



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

DEBATES

3rd Session

9th Assembly

Official Report

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1980

Pages 840 to 887

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 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.

X0E 0V0

(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 Kilebuk

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.

X0E 0N0

(Mackenzie Liard)

Ms. Nellie J. Cournoyea, M.L.A.

P.O. Box 1184

Inuvik, N.W.T.

X0E 0T0

(Western Arctic)

Mr. Bruce McLaughlin, M.L.A.

P.O. Box 555

Pine Point, N.W.T.

X0E 0W0

(Pine Point)

Mrs. Lynda M. Sorensen, M.L.A.

P.O. Box 2348

Yellowknife, N.W.T.

X0E 1H0

(Yellowknife South)

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

3 November 1980

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	840
Oral Questions	840
Questions and Returns	841
Tabling of Documents	847
Notices of Motion	847
Motions	847
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Tabled Document 16-80(2) Report of the Special Committee on Unity	848
Report of the Committee of the Whole of:	
- Tabled Document 16-80(2) Report of the Special Committee on Unity	887
Orders of the Day	887

FROBISHER BAY, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1980

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

ITEM NO. 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

SPEAKER (Hon. Don Stewart): As I indicated on Friday it is my intention to go through the orders of the day. I would however, hope, that Members would just ask those things of an urgent nature so that they can continue with the unity debate. However, it is up to you. The question of time is in your hands.

Item 2, oral questions.

ITEM NO. 2: ORAL QUESTIONS

Mrs. Sorensen.

Question 170-80(2): Representation At DIAND Meeting Re NCPC

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is of an urgent nature. It is directed to the Minister of energy, the Hon. Mr. Nerysoo, but I see he is not here just now so I will direct it to the leader of the elected Executive, Mr. Braden. The standing committee on Indian affairs and northern development will be meeting on November 4th, which is tomorrow, to discuss the Northern Canada Power Commission and its service to northerners. Mr. Braden, in view of the fact that this Legislature has unanimously adopted a position with respect to the disposal of NCPC and the creation of a new territorial power commission, I wonder if you could assure myself and fellow Members that there will be territorial government representation at that November 4th hearing to present this Legislature's point of view.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, Hon. Mr. Braden.

Return To Question 170-80(2): Representation At DIAND Meeting Re NCPC

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In reply for my colleague, who is absent right now, I can indicate very briefly that the government will be presenting the motion through our intergovernmental affairs department in Ottawa to the standing committee. I am sorry I cannot provide any more detail right now.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Oral questions. Mr. Noah.

Question 171-80(2): Keewatin Students In Frobisher Bay

MR. NOAH: (Translation) Mr. Speaker, this is directed to the Minister of Education who can respond to this concerning the Keewatin students in Frobisher Bay. If they could be able to be sometime in this summer, could you please inform the Assembly on that? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice and file a reply.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Oral questions, Mr. Curley.

Question 172-80(2): Quota System For Outpost Camps

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have an urgent question to the Minister of Renewable Resources. Since the last Assembly urged the Minister to set up a quota system for outpost camps during the winter session, has the Minister any plans now to enforce the wish of the House as expressed during the winter session of this year?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, Hon. Mr. Nerysoo.

Return To Question 172-80(2): Quota System For Outpost Camps

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Yes. At present I am working on it because there were a number of things that were to take place. Some issues have been brought up already by outpost camps and hopefully we will have that resolved before the coming year.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Mr. Arlooktoo.

Question 173-80(2): Soapstone On Baffin Island

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) Mr. Speaker, I do not know which Minister I will direct this to. The Inuit people are waiting for -- the Quebec people are coming up to Baffin Island to get soapstone and I would like to be informed who should be able to answer this question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister, Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I guess I am the Minister responsible for soapstone. I will have to take that question as notice and I will report back for my hon. colleague as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions.

Item 3, written questions and returns.

ITEM NO. 3: QUESTIONS AND RETURNS

Ms. Cournoyea.

Question 174-80(2): Ordinances Regarding Incorporated Communities

MS. COURNOYEA: A question to the Minister of Local Government in regard to community government ordinance; an ordinance respecting community government, hamlet port; an ordinance respecting community government, incorporated communities, community government structures; difference between corporated communities and settlements.

I would like to seek clarification on what is going on regarding these ordinances. These proposed ordinances are being discussed by the Department of Local Government with local settlement councils within the last few months. The preliminary reactions I have had from these settlement councils who have considered it is, there is little, if anything, in that ordinance for the communities in the way of real power; they see it rather as a solidification of power at the Yellowknife level.

From my reading of this legislation I would agree and I think it is inconsistent with the aspirations of communities for devolution. In addition I understand from the settlement council of Sachs Harbour that the Department of Local Government is pressing that community to begin the process of incorporation as laid out in this draft ordinance. This is even before that ordinance has been considered by the council and before it is law.

There has been an expression of concern from within the communities of the Western Arctic on that draft ordinance and the actions of Local Government to press for implementation before legislation is even accepted or passed. The communities feel that these actions might well be not so subtle attempts to undermine their desire for real decision making and control as contemplated by their proposed Western Arctic regional municipality. Therefore I have the following questions to the Minister of Local Government.

- (1) Is he aware or did he instruct his officials in Local Government to carry out the above mentioned activities?
- (2) Does the Minister view the incorporated ordinance as a substitute for effective regional government, in particular the proposed Western Arctic regional municipality?
- (3) Why at this time is the Department of Local Government advocating this draft legislation, which in my opinion is inconsistent with the statement expressed with the Western Arctic communities for a form of regional government, in particular the Western Arctic municipalities?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Ms. Cournoyea. That is once. That is number one. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to have my memory refreshed on how written questions are to be put to this House. I think the hon. Member has as I understand it stated a number of opinions and arguments and requests and I would like you to let us know how questions should be put.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister, you are absolutely correct. It is very difficult to hear, until after the words have been spoken to know whether or not it is by way of explanation or by way of argument. That is why I have warned the Member that that was once and the question should be preceded only by a note of explanation required but not certainly a statement nor by arguments. Are there any further written questions? Mr. Kilabuk.

Question 175-80(2): Whaling In The N.W.T.

MR. KILABUK: (Translation) Mr. Speaker, from my past experience this was a request concerning the whaling in the Northwest Territories. Is it prohibited in the Northwest Territories? Can some of the communities get whales? Perhaps I can get an answer to this maybe not just now but later on.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Kilabuk. Any further written questions? Mr. Kilabuk.

Question 176-80(2): Mayor's Wages In Communities

MR. KILABUK: (Translation) Mr. Speaker, I think you will recall those questions concerning the mayors in the communities. There are mayors in some communities. I do not think that the mayors in the communities are earning enough wages yet and the communities that have mayors wanted to know what has been happening because they have been requested to start earning wages.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Kilabuk. Again, it is all right to give an explanation but not your opinion relative to the question. So in the future just try and keep your remarks to an explanation plus your question, not your opinion. Any further written questions? Returns? The Hon. Mr. Butters.

Return To Question 119-80(2): Driver's Licence Restricted To Frobisher Bay

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I have three brief returns. Question 119-80(2) asked by Mr. Patterson on October 23rd, related to driver's licences restricted to Frobisher Bay.

My reply is that it is only possible to obtain a driver's licence restricted to the Northwest Territories in Frobisher Bay and other centres outside of Yellowknife, Inuvik and western urban centres due to the fact that in order to maintain a sufficiently high standard of test which will ensure that our licence holders are competent to drive under the complex driving conditions found in other jurisdictions and have our driver's licences accepted by the other jurisdictions, sufficient roads, traffic control devices and traffic volumes are a prerequisite to providing road tests. It is not possible to provide a comprehensive driver road test without these requirements.

Return To Question 148-80(2): Inspection Of Kamotiq Inn In Frobisher Bay

The second return is to written Question 148-80(2), also asked by the hon. Member for Frobisher Bay regarding the inspection of Kamotiq Inn, Frobisher Bay.

The inspection of an establishment by a liquor inspector prior to issuance of a liquor licence is not mandatory but the Liquor Licensing Board may direct inspection take place. The Kamotiq Inn was inspected by representatives of the health and fire departments. The appointed liquor inspector was on annual leave and not available to inspect. The licence was in the possession of the representative of the Liquor Control System who was instructed to pass the licence to the applicant if no obvious discrepancies were evident. Inspection of the premises by a liquor inspector before opening would be limited to the items covered by health, fire and building inspections.

Return To Question 118-80(2): Education Facilities In Gjoa Haven

The last return, sir, is to written Question 118-80(2), asked by the hon. Member for the Central Arctic regarding educational facilities in Gjoa Haven.

On October 23rd, 1980, the architect along with an official from the Department of Education and the Department of Public Works, visited Gjoa Haven to review with the education committee and the teaching staff, plans for the completion of the mezzanine and renovations to the main floor. The project is on schedule for completion by the beginning of the 1981-82 school year. This project will provide the school with three additional classrooms in the presently undeveloped mezzanine area.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Are there any further returns? Hon. Mr. Nerysoo.

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

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is in reply to a question asked by Mrs. Sorensen on June 20th, 1980, with regard to the Beverly caribou herd.

The estimated number of caribou killed from the Beverly caribou herd in Saskatchewan during the winter of 1979-80 was over 12,000. The Saskatchewan kill in previous years averaged about 3000. Figures were obtained from monthly interviews with each hunter in Stony Rapids but in other communities the harvest was estimated by conservation officers. One reason for the high Saskatchewan kill was that an unusually large number of hunters had access to the caribou. This situation developed because caribou moved further south than in previous years and because low snowfall permitted hunters to drive to the animals. The numbers of caribou shot in the Northwest Territories and Manitoba from the Beverly herd were 2100 and 2500 respectively. The total 1979-80 kill was, including losses through crippling, therefore 20,000.

I was scheduled to have a meeting with the ministers of renewable resources of

Manitoba and Saskatchewan as well as the federal Ministers of DIAND and the Environment. It was to be at this forum that the Saskatchewan kill would have been discussed. The meeting is still planned but the federal Ministers' involvement with the constitutional conference and the budget have delayed it.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Any further returns? Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: There are further returns to be provided by the Executive at this time, Mr. Speaker, so is it possible for me to continue?

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, Mr. Braden, I could not hear you. Could you move closer to your mike?

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: There are further returns to be presented by the Executive at this time. Could we continue please?

MR. SPEAKER: I had asked for returns and I did not see any motions. I am sorry. Please proceed.

Return To Question 42-80(2): Proposed Polaris Mine

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you very much, sir. I have a number of returns, Mr. Speaker. I will start with return to Question 42-80(2), and it was asked by Mr. Patterson on June 13th at Baker Lake. It concerns the proposed Polaris Mine and the socio-economic agreement.

The following methodology to be used in negotiating a socio-economic agreement has been approved by the resource development committee. The resource development committee, headquarters departments and regions will review Cominco's socio-economic statement and develop a shortfall statement. The shortfall statement and basic elements/issues will be submitted to the RDC for approval. Following RDC approval the statement will be presented to Cominco. The resource development review package currently being finalized will be presented to the company and explained. Key government and industry representatives involved in the action plan will be identified.

Cominco will develop the action plan for submission to the Government of the Northwest Territories for approval. Consultation with communities and regional organizations will occur at this stage. When mutual agreement is reached a letter of agreement will be signed and attached to the action plan. Participants in the action plan developed will be Cominco and the Government of the Northwest Territories. There will be consultation with the following organizations: Baffin Region Inuit Association, Keewatin Inuit Association, Kitikmeot Inuit Association, the Baffin Regional Council, communities and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Return To Question 83-80(2): Consideration Of Transferring STEP Program

The next return I have, Mr. Speaker, is to Question 83-80(2), which was asked by Mrs. Sorensen on June 18th, 1980, at Baker Lake. It is consideration of transferring the STEP program or the Subsidized Term Employment Program.

The administration after review does not believe the Subsidized Term Employment Program should be a program of any one department; rather it should continue to function on a multidepartmental basis, co-ordinated at the regional level by the regional director with the participation, involvement, of Social Services, Economic Development and Tourism, Local Government and others as required.

STEP funds were decentralized to regional control in the 1980-81 fiscal year. The Department of Social Services does not have business management field staff available to monitor and advise projects adequately to ensure a smooth cash flow for well managed projects. There would not seem to be much advantage in transferring the funds from Economic Development to Social Services.

Return To Question 169-80(2): Vegetable Garden In Arctic Bay

I have a further reply, Mr. Speaker, to Question 169-80(2), which was asked by my hon. colleague Mr. Pudluk and it concerns the windmill and vegetable garden at Arctic Bay.

The office of energy conservation sent information to the office of the Member for the High Arctic and the hamlet of Arctic Bay earlier this year regarding the conservation and renewable energy development and demonstration program. The office of energy conservation offered to assist the hamlet in preparing their proposal for assistance under this program but has not yet heard anything further from them since May of this year. The Department of Economic Development and Tourism provided information to Mr. Pudluk in June regarding greenhouses in the North and offered to make available to the hamlet of Arctic Bay the data and records from the department's greenhouse pilot projects which operated in Frobisher Bay and Sanikiluaq. To date the department has not heard from Arctic Bay as to whether they wish to proceed with their greenhouse proposal.

Return To Question 160-80(2): Legislation Re Tendering On Projects

My fourth return, Mr. Speaker, is in reply to oral Question 160-80(2), which was asked by the hon. Mr. William Noah on October 28, 1980, which concerns legislation re tendering on government projects. The reply reads as follows:

While legislation is not in place at this time, there are two papers being developed that deal specifically with this issue. The Departments of Economic Development, Local Government, Public Works, Social Services, and the Housing Corporation are jointly preparing a purchasing policy which is aimed at providing preferential treatment to northern firms relative to supply and construction contracts as well as professional and special technical support contracts.

This policy will define northern businesses, northern materials, and categorize contract amounts to ensure that, whenever it can be shown that northern expertise is available within a competitive range and can perform the required duties without adversely affecting the supply of local goods and labour, a northern entrepreneur will be given priority over other contractors.

MR. CURLEY: Hear, hear!

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: In a similar context, a socio-economic review process is being developed that monitors the activities of non-renewable resource developers and then determines where and when these developments can and should make use of existing northern expertise, whether it be labour or the provision of goods and services. Again, this process involves a number of departments all of which have a vested interest in ensuring northern development benefits accrue to northern residents and communities.

Return To Question 162-80(2): Terms Of Contract

My final return, Mr. Speaker is a reply to written Question 162-80(2), asked by the hon. Bob MacQuarrie on October 28, 1980, and it concerns the terms of contracts with two advisers on mineral and petroleum resource development. The return reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

The terms of the contracts for the two ministerial advisers on mineral and petroleum resources include:

- (1) providing advice to the Minister on the development of major resource development policies;
- (2) providing advice to the resource development committee on the impact on the resource industry of proposed Government of the Northwest Territories policies;
- (3) providing, if I may say so, sir, a much needed liaison between the Minister and industry organizations;

- (4) bringing the Minister's attention to major problem areas identified by the northern mining industry; and
- (5) acting as a consultant to the department in the development of departmental positions relating to resource development.

As yet, Mr. Speaker, no work has been directly assigned to the advisers. However in the very near future, several assignments are scheduled. These are:

- (1) reviewing the proposed guidelines and review process for resource development;
- (2) assisting in identifying other ways and means of assuring more direct benefits to northerners;
- (3) identifying ways and means by which government and industry can better foster each other's goals; and
- (4) assessing the potential impact of the international biological projects program on future development. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Further returns, Mr. Wah-Shee.

Return To Question 144-80(2): Permanent Bridge For Little Buffalo River

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Mr. Speaker, I have a return for a question asked by Mr. Sayine on October 27th, regarding a bridge at Little Buffalo River.

Construction of a permanent bridge for the Fort Resolution highway crossing of the Little Buffalo River has been recommended to the Executive subcommittee on priorities and planning for construction in 1984. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Any further returns, Hon. Mr. McCallum?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I would ask your indulgence to provide a piece of information I think that would be of interest to the Members from the Keewatin South and the Keewatin North regarding the provision of a doctor in that area. It is not legitimately a return, but I wonder if I may make a statement regarding that as a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: It is certainly not a point of privilege, but go ahead.

Doctor For Keewatin

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to argue with you. Mr. Speaker, officials from the Department of Health of the Government of the Northwest Territories and Health and Welfare Canada have reached a verbal agreement whereby Health and Welfare Canada will recruit a physician to be resident in Rankin Inlet to serve the Keewatin. The Government of the Northwest Territories will provide accommodation at a subsidized rate, it will be providing a fee for service with a guaranteed minimum that would have to be negotiated and Health and Welfare Canada will provide travel, relocation costs, various fringe benefits that that government provides. It will make the contractual arrangements on a per diem basis for days spent in communities other than Rankin Inlet, the air transportation and accommodation while the physician is in other communities other than Rankin Inlet and it will provide capital funds to erect or renovate a building suitable as a clinic outside the nursing station.

There are other details to be arranged, Mr. Speaker, but Health and Welfare are now approaching in conjunction with the Government of the Northwest Territories Department of Health, the University of Manitoba to inquire about the relocation of a physician from Churchill. It may be necessary to take advantage of a house that may be set aside for a while by the housing association of Rankin Inlet for this particular doctor, but we expect that we would be able to accommodate the doctor and we look forward to this physician being in the Keewatin in the very near future.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. McCallum. I think all of the time that I have been in the House it is the first time I saw the rule with regard to returns broken but there is a first for everything. Congratulations, Mr. McCallum. Now, speaking of returns to questions, are there any further? No further returns.

Item 4, petitions. No petitions.

Item 5, tabling of documents.

ITEM NO. 5: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table Tabled Document 22-80(2), a letter from Allan McDonald who is the chairman of the NWTTA local at Sir John Franklin High School to Mr. Chris Reid who is the president of the Northwest Territories Teachers' Association, which outlines the extent of financial difficulties at Sir John Franklin High School.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Are there any further tabled documents? Mr. Nerysoo.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the following documents:

Tabled Document 23-80(2), Fourth Annual Report, Science Advisory Board of the Northwest Territories.

Tabled Document 24-80(2), Uranium Exploration in the Northwest Territories, Science Advisory Board of the Northwest Territories.

Tabled Document 25-80(2), Environmental Assessment Request, Science Advisory Board of the Northwest Territories.

Tabled Document 26-80(2), Recommendation to Develop a Medical Research Unit, Science Advisory Board of the Northwest Territories.

Tabled Document 27-80(2), Fish, Fur and Game in the Northwest Territories, Science Advisory Board of the Northwest Territories. Further, as Minister representing the Science Advisory Board, I would like to invite comment on the items raised in this document.

Tabled Document 28-80(2), A Summary of Electricity and Petroleum Product Consumption, Science Advisory Board of the Northwest Territories.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Are there any further tabled documents?

Item 6, reports of standing and special committees. Item 7, notices of motion.

ITEM NO. 7: NOTICES OF MOTION

Mr. MacQuarrie.

Notice Of Motion 54-80(2): Amendments To Mining Safety Ordinance

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to give notice that on Wednesday, November the 5th, I will move, seconded by the hon. Member from Yellowknife South, that the Minister responsible for the Mining Safety Ordinance prepare to make suitable amendments to that ordinance and that he announce to those unions and companies involved in mining in the Northwest Territories his intention to do so and that he provide them with suitable opportunity to recommend changes.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of motion. No further notices of motion. Item 8, motions.

ITEM NO. 8: MOTIONS

Mr. Curley, Motion 44-80(2), do you wish to proceed today with it?

MR. CURLEY: Not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Mr. Pudluk, Motion 47-80(2)?

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker, not at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Mrs. Sorensen, Motion 49-80(2)?

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I will stand it down today but I feel I must bring it forth tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson, Motion 50-80(2)?

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I will stand this motion down until after the unity committee's debate is finished.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Mr. Noah, Motion 51-80(2). Do you wish to proceed with it now or would you set it aside?

MR. NOAH: (Translation) I will stand it aside for now.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. We will go on to 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

We will resolve into committee of the whole to study the paper on unity, 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): I call the meeting to order and continue with the unity committee report. I think when we adjourned on Saturday we still had to hear from the Dene Nation, or were we through with them? What is the wish of the Members? Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I think that the one group of witnesses who were to come back and speak with us again is the Dene Nation and I believe they are in the House today.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Is it your wish that we bring back the Dene Nation for any questions?

---Agreed

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Sergeant-at-Arms, see that the witnesses from the Dene Nation are seated at the witness table. Thank you very much. We have the Dene Nation at the witness table, Mr. Frank T'Seleie and Mr. John T'Seleie. I understand that some of the Members still had questions and we will open the floor now to questions of the Members. Have you any comment to be made after hearing the reply made by ITC on Saturday if you were here? They had a go at the questions again. Have you any opening comments before we go into a question period? Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would turn the mike over to John T'Seleie to make an opening statement.

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We want to try and clarify statements that were made on Friday, I believe it was. I want to thank the Assembly for allowing us this time. I think on Friday some of you found our postures to be somewhat undiplomatic. Well, I have to say it is a result of our experience. I want to now try and clarify or make more clear for you the Dene Nation's position on this debate.

Dene And Inuit Live Side By Side

Traditionally the Dene and the Inuit have always lived side by side. There has been very little interference and this was basically the result of a lifestyle, a certain kind of relationship to the land. While we continue to believe that this is still the case with the vast majority of Inuit and we know it to be the case with the Dene, we recognize that modern influences have, to a large extent, changed certain things for both the Inuit and the Dene. However, we share the same modern struggles with Inuit people and it is because we share these struggles that we support the creation of Nunavut in principle. There is no question of our support for the right of the Inuit to set up their own government, but because our futures are inseparable and because we share many similar characteristics as a people, our support must be seen as mutual. By this we mean that this Assembly must support also the Dene Nation's position for the creation of Denendeh in the western part of the Northwest Territories. Mr. Chairman, I have some other points that I want to bring out, but I think they will come out during the questions.

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

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to say that we have had a meeting with ITC over the weekend and have come to some understanding. I would like on behalf of ITC and the Dene Nation to release a joint statement.

Joint Statement Of ITC And Dene Nation

- (1) ITC and the Dene Nation support the division of the existing Northwest Territories into Nunavut and Denendeh.
- (2) ITC and the Dene Nation express their hope that the creation of Nunavut and the creation of Denendeh will proceed with the active support and assistance of the Northwest Territories Legislative Assembly. Support and assistance should commence with the appropriate resolutions by the Northwest Territories Legislative Assembly on the principle and processes of division.
- (3) ITC and the Dene Nation recognize that forms of public government may need to differ in some respects between Nunavut and Denendeh.
- (4) ITC and the Dene Nation also recognize that the people of Nunavut and the people of Denendeh may seek somewhat different powers from the Government of Canada for the government of Nunavut and the government of Denendeh. ITC and the Dene Nation join, however, in requesting the Government of Canada to be particularly flexible in negotiating the demands of the people of Nunavut and the people of Denendeh for suitable powers over resource development and resource control.
- (5) ITC and the Dene Nation state their determination to work co-operatively to resolve the question of a boundary between Nunavut and Denendeh. ITC and the Dene Nation recognize that the boundary question will necessarily involve consultation with the Government of Canada. ITC and the Dene Nation believe that the resolution of the boundary question would be assisted by the appointment of a minister of Nunavut and a minister of Denendeh to the existing Executive Committee of the Northwest Territories Legislative Assembly.
- (6) Lastly, ITC and the Dene Nation assert that aboriginal rights issues are issues to be dealt with by the representatives of the aboriginal peoples and by the Government of Canada.

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

---Applause

You have heard the opening remarks and comments from the Dene Nation. If we want to go into a question period now with the Dene Nation, there are some further questions I think that some of the Members wanted to ask. I take it then there will be no more questions. Mr. Noah.

Position Of Support For ITC Unchanged

MR. NOAH: (Translation) Mr. Chairman, thank you. If I understood correctly it seems to me that the Dene Nation on Friday were not in support of the creation of Nunavut as a government. Is this correct to my understanding?

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

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: I do not think our position regarding support for ITC creating its own government has changed. We support it in principle.

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

MR. NOAH: (Translation) Yes, that is answered.

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

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. T'Seleie, I wonder if you could outline and elaborate a bit further on the principles of the government that you call Denendeh.

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

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: I do not know how much detail you want on that. In the Western Arctic the Dene are still the majority and I think the principles extend from there.

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

MRS. SORENSEN: I would be specifically interested in timing. I would be interested in the boundaries that you propose, the type of government, whether it would be public government or private government, that kind of thing.

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

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: The Dene Nation has been ready to negotiate for quite a few years. As far as public and private government is concerned, I think that I do not understand that because I always thought that government was public.

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

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. T'Seleie, do you have a paper that outlines what your government is and how it is to be set up? Has it been released?

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

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: I am sorry. I did not catch the whole question. Would you repeat it, please?

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

Document On Denendeh As A Government

MRS. SORENSEN: I asked, Mr. T'Seleie, whether you had a document or a paper that outlines what Denendeh is as a government and how it would be set up. Has that paper been released, if there is such a document?

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

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: Yes, there has been. Different statements have been released over the years; statements of basic principles and statements of things that have to do with consensus. The decision making in our communities with our people takes a long time because we try to work in such a way that everybody has a say in what is going on. I am not clear on why you are asking these questions.

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

MRS. SORENSEN: When you went before the unity committee, did you present that document to the unity committee?

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

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: No.

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

MR. MACQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. T'Seleie, if this Assembly were to establish a constitutional development committee as is recommended by the special committee on unity, would the Dene Nation be willing to participate with that committee to try to work out principles for the development of a public government in the Western Arctic?

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

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: Yes, we would be willing to be part of such a committee if it is established.

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

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Do I take it from discussions that you have had this weekend with ITC that you now feel that the border question, which you earlier said was a problem, could likely be solved by discussions between the Inuit and the Dene?

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

MR. FRANK T'SELEIE: Yes, that could be resolved between ourselves, between the Dene and the Inuit.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Any further questions? Hon. Mr. McCallum.

Figures On Dene Majority

HON. ARNOLD MCCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. John T'Seleie. Mr. Chairman, Mr. T'Seleie made a statement wherein he said that the Dene are the majority in the West. My question is twofold. What figures does Mr. T'Seleie have to back that statement and does he include within the Dene the Metis?

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

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: Yes, the Metis are included with the Dene, together in the majority.

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

HON. ARNOLD MCCALLUM: I would just like to ask again the first question. What figures does he have to suggest the Dene are the majority?

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

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: I am sorry, I did not memorize any figures.

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

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering if the witnesses can tell us whether the Dene Nation looks to this Assembly to give it support for its government proposal, Denendeh, in the northwestern part of the North.

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

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: Yes, the creation of Nunavut implies the creation of another territory and we have been after our own government for many, many years, so what we are after here is for this Assembly to pass a motion of support for the creation of Denendeh.

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

MR. SIBBESTON: Do the witnesses feel that the relationship between the Dene Nation and the territorial government has become better in the last year and do they intend to hold discussions with all people in the northwestern part of the North in regard to their proposal for Denendeh?

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

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Any further questions? There being no further questions could we thank the witnesses. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: Mr. Chairman, may I make a few additional comments?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Fine, go ahead, Mr. T'Seleie.

Advantages For All Northern People

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: The Dene Nation feels that the creation of Nunavut and Denendeh is in the interest of all northern people. It would be advantageous for all northern people, because it would mean the transfer of certain controls to the North. I think that refers back to some of the statements we made on Friday in the prepared statement, that this Assembly has to begin to take serious measures in taking control from Ottawa, because this debate that we are involved in today is not only a debate about the creation of a government or the drawing of a line on a map. I think that it is a debate that touches on the larger issues of national unity, the larger issues of the constitution, and that if this government lies down and plays dead that the rights of all northern people will be threatened. I hope that during your debates you will keep that in mind. Thank you.

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

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, a question arising out of the statement just made by the witness. He mentioned, and I do not know if I have the correct quote, but suggesting that the division of the present Northwest Territories "would be advantageous for all northern people". Am I then correct in believing that the witness is saying that any such division is of interest to all of the people of the Northwest Territories and that all of the people of the Northwest Territories should be consulted, involved, and have an opportunity to comment on the proposed division?

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

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: Yes, certainly it means all of those things.

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

Conditional Support For Assembly

HON. DON STEWART: The witness has indicated that a strong stand should be taken by the government. I presume by "government" he meant the territorial Assembly as so constituted now. It has been my understanding that the Dene Nation has refused to recognize this Assembly as their government. Is the Dene Nation prepared to recognize this? It seems we cannot act as your government since you have publicly stated that we are not your government. Are you prepared to reverse that and say that we are your government now?

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

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: Mr. Stewart, we live in a democratic country. One of the principles of democracy is the right of people to vote for the type of government that they want and that the support in a democratic country is support of people and is conditional upon what the government of that country does. That is a principle of democracy. Of course, for us to give this Assembly its unconditional support would be foolish from our point of view. Our support is conditional upon whether or not this government serves our interests and that is what democracy is about.

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

HON. DON STEWART: Thank you for the lesson on democracy. The problem as I have seen it, the territorial government has lost a great deal of strength in negotiating for many of the things that you want. Again we run into the federal system that says that the Dene does not recognize you so how can you speak for anything that they may want. This has always been the problem. We have got to try and get one roof over what we are trying to do, so that we can accomplish the things that you want, but we have no strength. One group says, "Well, we do not recognize you" and the other group says, "We do not recognize you", so the territorial Assembly really has had a great deal of its strength pulled away from it by the mere fact that groups within the Northwest Territories have flatly stated "It is not our government."

Dene Nation Must Recognize The Government

So, we have had our problems. I think until we can rise at the time and say "Yes, we want change and we are prepared to work towards change" and when you recognize us not as a negotiator for your land claims as we recognize this is your prerogative, there are things that we can do but have got to do them with your blessing. Yes, you must say they are our government and they are speaking for us. Do you see what I mean? You see, the Dene Nation has flatly said time after time that we do not recognize that government.

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

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: Mr. Stewart, I think if you would institute a motion to try to get some kind of court action against the Norman Wells pipeline that you would have more of our support.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I am just wondering if the Dene Nation's position in respect to this government is that they do not recognize the government as their government. They do recognize that it is a government, but that it does not have the full support of the Dene Nation. Is that a correct assessment of your view toward this government?

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

MR. JOHN T'SELEIE: Yes, I think that is basically it.

MR. SIBBESTON: That is what I thought.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. T'Seleie. Any further questions? There being no further questions, could we thank the witnesses? Agreed? Thank you very much for appearing again before Assembly and answering questions. Mr. Curley.

Appreciation For CBC Coverage

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to congratulate the last witnesses from the native organizations because I think I should say at this time that we have had for the first time, an opportunity to give those organizations extensive opportunity to respond to the Members of the Assembly. By doing that I would also like to give my appreciation to the coverage the CBC has had with those people. Because they have been a minority, they have never had an opportunity for extensive coverage but this time I think the CBC deserves to be given a little nod of appreciation by this House.

---Applause

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Curley. Thank you again, Mr. Frank T'Seleie and Mr. John T'Seleie. We have completed the witnesses. It was recommended that they come back and answer questions. I think we have had them all back, whoever is here, and I believe that the municipal mayor from Yellowknife has returned home so we cannot get him on the stand. Is it the wish then that we go into the unity committee report? We are open for comments from the floor on the unity committee report, but first of all we will break for 15 minutes for coffee.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The Chair recognizes a quorum. We are open for general comments on the special committee on unity of the Ninth Assembly. I am going to try to restrict the comments to Members other than the unity committee. The unity committee have had a chance to comment. They will get a chance again but I would like to see the Members comment and then we will come back to the Members of the unity committee. Comments of a general nature. Mr. Pudluk.

Changes Cannot Be Made Overnight

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a small comment concerning the witnesses. I would like to make a motion we appreciate them for coming as witnesses. On the question of division it seems to make a lot of sense to our land, our people, our settlements. I have been a Member for five years now. I have one problem that exists concerning the legislation that we are trying to make, trying hard. It has caused quite a bit of problems because there are differences in our culture and our ways, mostly concerning the wildlife regulations. This cannot be cleared up because of differences in lifestyle. If the North is to be divided, there will be probably other problems concerning this. We cannot just leave things the way they are below the tree line. We cannot just leave them like that and I know we will not, but if the ordinances could be operated, the ordinances could be in better condition and because of those ordinances problems are forcing the division of the Northwest Territories. I know that it cannot be done overnight. It probably would solve a lot of financial problems that we have right now. This Legislative Assembly can make this unity committee follow our options and I am in full support of what they wrote down. Also the ITC presentation that they gave us, I appreciated it too. I thought I was just going to make a small comment. That is what I wanted to tell you, that there are differences in the Northwest Territories. That is all for now. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Pudluk. Next speaker I have is Ms. Cournoyea. I would just like to remind Members that when making general comments you should also feel free to ask questions of clarification of the committee, whether it be the chairman or one of the Members of the committee. Ms. Cournoyea.

MS. COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I am not asking or making a general comment. What I would like to know from the chairman of the unity committee, I would like a breakdown on where he met with the various organizations and what amount of time he spent with each.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms. Cournoyea. Are you prepared to answer that now, Mr. MacQuarrie?

Schedule Of Unity Committee

MR. MACQUARRIE: To the best of my ability, certainly from memory. We met with the board of directors of the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada in Eskimo Point near the end of March and the meeting we attended with them lasted several hours. I cannot say exactly how many, but it was several hours. Prior to that time we did have or did sit for an evening with the Hon. C.M. Drury over dinner and talked about a variety of things that were related to his report and also to what we were trying to do. That would have been perhaps three hours time. We visited the regional Inuit associations, the Baffin Region Inuit Association in Frobisher Bay in July, the Keewatin Inuit Association in Baker Lake in June, the Kitikmeot Inuit Association in Cambridge Bay in August and again each of these meetings would have been of several hours duration, the one in Baker Lake being the shortest, perhaps only an hour and a half maybe there. The others were longer than that. We also met with the board of directors of the Metis Association in Yellowknife and that would have been in July as I recollect, and the meeting again would have been a period of a few hours. We also met with the Dene Nation in Yellowknife on two occasions. The first would have been with the president, I cannot really recall whether it was April or somewhere in that neighbourhood and that would have been over a period of perhaps two and a half hours, and again in September for a period of perhaps two and a half hours, something like that.

In addition a great many materials were circulated to Members which included the positions of all of the native groups in the Northwest Territories, the COPE agreement in principle, the Dene discussion paper on Dene government in the Mackenzie Valley, the Nunavut proposal of ITC and Drury's report and a great many other papers as well. I cannot vouch that every Member read every document but I can vouch that I did so. In addition, we had a final meeting in Yellowknife that extended over four days during which time we referred specifically to many things that were written in the proposals, went back and read them in a variety of documents, discussed them, recollected the meetings that we had had with a variety of people and talked about -- pardon me, there was one other meeting, the COPE meeting in Inuvik and I think that was late July, and that would have lasted about three hours as well. Back to the final meeting again which extended over a period of four days when we did quite thoroughly I think discuss and review the things that we had heard and talked about and read and then finally began to deal with recommendations after that extensive discussion.

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

MS. COURNOYEA: When you were conducting your unity visits to the various places that you have visited, did you have a specific list of questions that were given to each organization or group that were similar?

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

Unity Committee Prepared With Specific Questions

MR. MacQUARRIE: We started out in that fashion. I would say largely that was a method that I had chosen as chairman, not to formally put questions to the group but rather that we would be prepared with questions, but I found that as the groups saw that we were prepared with questions they wanted copies of those specific questions. When we gave them those copies, that kind of diverted the free discussion and interplay that we were seeking so that in meetings later on we tended to get away from that. Each of the Members thought over the kinds of things that they would like to know themselves and those matters were raised at the meetings.

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

MS. COURNOYEA: Then you would say that the list of questions that you began with was not applied to your later meetings, you made the decision somewhere between half way in your discussions with people that this was not a good idea so in your last meetings you did not have the list of questions available or presented?

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

MR. MacQUARRIE: Not a list of formal questions at the end, although certainly many of the same questions that had been raised earlier would have been raised at times like that but naturally in dealing with each group there would certainly be a different focus, different concerns, depending on the group we were dealing with.

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

Support Of Unity Committee

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have general comments that I would like to make now concerning the unity committee report. Throughout the last 12 months, Mr. Chairman, I have defended the Ninth Assembly's move to not be bound by the Eighth Assembly's position paper on political and constitutional development and in addition I have and I know my constituents have supported the Ninth Assembly's decision to appoint the unity committee to determine and make recommendations on a means by which a political consensus might be generated among the people of the Northwest Territories. Now it was my understanding that

the creation of the unity committee and the approval of its mandate was the first stage of the Legislative Assembly's plan to develop its own position on constitutional development in the Northwest Territories. It was also my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the second stage would involve the implementation of the unity committee's recommendations as adopted by this Legislative Assembly. Now over the last 12 months I have felt quite confident that the unity committee was working diligently and urgently to develop recommendations for this fall session and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we have been presented with what I would term a very powerful report, a report which in fact will change the North.

There is at least one fundamental principle within this report which I feel we must discuss even before we discuss the recommendations. The unity committee has in its preamble clearly stated that the Northwest Territories has served as an interim measure for the provision of public administration to be altered when some other part or parts of the Territories seemed ready for provincial status and I am talking about the Northwest Territories, not the Northwest Territories government, although the same would probably apply.

Now, if a new territory called Nunavut is established then the unity committee tells us that the interim arrangement stills exists in the remaining jurisdiction in the West and ITC supports that. I believe they said on Saturday that we have not decided what we want in the West and I am afraid that many would agree. The unity committee infers that we are not really forming two new territories if we divide, only one called Nunavut which aspires as Saskatchewan and Alberta did in 1905 to provincehood, that we in the West are not sure of what we want and that is why the constitutional committee and a constitutional conference has been recommended for the leftover region known as the Northwest Territories if we should divide.

N.W.T. Has Been Whittled Away

I can develop that theory, Mr. Chairman, the theory that the Northwest Territories is an interim measure. Briefly though, in 1870 the Northwest Territories was purchased from the Hudson's Bay Company by Canada. This was a huge tract of land that included and covered most of Canada. Since that purchase the Northwest Territories have been whittled away as parts seemed ready for provincial status. We have all heard that Manitoba was first to divide or leave the Northwest Territories forming the fifth Canadian province. More of the Northwest Territories was given to Quebec and Ontario to complete their provincial boundaries. Then came Saskatchewan and Alberta and now, Mr. Speaker, now the unity committee states history is taking its course. Another part of the Northwest Territories wishes to break away. It feels it is ready for provincial status. That part will be called Nunavut.

The unity committee points out that the remaining portion, the Western Arctic, will remain the Northwest Territories and to continue on as a stopgap administration unless or until the people of that area decide differently. What we could have next is the western High Arctic breaking away when it is ready. We may also have that area defined as Denendeh feel it is ready for provincial status and so break away or, Mr. Chairman, the West could opt to have one public government in one tract of land with a new name. As this happens the Northwest Territories, as history knows it, would become less and less of a huge tract of land. If history is correct it will continue to shrink and eventually cease to exist.

This, my friends, my honourable colleagues, is a powerful fundamental principle in the unity committee report and one that this Legislative Assembly must adopt or reject even before we begin to discuss the recommendations, because the concept of what the Northwest Territories is and has been will determine to a great extent how we must vote on the unity committee's recommendations. We cannot ignore the unity committee's preamble. It is too important and relates too much to the recommendations to leave without discussion.

Division Inevitable But Subject To Referendum

Now, with respect to Mr. Patterson's motion supporting division, it was my feeling initially that if it was discussed before the recommendations of the unity committee it would usurp the role of the unity committee. Mr. Patterson, I thought, would be asking the Assembly to approve of a constitutional change before the Assembly had even determined the mechanism for the discussion of major change, let alone conducted the second stage of its plan, that of through that mechanism determine the consensus point of view on constitutional change. Mr. Chairman, the unity committee has already rejected that. It has accepted the fact that division is inevitable, but of course, subject to a referendum.

Next then, it has recommended through recommendation number nine, a mechanism whereby the remaining territory can shape its future and that mechanism is a constitutional committee and possibly a constitutional conference. With respect to the report, I must say again that the committee has worked hard to try to please everyone because there is something for everyone in it. However, I caution that it cannot be taken lightly.

MR. CURLEY: We cannot wait too long.

MRS. SORENSEN: I made a submission to the unity committee in early September and in that report there were at least nine recommendations. At least five of those recommendations are in some way or another included in the unity committee's report and I like that, but there are some which were not and, therefore, when we are in the more detailed discussion of the report I will elaborate further on those items and try to persuade my colleagues here to include them.

Eighth Assembly Missed Brilliant Opportunity

The unity committee report makes reference to Mr. Drury's statement in his now well known letter of April 22nd, 1980, recently reprinted in the News of the North in which he stated, "Residents of the Northwest Territories should assume major responsibility for determining political change." Certainly I apply that statement. It has been my position for many years. If I have one major criticism of the Eighth Assembly, that is the last Assembly, it would be the fact that they decided to co-operate with the Drury commission. As much as I respect and admire Mr. Drury and his hard working and loyal staff and as much as I agree with many of the Drury report suggestions and recommendations, it was always absolutely clear to me that we in the North had to decide what our political and constitutional future would be. What was even more clear to me and I remember saying it at the time, was that the Eighth Legislative Assembly missed a brilliant opportunity to join with the native organizations in their boycott of the Drury commission. They perhaps missed their only opportunity to begin a relationship with the native organizations which was long overdue.

The Drury report has not been discussed in this House and I doubt that it ever will. I agree with the unity committee when they say that many of the Drury report suggestions will have application when the details of constitutional development are addressed in one or more northern territories because his report is practical and many of his suggestions useful and worthy of deep consideration.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mrs. Sorensen, are you just about finished? You have used your ten minutes.

MRS. SORENSEN: Yes. I say we will not discard the report because of the personalities of the people involved in the Drury report. I believe that they were and are good people, but simply they were not of us. They were a creature of the federal government and northerners can no longer afford to allow our political future to be a subject of federal study.

Political And Constitutional Recommendations Are In Northern Hands

The unity committee report, Mr. Chairman, is the beginning of our Drury report, our own special report on political and constitutional change. Mr. Patterson's

motion, a brilliant motion, a good motion which is due to come up for debate soon is the beginning of the shaping of our political and constitutional destiny, the beginning of making tough decisions in this House and recommendations to the federal government which, as some have always said, have always been put aside as too tough to address. The difference, Mr. Chairman, this time is that political and constitutional recommendations are out of the control of the federal hands and in the hands of the northern people, in the hands of this Legislative Assembly made up of all people of the North, in the hands of the people where it belongs. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Any further comment? Mr. Sibbeston, we were going to give the Members that have not spoken yet to the report first chance, but it does not seem like anybody has their hand up. Mr. Butters? We will come back to the unity committee Members at a later time.

Debt Of Gratitude To Unity Committee

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Speaking, sir, to general comments. I have two particular directions I would like to pursue, but first I would spend my first ten minutes congratulating the unity committee, the five Members who not only conceived the idea and put it to the House, but brought it to its completion in a very short space of time. In recognizing a debt of gratitude to the Members of that committee, I do not in any way suggest that I am totally in support of some of the directions that it presents to us or the recommendations that it has laid before us, but I think we cannot take away from that committee a real debt for the very hard work and care and thoughtfulness that has gone into it by its Members and particularly its chairman, the hon. Bob MacQuarrie.

I remember on the first opportunity to reply to the Commissioner's opening Address, I mentioned that the Ninth Assembly is a very interesting departure from previous Assemblies in that for the first time the debate and the dialogue in the Territories will not be a case of "other voices : other rooms". In the Ninth Assembly the record and history will show that the debate on constitutional evolution in the Northwest Territories took place where it belongs, in the territorial House of Assembly and I think that this is one of the pluses and achievements of the unity committee in that as a result of their report they have enabled us to hear from, with the one exception and that is the Inuvialuit, they have enabled us to hear from all of the major organizations in these Territories today.

Understandably, the Hon. Bud Drury was not present but I think that he would be delighted even though he could not be here with what has occurred in this chamber. If you will remember, Bud Drury has said and his report contains the recommendation and in fact his covering letter to the Prime Minister indicates that the people of the North will be able to resolve and work out their own particular differences if given the opportunity and left alone to do so.

Interest In Division For Many Years

I would just like to briefly examine the presentations that have been made to us. I cannot recall that in any presentation that we heard and even in any comment or question or suggestion that we have heard from the Members of this Assembly that there is anybody against the idea of division of the Territories. The idea is an old one as the hon. Member from Frobisher Bay has pointed out, it became a bill in the House of Commons in 1964 I believe and died on the order paper at that time, but that did not end the interest in division. It materialized in the report of the Carrothers Commission and the Carrothers Commission we will remember, recommended that the concept of division be delayed for ten years. I remember that very well because in 1964-65 my presentation to the Carrothers Commission was for division.

In 1975 the ten years being up, the outgoing Seventh Assembly of that day, and the incoming Eighth Assembly recalled and recollected that recommendation and sought for a re-examination of the question of division. The Eighth Assembly has received a number of kicks and slights for possibly not addressing this question but I think that some of our current membership forget the climate in which the Eighth Assembly was comprised. For the first time we had 15 elected Members. We recognized the issue of division was very strong. In fact the previous member for Frobisher Bay, the hon. Bryan Pearson was personally responsible for seeing that the Eighth Assembly was 15 seats. Had it not been for Mr. Pearson, that Assembly would have been assembled with 14 seats and there would have been an imbalance with the Arctic areas not so well represented, but Mr. Pearson made a personal representation to Mr. Chrétien and 15 seats were set up.

Eighth Assembly Did Not Ignore Division

I think there was a recognition that for the first time elected Members were in control of the government to a certain extent. We recognized that we wanted to make the government work. We wanted to put to rest the lie that elected people, a wholly elected Assembly could not be responsible and could not carry out the function of a legislature. I believe we put that criticism and concern, relegated that concern to the place where it deserves to be. However, we did not ignore -- while we did not debate division, we did not ignore it and in the Priorities for the North paper which the Eighth Assembly put out, there is one item on constitutional development which indicated that we were aware of the question of division as we said at that time and this received very thorough consideration by every member of that House.

The same cannot be said for the constitutional report we gave to Bud Drury. That was hammered together in the last few months of the Eighth Assembly's life and it did not get the examination and consideration by members of the Assembly that it maybe should have, but the Eighth Assembly said the question of division of the Northwest Territories is of such magnitude that it must be brought within the terms of reference of the Prime Minister's special representative and in no case would this Legislature recommend any division based on the new federal constituency boundaries. This is what we recommended. We recommended that the subject of division might possibly be referred to a referendum at the time of the next general elections, so that the Eighth Assembly did recognize that division was a very important question but rather than have it appear to split that 15 seat Assembly we recognized its importance and referred it for consideration at another time.

Summarization Of Witnesses

Now to bring us closer to the debate that is beginning on the division issue, I would like to just very quickly summarize what I heard the various witnesses say. COPE, as you remember, could not attend because of the short time available to them and they suggested to us that "If you are truly seeking our effective involvement in the consideration of this issue it should be delayed until the next session." ITC which has indicated its interest in the division issue for many years said that ITC has never argued that the creation of Nunavut could be achieved overnight and in another case one of the witnesses said "I think people should understand that once the idea of creating a new political unit has been accepted that is all we are really after." So all they are asking us is to recognize that division is a realistic direction for the people of the North to pursue. The Member of Parliament for the Western Arctic, the Hon. Dave Nickerson said "I think that division should have occurred in the 1960's" and his colleague in the opposition also supported as a concept the direction of division. The Association of Municipalities said the Association of Municipalities can agree that in the long term division is perhaps the inevitable.

The Metis Association said "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..."

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Butters, your ten minutes are up. Are you just about through? We are going to have to change the rules here. I think maybe if it is the wish of the Members on an important report like this if they want to change the rules to let Members talk over ten minutes, otherwise we are going to have to get unanimous consent to continue with the comments. Carry on. Three seconds.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: "...when it is most beneficial and agreeable to all people of the North" and the Dene Nation position was one that accepted the concept of division, but again suggested that certain powers should be in the hands of the people of the Territories before that division occurred. Thank you. I have some more things to say when I have more time.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. Mr. Butters. Any further comments? I am asking Members who do not belong to the unity committee to comment on the report and then we can go back to the Members. If there is nobody else to comment -- Hon. Mr. McCallum.

Difficulty Unity Committee Has Encountered

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I would just like very briefly to indicate that I would recognize the difficulty that a committee such as this would have in trying to prepare and to complete a report dealing with such a difficult and important topic that its mandate gave it within such a period of time, not only in moving around the various areas and meeting with various people, either collectively or individually and trying to assess and put down what those views are and to come forth as a voice either for unity or for something else. It is not unusual to have that committee criticized in a number of areas for, among other things, lack of full and meaningful, to use the kind of terminology that is banded about, consultation and it is not possible to get all these things together. However, I would as I say, like to indicate my appreciation of the difficulty that the committee encountered in its work. I have some concerns that it was a committee for unity and, of course, what comes out of it is not unity and that may be the difficulty with the name itself. Quite obviously it is a misnomer, given the final result.

Previous Assemblies Wanted Change

There is some indication that there should be some kind of unity, as Mrs. Sorensen indicated, the possibility that there may be some unity in parts of the Territories, not the least of which there would be unity as was expressed by ITC within their proposed area. However, I would simply like to suggest to Members of the committee, that is, this committee of the whole that I think it is not only native groups, I believe it is not only native groups that want change in government. I think there has been change advocated in government, even going back to the Sixth and Seventh Assemblies of the Northwest Territories and the little bit of things that they did in comparison with later ones, obviously they wanted change. Certainly in terms of the Seventh Assembly they put forth the idea of increased representations, put forth the idea that there had to be a fully elected Assembly at that time and I think the kind of work that they opened up was continued by the Eighth Assembly, will be continued by the Ninth Assembly. But I want to know that many people recognize there is a need to change, for that change to be brought about. There are many statements that I agree with, not the least of which would be that political development must and can only proceed when the expressed interests of various communities of people are heard and addressed. I agree that strong and effective government for all people has to be founded upon the consent of those who are governed.

While I agree that there were many aspects to the committee's report that I would be in support of, nevertheless there were some conclusions made in the recommendations that I find very difficult to not only support but to recognize the conclusions that were drawn. To those particular areas...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. McCallum, we are having difficulty with the interpreters. Can you hear me now? Carry on, Mr. McCallum. How about now? Apparently we are having some problems here. Testing, testing, one, two, three. Maybe we should get Mr. Butters back on there so he could keep talking. Mr. McCallum, try again.

Appreciation Of Unity Committee Members' Work

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I would simply conclude that there are aspects and recommendations of the committee's report with which I agree. Conversely there are aspects and recommendations that I will find it very difficult to support, that I fail to see the logic behind the kinds of recommendations that were made, so that I will have particular comments to make regarding individual recommendations as we go through those, but I simply want as an indication of how I feel in terms of the committee's work and the effort and time that was involved that I will, of course, appreciate the work that was done by the Members and the actual end result of it. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. McCallum. I just have a note from one of the Members and I will throw it over to the floor. If we could go through the recommendations starting from one and then discuss each recommendation, I wonder what the Members feel about that. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that this debate is the most important debate for this House. We have spent three and a half days listening to the very valuable representations made by witnesses and I think that Members of the committee should be allowed to remain on the area of general comments for as long as they feel it is necessary, because once division occurs it occurs for all time.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Butters. Is it agreed then that we open the floor for general comments?

---Agreed

Mr. Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have talked a lot about division already in the life of this Assembly, probably too long for some of the Members' taste. I think I once spoke for over an hour and a half in reply to the Commissioner's Address in Yellowknife and some hon. Members told me I had better learn to make shorter speeches, but I am trying to learn by the way, Mr. Stewart, but I must say that for me personally I am very thrilled about this debate having taken place in Frobisher Bay. I have sensed that we are making history and I have a strong feeling that what we are discussing is perhaps the most -- I am certainly not as long an observer as some people I have talked to -- but they seem to share this opinion, perhaps the most important debate this Assembly has ever had since it began.

Division A Vital Precedent To Making Progress

I personally have always had a very strong belief that the division of the Northwest Territories was a vital precedent to making progress. I ran for election in Frobisher Bay on a platform of dividing the Northwest Territories. My predecessor, Mr. Pearson, felt the same way and in fact I remember during the election campaign in Frobisher Bay, just near the end of it, he put an ad in the newspaper and said "I cannot wait for Nunavut." So I feel that the people of Frobisher Bay have always seen the sense of division and I mean all the people, not just the Inuit either.

I would like to briefly say and perhaps disagree with Mr. McCallum that this was not a committee set up to promote unity at all costs. I think Mr. MacQuarrie made that quite clear when the committee was established and in fact for that reason it was named a committee on unity and not a committee for unity. I think they have made an honest effort to see if there was a consensus in favour of unity and clearly have found none.

I would like to pay perhaps particular credit to the chairman of the committee, because I think that it is evident from the report that he has done his objective best to put together all of the different opinions that he encountered across the Northwest Territories. I think it is probably fair to say that he has done so at perhaps some personal political risk since many of his constituents might well disagree with some of the stands that he has taken on such issues as whether or not there should be a universal plebiscite and whether or not the people in the East should be able to decide for themselves. I think he has done that because he has been deeply committed to being fair and objective and I personally want to say that I am very impressed with the way he has conducted his duties as chairman.

I would also like to say that I disagree with Mr. Drury and perhaps Mr. Drury would change his opinion now if he were to be asked if the people of the Northwest Territories are ready to make this momentous decision. In his report, he felt that we were not yet sufficiently aware of the issues and the ramifications to decide and I am not sure that that is true any longer. I certainly feel that at the very least after this week the Members of this Assembly are ready to give some leadership and direction and chart a course.

People All Over N.W.T. Listening To Debate

I also must echo the previous comments earlier today of my gratitude to the CBC for having on very short notice, broadcast in I believe eight languages, this debate to the people of the Northwest Territories, because I think the people of the Northwest Territories are perhaps already very highly politicized. You just have to look at the turnout that we have in municipal and territorial elections compared with other parts of Canada to see that people are interested in the workings of government. After this debate and it is only because it has made the public aware of the issues there has already been a tremendous success no matter what we decide. I think the public consciousness has been tremendously increased. I went, Mr. Chairman, to an outpost camp yesterday and was astonished to find, and I did not raise the subject, that both young and old people at the Allen Island outpost camp have been listening to this debate on radio this week with fascination and are very excited about what is going on. They are excited about the fact that a large part of the discussion has taken place in a language that they can understand. And I have heard comments from all parts of the Territories through other Members that the people are excited about what is happening and this is very thrilling to me because I believe that this is the most important thing that this Assembly will discuss. I believe particularly for me personally, that if we can make a decision to chart a course and plan the future that personally it will be much more easy for me to participate in this government and work with this government, because I do not understand the West. Some may say I do not even understand the East, but we live in a very complicated society with extremely complicated, competing interests and I think it is too much to expect Members of this Assembly to assimilate and rationalize all of those interests and come out with policies that will please everyone. I think it is just logical that it is too big for all of us to handle, despite our willingness to co-operate and make compromises.

Consensus Much Closer As Result Of Debate

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I think this Assembly, that I have now had the pleasure of associating with for over a year, is a remarkable collection of people and I look forward to working with this Assembly to implement its decisions and I think while we are together we can do a lot before division takes place. I echo the feelings of some people in the West that there is a lot that this Assembly can do before division takes place.

Just in summing up, Mr. Chairman, I think and again I would disagree with the Hon. Mr. McCallum, I think that rather than disunity we have come very much closer to achieving consensus as a result of this debate this week. There have been some reservations expressed and concerns expressed about the possible border problems. Some fear that the public is going to be somehow left out of this process, but I think all of those questions can be answered by the sort of public discussion that we have engaged in this week. Everyone, and I agree with the Hon. Mr. Butters, everyone seems to feel and the word that is commonly used is inevitable, that everyone seems to feel that the decision is inevitable and I think all we are going to be discussing in this debate is the question of the best process for fully involving the public and resolving some of the difficult questions that we face.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Your ten minutes have expired. Comments of a general nature. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. My remarks will be brief as I know this committee wants to get into detailed discussion of the unity committee report. First I would like to express my thanks to the unity committee and also to the guests we have had the opportunity of hearing during the past few days. Their input has been very useful in my view because, I believe, they reflected in their presentations a number of views, differences of opinion and thoughts about the future. This afternoon I want to stress two points which I hope we will consider throughout our deliberations.

Decisions Made Are That Of Assembly

First I feel that any decisions taken, particularly in respect of the unity committee recommendations, are considered to be decisions made by the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories. While Members may feel that their perspective should or may only reflect that of a particular organization or a government, I believe that we are in the final analysis making decisions on behalf of and which will affect all of the people of the Northwest Territories. If I may say, Mr. Chairman, the attention which various organizations and governments, both federal and municipal, are placing on this House, is to me another indication that while we may be just an interim institution we are representative enough to take on this responsibility. I hope that in our deliberations we will always keep in mind the interests of our whole constituency and that is the Northwest Territories.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer some comment on what I believe to be some national factors which could affect our territory and our decisions on the issues of political development in the Northwest Territories. More specifically I consider that we are making decisions in almost a total vacuum or with very little knowledge of the federal government's intentions respecting the Northwest Territories. Now we do, of course, get some indication from time to time about what they have in mind and I think the latest indication, if Members have seen this report, is the national energy program.

MR. CURLEY: Shame!

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: We will see reference in this document not to territorial lands, not to aboriginal lands, but to Canada lands.

MR. CURLEY: Shame!

Ace Up Federal Government's Sleeve

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Generally I am very concerned that we may be disappointed in the future if we do not make a commitment, whatever we decide to do in this House, whether it is to stay together or to divide, but we must make a commitment to continue to build the bridges that Mr. Suluk referred to and to co-operate

together whether it is through a federation of territories, to react to and to fight the kind of things that are in this report because I believe that the Government of Canada has recognized the Northwest Territories as it exists today or however we believe it should exist in the future, as their ace up the sleeve. They are going to use us in their deliberations against the provinces and in trying to define a future for the Government of Canada in the resource picture of our nation.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I will make a general comment on a national factor which I find very, very disturbing and that is the reaction of western provinces to the new federal budget and the discussion of separation from Canada. We had this once before a few months ago when the province of Quebec was considering sovereignty association and I do not know how many Members heard the comment one morning from the member of the province of Quebec. He had the audacity to say that in his view and perhaps in the view of a lot of members of the province of Quebec, Baffin Island should become part of the new Quebec nation. I am very concerned, Mr. Chairman, that there are forces in the South which are looking at our territory and resources which belong to the aboriginal people of the Northwest Territories and to all people of the Northwest Territories, so it is not just the federal government, Mr. Chairman, it is the provinces as well. I hope that in our debate whether we decide to stay together, whether we decide to separate, we recognize that in the future we have to continue working together because there are forces in the South which are overwhelming. We are finding this out in the government every day. Mr. Chairman, I wish this whole House success in their deliberations and I look forward to seeing everybody in Yellowknife in February.

---Laughter

MR. CURLEY: Province of Yellowknife.

MR. PATTERSON: Where is Yellowknife?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. Mr. Braden. Any further comments? Mr. Curley?

Those Committed To Division Have Done Extra Work

MR. CURLEY: Yes. If no other Members have general comments on the unity committee's report I would just like to expound further the case for the division. Mainly I think although some hon. Members on the other side indicated to this House that the Eighth Assembly recognized the fact that political and constitutional issues had to be discussed with the public and all interested parties, I am not sure whether they did that and as a result of that, the unity committee Members recognized that it was important to pay extra attention to those who had not been given an opportunity to respond by the Eighth Assembly, particularly the native organizations. We have paid particular attention in that fashion not to exclude the other members of the population. They have had their opportunities to express their interests through their Members and through the MLA's daily routine, daily responsibilities with their constituencies. I think those of us who are committed to division, we have done extra work in keeping our constituents aware of the developments. I was at Eskimo Point recently speaking to the teachers in that settlement and I asked them the question what their views were, what their concerns were with respect to the division and all the teachers there, not one, there were about 15 of them and not one of them expressed dissatisfaction with division. They said they would get services closer and the positions would be easier and more reflective of the needs of the area.

West Has Easy Access To Government

I can understand the Members from the western part of the area, particularly the southern Mackenzie in their desire to delay the question of division. Like the hon. Members, the mayor of Yellowknife, they have all the conveniences they need to visit and speak to the Executive officers of the government. I can understand their settlements have access not only by air transportation, frequent air transportation to the centre of government, they in the southern Mackenzie I believe have access to headquarters by road transportation. They have access pretty well in every other way which we do not have in this part of the area so I can understand the Members from the southern Mackenzie and Yellowknife Members saying to me they are not giving their constituents a fair representation in this House. What we need I think as I said the other day, is a sense of leadership. The case for leadership is a need now rather than a vague one. You know, I do not think we should be giving the public, our constituents, uncertainty, delay means uncertainty, I do not think we should be putting fear about the outside forces because the only time we should fear the outside forces is when we are not clear exactly where we want to go. The Eastern Arctic is certainly not having that problem. We are aware of exactly where we would like to go.

I want again to stress the fact that the communities in the Eastern Arctic have difficulty in getting access to the government services and to the Ministers, unlike the Mackenzie. We can only deal with the communities, each community in the Baffin region and there are about 13 of them. We can go through them all; Frobisher Bay, Cape Dorset, Pangnirtung, Broughton Island. Let us ask ourselves what kind of access do they have going through to the Executive Members of the government and asking for certain policy matters like the Members from Yellowknife have? Some Members are right across from the headquarters of the government, just down the street. You can even look through the windows and see the Commissioner in his office, if he has not already put blinds in his office. These are the kinds of things we do not have in the Eastern Arctic and now you are telling us "We might be making a decision too quickly to support the principle of division." I think that is going to compound the problem further with the East and West relationship.

Study The Options

On that basis, I would urge the Members from the Western Arctic to not only question the judgment of the eastern Members but really question themselves, whether they in fact are really representing their constituency. I have not heard one good option yet. You talk about an option. Let us study all the options. What are the options? There are only two as far as I know. One is to stay together and support the status quo but that is not what the people in the Territories want. The other option -- what are the other options? I have not been given any case for other options so what you should be saying to us, if you really represent your constituents, is to bring a proposal to us to see whether or not this Assembly would be in support of it rather than talking vaguely and very generally about how desirable it is to stay united. But I can understand that because, you know, some Members are trying to say to me, "Look, if we separate the Territories into two distinct political units we are going to be separating ourselves from the rest of Canada." I do not think that is what we are trying to do. We are not trying to separate like Quebec did, so I do not think there needs to be any further expression given by the Members about fears and problems which we would encounter. Sure, we would encounter a lot of difficulties, a lot of problems, but we are prepared to work toward solving these problems. I think we are ready and I believe that we are more than ready. Today we are ready to vote on the question if you would permit us to deal with the motion dealing with the division question. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I think it may be a little early. Mr. Sibbeston.

Political Matters Must Be Brought Up To Date

MR. SIBBESTON: (Speaks in Slavey.)

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say as a Member of the unity committee, I consider myself fortunate to have had the unique experience of being involved as we have been in visiting all major native groups and their leaders and to sit down and help write the report, because we were able to meet with the leaders of all major organizations in the North. We, I think tried to capture or get the most up-to-date thinking of people. Reports, particularly reports on political situations of people and what they think about political matters can become outdated very quickly because politics is always in a state of flux. However, I feel we were able to capture the political state of the North as it existed for the past summer and fall of 1980. I want to say that I am proud to have been part of the unity committee and to have been involved with the findings, conclusions and recommendations.

I am proud to have been involved with persons on the committee who had the guts to say what many people would not have dared to say. What the unity committee had dared to say was that the majority of people in the North, particularly the native people, are not satisfied with the territorial government and they want change. That is the message pure and simple. It is not something that we as Members of the unity committee dreamed up or made up just because of our own feelings. We have been truthful I think in telling you exactly what the native leaders have said. If the truth hurts you or if you do not like it it is too bad. The momentum is there and you will have to go with the waves or you will be drowned out by the wave or the momentum. Undoubtedly, these feelings by native people have been expressed before, but either they were not understood by those in power or did not tell the truth in relaying the feelings, or these feelings were simply suppressed by those in power and imposed their own will and thought that these feelings would go away, but as we know these basic feelings that people feel do not go away. The Dene Nation spoke of it in terms of a nationalistic feeling and we also saw for the last few days the determination of the Inuit people and how could anyone not sense that and how can anyone dare stand in the way of it? I just feel that it is impossible to try to stop.

Federal Government Challenged In Past

There have been some people in the past in the North who have listened to native people and who have understood and relayed the message as true as they heard it. People like Judge Morrow had a lot of empathy for people in the North. He challenged the federal government in the Paulette caveat case of 1973 and he wanted to know the truth about the treaties which the federal government made with the Dene people in 1921. He went amongst the people and found out the Dene people's versions of what the treaty was and he came to the conclusion that native people saw the treaties as peace treaties only. They did not give up their lands and because of this he stated that there was strong evidence that treaties as such may not have extinguished the aboriginal rights of the Dene people in the Mackenzie Valley. That decision has altered the course of events in the North. It has made the federal government reluctantly agree to renegotiate aboriginal rights in the North with both the Dene and the Metis people. We have also had...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Could you slow down a little bit please, Mr. Sibbeston?

MR. SIBBESTON: We have also had people like Judge Berger who have really listened to the people and gave credence or gave credibility to what was said by native people and told all of Canada and the world about the Dene people, the present state, their aspirations for self-government and their struggle for self-determination and the danger of all of these aspirations being thwarted if a pipeline were to go ahead. Again, such truths and recommendations by Judge Berger had the effect of delaying or stopping the large oil pipeline down the Mackenzie Valley. His decision had the effect of changing the direction of things in the North. How many times I have heard people in my area say "Thank God that there was no pipeline, we still have a chance to get on our feet to build a good future"? Unfortunately, we are again being threatened with a smaller pipeline only three years after Mr. Berger said no pipeline for at least ten years, but this topic is one which will be dealt with on another day.

Past Assemblies Insecure About Their Credibility

More recently, we have had Mr. Drury examining the political situation in the North. You must remember the political state in which Drury was appointed to examine the political situation in the North. If you could just think back a few years, Berger had made his decision in 1976. The Dene Nation was making a strong bid for a Dene government. The Legislative Assembly of the day supported the pipeline while everybody in the Mackenzie Valley was saying no. The Assembly was also clamouring for constitutional changes, nothing original, just along the old traditional Westminster model of government, I guess because they were insecure and had some doubts about their credibility. I remember them continuously saying and beating their breasts "We are the only legitimate body in the North." You know that saying. While they were saying this I guess a lot of people really doubted whether they were really the only legitimate group representing people in the North.

Also about that time the Dene Nation and other groups were seriously challenging the status quo. They were saying, "We do not recognize this territorial government." And Mr. Allmand one of the fine Liberal ministers of the time appeared to favour the establishment of a government more in with the Dene traditions in the Mackenzie Valley. In the midst of all of this -- particularly because the Dene people were in the eyes of some people in the North who were in power -- some people thought the Dene people were getting too strong, somebody or some group was able to get to the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Trudeau, at that time, and the message to him I am sure was clear, the native people, particularly the Dene people are getting too strong. They have to be stopped. They have to be held in check.

The present government system in the North had to be reinforced, so Trudeau picked the right man for the job, that is Mr. Drury. He was an elderly man. He was not likely to be too original or challenging. He did not know anything about the North, let alone the native people. All he knew was Ottawa, the federal system of government...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Sibbeston, are you just about finished? Your ten minutes are up.

MR. SIBBESTON: I have got still quite a few pages.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): You are going to have to have unanimous consent. Agreed?

---Agreed

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): There seems to be unanimous consent. Please carry on.

MR. SIBBESTON: Thank you. I will forever be grateful. I thank you for listening.

Emotions Of People Omitted From Drury Report

So, I was talking about Mr. Drury. Mr. Drury was the guy that Ottawa picked to put the native people in their place and that is how we got the Drury report. In my view, Drury did an excellent job of supporting the status quo, but he did a poor job of getting his hands on the pulse of what people in the North really said because I think if he did he would come to the same conclusions as us. Speaking generally of the Drury report, the report does a good job of recommending the status quo. Mr. Drury's report is a very logical, well reasoned outline of what should be done. The problem is that Mr. Drury has missed the spirit, emotion, the nationalistic feeling of people. That is why Mr. Drury's report is not a very credible report amongst native people.

When dealing with political matters it is not just a rational undertaking. Emotion, spirit and deeply rooted feelings are as important as the rationale of things. Mr. Drury did not capture this emotion and spirit which is prevalent in the North. Just because you make it so that people can do things like take control of local governments, it does not mean that they will. As an example, native people in Fort Simpson see the band council as their representatives. People do not see the village council as their representative body. A good example of what Drury has done throughout his report is to say "Well, if you give more power to such bodies as the village councils then people will respond and take over responsibility." It is not quite like that. People must have emotional and real feelings for a body or form of government before they take part in it and people must be part of setting up the local body if it is to be recognized and respected by them.

Native People Must Help In Setting Up Government

I guess what I am saying is that Drury was trying to take an existing body, the territorial government, which was imposed on the North and which is not accepted by native people and saying if we change it here and there it will become acceptable and it just is not that easy however. Obviously, the Inuit people rejected this approach to constitutional changes in the North. They do not want this government. They want their own government, Nunavut. They said they would have liked to have set up a government based on Inuit tradition and custom, but they have made a major compromise in proposing a territorial style of government.

The important thing in fact and which will probably make Nunavut acceptable to the people is that it is the Inuit people who are setting up the government, so in the future if the government in the West in our part of the North is to be acceptable, the native people must have a major hand in setting it up. Otherwise it will fail again. Those are all of my general comments and now I have specific positions which I will deal with when we get to the recommendations.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. I recognize the clock and we will take a 15 minute recess for coffee.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The Chair recognizes a quorum. We will continue with the unity committee report and I have Ms. Cournoyea on the list. Hon. Mr. Butters, you have some further comments. Maybe you can continue until we get Ms. Cournoyea back.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to continue with what I was saying before the ten minutes ran out. I would just like to repeat because I do not think some Members either heard or understood what I was saying relative to the position taken by the Eighth Assembly on the matter of division. The Assembly members did not turn their back on the importance of the question of division. The position at that time was just that it was of such significance and so important and possibly so potentially divisive that it was not discussed but recommended to be referred to the Prime Minister's special representative. Now there has been some criticism levelled in the last few minutes by some Members relative to the degree of accuracy of the special representative's report and suggesting that it may not have been complete in its scope, but I do not think you can fault the special representative, Mr. Drury, for that. I think the two major organizations, Inuit Tapirisat and the Dene Nation, did not avail themselves of the opportunity to participate in that exercise.

Analogy Does Not Truly Represent Situation

One of the analogies that was used a number of times last week during the representations was, "It is time for a divorce or if not a divorce at least a separation and if not at least a separation then we should be, the Territories should be living in separate rooms." This is a very unfortunate analogy. Certainly divorce or separation is a very sad occurrence for the human condition and I tend to think really that the analogy does not truly represent the situation in which we in the Northwest Territories find ourselves today. As Members pointed out, there was no mutual consent. It was not a case of consenting adults going into any kind of arrangement.

We are here today more in the situation of a family of young people growing up, becoming aware of their manhood and their womanhood and seeking the independence that that state brings to them, offers to them. So that I see the Territories really as a family and as a family grows up the family divides, it separates and they go their own way, but they never forget that they were part of a family. They did not ask to be born into that family. They did not ask for their mother and father or brother and sister, but that is the way things came about and this is the way it is in the Northwest Territories today. We sit together, the 22 of us, as one family. We did not ask to sit together possibly but here we are and I think that the Eighth Assembly had a very good objective in mind which was, even with our various backgrounds and our different upbringing that we should work together and co-operate in the best interests of all our people, all the people in the Northwest Territories.

N.W.T. Like A Growing Family

So, as I say, I think the suggestion of divorce is really not a good one. I think that we should look at it as a growing family who will, when the time is right go our own way, but in so doing, not forget our origins and not forget our early attachments so that the unified approach that Mr. Braden referred to 20 or 30 minutes ago can occur. When the people of the Territories wish to make a joint approach to the Government of Canada it will be possible. So that I look to the situation where it would appear it is recognized we must now grow apart or we will soon grow apart and let us recognize this and take steps to effect it, but it will not happen all at once. It is not going to happen tomorrow. It is not going to happen next year and let us realize that. Let us plan together and work together and achieve the objective which seems the one that everybody who has spoken in the last four days agrees is before us, which is a division of the Northwest Territories as we know it today.

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

MS. COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I think what we are doing is going around in circles because almost everything that has been said from the very beginning of this debate is being repeated again; we should not continue to do that. Also to meet the general ideas of this paper I am just wondering and I guess I was a bit concerned that the unity committee in its travels and in its deliberations around the Northwest Territories, why they had not shown a stronger case for regional government. It does not matter which way the Territories go, but it did not seem to address the real need to strengthen the regional concept of government.

Concept Of Regional Government Has Been Neglected

It seems to me when we talk about Nunavut or what is proposed by the Dene there is an idea that there is a total concept but not really addressing how we handle and bring that government close to the people who are being governed. There are many different ways that I feel that this idea can fit into Nunavut or Denendeh, but it does not seem to me that the unity committee had really put this in the report or the concept of realizing good government by having these regional governments within a bigger government. This is not in relationship to saying that there should not be Nunavut or there should not be any of the other kinds of government or a division, but to give ideas that no matter which way you go that this is neglected in the present system. We have a government system but it seems that everything is tied to Yellowknife.

These are the kinds of concerns that everyone has when they talk about how to make a decision. How do I have control over my life and how do I make the laws that govern my everyday living? Now there is the idea that the country is too big, but then there is the next stage within that, addressing the need to make sure that when we move into the next stage we have the idea of making it more sophisticated. These are the kinds of things that cause fear. The fear comes that everything will be the same.

However, I think what has happened over the past is that everyone has learned and they are not going to try to make the same mistakes. They are not going to try to say, "Well, we are going to just transfer and just draw a line." A certain group of people have an idea and they have a desire and all the mistakes that have been made probably would not be made again so there is no need to have a fear about this because when we talk about how you give control to a community, the present government continuously makes options available that are not really options at all. They are very poor options.

Present System Not Moving Ahead

It gives you the feeling that something is moving ahead, but it really is not. It might be another water truck. So the present system has not worked and to have a fear of saying, "Well, let us not divide because we really need each other" and have a fear of a division saying to everybody, "Well, we do not want you", I do not think that is the point. The point is saying, "Well, let us put it on a ground we can go forward on." I do not in my mind feel confident, certainly in the paper presented by the Dene Nation saying "Well, you turn the forestry over to the territorial government." I was very surprised at that. Maybe they will give in to you. I know I may be suspicious of people, but to me once the trees are given to the territorial government, the Dene will not get it and I can say that in the present system they will not. So we should not try to be too nice about these things and try to make things so lovable because it is not. We are trying to deal with government and we should not be embarrassed about our feeling of divorce or whatever it is because that is the way life is. The

government has to go to the people and the people have to control the laws, they have to be able to set quotas in areas where they are. They have to have a right to do that and they should not have a father coming down to them when they are 40 years old saying, "This is the only way you can do it."

Concept Of Government Of The People

I think, basically, if you think of it in the concept of government of the people you will not have any fear. I have no fear about what is being presented here and as a representative of the Western Arctic region I would say possibly I should have the greatest fear of all because we may be squeezed into the ocean by many factors but I have no fear of that...

MR. PATTERSON: Hear, hear!

MS. COURNOYEA: ...because I know we are moving progressively to decide we are going to do something. All the details have not been worked out and they will not be worked out for a period of time, but the request is saying let us make a decision, more than how many water trucks we are going to have and how many half-assed roads we are going to build. Let us make a decision where we can move forward and then we will work out the details as we go along because we do not have all the answers, but we have to take that one step forward.

---Applause

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms. Cournoyea. Any further comments? Mr. Wah-Shee.

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some brief comments regarding the recommendation of the unity committee. At the outset I would like to state that I will support the division into two territories. My reason being, of course, that I have already stated earlier that the aspirations of the residents of the East are legitimate and they have been discussing this particular proposition I gather for the last six years.

Problem Of Access Will Continue To Exist

I think that some things ought to be said at this point in time because I think that from the previous sessions comments have been made regarding the present set-up, that it is not adequate. We have problems in transportation, communication, access to the Ministers, the kinds of proposals that are coming forth from local government or lack of it, whatever the case may be. I would like to respond to the remarks that were made by the hon. Member from Keewatin South regarding the access to the Ministers in Yellowknife. I think that that kind of problem, I can see it continually existing even though you have Frobisher Bay, your capital of Nunavut territory when somebody residing in Holman Island wants to have access to the Executive.

I may add that the transportation system and the communication system that exists in the Northwest Territories is not the responsibility of this particular Legislature nor the territorial administration. These particular systems were in place long before the Legislative Assembly decided to remove itself from Ottawa to the Northwest Territories. So I think that the inadequacies regarding the transportation routes, having to travel from one community to the other and to go from Baffin to Yellowknife really should not be used as an excuse to dump on the West as I see it. I think that we sympathize with inadequacies regarding these two systems, but even though you do get your own territory I do not think that those two areas will be transferred to your legislature because at the present time it is a federal responsibility. I think that point ought to be made regarding the influence that the residents of the East will be able to use the influence their future legislature will have on the kind of problems that exist in these two areas with the federal government.

The other thing too, is that we have been spending as Ministers, some time in the East. We have not had that much time to spend in the West, so I certainly look forward to spending more time in the Mackenzie Valley. It is not only that I am comfortable there but that is my part of the country. So I think that the time really has come and I am extremely happy that we have come to this point to really address the issue head-on, because it has been an issue for a long time. I think that the matter should have been brought up a long time ago but due to a variety of reasons it never came to a head until now.

No Additional Powers From Federal Government

The other thing I would like to comment on is that even though we do go our separate ways hopefully, that the present authority and the present powers that we have are really not adequate. I think that even though you do create two territories, you will not, I think at the present time, have additional powers transferred from the federal government to this Legislature even though you do divide. I think that what we have to consider in going our separate ways in the East and the West -- and I like the suggestion that has been made by ITC that there is still room for future co-operation and a working relationship between the East and the West. I think that that is a very good idea, because in order to gain further provincial type of responsibility in a jurisdiction it will take one hell of a fight on the part of the residents of the North with Ottawa. I do not think that we are that naive to think that it is going to be all that easy and this is in no way to try to convince or to try to justify unity at all, I do not think that we have passed that point. We have come to the point where we would like to go our own way.

Elected Representatives Should Give Full Support

The other thing, of course, is that when we are dealing and addressing the issue of two separate territories, what would be a very good approach is that in dealing with the recommendations of the unity report, it would be a good gesture on the part of the elected representatives in this Legislature to come out 100 per cent behind the basic concept of division. I think that that would be the most appropriate way to address the issue because I think that there are some of us from the West and we feel that we do have the right as Canadian citizens, not as Inuit or Dene or Metis, but by the mere fact that we have our right in the North as northern residents to participate. I think that it is only appropriate that all residents ought to participate and this is not the way, to say that they will not support the division of the Territories.

I would think that the majority of the territorial residents would support the division question. It is really a matter of the approach that we ought to consider and for my part I believe that we ought to continue -- we will be required to co-operate anyway in the interim period, because the more united people are in the North regarding a particular issue which is so fundamentally important to all residents of the Territories, we have to support each other, because the next step of course is to convince Ottawa that this is the legitimate concern of the people in the Northwest Territories. This is what we want. It pays, I believe, to remain together. We may differ in our views and on a lot of other things but in this particular case I would hope that we are flexible enough to realize that a united position coming forth from this Legislature will have a positive effect. I do not want to even discuss the various options that some of the Members from the other side of the House have indicated, that these are basically some of the views of the West anyway. I have already indicated at the outset that I will support the division into two separate territories. Thank you.

---Applause

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Wah-Shee. Mr. Appaqaq.

In Favour Of Splitting The Territories

MR. APPAQAQ: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My main concern is that we have heard that there has been a concept of dividing the Territories for quite some time now. How are we to improve our responsibilities? It has been indicated today by a suggestion that if we were to divide and improve our responsibilities -- I will use as an example that when we are in the Inuit homeland I have experienced this and I will mention it, that the Canadian parliament makes legislation that directly affects us and the legislation is in force the following day. For example, say the Inuit were allowed to catch only two char per year and we have 365 days in the year and if you do not have any money or financial assistance you are just going to die off and this is how we are treated when we are in our own Inuit land.

When we hear the issue of splitting the Territories and I have heard that the public will have the opportunity to voice their opinion and I am in support of the splitting of the Territories. I as a Member of the Legislative Assembly, I do not have the experience in dealing with the political issue as an Inuk. You probably will not be able to understand the Inuit system, what I guess I will call our political system and I am much in favour in splitting the Territories if the Inuit opinion would be voiced more frequently in the Legislature. I have heard that as long as the Inuit's concerns are brought up in the Assembly that they will at times be favourable and at other times they will not be favourable but they will still be alive when this comes into reality and I will see that this comes into reality in the very near future. I just wanted to mention that I am in favour of the splitting of the Territories and we are dwelling at great length on the splitting of the Territories. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Portraying The Positive Side Of Division

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Yes, I think my own position with regard to the issue of division is one of support and that I think the one thing that this Assembly has to do is portray the very positive note to division. I think it is imperative that when we go back to those constituencies that we represent that our discussion on division and on the issue should be one of a positive note. I think that people are bringing up other issues that are very important to address. I think that it is also very important that our working relationship in this House becomes very -- I guess close -- especially on an issue where it has been so many years that people have talked on the issue of division and very little, if anything has been done on the issue and so other people have brought it up, I think this is the first time in the history of the Northwest Territories that it really has been a discussion issue and though it has been one where at times I have been frustrated, I would like to and I think somehow express my appreciation to those people who have brought this idea for discussion up. It has been an important issue and we have to now begin the work. The position has been clear I think, but I think that it should include the people of the Northwest Territories. It is important because we need the support of all people.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Hear, hear!

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: I think when we address this issue in future, sort of structure the path which we are going to follow, I think that we require support for one another and a support that the people in our constituencies will give. I think that is important. I only hope that as Mr. Wah-Shee has stated that we will in fact develop a very, very good working relationship. Whether there is a Nunavut territory or there is Denendeh, whatever the results may be, we must be very clear about the strength that we have together to fight people who may not want the things that we have or will want to get and we think that we should get. I think that is important.

At the same time I think that we should address the problems that we have today and try to make the situation in both territories or how many territories we create here very strong and very viable so that people in fact have the authority and the strength in those areas to function and they should in fact have the support of the Assembly. We must make it very clear to people that we are willing to work together to improve the situation up here. I think that is where we are going to in fact win out in the end sort of thing. Again I stress the fact that I do and will support the position, the principle of division. Thank you.

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

---Applause

Any further comments? Mr. Kilabuk.

Working Together Toward Progress

MR. KILABUK: (Translation) Mr. Chairman, I have had my hand up for quite some time but I guess you did not see me. I was thinking that maybe only the unity committee was supposed to comment. Mr. Chairman, the unity committee chairman, I would like to thank him very much and the other committee Members who have reported a clear paper. I feel that some things are not present in here that were discussed and should be put in the paper too, mostly the political development of the Northwest Territories. What I have thought myself is about the regional government in Frobisher and other parts. They all have to get consensus on every program or whatever, but this has been a problem that has been a concern of mine and also even if we say something to the Yellowknife people we have a problem and we have to consult with Ottawa first because of the vast territory. I also feel that if Nunavut was to become a reality and we all have different dialects so far, they would be able to get what they want from the parliament in Ottawa.

We realize this is developing at the present time. We hear from the comments of the other Members in the future it has been realized that the government is divided here today but the people who want to work together should be working together. I do not understand today the committee has talked about the different native groups. Maybe we will be able to work better instead of being against each other. I am very happy today that the native groups have been talking to us and are giving a place to work and the unity committee has given us something to get started, but I am sorry about the Baffin Regional Council and I want to be informed now about the report of the unity committee that is our concern because I want the people in the Territories to find out more about this. I also am in support of this unity committee's recommendation. So what we are talking about today is progress and the people who wrote the report should inform the people about it and give them something to work with. They have to consult more with everybody, native groups, and I thank you very much, the people who wrote this and I would be in support of it too.

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

Division Is Inevitable

HON. DON STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have listened intently to the debate and the presentations made so far and I have firstly no fears of division of the Territories. However, it is not a simple division that we are talking about. If we were dividing the Territories because of the distances involved and the difference in the culture of the two areas, this provides me with no difficulty. However, as we progress it is evident that all of the native organizations wish at the same time to exercise their prerogative for a new type of government and setting up so many new things all at one go-round.

I suggest to you that I think that the division is inevitable. It will happen and it will happen soon. By "soon" it probably means to the bureaucracy of Ottawa some time in the next five to ten years. But my biggest concern is that in the interim that the progress that the territorial Assembly has made to date on trying to get control and authority over various things in the Territories will stop and we will be in a state of limbo until such a time as these various areas are set up.

Now probably with the state the Territories is in maybe this is inevitable, maybe this has to happen. It is quite possible, but I warn you that in the process there is going to be some gain, but there is certainly in a five, ten, 15 year period there are going to be losses and the loss will be control over many of the resource based types of things we are looking for. I can see Ottawa just closing the door and saying "Fine, we are going to use this political separation, this division question as the order of the day and everything else is going to be put back into abeyance." I have seen it happen so often when something of this magnitude raises its head. So we have a job to do but there is a price that you will pay for it and that is just as sure as you are sitting in this chamber today. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Stewart. Any further comments of a general nature? Mr. McLaughlin.

Basic Areas Of Concern

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to say that I too am basically in favour of a division of the Territories, but, as I expressed, I have fears about what will happen when the Northwest Territories Act is amended or repealed and replaced by something else. I am concerned about basic border problems which may not be acceptable to some of the groups but these things can be hammered out. What I think has to be done is a territorial plebiscite has to be taken to get support of all the people of the Territories because that will make our case more important and be understood more by the federal government if all of the people in the Northwest Territories vote to divide the Territories, which I am sure they will.

I am also concerned in some of the areas Mr. Stewart is, that we have got to also keep pressing at the same time for more responsible government for this Assembly and those responsibilities can then be passed on to the new territorial governments which will be created down the road in a timeframe that could be way longer than some of us would like to hope. So I think it is very important that the government continues to address the issues. I think we have to look at things like the Norman Wells pipeline, being very aggressive to make sure that in resource developments like Norman Wells and Baker Lake that the people of the Northwest Territories get something out of developments like that. If these developments go ahead without our consent, which could happen if Norman Wells can go ahead possibly the uranium mine at Baker Lake could go ahead, we have got to continue to fight these things and try to get something out of them if they are going to go ahead. That is going to take an aggressive Executive Committee supported by all the people in the House.

More Power To The People Of The N.W.T.

So, I think it is very important that we fill these two empty seats with two Inuit Members so they can take a role in helping run this government and that while they are there they can work with the Executive Committee to strengthen our position in the federal field and in federal relations and at the same time work toward a separation into two territories which would be beneficial to all of us. In other words, we should improve our position as we go during

the life of this Assembly. Let us take advantage of the co-operation and consensus we have seen to date in this Assembly to give more powers to the people of the Territories through this Assembly so it can be passed on to the two territorial governments.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. McLaughlin. Any further comments? There being no further comments, do you wish to go through -- Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: If no others have general comments, I would like to have five or so minutes to make a statement before we begin the recommendation by recommendation study of the report.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. There does not seem to be anybody else and you can wind up the debate and we will go into the committee report recommendations. Thank you.

Full-blooded Committee Report

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had thought of calling a final meeting of the special committee on unity here in Frobisher Bay in order to try to have Members on the committee agree on some strategy for guiding the committee's report through the House. As chairman, I finally decided against that. I have not tried and will not try to orchestrate the committee's presentation. Despite Mr. Nickerson's reference to style which may have contained the implication that the report is a one man report and despite Mr. McCallum's use of sports logic that reduced it to a two man minority report, I will assert confidently that this is as much a full-blooded committee report as such a species can ever possibly be.

---Applause

Members observed together, listened together, talked together and worked together and decided together as much as it is possible for five different people, all of whom have other commitments and interests to look after as well, to do. At the final meeting I believe that a particularly thorough job was done of review and analysis and Members agreed then that a certain course, the one that is charted in this report was the best to follow, not only were the recommendations agreed upon but some of the ideas which should appear in the body of the report were agreed upon as well.

Now, if there are subsequent changes in the opinions of some Members I do not find that to be an embarrassment to this committee, nor an indictment either of the process the committee followed in doing its work or of the final results of its deliberations. Rather it is merely a reflection and an affirmation of the real complexities and difficulty of our northern political situation. Having said that though, I will also suggest that in the end, cynics might very well be surprised when they discover the amount of true agreement that does exist within the committee with respect to this report.

Aim Of Report To Win Political Stability

As we discuss it over the next day or so I invite all Members to read the report thoroughly and to give it thoughtful consideration, that is to the body of the report as well as to the recommendations, and to try to appreciate the full implication of everything that is stated. The aim of the report is to try to win political stability. Because of this you as Members can be sure that there is no intention of slipping by you. That attempt would be foolish in that it would ultimately defeat the object of the entire exercise. So your committee asks you to work hard to fully appreciate the import of what has been said in its report and if you do that you will recognize, for instance, that recommendations one, two and three are not mere motherhood statements at all as they have been described, but rather -- and that they are not either expressions on an airy fairy kind of philosophy that has no connection at all to reality, but rather that they are expressions of value that can shape the destiny of the North.

If you appreciate the import of what has been said you will recognize that recommendation number two, for instance, is a powerful recommendation that has important implications and Mrs. Sorensen is absolutely right in her analysis on that account. If it is adopted this is the kind of implication it has. Then the Assembly in later establishing an Eastern Arctic territory if that is what it chooses to do, would not be co-operating in the creation of two territories as the Hon. James Wah-Shee suggested the day before yesterday, I believe, but rather it would be helping to create one territory with a potentially long-term political future and then leaving a reduced residual territory out of which another territory or territories might be created and I will say surely will be created in the future. That is a significant difference and it has importance with respect to, for instance who should vote in any referendum on the establishment of an Eastern Arctic territory.

Diversity Of Opinion

Finally, let me say that some of you may have been tempted to underestimate the thoroughness of the committee's work and perhaps the extent of its judgments. I do trust though that in the past four days of hearing witnesses that you and all of the people of the Northwest Territories will have heard for yourselves as your committee heard, the strength and momentum of the movement to establish an Eastern Arctic territory. I trust that you and the people of the North as well will have seen for yourselves as your committee saw, the diversity of opinion that exists about political development in the Northwest Territories and that you will have recognized as your committee recognized the utter impossibility of fully satisfying every party of interest in this matter.

Speaking in my capacity as chairman of the special committee then, I trust that as legislators who are responsible for the well-being of the people of the entire Northwest Territories that we will, all of us, for the next short while put aside any hurt feelings that we might have or personal grievances, that we will set aside our particular identities as Members of ethnic groups and as representatives of particular regions to the extent that it is possible, and that we will try to choose a path through the dark political woods that is the best path in the view of the total situation confronting us, for all of the people of the Northwest Territories.

An Acceptable Compromise

Your special committee on unity has already done some trail blazing and I think it has found that path. Some, considering it may lament that the path the committee has laid out runs too near a precipice, others that it is only a rutted trail and not a gravelled byway, others that it runs a longer distance than is really necessary and there are surely those who will hesitate to take the first step along that path because they cannot see clearly its end. Despite these concerns, Mr. Chairman, I believe that in the final analysis it is very likely, certainly with opportunity for refinement that it is the best path open to us, or putting it another way, that considering all of the diverse opinions that we have heard that the report may very well be an acceptable compromise.

So, as chairman of the committee, again I would ask all of you to give some very serious consideration to supporting the principles of the report and there is always the opportunity for amendment in details, but supporting the principles of this report in their entirety. Perhaps the final result will not be all that you as individuals or as a representative of a region or a group would want, but in the end it may be the best that all of us to the extent that we have to take account of political realities, it may be the very best that all of us are going to be able to get. If I may take a moment, Mr. Chairman, to respond to certain questions that were raised by other people, would that be in order at this point before proceeding?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Agreed. Carry on, Mr. MacQuarrie.

A Territory With A Potentially Long-term Political Future

MR. MacQUARRIE: With respect to some comments of Mrs. Sorensen then, I would say that she did hit on a very fundamental principle and I would invite all Members to seriously consider whether they can agree with the perception that is stated in the committee's report, because it does have important implications. I thought, however, that we would be dealing with that, when we begin to deal with recommendation number two but if any Member does not feel that that is the case then I would certainly suggest that it be dealt with prior to going any further. Mrs. Sorensen did mention that she thought that the committee had seemed to indicate that Nunavut was ready for provincial status and of course that is not what the committee feels, but I also believe that that is not really what Mrs. Sorensen meant when she said it either, but simply that we have identified a territory that seems to have a potentially long-term political future.

With respect to some comments of Mr. Butters, I would agree very much that the analogy with respect to marriage is not a good analogy and that the analogy with respect to a growing family is more accurate. I point that out now, because later on in one of the recommendations I will want to discuss why that has particular importance. With respect to Mr. McCallum -- oh yes, one of the points Mr. Patterson did clear up was that it was the committee on unity. I do not know how many times I said that over the period of a year. Our aim was never biased in favour of keeping the territory together, but to try to deal honestly with the whole subject and Mr. Patterson was right in his observation. Also, I believe that Mr. McCallum was concerned about the approach that we took. I would say that we took that approach, that is dealing largely with native associations because as Mr. Curley rightly pointed out that there had been some neglect of their positions by this government and we wanted to readdress the imbalance. I think that Mr. McCallum need not worry though because I believe that with the way we have approached things there will be ample opportunity for those who disagree with whatever the native associations are proposing to make their points of view heard.

What The Federal Government Will Allow

With respect to Mr. Braden's comments, he raised a particularly important point and privately in discussing the paper it was raised to me by Mrs. Sorensen as well. And I had even thought about it myself at one time and then just did not get it into the report and that is the question of what exactly will the federal government allow. The reason I had thought of it before is because Mr. Drury in his report does point out that it is a task of the federal government to let people in the Territories know whether it has already made decisions about certain matters with respect to political development in the Northwest Territories, as an example I might say holding the High Arctic islands in reserve as a federal territory. If they have already made some decisions like that I think it would be very important for us to know and for the federal government to tell us and so I am prepared to move at the end of our report where it is suggested that we have a delegation go to Ottawa to deliver the recommendations that at that time we also put in an urgent request that they do inform us what the parameters are as far as they are concerned. That is not to say that we should necessarily accept them but we ought to be aware of what that point of view is.

Issue Of Regional Government

With respect to some comments of Ms. Cournoyea and also Mr. McCallum and other people as well. They often wonder why it is that we did not consult more with communities or with people, why did we not address the issue of regional government. Well, one might also say why did we not save the world? It is simply because we could not. We could not include everything. It was just impossible. What we have done I hope, is left the way open for that kind of concern to be addressed effectively. In other words, if Ms. Cournoyea believes

that it is very important for the question of regional government to be covered there will be a constitutional development committee which will be making available the opportunity for interested parties to say what kind of structure there should be in the Northwest Territories.

If the question to us is why did we not raise that alternative with ITC, I can tell you frankly we did. We raised it with the ITC board of directors, we raised it with each of the Inuit regional associations and I will hesitate to give you the answers that we received. In other words, they knew what they wanted and it was not regional government. Now you might say they are wrong in wanting what they want, but I do not think you can say we were wrong in not still insisting to them that they have regional government. We wanted to lay out the facts as they exist.

Transfer Of Powers From The Federal Government

Finally in this respect a comment that relates to something Mr. Stewart said and that is with regard to the transfer of powers from the federal government. Just as a personal assessment I would largely agree that that is what will happen, that is, in a period of uncertainty about political development the federal government will almost certainly stop the transfer of powers to territorial governments. Perhaps it is not only for that reason though. In view of the reality of the world political situation the federal government may already have stopped transferring powers and certainly powers over resources, non-renewable resources to territorial governments. At any rate I believe his assessment may be correct and when he says there is a risk if people insist on particular forms of political development, that they will not acquire the kinds of powers that they seem to hope to acquire.

Well, I can only say that I believe certainly in the case of ITC and others who are promoting a division of the Territories and the establishment of an Eastern Arctic territory that they are aware of that risk, but they have come to the conclusion that the ownership of resources at this time is not the most fundamental question to them, that it is a question of being able to establish a political jurisdiction that meets their needs and through which at a later time they can pursue other objectives. So I think they were very well aware of that, but if they were not, certainly Mr. Stewart's warning will serve to make them aware. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If there are any comments from others with respect to what I have said, I defer. If not, I am prepared to start into the recommendations.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. Is it the wish then of the Members that we go into the recommendations starting with recommendation one? Do you want to leave the preamble of the report and go into recommendation one? Mr. Braden.

Importance Of First Pages Of Report

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The chairman of the unity committee has indicated in his remarks very eloquently that he believes the text of the document as well as the recommendations is very important, so I do not want this to be blanked out but I would prefer to see some systematic way of going through at least the preamble which is the first four pages and then getting into the recommendations. It may be that Members have no comments on pages one to four, but I do not think we should exclude them.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): It does not matter to me. Whatever way the Members want to discuss it we can throw it open to the floor. Mr. Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON: The whole report has been read out, every word of it, and before that we had a week to consider it. I am beginning to wonder whether we are afraid to get into the recommendations or not. I do not think we should go through the first four pages. Let us start with recommendation one and move along.

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

MS. COURNOYEA: I certainly do not mind going over the page as long as we do not unleash Mr. MacQuarrie on every word we get. He unleashes himself and spends 15 minutes telling us why we should not have said what we said, you know. It seems we have gone over this report at least ten times. I think Mr. Nickerson read it point by point and other people read it as well and if we take this long to go over a document we may never get division, but maybe that is the tactic.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms. Cournoyea. Is it the wish of the committee then that we go to recommendation one? Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Chairman, you know, I am not out to try and delay consideration of the recommendations, but there are some statements made in the first four pages where I would just like to ask a simple question of the committee. Maybe we can do it very quickly. Is this House agreed that we can go through the first four pages?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. Mr. Braden. I do not have a problem if somebody wants to ask questions on any of the pages, by all means. We will eventually get to recommendation one if we do it like that. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MACQUARRIE: I am very happy to do that. The only thing I would say, of course, if you vote on the recommendations that whatever else is in the report, the Assembly obviously would not be committed to, but I do not say that as a means of trying to avoid answering for anything that is in the report and other Members would be happy to as well, at length if necessary.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Is it agreed that we go through the preamble of the report starting at Appendix A? Ms. Cournoyea.

MS. COURNOYEA: Can we have an agreement that there is a time limit on how long it takes to answer any comments by Mr. MacQuarrie? Maybe 30 seconds.

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

MR. MACQUARRIE: I could agree if there was a time limit on the questions that were asked, Mr. Chairman.

Appendix A Of Unity Report, Agreed

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Appendix A of the report, is it agreed?

---Agreed

Pages One To Three Of Unity Report, Agreed

Page one, special committee on unity, Hon. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: No comments.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Page two, agreed?

---Agreed

Page three, agreed?

---Agreed

Page four, Hon. Mr. Braden.

Realities Of The Northern Situation

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: That was not so hard, was it? Mr. Chairman, I am looking at the second paragraph beginning: "The major task facing all parties in this endeavor is to reconcile,..." etc., etc. In the final line the committee on unity has indicated that one of the factors or one of the major tasks facing all parties is the reconciliation finally and I quote: "...the geographic, demographic and economic realities of the northern situation". Now I am wondering very briefly if the chairman or perhaps someone on the committee could indicate to me what those are, and how they have been considered in the analysis in the report.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. Mr. Braden. Anybody want to answer that? I think it has to do with the preamble. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MACQUARRIE: All right. I am happy to do it if other Members do not wish to and I will try to be as brief as possible, especially for Ms. Cournoyea. With respect to the geography of the North it is obvious that there are vast distances. This has been commented on by a number of people in the debate already and that the means for transportation across this vast territory are not readily available, particularly in the Eastern Arctic. The demographic factors, the truth is that we do have a relatively small population and I am always reminded when I see a baseball or a football game coming to us from Olympic Stadium in Montreal that the entire population of the Northwest Territories could fit into that stadium and there would still be about half the seats empty. So that is a demographic reality. As to what weight should be placed on it I can not say but it is a reality.

Economic realities, at the moment whether it is fair or not, we are in a situation of receiving deficit funding from the federal government, that the federal government has control of the resources of the Northwest Territories and so on. Now what I am suggesting, Mr. Braden, is not that we as a unity committee had to analyze all those factors and come to conclusions, but the people who finally are going to choose division or unity or whatever it is, these are some things they should be considering, but I would not want to tell anybody that because your territory will only have 17,000 people that you had better not establish your territory. That is a fact that they must be aware of, take into account and make their judgment on the basis of it. They may feel there are other factors that are far more important and that outweigh that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. Page four, agreed? Hon. Mr. McCallum.

Lives And Futures Of All Northerners

HON. ARNOLD MCCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, in the third last paragraph the committee indicates that we must make explicit an understanding which is already implicit in a number of its previous actions, "...acknowledge the peculiar situation in the Territories which prevents the simplistic approach of 'we are all northerners' from succeeding where political development is concerned." I would like to ask any Member, maybe Mr. Sibbeston, if in fact when you met with the Dene Nation and the Metis Association, whether in fact they proposed to you the connotation of using northerners as being together because in the submissions that the Dene Nation presented to this House they make mention in a number of areas about being together, northerners, both native northerners, non-native northerners. They refer to the lives and futures of all northerners and on the

one hand you have the committee saying you cannot use that simplistic approach by saying we are all northerners and on the other hand we have the Dene Nation in their proposal saying, "Yes, at least to my way of thinking, we can identify as being northerners" and I wonder if in fact they made that approach to the committee.

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

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. McCallum, I do not think whether in your needs for the Dene Nation or the Metis Association they told us specifically that we should not use the terms or see people in the North as being all northerners. I guess what we are saying here is that sometimes you can avoid dealing with the real issues that confront you by saying "We are all in it together" or "We are all the same." What we are saying here is that we must realize the fact that though we are all northerners we are different types of northerners, we have Dene, we have Metis, we have white people and we have Inuit people and that this factor must be recognized in the future political set-up in the North here. I guess it was just an attempt to avoid falling into the pitfall of just dealing with a political situation in the North by just glossing over everything by saying "We are all northerners." I hope this helps you, but that is about all that I can answer.

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

Idea Of Discrimination

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what Mr. Sibbeston has suggested because that is exactly what the report says. The report goes on in the next paragraph to say that that is what colonial policy was, that is it treated people differently based on race and in fact our BNA Act discriminates on the basis of race and in fact language. I would like to pose the question to Mr. Sibbeston then, is he in reality then trying to perpetuate the idea of discrimination on the basis of race, language, in other words, to perpetuate colonial policy? Is it not time that we do something different?

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

MR. SIBBESTON: Does Mr. McCallum say that we all become then like white people and speak English and not be born brown or black and that we all come out the same, speak English the same way and live the same way? Just because you recognize that we are all not northerners, just because you say we do not all want to be seen as a bunch of northerners does not mean that we are prejudiced. It just means that we have to realize the reality of the fact that in the North there are different native people and there are white people and you cannot just treat everybody the same way. You just cannot propose to deal with everybody the same way and you cannot propose to set up a government on the basis that everybody is equal. People are different and people have different cultures and languages and these factors have to be accepted or recognized in the forms of government that are set up in the North and that is all we are saying. We do not mean to be prejudicial at all, but just really asking you to be practical and realistic in recognizing the situation for what it is. The worst thing that one can do is to say that everybody is the same in the North, we are all northerners. It just avoids the issue of seeing people in the reality for what it is.

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

Use Of The Term "Northerners"

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Sibbeston posed a question whether I would suggest that everybody should all be white people. Not on your life. I do not suggest at all it should be any particular race. I am not going to have much to do about making everybody the same in terms of race or religion,

but I am saying that simply by indicating that we belong to a geographic area does not negate that there are different kinds of differences in languages, different pigments of skin. Fine, I am not suggesting that. I am questioning the use of the term "northerners" because on one hand we had witnesses, an organization used the term and on the other hand we had a committee saying that we cannot use the term. I am not saying that everybody is born equal. I know that.

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

HON. DON STEWART: I would just wish to take it a step further with Mr. Sibbeston and ask him if down in the long term would it be desirable that as far as the state and the place that a person lived that everybody was equal. Is that not the long-term goal? I realize that it cannot be done tomorrow, but surely when we put something in place here and when we are going to change things, we want to change them for the better and the only way it is ever going to get better is a country or a place where everybody is the same and equal, not the same colour and the same religion, but treated the same. Surely that must be a part of our end result of what we are looking for somewhere down the pipe.

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

Long-term Goal Is Toward Equality

MR. SIBBESTON: I appreciate your question and I think it is a very fair question. The long-term goal is that everybody in the North will be on the same basis regardless of race, culture and so forth, but between now and then we have to set up institutions and governments which will make that possible. So far the type of government we have had in the North is a white government. It is a white institution, a very complex system of government and native people act at a severe disadvantage. You have to have grade 12 or a university degree to get a job with the government and native languages do not mean a damn thing to this government. The only language that the government has is English. So that has been the rule thus far and so native people have been at an extreme disadvantage.

Now what we are talking about is setting up a government in the North where native cultures, native ways of doing things, native people have a better chance of fitting into government, and it is possible to develop such a system of government. It will take some novel work. Certainly the usual system of setting up government in the South will not work in the North and in the end and maybe in 20, 30 or 50 years from now if we do have a good government everybody should be on the same level. It does not mean we are all going to be staying. We will still have Dene people who speak their language. We will still have Inuit who will speak Inuit. We will have English people who speak English, but everybody hopefully will be on the same level in regards to being, to feeling good, to having secure jobs, you know, to having the same political rights. We will all be different but we will hopefully be a little bit closer to being equal.

---Applause

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. Any further comments on page four? Mrs. Sorensen.

Two Separate Issues

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Sibbeston, I am still a bit confused, because in that line that Mr. McCallum read out the words "political development" is mentioned and to me we are all northerners when we talk about public government, that that may be simplistic but we are all northerners. With aboriginal claims it is a different matter and it seems to me that we have been talking about two separate issues here, the development of a government, a public government where we are all equal and aboriginal rights claims where only those people of aboriginal descent have special rights, so I am not sure what that line then really means.

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

MR. SIBBESTON: I guess what it means is that as regards to political development it does not mean that native people will have maybe two votes as opposed to one vote for a white person. It does not mean that. It just means that in the political development, in the political institutions that will be set up these institutions will pay recognition to native people and that is all that means. It means that political development will occur, recognizing that people are different instead of lumping everybody in the same, under the slogan of "We are all northerners." Maybe that is not as clear as it could be, but I think it is about as best as I can do and please ask someone else these questions.

---Laughter

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): You are doing a fine job there Mr. Sibbeston. Any further questions on page four? Is it agreed? Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Just a point of order, when Members say "Agreed" that just signifies that we have agreed that there are no further questions to be asked on that page? It is not an acceptance of the page as such.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

Page Four Of Unity Report, Agreed

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Right, my job is to get all of these pages finished. Any further questions on page four? Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Thank you. Page five. Mr. McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD MCCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, page five of the committee report in the second paragraph, well, one, two and three, all three paragraphs I think lead to it. It talks about people acting in concert to achieve goals where there was a natural identity based on race, language, lifestyle, prompting these people to act in concert. It notes that the policies of the Government of Canada have recognized and fostered the distinctiveness of indigenous people. It talks about the committee recognizing however a further truth, that there is also a significant presence of "others". And I guess here and the -- well I am sorry I do not get the next two words "predominantly white", who have legitimate aspirations and acknowledge the interests of these others who have demonstrated a commitment to northern living, either born here or who have resided in the Territories for five or more years.

Five Years To Become A Northerner

It goes on in the third paragraph while it is not customary within Canada to draw arbitrary distinctions of residency greater than six months that that is done in the Northwest Territories but it says that visitors only average two or three years and the committee firmly believes that such people should not have the right to determine the fundamental shape of the Northwest Territories, so it is those people who have been in here for two or three years -- visitors. It takes three years as I understand it to become a Canadian citizen. Why then would the committee say five years? If in fact the Inuit, the Dene are Canadian, if it takes a Czechoslovakian, a Pakistani, a South American, a person from South America three years to become a Canadian citizen why in the Territories do we lend credence only to five years?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. Arnold McCallum. Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: My answer to you is that it is a matter of relativity. Maybe in the South, just as an example, when you deal with Albertans and people that come into Alberta, you have got to recognize that people in Alberta were there maybe for just about 50 years, the first original inhabitants like southern people maybe were in Alberta for 100 years. So five years would be too long relative to this hundred years so you can have less, but in the North the original people have been here for thousands of years, so what is five years? It is nothing.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you.

MR. SIBBESTON: Can you perhaps look at it that way?

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

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you. Considering the length of terms that people use today and we did not have hard statistics to base it on, although we would have liked to have had, there are many people who come and enjoy life in the North and find it an interesting experience and have every right to do so, but who do not have a particular commitment to living in the North and when we talk about perhaps is there some period of time when it does seem that if people stay that long they may stay a whole lot longer? We sort of felt that it was somewhere around five years so that if someone had been here for that long there was a good possibility that he would be here a good deal longer and that he would have to live with the consequences of any fundamental decisions that were made about lifestyle.

Intruding On A Well Established Lifestyle

I would suggest that your analogy with southern Canada is simply not adequate at all, Mr. McCallum. A Czechoslovakian coming to Canada is an individual who is coming to a country that has a population of 23 million people with a well established lifestyle, a pattern of living. He is not going to make much of an indentation on that at all, but the fact that yes that in the North we do have a very small population and that the numbers who come from elsewhere can have a significant impact on the lifestyle of an area. I may just say that for me that is one of the things, the thing about all being northerners. I used to say that and it took me some time to try to understand a different point of view and one way that I did understand it finally was to say "I live in Yellowknife. I have a lifestyle that I enjoy. What suddenly if 12,000 Scotsmen descended on the city?" We would be hearing about porridge and football and there would be Highland games instead of our Caribou Carnival or whatever, and I would suddenly feel uncomfortable in an area -- I am of Scottish origin but I do not have the brogue or whatever -- I would suddenly feel uncomfortable in a place that I consider to be my home. Mr. Sibbeston does not think it is maybe but I do and suddenly I am losing control of my own life.

Now, what difference if instead 12,000 Scotsmen it was 12,000 Chinese? I do not mean that to be racial in any sense except that they would have even a far different lifestyle and a different language so suddenly I would be walking the streets of my own city, the newspapers are different from what I am used to, the language is different from what I am used to. I would almost go insane. What I am suggesting is with a significant introduction of people from southern Canada to the North that must be how many native people feel and simply to say then that we need to take some account of the fact that there are people with significant characteristics here who care about their lifestyle regardless of what somebody else might think about it.

---Applause

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. I think we had better recognize the clock before those guys come, 6:00 o'clock I get off the chair.

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 special committee on unity and wishes to report progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. On setting the hours for tomorrow we will start again at 1:00 o'clock. I would like to leave the options open for an evening sitting and that would be based on the premise that the unity debate had been concluded. I have purposely held down the hours on the unity debate because I feel that it is of such importance that people should be rested and be able to deal with this subject without getting themselves involved in a manner that might not be becoming this House. I think you can do that very easily when everybody is tired. That is the reason that I have not extended the sitting hours during this debate. I would, however, tomorrow in case unity is finished by 6:00 o'clock, leave the options open to announce an evening sitting at that time if I have your concurrence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: I hear a "nay" so we know the orders for tomorrow then. Mr. Clerk, are there any announcements?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): I have been asked to remind the education committee that they are due at the Inukshuk studio at 7:00 p.m. today. Caucus meeting tomorrow morning at 9:30 at the Ukkivik students residence. The bus will be in front of the hotel at 9:15.

MR. SPEAKER: The orders of the day, please.

ITEM NO. 12: ORDERS OF THE DAY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Orders of the day, November 4, 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)
13. Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER: This House stands adjourned until 1:00 o'clock p.m., November 4, 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