you had a pretty good presentation to give the Assembly. If everything goes your way, what timeframe are you looking at for the settlement in principle with the federal government? If it was agreed on by this Assembly, it has to go, I imagine the final decision would be made by the federal government. What timeframe are you looking at in years to come up with an agreement in principle? Is that a fair question to ask?

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

MR. SULUK: I will try and answer as best I can. As the chief negotiator for the Nunavut land claims project, as a negotiator it is in my interest, in the interest of the other regional negotiators to try and resolve our grievances, so to speak, with the federal government as fast as humanly possible, but not so fast as to go too far ahead of our people. Now there are quite a lot of technicalities, technical points, points which many of the Inuit will not have the ability to understand in detail due to the differences in education and so on. However, we now have a comprehensive position ready.

Timeframe Of Agreement In Principle

I have stated in August that we were releasing our general positions, restricted circulation, to communities, which we have already done. We have even gone as far as providing copies to CBC and so on. So the point here is, to make it short, that we hope that by next year, a year from now that we might be able to be near

the agreement in principle stage. So the relationship on this Nunavut thing is not just that since we know what we will be getting into, we feel that the Nunavut proposal would pretty well plug up some of the leaky areas in our land claims settlement. Just to reiterate again we hope, and I have to emphasize we hope, that we could reach an agreement in principle a year from now. You never know. As we said in the final page I think of the general aims and objectives we did mention that the best laid plans of mice and men often go astray, so we can only say that we would hope to.

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

MR. FRASER: Thank you, Mr. Suluk. My other question would be that the unity committee has recommended a referendum. Do you feel, as a negotiator for ITC land claims or Nunavut, that a referendum is necessary?

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

MR. SULUK: I would have to answer in the same way Mr. Amagoalik answered it, yes and no. First of all, as we mentioned before we do not oppose the principle of the referendum. It is best that we know the outcome in the East. It just might require a little bit more effort on our part to iron out a few points. However, our preference has been that the Assembly would have the primary responsibility to work out the details whereas we would concentrate on our claim.

Referendum Could Emphasize Differences

There are, of course, other issues relating to the referendum, the issue of the West. Now it is our belief that if a general referendum is held across the Territories, if the referendum should show in the East as close to being unanimous and in the West as a badly split vote it will only emphasize the differences or the near inability of the West to some kind of unanimous or close or over 50 per cent deciding vote. However, on the other hand, even if the West should vote for no and the East for yes, it will only tend to emphasize the differences of the West and the East. So in fairness we felt that we could agree completely with the report of the recommendation of the unity committee that the referendum should be held, if it should be held, in the East.

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

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Just a question. Do you feel that the question of division is in fact supported by everybody? Certainly that is the indication that has been given to me. As you said, it has been I guess the approach to the decision of division and did you find it very difficult -- the people in the Northwest Territories go to Ottawa and at present negotiate on the splitting of the Northwest Territories, if only half of the people of the North, in fact, have an opportunity to vote on the split.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Hon. Mr. Nerysoo. Mr. Suluk can answer that question.

MR. SULUK: I will try as much as I possibly can, as usual, to answer you in the most fair way. We had not dealt with the question of referendum in depth because we feel that it is the primary responsibility of the Legislative Assembly or in this case the unity committee of the Northwest Territories to look into these questions and to make appropriate recommendations. Now we tried to respect governments and others as much as we can and one of the earlier decisions that we had made is that with regard to referendums and so on, we would first have to find out what the actual recommendations would be like, because we did not feel at that time that it is appropriate for us to deal with the referendum question. However, in the event that the referendum does become a reality we had already made a head start by working on the question of division and the proposal for Nunavut government.

West Did Not Take Proposal Seriously

As I mentioned before, I would have to go back to my earlier comments. I think last Friday when we made our presentation during the question and answer session that this time it is the West which does not seem to be ready. If they had taken us seriously, if they had taken the ITC seriously, the matter would get into the stage that they would not find themselves in the predicament that they now find themselves. However, it is a difficult question and I think we would prefer that these questions be dealt with. The point is, the issue is, is there going to be division or not? Now once we get that issue settled, then we will get to work on the referendum and we have always stated that we are reasonable people. Some people may have other ideas but we consider ourselves gentlemen so we would be open for discussion or negotiation or whatever.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Thomas Suluk. Does that answer your question, Hon. Mr. Nerysoo?

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Yes. That was a very good answer in fact because I think the problem here is not a matter that people are in disagreement with division. Certainly I am not and I have never argued that. It has been the fact of saying yes to one side and I am not sure about the other side. I am part of the West, as you know, and I am just wondering whether or not one of the ideas or one of the principles that we require to be adopted, whether it supports Nunavut or whether it supports the Western Arctic as divided, as divisions, that the principle has to be the fact that we support division.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Hon. Mr. Nerysoo. Did you want to answer that? I do not think that was a question. I think that was a statement.

MR. SULUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thought you were making a statement. If there is a question, can you re-state it?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Were you asking a question, Mr. Nerysoo?

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: I wanted to know whether or not one of the ideas or one of the principles we had adopted at this time was, in fact, that of division, just division, whether it was support for Nunavut or support for the Dene Nation, position, or whether or not it was adoption of the separation of Yellowknife or whatever, or just the principle of division?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you. Mr. Suluk.

Hesitation In Trying To Instruct The West

MR. SULUK: We believe that the issue in question is the principle of division, as we have pointed out in our presentation. I suppose to some extent it was unfortunate that it is beginning to look like the West is not quite sure, although the unity committee did recommend that people in the West who are left behind, so to speak, would then have a general get-together, have a constitutional development meeting or some such -- I have forgotten exactly which, but they would get together immediately and decide where they go from here. As far as the East is concerned, I think we know what we want and we hesitated in trying to instruct the West, "We are doing it this way, now you do it this way." We do not presume or want to presume to tell the West how they should manage their own affairs. I think we would rather stay away from it as much as we can. I hope you can understand the reasoning behind it.

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

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I have initially a question for our Legal Advisor and any historians in the House here. Then I have a comment and a question to our guests from ITC. My question to the Legal Advisor is, under what authority can the Government of Canada change borders? I have been flipping through the BNA Act and I have come up with section 146 which is entitled "Admission of Other Colonies" which I think gives some authority and is a very appropriately entitled section.

As I understand it, over the last 100 years Canada has altered the borders of various provinces and I am just wondering if the Legal Advisor can give us some advice on how the Government of Canada deals with this kind of issue. Also, are any historians in the House here who could tell us if there has ever been a referendum in Quebec or Newfoundland, Labrador or any other part of Canada when boundaries were changed?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Braden. Who was your question directed to? Is it these people at the table or the witness table?

Legislation Concerning Boundaries

LEGAL ADVISOR (Mr. Johnson): Mr. Braden, the initial section you read of the BNA Act was used on a few occasions after its passage, but it did create some problems and as a result there was an amendment to it called "The British North America Act of 1871" that specifically authorized the federal government to create provinces out of territories not included in any province. Pursuant to that act it has been utilized by passing specific legislation on a number of occasions.

In 1912, the Ontario Boundaries Extension Act was passed and then we had the Quebec Boundaries Extension Act also that same year and also Manitoba where they took parts of the Northwest Territories and added them on and the same with the Yukon Territory Act in 1898. So, I would say that that section authorizes the creation but then they do it by specific legislation when they want to go ahead with it. Those are the only ones I am aware of where they have changed boundaries in Canada and I cannot tell you specifically about a referendum.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Legal Advisor. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Anyway, to my knowledge there has never been a referendum held where borders have been established or modified. To a certain extent I can sympathize with Mr. Amagoalik's comments when he indicated that Canadians right now are on a referendum binge. I suppose that we in the Northwest Territories could, in fact, hold our own referendum, whether it is in the East or the West or both, but I am wondering if we would be saddled with another commission, namely a boundaries commission which would be federal. We would have to suffer through that before the federal government could make up its mind.

Working With A Boundary Commission

Now, I will just make one other comment. I understand there are boundary commissions that are held quite often with respect to electoral boundaries and districts. My question to the ITC is, if the federal government establishes a boundaries commission, would the ITC be prepared to make presentations and work through that? Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Braden. Perhaps the legal adviser could answer that.

MR. MERRITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to say a few things that may be of assistance in light of Mr. Braden's question. I think ITC is quite aware of the fact that the creation of Nunavut would require federal legislation. I do not think there are any constitutional impediments to the federal government doing so at this point. The creation of Nunavut would probably take place through the passage in the parliament of Canada of a Nunavut act, which might, I suppose, be accompanied by changes to the Northwest Territories Act depending upon the type of political changes sought in the balance of the Territories.

I think, technically speaking, there is no referendum process in Canada and even the recent vote in Quebec was not in fact a referendum but in fact a plebiscite. A referendum is usually the term used to describe a legal process that has a binding result and a plebiscite is merely a polling of opinion. The question of whether or not the federal government would insist on having some kind of boundaries commission is something which of course ITC cannot predict one way or the other. However, the passage of legislation would have to be accompanied by debate inside the House of Commons and considerable discussion at the committee level and certainly ITC would be quite prepared to put in the time and effort to assist in the drafting of legislation and in the passage of legislation through the appropriate legislative bodies.

Mechanism To Make Decisions

I would think that ITC would hope that this Assembly could set up some kind of mechanism to work on the process of boundaries, as well as related problems such as timing and transitional arrangements, and certainly would be prepared to assist this Assembly in coming to those kinds of decisions. One would hope that decisions of that sort could be made in the North before going to Ottawa and asking for legislation, although Ottawa has the responsibility I am sure the federal politicians would want to be participating actively with representatives from the people of Nunavut and the rest of the Northwest Territories in coming up with legislation. I hope that is of some assistance.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Merritt. There are three other people who want to question, but first we will have coffee.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) The Chair recognizes a quorum.
Mr. Kilabuk.

MR. KILABUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have one small question. This concerns the Metis Association and the Dene association when they first presented their presentation. They said that in terms of division, what they said about division really shocked me because I thought everybody -- are we going to be going against them as to what they said before?

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

MR. SULUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This subject has to be really understandable to everybody in the Northwest Territories including the Dene, Metis and also other people concerning the Dene Nation. We are like the same group and we understand even though we have not stopped we have a way of having a little bit of difference in what we are doing. I would say that the Dene in Canada along with the western part of the Territories have been discussing this subject for 100 or 200 years. Their land has been taken over by the white people. They have been having an agreement with the Canadian government. They were put on reservations and many years ago there were treaties and the federal government and the native government -- they are under a situation quite a bit different than ours. I think dealing with the government and the way we relate to government, our reply was that we have not been involved in this sort of situation as long as the other natives and we have not made agreements in the Dene Nation.

ITC Not In Opposition To Dene And Metis

The southern Indians, their conditions are a little bit different and on behalf of the Inuit we wish to have a different form of government and leadership. Our conditions are slightly different from theirs and I want to clarify that Nunavut has to answer our questions. We are all fighting for the very same thing. We are different and seem to be taking different routes but we are fighting for the same goals -- whether they be living in Alaska -- but we have to deal with these two other countries and we have to deal with different governments other than Canada so our goal is slightly different because we know we have a tough task, let us recognize this fact. We are dealing with two different countries instead of Canada. We are not in opposition to the Metis and the Dene. Let us recommend the fact that our cultures are a little bit different and our objectives are slightly different.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Suluk. Have you got any more questions, Mr. Appaqaq?

MR. APPAQAQ: (Translation) I only have one small comment to make.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Right now this is question period. Maybe later on you can make your comments. This is question period. Thank you. Mr. Curley wants to ask a question.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have a question to the ITC representatives. I have a question to the Member from Fort Smith. He was very fuzzy with his question. I was not sure. Politically he might be skating on thin ice in his constituency and he was not really prepared to give a strong position to this House for the Western Arctic. A little earlier, because he wanted me to know, he indicated to me he was not prepared to represent the constituency of the Western Arctic because they may require a strong government in that area. Then a little earlier he was indicating to us something about hockey or something. Maybe he wants to solve the problems of the East and West division by hockey night. We prefer to challenge him if he will drop the puck.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Are you ready? Name the time, Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: We will get at it.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I have a good left winger.

People In Eastern Arctic Should Strengthen Present Government

MR. CURLEY: I have a question to ITC. The mayor of Yellowknife representing the municipality yesterday was very concerned about the fact that maybe we should really seriously consider options, but then I seemed to gather that the West is not coming up with proposals for options. What I want to ask you is in your view do you think that ITC or people in the Eastern Arctic are prepared to strengthen the present government and are the ITC representatives prepared to support the Western Arctic in getting more provincial powers and leaving to provincial status as a single unit? I would like you to respond to that because that, it seems to me, would be the only option left that the present government can acquire because there are no other alternatives other than division. Thank you.

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

MR. AMAGOALIK: Well, I do not think we would be prepared to accept the option as described by Mr. Curley, but it is our hope that once the principle of division has been accepted by this Assembly, it would force the players in the Western Arctic to sit down and get their act together.

---Applause

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Amagoalik.
Hon. Mr. Stewart.

Proposed Boundaries Of Nunavut Would Make Governing Unmanageable

HON. DON STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask any or all of the witnesses the following: One of the arguments used for the division of the Northwest Territories is because of the size of the Northwest Territories and the resulting distances involved between places to be governed, now how does ITC think that the Nunavut claim reduces the size of the Northwest Territories to a manageable size in that the tree line boundary does not reduce the distance east and west because the boundary would remain the same as I understand your proposal and, of course, the distances north and south would remain unchanged? In fact, the western side of your proposal of Nunavut would take those communities further from their seat of government than they are now. Now has ITC looked at this problem because I think distance is relevant to being able to have a manageable area that you can govern but I do not think that the claim as it sits has had a look at this because I think it is just as an unwieldy to try to govern as we have now.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Hon. Mr. Stewart.
John Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: I will attempt to answer that question and Mr. Suluk will perhaps have some additional remarks. First of all, whether or not the Nunavut area if it was divided along the tree line would be manageable, I think it would be more manageable than the present Northwest Territories. It would be two thirds of what it is now and also it is important to remember where the capital would be. I think it would make sense for the capital to be located in a geographically central area so that would reduce the distance between the communities and the capital. The division would also remove certain obstacles, the obstacles of language, the obstacle of doing different things differently. Also there is no reason in this world why the transportation system and communications system which is now in existence cannot be changed. We foresee that the changes to these systems would be made. I think for this reason, the concern that the new territory would be too big and distances would still be a problem, it is a legitimate concern, but it is something that can be worked out.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Amagoalik. Thomas Suluk, do you have any comments?

Irritation Between East And West Would Be Removed By Division

MR. SULUK: In addition to this, first of all the argument on distance and size is just one of the arguments. Now in terms of distance between East and West, I imagine you were referring to distance, physical distance between the Central and Eastern Arctic or you might have been referring to the distance of the designation between the western part of the Territories and the eastern part. However, the physical distance and so on of the Northwest Territories is, I think, fairly clear. It is very obvious. However, the distances between the Nunavut Territory and those of Nunavut themselves would be lessened considerably. Now I have observed during my participation here the amount of differences ideologically, culturally and politically or otherwise between the Members of the East and Members of the West which provides to some people a lot of entertainment or a source of aggravation to some of the Members.

Now, I think this difference of opinion, not just in terms of the physical size, a large part of it would be removed by division, so that those of you in the West who would like to govern your territory without being constantly tickled by those in the East or without being encumbered by an unsophisticated people, so to speak, of the East, can be all one. Those of us in the East will do the same. I think the big obstacle here is the psychological distance as opposed to the physical distance, geographical distance of the Northwest Territories. This is just one of the arguments. Perhaps you might like to put another question on the other arguments which we have put forward. However, I feel that division would go a long way towards removing the constant sources of irritation between the East and the West.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Suluk. I will ask Mr. Maghagak to comment.

Decentralization Of Power To One Area

MR. MAGHAGAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In researching the possibility of creation of the Nunavut government it also goes to the extent of I think decentralizing the power structure to one area. We are looking at the possibilities of transferring responsibilities to the regional governments; whereas they have their priorities and communications could be something to be handled as quickly as possible. The Nunavut head office, wherever it may be, will sort of monitor and try to ensure that there are no duplications. Because of the funding problem it is going to be very tight, we realize. So this area that we are looking at -- transferring some of the responsibilities to the regional offices so that head office do not have the burden and sort of miss out the immediate concerns of the communities.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Maghagak. Would you like to ask another question?

HON. DON STEWART: A supplementary question, Mr. Chairman. Our last speaker indicated a regional type of government. Well, is that not what we are doing now on the territorial plane with the BRC and the first part of the action of development of this type of program and possibly this could continue to operate and be successful? If that really is what you are going to do, that procedure is already in the works so that the local people, whether they may be Indian or Inuit, would have the opportunity of governing in their own area. So really you are going to follow then basically what this Assembly has already started to put in place. Is that correct?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Hon. Mr. Stewart. John Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: Well, let us not kid ourselves and try and make people think that the establishment of regional councils is a substitute for the creation of a new political unit. You know, it is our intention to copy a lot of the things that this government has done, after all there are some good ideas and we admit that, but the issue is the creation of a new political unit. That is the issue.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Amagoalik. I would like to recognize in the gallery Mr. Adla, president of the Frobisher Bay Hunters' and Trappers' Association.

---Applause

Mr. Kilabuk, do you have a question?

MR. KILABUK: (Translation) My question is very short, Mr. Chairman. I believe that everybody here today believes surely in what we are doing. Concerning the split of the Northwest Territories, the Assembly does not approve to support the Inuit proposal. Will there be support in principle from this House?

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

Proper Steps And Procedures Will Be Taken

MR. SULUK: (Translation) Mr. Chairman, thank you. For a long time really our objective, we are going to try this area -- during our general assembly the delegation from Labrador, Quebec, the Territories and Greenland were here to discuss this, that this proposal is going to be taken. Our people in the said area -- this at the moment is our priority, to give some governmental abilities for the territory and you will remember about two years ago that the proposal was to create a government elected through our people and that kind of government -- they did not like the idea. This is a reality, this region and we at the general assembly we were talking about if this does not work here that people are going to be very frustrated and will continue to live and will never make any headway.

We want to take the proper steps, the proper legal procedure and it seems like we are trying and the Inuit people like the idea and we are going to continue to fight for this. If we are unsuccessful, maybe our people have a struggle now in northern Quebec and Labrador but we are trying to take the proper procedures here. We do not think we are going to have to carry out what we are fighting for. If you do not support us, the government, we are going to have, we are going to start -- we want the future and make sure there is many educated people that we have and members of the government have taken some high education and people are not going to just sit back and rest because in the past the government procedures -- now we are going to take proper procedures to come up with our plans for action that we will be introducing in the future. Does that answer your question?

---Applause

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Mr. Kilabuk, does that answer your question?

MR. KILABUK: (Translation) That answers my question. Thank you.

MR. NOAH: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have some questions but they have been answered already. I do not want to ask a question. It came to my attention last week.

THE INTERPRETER: We cannot hear the speaker. The sound goes on and off.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Try it again.

MR. NOAH: (Translation) We have been told there was a meeting to discuss these plans with the various associations, with various government authorities and many people were asking questions relating to...

THE INTERPRETER: I cannot hear him.

Division Could Give Government Less Power

MR. NOAH: (Translation) There have been talks between the government. I am concerned with the Metis and the Dene. My question is as follows: If the Northwest Territories is to split, there would be less authority, less power in the government. In our deliberations, what would your answer be after we have split, how do you feel about less power for the government or how would you go about ensuring that with the government? I heard yesterday in the document issued by the Metis and the Dene Association, the president stated there was something inside that I did not believe. If we were to split, the government would have less power. What would be the cause of less power?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Noah. Thomas Suluk.

MR. SULUK: (Translation) Mr. Chairman, we are ready to act. We will have a very simple structure similar to the territorial government, because of the constitution of Canada. We will have more power than now. It is our intention now that we have powers in the government. We have the authority because of the Canadian constitution and it is said that the Legislative Assembly has the power but they do not have it at the present time. They are advisers and because of the fact of the constitution. At this point in time there is friction between East and West because we are being used. There has been a split in the Territories of different ideas. We are weak because of the fact that there is the split out here, so we can look at this as weakening. If we were to split, the West and the East, there would be a decisive decrease at least. If we split there will be land claims coming out, ten different ideas. If we split between the West we will have Nunavut and we will have two different bodies and they can work together and go to the federal government together. We are trying to build this and we have different ideas, different concepts, different interests.

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

MR. NOAH: (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I was very concerned about this, because the people in my area are very happy you were able to answer that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Are there any more questions?
Hon. Mr. Stewart.

More Than Two Governments Would Evolve

HON. DON STEWART: Well, the question -- I think the answer has been greatly oversimplified. In fact, I do not think, if I understand the "proposition" and if I understand the desires of the Dene Nation, that indeed you are going to have only two governments. It would appear to me at this time that the desire being expressed would indicate that there would be three governments in the West and East and another government in the Nunavut area. So instead of two I would suggest to you we are going to have four. What is your opinion on it?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Hon. Mr. Stewart.

MR. SULUK: Mr. Chairman, you have asked for my opinion and I will give you my opinion. Perhaps the territorial government has not made enough of an attempt to try and keep the people in the Western Arctic, the Inuvialuit, involved or supported enough the issues affecting those areas and I would attempt to throw back the answer at you in such a way as to say that we have not proposed three or four territories. Our proposal is to get one territory for us and for you to try and get one territory for yourselves. It would only be once again that the West would be having great difficulty keeping those various groups together. Another thing I have to qualify and I say we do not presume to tell the people of the West how they should go about their business, but I would hope that you would be concerned enough to try and keep them as one so that you can have a stronger voice.

MR. CURLEY: Hear, hear!

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

HON. DON STEWART: Thank you. I find it difficult to understand that type of an answer when I just previously understood from the witnesses that they would support the Dene and other native groups in their desires. All of these groups have made these desires very well known, that is what they want, so that answer to me seems to be in conflict with what you had previously said that the Inuvialuit would support the native groups and what they wanted and I think they have made it abundantly clear what they want. They want a separate territory. So I do not see how your answer is similar in reply to the two different questions.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Hon. Mr. Stewart. John Amagoalik.

Nunavut Wants Only One Government

MR. AMAGOALIK: Well, I think we can tell you that there will be one government in Nunavut and how many you want in the Western Arctic I think is up to you. Not to you but the population in general.

---Applause

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I would simply want to say that again I appreciate the conviction of the ITC, the way in which they have presented their particular case. I think nobody within the Assembly would question the manner in which they have put their proposal to us. I think we all recognize that as such. I had better be careful when I say this, but I mean it sincerely, that I would like to be in a position to see that their particular aspirations are met.

---Applause

But, unfortunately, they are not going to allow me to do that, but so be it. I would say that in my opinion, were a plebiscite taken across the entire North that the members of ITC, their executive as well as the Members of what has been called the eastern caucus would be very pleasantly surprised and I guess in that way you have some idea of the manner in which I would vote on the question of division.

I would just like to make one comment and I do not want to prolong this very much, Mr. Chairman, but for the comment of Mr. Amagoalik on my capability of running particular departments, I think that has been very well expressed by

Members of the eastern caucus. I even get help from Mr. Curley and Mr. Patterson, so I take the source of the comment and suggest that I remain content and confident of getting the support of Members of the eastern caucus. So I have no difficulty. I would then, therefore, Mr. Chairman, suggest that you pass along to the witnesses our sincere appreciation and thanks and that you inquire of either the Dene Nation, the Metis Association or the Association of Municipalities to come back in in the remaining few minutes of this particular session for any comments they wish to make.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. McCallum. Have you a reply, Mr. Amagoalik?

Small But Important Step In Political Evolution

MR. AMAGOALIK: It is not a reply to Mr. McCallum. Just before we step down I would like to say a few last words. Mr. Moses Appaqaq said something yesterday which I think is felt by many people but which is not expressed too openly by many. Mr. Appaqaq said something to the effect that he hoped that Nunavut would become a reality within his lifetime. Mr. Appaqaq is a young man like I am and the good Lord willing there is no doubt in my mind that it will be a reality within our lifetime.

Even if this Assembly, for some strange reason, said "vote no" to this important step in our political evolution, our persistence will not cease and we are confident that sooner or later our labours will be rewarded. For this reason it is not so discouraging for the young because they have the time, they have the energy and they have that determination to carry on and to realize this important goal. But it is our elders who would lose the most from a negative from this Assembly. They do not have the luxury of time on their side. They remember the way it used to be and the way it has come to be. They have seen the erosion of their culture and their society and it would mean so much to them to witness this small but significant victory of their people in their struggle for survival, so we ask this Assembly not only on behalf of all the people of Nunavut but especially on behalf of our parents and grandparents to demonstrate the trust in our judgment and confidence in our abilities by accepting in principle the reality of Nunavut. This would be a small step, because let us not kid ourselves, it is a small step in our political evolution, but it would be for us a very important one. Thank you.

---Applause

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

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask a question of our Legal Advisor. I do not have any more questions for the ITC delegation. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Does Mr. Appaqaq want to ask a question?

MR. APPAQAQ: (Translation) I would just like to say I am not very happy about what is happening. I asked a question and I wanted to speak now that Mr. McCallum has spoken and I feel like we are just not getting anywhere.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) I think he just stated that the witnesses are here to answer questions. I thought everybody understood that this is the question period and there would be no sort of comments in the Assembly. I would at this time like to thank the ITC delegation for answering the questions posed to them. Thank you very much.

---Applause

I would like to ask the committee if they want another witness to answer some questions to the Assembly? Mr. Butters.

Courtesy To Guests

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I think in view of the fact that we will not be sitting again until Monday, it would be a courtesy to not only offer the floor to all of our guests but to hear them if at all possible. This would then allow them to leave today if they can get transportation out.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) I am in agreement. The Metis Association and the Dene Nation can think about it before they sit in the witness box. I would like to see them be prepared first. Mr. Noah.

MR. NOAH: (Translation) Mr. Chairman, I understand that they are here because they have comments. I am prepared to move in the Assembly to not ask people who are not prepared to come in, so I am sure that we are quite prepared. It seems like there has been confusion since yesterday.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Since we are sitting here this afternoon, it is better to come prepared and I think we are all aware that we have to have at least something for our Members prior to being on the floor. If they wish to come in at that time we will accept them.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I move we break for five minutes and I will ask the Clerk to check with the delegation to see if they want to make remarks to the Assembly before the day ends. Thank you.

---Applause

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) We will break for five minutes.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): The Chair recognizes a quorum.

(Translation) The Dene Nation have agreed to come to the witness table and the Metis Association have left Frobisher Bay. David Nickerson and Peter Ittinuar have also left. Hon. Mr. McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman. I move that we recognize the clock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Is that agreed?

---Agreed

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

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Pudluk.

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

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

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): There will be a meeting of the finance committee at 9:00 a.m., Monday in the committee room in the Brown Building. A caucus meeting Tuesday at 9:30 a.m., in the Ukkivik students residence. The bus will be in front of the hotel at 9:15 a.m. The cars will be in front of the hotel at 9:15 tomorrow morning to depart for the airport at 9:30 for a trip to Allen Island outpost camp.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, orders of the day.

ITEM NO. 13: ORDERS OF THE DAY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Orders of the day, November 3, 1980, 1:00 o'clock p.m., at the Gordon Robertson Education Centre.

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

12. Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. This House now stands adjourned until 1:00 o'clock p.m., November 3, 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