



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

5th Session

9th Assembly

HANSARD
Official Report

TUESDAY, MAY 26, 1981

Pages 377 to 417

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)

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

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

Braden, The Hon. George, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 583
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0
(Yellowknife North)
Leader of the Elected Executive and Minister
of Justice and Public Services

Butters, The Hon. Thomas H., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1069
Inuvik, N.W.T.
X0E 0T0
(Inuvik)
Minister of Finance and of Economic
Development and Tourism

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Patterson, The Hon. Dennis G., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 262
Frobisher Bay, N.W.T.
X0A 0H0
(Frobisher Bay)
Minister of Education

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

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

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

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

Tologanak, The Hon. Kane, M.L.A.
Coppermine, N.W.T.
X0E 0E0
(Central Arctic)
Minister of Government Services

Wah-Shee, The Hon. James J., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 471
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2N4
(Rae - Lac la Martre)
Minister of Local Government and of Aboriginal
Rights and Constitutional Development

Officers

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

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

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

Editor of Hansard
Mrs. M.J. Coe
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0

Sergeant-at-Arms
Mr. Jim Miller
Hay River, N.W.T.
X0E 0R0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

26 May 1981

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	377
Questions and Returns	377
Tabling of Documents	379
Motions	379
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- 10th Report of Standing Committee on Finance	380, 399
Report of the Committee of the Whole of:	
- 10th Report of Standing Committee on Finance	398, 416
Orders of the Day	417

HAY RIVER, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

TUESDAY, MAY 26, 1981

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Appaqaq, Hon. George Braden, Hon. Tom Butters, Ms Cournoyea, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Kilabuk, Hon. Arnold McCallum, Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. MacQuarrie, Hon. Dennis Patterson, Mr. Sayine, Mr. Sibbeston, Mrs. Sorensen, Hon. Don Stewart, Hon. Kane Tologanak, Hon. James Wah-Shee

ITEM NO. 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

SPEAKER (Hon. Don Stewart): The orders of the day for Tuesday, May 26th.

Item 2, replies to the Commissioner's Address.

Item 3, oral questions.

Item 4, questions and returns.

ITEM NO. 4: QUESTIONS AND RETURNS

Mr. MacQuarrie.

Question 68-81(2): Progress On Differentiated Staffing Policy And Cultural Inclusion Programs

MR. MACQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is an oral question for the Minister of Education. Mr. Minister, motions were passed in this Assembly on March the 5th, calling for the Department of Education to discontinue the policy that it called "differentiated staffing" and further, to consult with the Executive Committee to try to find additional funds to support cultural inclusion programs. Will the Minister give this House a report on what has been happening in these areas and what progress he foresees in the future?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 68-81(2): Progress On Differentiated Staffing Policy And Cultural Inclusion Programs

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since the advice given by the Legislative Assembly in the recent budget session came when staffing plans for next year in certain schools, and negotiations with certain societies who had been considering the differentiated staffing option, were quite well advanced, I have recommended to the Executive Committee that, in order not to disappoint those local education authorities where commitments had been made and arrangements fairly well advanced to implement differentiated staffing programs for the coming year, that in those particular communities the arrangements which had been discussed and virtually finalized should continue this coming fall. However, no new differentiated staffing programs and no expansion of that policy have been permitted.

Well in advance of the following budgetary year I will be preparing a recommendation to the Executive Committee which would totally discontinue the differentiated staffing policy as it now exists, and seek to replace it with another measure providing cultural instruction and local instruction in schools other than at the cost of professional staff. I hope that answers the Member's question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Written questions. Are there any returns today? Mr. Braden.

Partial Return To Question 43-81(2): Consideration Of Proposed Staff Housing Policy

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a return to Question 43-81(2). It was asked by Mr. McLaughlin on May 20th, and it concerns the staff housing policy of the Government of the Northwest Territories. With respect to Mr. McLaughlin's question, the Executive Committee will review the decision to make Pine Point a level one community under the new staff housing policy. I appreciate the Member's concern, and I will let him know in due course what the Executive Committee decides to do.

Further Return To Question 50-81(2): Government Assistance, Canada Census

I have a further return, Mr. Speaker, to oral Question 50-81(2), and supplementary, asked by Mr. McLaughlin on May 23rd, 1981, and it concerns the federal government's census of this year. The written return reads as follows:

At several federal-provincial meetings with Statistics Canada, the Northwest Territories bureau of statistics has raised this issue of population under-enumeration in the 1976 census in the North, especially in larger communities like Pine Point. Statistics Canada has acknowledged the existence of this problem and they are doing their best to avoid this situation in the 1981 census. Statistics Canada's Edmonton regional office is also aware of this issue and they are co-ordinating the census operation in western, central and northern Arctic from Yellowknife. A full-time census officer with northern experience has been hired by Statistics Canada to co-ordinate the census effort from Yellowknife. Statistics Canada plans to release the preliminary population counts by January 1982. The Northwest Territories bureau of statistics would make this information available to the community councils for their comments and these will be forwarded to Statistics Canada before they finalize their numbers. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Further Return To Question 134-81(1): Retail Price Increase On Fuel

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a further return to oral Question 134-81(1), asked by Mrs. Sorensen on March 4, 1981. On March 4, 1981, I made a statement to the Assembly in response to a question by Mrs. Sorensen regarding increases in the retail price of fuel in the Northwest Territories. In general terms the response was correct and no increase in the retail price of heating fuel and gasoline is expected until October of 1981.

However, the Department of Government Services is also responsible for the supply of other types of energy. Natural gas is one of these products. Revenue Canada has given notification of a 15 cents per 1000 cubic feet, excise tax effective May 1st, 1981. Therefore the billing for May services will contain a 5.8 per cent increase in the price of natural gas in Norman Wells, \$2.59 MCF to \$2.74. Explanations to customers of the increase will be included with the billings. I have notified Mr. Peter Fraser, MLA for Mackenzie Great Bear, by way of a letter. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Item 5, petitions.

Item 6, tabling of documents.

ITEM NO. 6: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Yes. I would like to table Tabled Document 17-81(2), a telex from Mr. Zgola of the Atomic Energy Control Board in Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Any further tabling of documents?

Item 7, reports of standing and special committees.

Item 8, notices of motion.

Item 9, motions.

ITEM NO. 9: MOTIONS

Mr. McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, yesterday when I gave notice that I would make motions on Wednesday, I asked for unanimous consent to deal with a motion for the appointment of directors to the Housing Corporation. I would now seek unanimous consent to introduce that motion today.

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent being sought. Do I hear any nays? Mr. Fraser.

MR. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, I formerly denied unanimous consent. The Minister has satisfied me that the names have been changed. I will proceed with unanimous consent.

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent of one.

---Laughter

Proceed, Mr. McCallum.

Motion 14-81(2): Appointments To NWT Housing Corporation Board

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I would like then to introduce a motion for the appointment of four members to the Housing Corporation board of directors.

WHEREAS certain vacancies have occurred on the board of directors of the Housing Corporation;

AND WHEREAS appointments to the board of directors of the Housing Corporation are made by the Commissioner on the recommendation of this Assembly;

NOW THEREFORE, I move, seconded by the honourable Member Ms Cournoyea, that the following persons be recommended by this House for appointment to the board of directors of the Housing Corporation: Mr. Steve Brooks, Mr. Red Pedersen, Mr. Steven Kakfwi, Mr. Sarto Ippiak.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is in order. Proceed.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I think that as Mr. Fraser has indicated, we have attempted to get representation from various areas. This time we will have a representative from the Central Arctic area as opposed to not having that before. I think that we have a representation from the Mackenzie Valley and also from the Keewatin with the appointment of these four members to the Housing Corporation board. I think we have covered a large area on it. I would just leave it at that and hope that we could move with the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. As seconder, Ms Cournoyea, do you wish to speak?

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, we have spent a great deal of time trying to find people who are willing, to let their names stand for this very important job on the board of directors for the Housing Corporation. I do not believe that in history we have had someone from the area of Fort McPherson, Arctic Red River and Aklavik area and I hope that the Members of this Legislative Assembly would accept that we did pick Mr. Richard Wilson for the job of being a board director. This gentleman has travelled throughout the Dene territory and has been involved with the Housing Corporation, so I believe that Mr. Fraser's fears of not having someone from his area can be alleviated with the fact that Mr. Wilson has travelled extensively in that area.

There was another name suggested. However, upon trying to get more information, it appears that the gentleman would not be spending a great deal of time in the Territories this year. I would like Mr. Fraser to recognize that I will be resigning from the Housing Corporation after June and I would be glad to consider the gentleman's name at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Are you ready for the question?

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

Motion 14-81(2), Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any?
The motion is carried.

---Carried

Item 10, consideration in the committee of the whole of bills, recommendations to the Legislature and other matters.

ITEM NO. 10: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS, RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE LEGISLATURE AND OTHER MATTERS

The 10th report of the standing committee on finance on spending priorities for 1982-83, operations and capital. I am not including today the Sessional Paper 1-81(2), Principles for the Development of an Agricultural Policy. So, unless I have any objections from the House, I am going to allow that to die on the order paper.

---Applause

---Legislative Assembly resolved into committee of the whole for consideration of 10th Report Of Standing Committee on Finance, with Mr. Fraser in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER 10TH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The committee will come to order. We have been dealing with the standing committee on finance 10th report, spending priorities for 1982-83, operations and capital. I believe we left off last night on recommendation three and I do not know if that recommendation was completed. Mrs. Sorensen, please.

MRS. SORENSEN: No, Mr. Chairman. The recommendation was not completed. I believe that Mr. McCallum was the last speaker and I believe that there are some other Members that have comments to make.

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

MR. MACQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to speak in support of the motion as it is with respect to vocational training in schools. I would like to see the Assembly be prepared in case that is the thrust of the system over the next few years. Am I on the right topic, Mr. Chairman?

MRS. SORENSEN: Point of order.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Point of order, Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps I could repeat the motion and then Members could reorientate themselves, if you will bear with me.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. I think that would be a good idea...

MRS. SORENSEN: All right.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): ...because 24 hours have gone by.

Motion That Education Be A Priority For Government Spending 1982-83, Restated

MRS. SORENSEN: All right. On behalf of the standing committee on finance, I move that the Legislative Assembly recommends to the Executive Committee that education be a priority for 1982-83 government spending and that the following areas be emphasized: Training for employment, vocational training in schools, on-the-job training, adult upgrading and the needs of the special committee on education. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MACQUARRIE: Yes. Mr. McCallum was the last speaker on the motion yesterday and at that time he voiced certain concerns and expressed it very well; a concern of educators over the years, that students not be singled out at too early an age and then channelled along an educational route from which there is no return. The fear, always, of educators was that such students would be deprived of a liberal arts education, that it is thought is important for all citizens in a democracy such as ours, the kind of education that would serve to broaden the horizons of these young people.

While I recognize the importance of that argument, Mr. Chairman, I still feel that there are developments on several fronts that indicate that that philosophy maybe needs some rethinking and revision, because it is just possible that in trying to satisfy everybody, that nobody is really getting the kind of education that is needed. Some of the evidence is the fact that there are large numbers of students who display an obvious lack of interest in the kind of curriculum, the kind of programs that they are faced with in their high school years and that is reflected in poor attendance. I certainly do not say that is the only reason for poor attendance. That is a separate problem and has to be addressed in a separate way, but I think the problem with the program is a part of the attendance problem.

Lack Of Highly Qualified Technical People In Canada

I think that in following the course that we have followed with respect to education, we may be doing something that is detrimental to top quality academic education for students that are interested in academic education. Also, the net result of the way education has been handled, not only in the Northwest Territories, but across the country, is the simple truth that there is a depressing lack of highly qualified technical people in Canada. It is a fact

and a shame that time and again industries in Canada have to turn to Europe in order to get skilled workmen in many areas. So, there is evidence that indicates maybe that kind of philosophy ought to be rethought and I would urge the education committee to recognize the importance of that particular concern and address that specific question. When I present my own brief to the education committee, I will urge that consideration. That is, specifically, whether it is desirable to identify at a reasonably early age, perhaps 14 or so, in accordance with the general interest and abilities of students and the desires of their parents, whether it is wise to identify the kind of program that students ought to pursue thereafter and to begin seriously to offer vocational education in our high schools, in addition to academic and general education.

I would say that we do this partly already, with our business education programs in high school and it, perhaps, ought to be extended. So, I do not know what the answer is, but I do know it is an important question and one that the education committee should address. I think that that would be okay so long as the opportunity exists for people who are channelled to be rechannelled if subsequent testing, subsequent developments indicate a need for rechanneling. I think, perhaps, if we were to pursue that approach to education, we might be able to offer more meaningful and worth-while courses to students who are not academically inclined. We, as a consequence of that, may also be able to offer a better academic program to those students who are so inclined and the net result may be that we are able to upgrade the standards of our vocational schools and offer a higher level of technical training at those institutions. It would have to be recognized, though, that if that were the course to be followed, that vocational education is costly and there is a need to budget, particularly with that in mind. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

Motion That Education Be A Priority For Government Spending 1982-83, Carried

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Question being called. All in favour? To the motion. Down. Opposed? The motion is carried, recommendation number three.

---Carried

Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are now moving into the area that was chosen as a priority last year, for the 1981-82 budget and which your committee had lengthy discussions about with respect to making it a priority for 1982-83 government spending. We, as I say, did some soul searching and we have come up with two recommendations with respect to language. I will deal with the recommendation that you will find on page five of our report. If this recommendation is adopted, then clearly it will be a decision that does have some ramifications with respect to what this government does.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Point of order. Is that page five or page four? Do we look at the top of the page?

MRS. SORENSEN: It is page five. I am going to deal with that recommendation first.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Carry on.

Motion To Support Advancement Of Money From Federal Government For Development Of Native Languages

MRS. SORENSEN: On behalf of the standing committee on finance, I recommend to the Executive Committee that money for the cultural development, revival and preservation of native languages be found within the various land claim settlements and that we as a Legislature urgently support the advancement of money from the federal government to the native groups who wish to do this.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. To the motion.

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, last year the Legislative Assembly, on the recommendation of the finance committee, adopted languages as a priority for government spending during 1981-82. The finance committee was extremely serious about this recommendation as I know the House was when it adopted it. Yet I cannot help feeling that we were perhaps fooling ourselves, that we were perhaps doing nothing more than paying lip service to languages, making statements that sounded good to our constituents without a real commitment to make languages a priority.

However, the Executive Committee did undertake a study done by James Ross on the Dene languages. It was as a result of reading and thinking about this study, Mr. Chairman, that I personally felt that we, as a Legislature, had to make a decision about languages and the financial commitment we were prepared as a government to make, or accept the fact that we would continue to operate in a piecemeal situation saying quite righteously that languages were important, yet at the same time, doing next to nothing as a government to fulfil that priority except what the government was forced to do in the Inuktitut language because we had non-English speaking Members who had been elected over the course of several Assemblies.

Now, the finance committee discussed this dilemma, and Mr. Chairman, it is indeed a dilemma. We felt that this government had to make the financial commitment to languages, or abdicate responsibility for the development, preservation, and indeed, in some cases, the renewal of languages. Members felt that because the people felt so strongly about the preservation and development of their languages that this government and this Legislature could not continue to lead them to believe that we were doing the job that had to be done, or even that we were prepared to do it, if we could not make the financial commitment.

Dene Languages Study By James Ross

I would like to read to you from the James Ross study that so impressed me and led me to bring this subject to the attention of my committee. On page 27 it says:

"A fundamental commitment must be made by the government to assist the Dene in their recognition, development, and preservation of their languages. This commitment must be made over the long run.

"This report has tried to point out that there are really no effective short-term solutions to the basic problems faced by non-English speaking Dene in the Northwest Territories. In particular, the Executive Committee must be prepared to make substantial financial commitments, spanning a five to 10 year period, if there are to be permanent results in the development of the Dene languages.

"It will not do to budget from fiscal year to fiscal year. Experience elsewhere, especially in Alaska, has shown that programs quickly begin to fail once budgetary cutbacks begin to occur in years of financial restraint, or when languages assume a non-priority status.

"For the Northwest Territories it is far preferable to guarantee a specific level of funding over several years rather than to start big and finish small. The commitment by the Government of the Northwest Territories must be specific. Goals may be set in a number of areas, but these must be clearly spelled out and understood by all before they are pursued."

Mr. Chairman, this report was tabled during the budget session and Members have received a copy of it. I believe it has also been translated into the Inuktitut language, and I would urge all Members to read it, because it clearly establishes the dilemma that this government is facing in terms of the development and preservation of the Dene languages specifically.

Mr. Chairman, your committee came to the conclusion that unless things changed very drastically, the financial commitment would not be made by this government, that it would continue to say that it considered languages a priority but nothing much would happen. History has backed us up in believing this. This government has operated in Inuktitut and English, particularly in this House, for some years, yet we do not have a language policy. We have knowledge of the Dene wish to develop at least five of their languages: Loucheux, Slavey, Dogrib, Chipewyan and Hare, yet the one division of the Department of Education which was doing some work in this field, the linguistics program division, no longer exists as a separate unit within the department. The chief has been transferred to the Baffin, and the program is basically in limbo. This was done during the life of this Assembly.

Mr. Chairman, the finance committee wants a decision on this now. Either this government is prepared to make the financial commitment, and there is still time for this House to give that direction and for the Executive Committee to accept that commitment, or we direct the Executive Committee to immediately meet with the land claim groups and agree on a mutual plan of action. Your finance committee believes that we owe it to the various land claim groups to tell them and explain to them what our financial difficulties are, and to work out a plan where they take on the responsibility or parts of the responsibility as agreed to for the development and preservation and revival, in some cases, of their respective languages.

Funding For Languages As Part Of Land Claims Settlements

Mr. Chairman, we came to the conclusion that realistically at this time the native people probably have a better chance of obtaining funding for languages as part of their land claim settlements, than this government could from federal transfers or grants from the Secretary of State. Just to make it clear, we are not talking here of thousands of dollars, we are not talking of even tens of thousands, we are virtually talking of millions of dollars for such undertakings. We also believe that the claims are based on culture and that the language is culture and therefore, those millions of dollars may come easier to the land claim groups than they would come to this government. That is why we have proposed this motion.

Mr. Chairman, we do want to make it clear, however, that the government would work in close liaison with the native language development centres which might be set up with part of the money that would be forthcoming under the land claim settlements, if the federal government were to accept language development as part of the land claim development, and this government would continue to have an interpreter corps to serve the needs of this Legislative Assembly. The Department of Education would continue its curriculum development, and government information would continue to be disseminated to the public in native languages on radio, television, and film.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that your finance committee has tried to place the cold facts before the Legislative Assembly, and we do it simply to get some of the decisions that have to be made on this extremely sensitive and crucial issue. We have done it because we do not wish the people misled about what this government is prepared to do or what it is capable of doing any longer. Mr. Chairman, the finance committee welcomes Members' response and in particular the response of the Executive Committee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. You have just completed your 10 minutes. Mr. McCallum, to the motion.

Development Of Language Policies Responsibility Of NWT Government

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I would just want to comment briefly on the recommendation. I wonder why the chairman of the finance committee is not making the recommendation that appears on page four, as well. Maybe she will be coming back to it, but I recognize that in this particular motion or recommendation that we take from this government what seems to be a responsibility of this government, on the one hand, to develop revived preserved native languages and then with a further recommendation, that she hopefully will make, that her committee calls for this government's continued involvement with a language policy concerning languages as a vehicle of government service, but splits the two.

I believe that the development of language policies in total should be the responsibility of this government and not split in two ways. I think that it is very well that we should be addressing it. We should have addressed it many years earlier, there is no question. To suggest that we only are concerned with languages in one area, that is as a vehicle of communication and for training teaching, and then to say that development money for languages revival, the preservation of native languages, should be funded by the federal government, I would not agree there. I think that it is a responsibility of this government. I think we should be doing it in total. I would hope that the chairman would come back to the other recommendation, that at least we are going to be involved with the language policy at some time.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. McCallum. Mrs. Sorensen, you have had your 10 minutes. Are you responding? Okay. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I do intend on going back to the recommendation on page four. You see, there is a chance that this recommendation may be turned down and, if so, that will certainly change the recommendation that we have on page four, because it will then include the commitment to be made by the Executive Committee to go into a whole linguistics program, which would include research that is needed to provide for dictionary work, for the child language acquisition, all the things that go with developing a language that is, for the most part, nearly dead.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame, shame, shame!

MRS. SORENSEN: Many of the languages are nearly dead, and that is why it is going to take a fair amount of money to revive them. That is not a criticism on my part, that is a criticism for the most part of the commitment of this government to its language development. So what I am saying here is if this motion that is on the floor now is defeated, then we do intend to expand the motion on page four, which will then call for the commitment by this government to going the whole route of developing a linguistics program.

Now, our problem, of course, is, are we prepared to make that financial commitment, and, if so, where is the money going to come from? So, I guess I would have to ask Mr. McCallum, since he has said that he believes it should be a government role, where does he see the money coming from to do that?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Supplementary, Mr. McCallum?

Financial Relationship With Federal Government

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I like plan B a lot better than plan A, and if the committee felt that you were going to lose on this one, I would have suggested you put it all together in the first place. As to the question of where it comes from, it may obviously have to come from the same place that we are going to put in vocational education in high schools, because that is going to cost a lot of money, and it obviously means that we are going to have to do some kind of work in terms of addressing our total financial picture with the federal government, and with the kind of resource revenue that we are attempting to get as well. I do not have any money trees out back. They have all been plucked clean years ago.

---Laughter

So it means that we have to look at the kind of financial and fiscal relationships that we have now with the federal government, and with any development that would go on whereby we can then take this revenue and put it into these programs. That does not negate the responsibility that we have, and I would have suggested that, instead of breaking it into two, that the committee recognize that it was a total responsibility of this government -- language and languages being used throughout the Territories -- and make that recommendation all in one.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. McCallum. I have Mr. Wah-Shee next. To the motion.

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, may I indicate at the outset that I am extremely disappointed in the recommendation from the standing committee. As the Dene person that sits on the Executive, I would like to see the James Ross report implemented, not five years from now or 10 years from now when the aboriginal claims are finally settled, I would like to see this government make a commitment to the Dene languages right now. I think that the Government of the Northwest Territories has the responsibility for aboriginal languages. I do not believe that the federal government has that responsibility. I do not believe that the Secretary of State has the responsibility for Dene languages. I believe that it is a responsibility of this government in co-operation with Dene Nation and the various chiefs and band councils.

I am rather disappointed as well that the Dene people should be asked, once their aboriginal claims are settled and compensation and royalties coming forth from aboriginal claims, that we should ask the Dene people to put aside a percentage of their royalties to look after their own language development. I believe that there are sufficient resources that the government has at the present time. The only thing you have to do is that you are going to have to look at your priorities. I see that the Department of Education has over \$40 million, and yet we are not satisfied with the education system that we have at the present time. That is why we have a House committee that is looking at the revisions and changes that ought to be made in the Department of Education.

Dene, Inuktitut And English Should Be Official Languages Of The North

The other thing, of course, is that the standing committee on finance has given priority to economic development, but it would appear that no priority has been given to the Dene languages. I also feel that it is not a case where only the Dene people should take an interest in the Dene languages. I would like to see, sometime in the future, that the non-Dene people take a little more interest and try to go out of their way to learn the languages of the Dene people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Why should we go and be expected to learn -- and your whole education is geared toward English anyway? I would have to say that I am very pleased with the kinds of development that have taken place in the Inuktitut languages, and I would hope to see that their language continues to develop, that it is a workable language. I am very pleased that the Government of the Northwest Territories has seen fit to use Inuktitut as the working language of this government. Well, I would like to see that this government makes a serious commitment to use the Dene language as the workable language of this government.

I would go even further, that in Canada we have the official languages as French and English. Well, in the Northwest Territories it does not make any sense, I believe, to Dene people to say, "Well, your regional official languages should be French and English." I believe Dene, Inuktitut and English should be the regional official languages of the North, and why not?

---Applause

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Why not?

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: So I would like to see the recommendations be amended to state, in the strongest possible terms, that we in the Northwest Territories would like to see our own regional official languages, and all the money the federal government is spending on the French language should be turned over to this government so that we can use it for the Dene and the Inuktitut languages, to develop them.

So I would like to say that some definite commitment has to be made to implement the James Ross report, and I for one am not prepared to wait until the whole aboriginal claim is settled, and I do not believe that you should ask the chiefs of the Dene communities to contribute funds toward an important program which is really the responsibility of this government. Thank you.

---Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Wah-Shee. Mrs. Sorensen, have you a response to that?

MRS. SORENSEN: Yes, I do.

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

Executive Committee And Assembly Deceiving The People

MRS. SORENSEN: We have now heard from two Executive Committee Members, and they have given us very emotional and very laudable speeches about languages, but the facts do not bear out what they are saying. We have a situation where the standing committee on finance, a year and a half ago, established the fact that languages were to be a priority, yet where within the 1981-82 budget is that priority reflected? It is not. That is one basic fact.

The second fact is the linguistic division of the Department of Education has been disassembled within the past year. That linguistic division was working on the development of Dene languages, and it is in limbo. That decision was made under the former minister of Education within the life of this Assembly.

So it is fine and laudable to say that languages are a priority, but the actions of this government to date have not proven that out. It is great that you are saying that they are a priority, but we have to see that translated into the financial spending of this government. If what you are saying now is that you intend to do that, then why were we not discussing the Ross report during this session?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MRS. SORENSEN: Why were we not talking about languages? We have been calling for the development of a language policy for four sessions now. Mr. Sibbeston has called for it time and time again. Yet we are no closer to one than we were in 1979, and that is precisely what the finance committee has pointed out, and wishes to point out, by bringing this recommendation to the floor.

So it is time that the Executive Committee and this Legislative Assembly put its money where its mouth is. That is all we are saying. If you are not prepared to do it, then pass this motion, which says that the Dene land claim groups, the ITC and the Inuvialuit will do it, because we can no longer say that we are going to do it if we do not do it, because it is deceiving the people. That is exactly what the standing committee wants. So if the Executive Committee is giving a commitment now, then that is great. Defeat this motion. However, if it is not giving a commitment but only paying lip service, then we had better be very careful. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Supplementary. Mr. Wah-Shee.

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Yes. I think that it is all fine and well for the standing committee to come up with all kinds of priorities on which this government ought to spend its money. I have already indicated to the chairman of the standing committee that one of her recommendations for priority spending is in the area of economic development, and other areas as well, but in the end, they are asking this government, "Well, if you can find the money we would like to see something being done in the aboriginal languages." I think that if the standing committee on finance was a responsible committee and committed to the aboriginal languages then they would have made some priority in terms of financial spending for this government.

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

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One of the Members of the finance committee suggested to me that this recommendation on page five had been put forth not seriously but rather to get discussion going. If that is the case, then I am disappointed in the finance committee. I do not think one should advance a motion that would serve...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Point of order. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: As chairman of the finance committee, I take exception to what the Member has just said, Mr. Chairman. It is my understanding that this recommendation is put forth in all seriousness. We have never to date put a recommendation on the floor of this Assembly that we have not been fully aware of and absolutely serious about, and I would ask for an apology for what the Member has just said.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I think the Member said that one of the Members of the standing committee has informed him of this, and we cannot stop that. Go ahead, Mr. Patterson.

Prime Instruments Of The Destruction Of Native Languages

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am glad to have the reassurance from the chairman that this is a serious motion. I would like to say, first of all, that I believe that this government and the federal government, along with other agencies of change have been, unfortunately, the prime instruments of the destruction of the native languages, if they are, as the chairman of the finance committee, perhaps carelessly, suggested, destroyed. I do not accept that, but the education system, until recently, our government and the federal government and the churches, imposed a foreign language upon the people of the Northwest Territories. Therefore, if one can accept the proposition that we have been present as a government, we have presided over

the erosion of native languages, then I find it surprising that the finance committee would turn around and recommend that therefore someone should pick up the pieces.

I always felt and still feel, in my new position, that education is a prime means of strengthening the native languages and through curriculum development, preserving the values and traditions that are referred to in the motion. To me it was a major failing in the recommendations of the finance committee for last year that language should be recommended as a priority and yet education and the Department of Education is not. I would briefly like to say that I take some exception to the remarks made by the Member about no progress having been made in languages in the Territories, and the linguistic program division should be seen not as a means of preserving native languages, but rather as a curriculum development division, and particularly concentrating on native language curriculum development.

I do not think the Department of Education has given up on native language curriculum, but rather has reorganized itself. Now whether that is effective or not is another matter, but the fact that that division has changed form does not mean that the department has given up on native language curriculum development.

Preservation Of Native Languages Should Begin In The Schools

Also, I think it should be mentioned that major efforts were made, and this is really before my time, to strengthen the teacher education program. This involved the expenditure of moneys both in Frobisher Bay and in Fort Smith, so that the teacher education program could truly produce teachers who could teach in native languages. To my mind, if we are concerned about preserving native languages, we have to start with the schools and the children in schools. If the languages are eroding, it is not because old people cannot speak the languages, it is because the young people cannot, especially in light of the fact that our Education Ordinance currently requires that we deliver education to children in native languages where those languages are their first languages, up to grade two, if the local community wishes. Then to suggest that we transfer this function outside our government, ignoring that our Education department has been struggling, admittedly with still a great deal of challenge ahead of it, to teach children in their native languages, and thereby preserving those languages and also the theory goes, permitting those children to learn English and progress in the other language as well, would seem inconsistent.

Now, one thing I would like to question the chairman of the committee about is the suggestion in the motion that native groups do wish to do this. The motion says that we urgently support the advancement of money from the federal government to the native groups who wish to do this; that is, revive and preserve native languages. I am just wondering could the chairman enlighten me as to whether or not the finance committee has consulted with the major native organizations in the Northwest Territories to confirm this suggestion in the motion that they wish to take on this responsibility. My concern is that first of all, land claims are a long way off, unfortunately. It may be true that if this government does not do at least the best it can with its limited resources to try and meet these objectives, then there may well be nothing left to preserve, especially in some of the Dene languages which I, too, am concerned about.

Consultation With Native Groups

So, has the finance committee determined whether native organizations would be willing to start work in these areas and petition the federal government to advance money for these purposes? Because I think that if they are not in agreement and if that consultation has not taken place, then whether we pass the motion or not it may be futile anyway. My suspicion is that they would have other priorities, and that perhaps economic development is the sort of area in which money in advance of claims might preferably be spent by those organizations. I think they are looking to the territorial government to meet this challenge and I am wondering if they had been consulted. Thank you.

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

MRS. SORENSEN: The reference within the motion to native groups who wish to do this was made with the understanding that if this motion were to pass, the Executive Committee would immediately meet with the land claim groups, explain the difficulty that we were experiencing in doing the work that really must be done in order to rejuvenate some of the languages and in advancing those that are healthy, as has been done with the Inuktitut language with respect to word definitions, new words, etc. So, we have not done any consultation with native groups, but we did not feel that that was necessary at this point in time because we were not sure whether this kind of a recommendation would be even accepted by our Legislature, recognizing that it is a sensitive and very, very important issue.

We also were very aware that particularly the Dene Nation, within its claim, wishes to take on responsibility for major portions of the education of their own people, and certainly that would be quite in tune then with the responsibility for the language development as part of that whole education responsibility that they obviously are going to be negotiating. I know that Nellie Cournoyea can speak to the COPE claim, but I do understand that within that claim there is provision for taking over the responsibility of some aspects of education, and you, yourself, Mr. Patterson, are fully aware of ITC's ambition with respect to education in that area.

With respect to your comments on the advancement of money, the precedent has certainly been set, not only with economic development, but with advancement of money to the Yukon Indians in anticipation of a settlement, money to be used for their old folks who were in advanced stages of age. The Yukon Indian land claims people felt that they should be able to take advantage now of the moneys that would come via the land claim settlement. So, we did not feel that the transfer in advance of the settlement of land claims would be a difficult thing for a land claims group to negotiate if the principles of advancing money under their cultural aspect of their claim for the development of their languages was adopted by both sides and was agreed to in principle by both sides. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Supplementary, Mr. Patterson.

Department Of Education's Commitment To Native Language Education

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, just to close that off then, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I am not opposed to the native organizations taking an interest and responsibility even for cultural development and preservation of languages in connection with land claim settlements, and even in advance of land claim settlements. But I think that as long as this government is involved in such areas as the teaching of children in schools, the teaching of native children in schools, and the training of teachers, that it should be recognized that we are spending a significant amount of money on language or language related matters, perhaps not enough. For example, I see the teacher education programs are primarily existing, the ones in the Northwest Territories, as primarily existing to train teachers who can teach in native languages. There is no need for them otherwise. We can at much less cost, send northern students to the South to get teacher training in regular university or other programs, but we have established these programs in the Northwest Territories because of our commitment to language and I would not like to see our government abdicate its responsibility in that area, and rather I think that until land claims are settled that we can do things like train Dene teachers.

I would like to see thousands of Dene teachers trained before the claim is settled, and if the Dene want to operate their own schools and create regional school boards or even new institutions for education, then our government will not have stood in the way of native language education in the Territories.

So I would just like in conclusion to say that I agree with the chairman of the finance committee that if we are to meet these goals, there have to be drastic changes, and as a Member of the Executive Committee, I will now say that I am prepared to support those drastic changes and I would, therefore, not support this recommendation and would be prepared to take responsibility for emphasizing this priority even if it is to be at the price of other programs and other priorities in the Territories. I see the Department of Education as integral to language revival and preservation, although that is not the goal of education; it is the result of native language education.

When the note to this motion says the Department of Education would continue to develop its native language curriculum for the TEP program and for the schools, it does not really fully describe the department's commitment and legislative mandate to native language education. This, of course, is being reviewed by the special committee, but the message that we seem to have been getting through that committee from parts of the Territories visited so far is that there is a great deal of concern about native languages, although there is a concern about people's abilities to learn English as well. So I will not support the recommendation and I will take responsibility for the implications of our continuing responsibility for language in my capacity as a Member of the Executive Committee. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased, firstly, that the finance committee brought this matter to our attention and have dealt with it the way they have. I guess I am very pleased, just to hear Mr. Wah-Shee speak as he has. I guess it has encouraged me, anyway. I am glad to see that he holds these views and obviously his views will rub off on the other Executive Committee Members in this government.

To suggest or to recommend that the native organizations themselves deal with the whole matter of languages and culture and preservation of it and enhancement of it, admits on the one hand that, this government has failed or is unwilling to deal with it and maybe the recommendation is made in the realization that perhaps there is no money or that maybe the Members felt that despite what had been said in the past, it does not seem as if it will ever come about. So it may be made in frustration.

Promotion Of The Use Of Dene Languages

I am of the view that this government should still try to do something about establishing and promoting the Dene languages, in particular. I feel that there are two aspects to the whole native languages. On the one hand you have the local people -- and in my case, I will just deal with the Dene people. In the local area, languages in the home and in the communities and in school -- this cannot really be done by the government. This has to be done by the people themselves. In the small communities like Nahanni Butte, Trout Lake, Wrigley, all the small communities, Slavey is still the predominant language. That is the working language that people use, but any time you get into the government area there is a tendency to use English. People amongst themselves talk in Slavey and use it, but any time when they deal with government, then there is a tendency or a pressure to use English. But as to the languages used in the home, this depends on the people. Of course the Dene languages will only continue and flourish if people are strong, if they are proud of themselves, if they are confident and they have proper self-image and so forth. This is why it is so important to make sure that the Dene people are not suppressed or undermined in any way. This is why people like myself and other Dene leaders stress so much the importance of land claims and a hope for the future, a hope that government and other things can change in the North so that the Dene, in a sense, are not undermined in any way.

It is important to the local people too, if the system of government also encourages and uses the Dene language. It is also even important for institutions like CBC, for instance. If CBC can talk or provide information to the people in the Dene languages, then that in turn encourages or supports the Dene language and it gives some value or some worth or some dignity to the people. It makes people feel that Slavey is important and worthy of using and continuing in the future. So that is the local situation and that has to be done by people themselves and people can only do this if they are strong.

Government Should Put More Money Into Dene Languages

Now, from the other end, from this government's end, I think a number of things must be done. I think, firstly, this government must recognize the Dene language as an official language even more than English or French. The other thing is that this government must begin to function in Slavey or in the Dene languages. It has to put money for interpreters. The government has put a great deal of money into the Inuit people, in providing translators and so forth. Well, in our part of the North, the government has not done that and that is an area that government has to put more money in. We have to have more Dene persons working in government, in the local level, the middle and also in the high levels of government and these people must be able to use their languages or feel comfortable or certainly be encouraged to use their own languages in government.

The other thing that I think must be done is that in terms of education, because education is so important, it has such a strong influence on the younger children, that the whole area of native languages curriculum, providing proper material, good teachers, must be strengthened. I really feel that what has been done to date is good, it is better than nothing but that is just a little bit. I do not think government should think that they are doing so fantastically well. I think government should see what they have done just for what it is, just a start. Dene people know too that it is really not very much and so much more can be done.

The other thing, I think, that must be done is that the government must, perhaps, even pay people to learn Slavey. As Mr. Wah-Shee said, white people should learn to speak in the Dene languages, if possible. It is fashionable or a good thing for white people to learn the Inuit language, but for some reason it is not fashionable or the "in thing", as it were, for white people to learn Dene languages. I am really surprised and disappointed in this area, that in the whole Simpson area, I am aware of only one white person in the last few years who is learning the Dene language. There is a preacher, Pentecostal or that kind of a person, in Fort Liard that is learning the language. Other than that, there is nothing. I think government should do something in this area of encouraging white people to learn the Dene language, pay them, increase their salary. White people seem to respond to money, so give them a few more dollars and who knows, there might be some people who will be interested in learning the language.

I think what has to happen, generally, is probably the same thing that has happened with the French people in Ottawa. You know, when Trudeau and Marchand, Pelletier, Chrétien and all those characters arrived on the scene in Ottawa, I think they were very determined to make the French presence felt in Ottawa and they established a bilingual program in English and French. That same push or effort has to be made with this government. I think the Dene people that are on the Executive Committee, the Dene people that are in this Assembly, must make a big push, a great thrust, to establish Dene languages as one of the working languages of government. I do not think you can expect white people to do it for us. If we are interested, I think we have to create or make the thrust ourselves.

I think that despite the shortage of money, we have to find money from somewhere to put into the development and encouragement of the Dene language, in education and in all phases of government. This is where, perhaps, during the next few months or perhaps at the next budget session, maybe a major thrust has to be made.

If we are serious in doing this, I think we have to approach it in a very determined way and it may mean that certain government programs have to be cut, but if it means that, I think we ought to do it. I guess what it may mean is substantial changes, perhaps, in government programs and I know I would be prepared to be involved in such a thrust.

Taking A Strong Position

I have always been for taking hard stands, hard positions, and I try the best I can. I have tried my best since I have been on this Assembly to state these things and I have certainly talked enough about the Dene languages and so forth, hoping that something will happen. But it appears clear that nothing is going to happen unless you almost do it yourself or you take a real strong position and take drastic steps like just suddenly deciding to not pass money for certain things that have up to now been provided, or else deciding to withhold the passage of bills, or withhold the passage of the budget, as it were, until you get what you want. It seems these steps have to be taken before changes are made. I am glad that this matter has been brought to our attention by the committee and I am glad it is being talked about today. It is certainly getting reaction and I am prepared to do what I can in the next few months and years again, to see if something could be done in this area.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. Mr. MacQuarrie, after the break. A 10 or 15 minute coffee recess.

---SHORT RECESS

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The Chair recognizes a quorum. To the motion.
Mr. MacQuarrie.

English Is Official Language Of Canada

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. First, I would like to express a concern over the statement by Mr. Patterson, the Minister of Education, that the schools have imposed a foreign language on the native people of the North. I perhaps understand the point that he was trying to get out, but to my knowledge, the vast majority of native people in the North, and certainly the Inuit, acknowledge Canadian citizenship and English as an official language of Canada, so what the schools have done is to bring the knowledge of that language to the people of the North, and in doing that added power into their lives, I believe. I realize that in doing that there had been some detrimental effects that have to be addressed.

I also take exception to the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Wah-Shee and his implication that the standing committee on finance has been irresponsible in bring forward a motion like this. I cannot accept that at all. I feel that generally and in this case as well, the standing committee on finance acts very responsibly, and if the Executive Committee were as organized and thorough in its work as the standing committee on finance generally is, we may be several steps further along in addressing some of the real issues that the Northwest Territories is faced with.

I think with respect to the debate that has taken place, there is not disagreement about the very desirable aim of helping to preserve and maintain native languages and I think that the standing committee on finance, as I read it, that is a fundamental concern of that committee. The question then is in order to effect that, how best do you address it? They have offered a proposal to this House for consideration, for debate, and not necessarily for adoption, and that is why I think it is wrong to say that they are irresponsible in what they have done. I find that very responsible.

With respect to the suggestion they have made that the matter of extraordinary funding be addressed in terms of aboriginal rights settlements. That idea is not shocking to me at all. I was again surprised to hear Mr. Wah-Shee look upon those negotiations only in terms of royalties and financial compensation. I am persuaded that aboriginal rights negotiations -- and I believe it is proper to get rid of the term "land claims settlements" -- that aboriginal rights negotiations go beyond that. I would say that if the term "aboriginal right" has any meaning at all, and I believe that it does, it means at least the right of aboriginal people to receive help from the federal government to maintain elements of their culture, and that certainly includes language, that are very important to them, and so it seems to me quite proper to have this particular issue addressed in those aboriginal rights negotiations.

Government Has Responsibility And Concern For Native Language

I do not see that it would have to be a cash royalties and compensation settlement and then out of that native people have to address the problem of preserving their languages but rather that the question of preserving languages be addressed as an issue in negotiation, and be an added component. At any rate, I think that the standing committee on finance is on the right track. What they have done is said that it is obvious that there will be a requirement for ordinary expenditures and extraordinary expenditures. Now the ordinary expenditures would be the kind of expenditures that this government would incur if it were, and the will seems to be present, to accept the principle that this government has a concern for and a responsibility in respect of native languages, and wherever expenses are involved, in ensuring that we have a proper language policy for the Government of the Northwest Territories, that those expenditures ought to be incurred by the Government of the Northwest Territories.

I think what the standing committee of finance is saying, if I read it correctly, is that in addition to that some very extraordinary expenditures will be required with respect to Dene languages in order to halt the erosion that has been taking place and to actually turn it around again so that the languages will thrive.

Now the question that faces this Assembly, and I think the committee has put it very well, is how best can you address the question of extraordinary expenditures? Can we really do it by simply saying that we will have a priority here? Or can we do it best, as they have suggested, by working with native associations and the federal government to try to ensure that that is the case. Personally, I am inclined to agree with the standing committee on finance that that may very well be the best approach for those very extraordinary expenditures, because within our own government and Executive Committee, there may be an intellectual will to accomplish this, but I think that the strongest and most effective will is to be found in the people themselves who are most vitally concerned in preserving these languages. It seems to me that adopting the approach that the standing committee on finance is recommending is a right kind of approach. I can only agree with Mrs. Sorensen, that if the motion is defeated then we would have to see immediately more than just a verbal commitment from the Executive Committee to set a priority, but rather to demonstrate clearly how it is going to manage the priority and arrange for the extraordinary financing that will be required to accomplish that end.

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

Assembly Must Take Practical Approach

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, the intent of the recommendation to this House was not to take away the need for support, but to our fullest ability, develop native languages and reach out to the people to support them in trying to develop this very much needed cultural requirement that native people really believe is necessary to sustain their identity. One of the difficulties that we find is that when you try to develop this need, we are always negotiating to fill other needs.

Now, I believe we should take the practical approach and say what, in fact, can we do to support the various native groups, and the native languages, and the development of the language. It is very easy to talk and to make grandiose statements about how you are going to commit yourself with your dying breath to this great cause, but in reality, all this is going to take money, because we are faced with various dialects in Inuktitut and in the Dene languages. You have to recognize that it is not a small task and it is not something that can be done piecemeal if we are really serious about this effort.

According to the various districts in the areas of the Northwest Territories, each group is at a different stage of the language problem -- let us call it that. Some areas have to have a great infusion of effort for recognition in the community level. There has to be a great deal of work within the family structure and within the school. Other areas have the language, they have retained it, they would like to progress to the next stage. It is not fair to say that everyone is at the same stage. I have heard that we have this great concern about the Dene language, and that is argued off against what we are doing in Inuktitut. So in our efforts to try to realize our ability to deal with that problem, and with the funds that we do have in this territorial government, who is going to win and who is going to lose? Are we going to take some money away from the Inuktitut program because a Dene program is behind times? Is the Inuvialuit program, that has been proposed within the negotiations of the claims, going to have to be infused into the territorial government umbrella and be negotiated to see who will get the funds first?

Concern In Giving Native Groups A Mandate

It seems to me that there is a concern in giving the native groups of people the mandate to move forward with their desires and take them into the federal government negotiations. Could that be the underlying motivation that the territorial government does not want to recognize that they cannot take care of the wishes of the people? Perhaps some honourable Members feel hesitant of admitting that, but I do not. I think native people and their desires, in their own element, are the ones that will be committed to doing that job. It is going to take a great deal of effort, and I do not believe that in our capacity as territorial legislators in this Assembly, that we should really be putting these people in the position of where we are bargaining off who gets what, when, and to what degree, and how much, and for what programs. We have our responsibility and I think we have to face that some of the recommendations we feel as a finance committee, are perhaps obtainable, and then what is not we left to prayers and to the negotiations.

Now, there is some inference from some Members of the Executive Committee that golly what are we doing? Why are we not taking our responsibility and why are we giving it to the federal government? Well, we are really not doing that. What we are asking is who is going to champion the cause? Is Mr. McCallum going to champion the cause? Is Mr. Braden going to champion the cause? Is Mr. Stewart going to champion the cause? How long will it take to develop this program that people want -- the Dene, the Inuvialuit, the Inuit -- how long is it going to take? How many different dialects? Are you going to commit yourselves to pay and struggle with that?

Who Can Do The Best Job

I do not think that the direction that we are going is a put-down to this territorial Assembly, but really a recognition of who can do the best job. I think to give the native groups the mandate, and give the federal government the direction that these people are expected to do that job, is giving a great deal to the negotiation process. It does not have to be part of the royalty payment or whatever is the limit in sight in what negotiations can be. What it is saying that in order to do the comprehensive job of preservation of native languages, revival and cultural development, that this can be done in its ultimate form at the negotiations. This territorial government, by supporting this motion, will be telling the federal government that these people are the best people to do that job in the negotiation process. By no means does it take away the territorial government's responsibility to do the best it can within its means.

Is there a fear to give the native associations the power that they have been asking for to negotiate this concern that they have been putting on the negotiating table? Is it a concern that perhaps these people will be getting funding and will be doing a better job than we are? I do not think that we should have that fear because as long as the job is being done it does not matter who does it.

The final thing that we have to recognize is that, in a number of years, some of us will not be sitting here. We do not know the make-up of the upcoming Assembly and we do not know what their priorities will be. We have had a Seventh and Eighth Assembly who did not put a lot of priority on native languages. I maintain that the only reason that we have a strong Inuktitut component is because there was no alternative to this government but to recognize that need, because they could not communicate. They had to have interpreters, and that is very well and fine but the fact is if the governments in the past of this territorial Assembly could have convinced the people not to use their language, they would have done so.

Recognizing Urgent Needs

So to give advance notice to the groups that we will support them in developing their negotiations for funding to do this job is a step in the direction that we are recognizing this urgent need. I do not believe any kind of commitment that this territorial Assembly can make at this time is going to take care of the needs of those people. To fool people, to lead them to believe that we have the money to develop the Dene language proposal and, also, to support the kinds of things that the Inuit want to do with radio and television -- with the Anik B channel, Inukshuk -- we do not have those funds, and we will not be getting those funds, unless you can have a great big new policy, and I see no indication of that.

I believe in the native groups and their commitment to do certain things and to carry that through because they believe in it. I am not fearful of giving them the mandate to secure the funding. With our ability to give them that mandate and to say, "We are going to support you", I have no fear of doing that. At the same time, I have no fear of recognizing the fact that we must do all we can. So this recommendation certainly does not take away the responsibility of this government to do as much as it can in developing languages in the schools and in any way possible.

However, I cannot support the idea that we are going to have the money to do this job, and I feel it would be irresponsible for us to lead the people, who want to do this fine job, to believe that we will be getting the money that they want to do the kind of job that they want to do. Not the kind of job that we want to do, or Yellowknife wants to do, but the kind of job that they want to do. Thank you.

---Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. Mr. Wah-Shee.

Priority On Dene Languages

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think that I would like to see the Government of the Northwest Territories place a priority on Dene languages. I have heard all kinds of excuses as to why we do not have the money. I do believe that the standing committee on finance is making a recommendation to this House that our present budget, which is in excess of \$300 million for 1981-1982, that they are recommending for the following year, 1982-1983, that the existing budget and additional moneys that will be negotiated with the federal government -- that the priority should be basically in three areas. The first one being constitutional development, the second priority being economic development and I would like to stress there that they have attached major priority to that area, and the third one of course is education. The fourth one is the language development which they have and they are not recommending any moneys to be placed in the development of native languages. This is where the disappointment comes in.

We have heard all kinds of excuses as to why we have not got any money, but we have all kinds of money for economic development, constitutional development and education. So I am not prepared to concede to the argument that we cannot afford it. Yes, we can afford it. The only thing we have to do is to reorganize our priorities.

Also, we are not saying that the aboriginal associations who will be negotiating aboriginal claims with the federal government should not negotiate language development as part of their negotiation process with the federal government. However, I do believe that we can make a commitment to the native languages.

This is not to say that the Dene people and the Inuit people should fight over new moneys. We are already spending money on the Inuktitut languages. We have already got interpreters and are already providing written material and so forth. We do not, however, have that for the Dene languages.

Amendment To Motion To Support Advancement Of Money From Federal Government
For Development Of Native Languages

This is the reason why I would like to make an amendment to the recommendation that the chairman of the standing committee has made, and this amendment, I would hope, would make a financial commitment to the native language development. I am not particularly hung up on how we go about it. I am sure that the Dene Nation and ITC would be most interested in getting involved. This is not to say that we should take funds away from existing Inuktitut programs, that is not the idea. The idea is to find moneys from the three priorities for next year.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an amendment, which would read as follows: "Your committee therefore recommends that money for the cultural development, revival and preservation of native languages be found from within the consolidated revenue fund of the territorial government, and that such language development be treated as a first priority for the 1982-1983 budget." Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Wah-Shee. Could we get a copy of that amendment, please? We will just take a few minutes to see if the amendment is in order. Mr. Wah-Shee, to your amendment. The amendment is in order. To the amendment. Mr. Wah-Shee.

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mrs. Sorensen, a point of order?

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, it is my feeling that the intent of the standing committee's motion was to seek extraordinary funds from the land claim groups negotiating process with the federal government and not from the consolidated revenue. I would then, on behalf of the committee, challenge the amendment and the decision that you have made.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you very much. You have challenged my decision. I wish to report progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Fraser.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF 10TH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON
FINANCE

MR. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, the committee has been dealing with recommendation number four. An amendment was put forth to the recommendation and my decision that the amendment was in order has been challenged.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Fraser. The House will stand adjourned for five minutes, while I look into the question.

---SHORT RECESS

Speaker's Ruling

Amendment To Motion To Support Advancement Of Money From Federal Government For Development Of Native Languages, Ruled Out Of Order

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. I have reviewed the question of the challenge to the chairman's ruling. The matter of the English language is always difficult and in many cases a matter of interpretation. I look at this motion to read in the following manner: "Your committee therefore recommends that money for cultural development, revival and preservation of native languages be found within the various land claims settlements..." and there could be a period and the rest of the addition. That is the way I read it and on that basis, the amendment then is out of order, because it changes the basic intent of the motion, which includes to recognize the need and where the funding is to come from. Therefore, I uphold the mover of the motion, that the motion on the floor is out of order. Now, that of course does not defeat the desires of Mr....

MR. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, did you say the motion was out of order or the amendment was out of order?

MR. SPEAKER: Well, actually the amendment is out of order. I am upholding the point or the position taken by Mrs. Sorensen. Now, so that fairness is preserved here completely, the same result can be gained by the honourable Member by defeating this motion and then bringing back an entirely different motion to replace it. So, although that ruling is made, that does not necessarily say you cannot get back and do the same thing to it, but it would have to be by defeating this recommendation and coming in with a brand new recommendation. It is a very difficult position to be in and in part, inasmuch as I am on the finance committee, I did not write the part and I have only done what in my opinion is correct.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into committee of the whole for consideration of 10th Report of Standing Committee on Finance, with Mr. Fraser in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER 10TH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

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

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is getting a bit confusing now, because we are having people who support the motion saying that the territorial government could continue to do language preservation work even if the native organizations were to be recognized as the prime vehicle. I would say to those people, if we defeat this motion and substitute a motion along the lines of that which I expect Mr. Wah-Shee will advance, that we could say the same thing. We could say the territorial government will do what it can, within its resources, to meet this important challenge and there is nothing to stop the native organizations from getting advances on land claims and doing more.

There is no question in my mind, Mr. Chairman, that we will never be able to fully meet the desires of the Inuit and the Dene in cultural development, revival and preservation of native languages, but this does not mean that we should not do what we can within our resources. I would say that, especially with this Assembly and this government, there is an excellent chance of co-operation, so that the interest and credibility of native organizations to press the federal government for funding in advance of claims to work, perhaps, in concert with our government should be encouraged and will be encouraged by our government.

I would just like to also briefly mention Mr. Chairman, that I take Mr. MacQuarrie's point that it is not proper for a Canadian to call English a foreign language and that my remarks, perhaps in the heat of debate, were inappropriate. I would accept that and I would accept that English is an official language of Canada and so is French. Therefore, it was not appropriate to say that our schools have imposed a foreign language, although from the point of view of many people I have talked to who went to school, particularly in the old days, that was exactly how it seemed to them, coming to school without any knowledge of English. But those remarks were a little extreme and I take his point well on that.

Abdicating Responsibility

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to say very much more about this, why I do not support this motion. I think I spoke at length about language at the first budget session we had. I think we discussed language for days during the estimates of the Department of Education. I made a number of motions at that time advocating research into the way native children learn languages, into recommending that older people be enlisted to take steps to preserve and chronicle the richness of the old languages, recommending the establishment of a language commission and language policy for the Northwest Territories.

I have talked before about how absurd it seems to me to be selecting a jury in an Inuit community where 90 per cent of the people speak Inuktitut, but those whose only language is Inuktitut are disqualified by our own territorial ordinance because they cannot speak English or French. I think this is wrong and I have talked about it at length before and I am not in favour of a motion which effectively abdicates this responsibility in large measure to native organizations. I think our government should take a lead role, and this is not to say that the native organizations do not have an even greater interest and responsibility, but I would see that we can and should work together with those organizations. The responsibility ultimately does rest with the native people, but we represent them in this government and they are a majority therefore I will not be part of a motion that seeks to put this responsibility off on native organizations who are struggling now with the resolution of their claims and do not have the necessary time or resources at this point to pursue this comprehensive subject the way this government can. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Mrs. Sorensen, go ahead.

MRS. SORENSEN: Just in response to some of the comments that Mr. Patterson has made. Mr. Patterson, with respect to the many motions that you yourself and Members of the Eastern Arctic put forward during the first and second sessions of this Legislative Assembly, you will remember that the standing committee on finance, when it sat for its very first meeting to discuss priorities for government spending, took all the motions that were presented during the previous sessions and categorized them and itemized them and from there, decided that the areas that the Members of the Legislature were most concerned with should be the priorities for government spending for the coming year. One of those priorities that we chose was language.

Now, most of those motions that you yourself presented, have not been established and the reason has been the lack of resources. Perhaps a further reason has been the lack of commitment by the Executive Committee to follow through. You would know better than I. You have been there for a while. You know what the commitment is to languages. That is a very important factor in our coming to the conclusion that we had to make this motion.

Additional Funding And Work Needed

Now, with respect to abdicating our responsibility, I cannot agree that that is what we are doing. We will still have major responsibilities and we will still need additional sources of funding to carry on the work that we have been doing

now, as a government, to serve the people in the languages of the North. The problem is that there is an awful lot of work that still needs to be done in more deeper areas than we have been able to attack and that is in the whole area of the revival of some of the languages that have been eroded and badly eroded over the years. These are languages that do not even have a written form, that a written form must be developed. The finance committee is well aware of that, particularly as a result of reviewing the James Ross study, where in at least five different areas -- I have marked them down on the front of the study -- he points to the lack of resources as a reason for the lack of work being done with specific Dene language development.

Making an arrangement with the land claim groups to take on a commitment for the development and preservation of their languages does not mean that this government will stop doing what it is doing now. It will mean that we will work together and that, hopefully, there will be the resources, not only within our government, but also as a part of the land claims, to complement each other.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. If the standing committee on finance's motion were to be defeated today, and if Mr. Wah-Shee's motion were to be adopted, which said we would find the money within the consolidated revenue fund -- some \$300 million -- to make language a first priority, does the Minister of Finance feel that within that \$300 million we can find the money to set up five regional Dene language training centres? I would anticipate that capital funds alone to set up these regional centres would be in the area of one million dollars a piece, because we are looking at a fairly sophisticated system that will require the use of computers and a building and specific things that are necessary if they are going to train interpreters. If you are going to begin the development of the language, we are looking at, and I would estimate approximately \$300,000 a year to provide the operating expenses for those five...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mrs. Sorensen, we are going to have to stop you because you are anticipating "if". We are dealing with a motion and a recommendation now, we are not dealing with if's. If you speak to the motion and then if, if, if, we cannot deal with "if". We have got to deal with this motion as it is now and not with the anticipation that the motion would be defeated and another motion presented. Mrs. Sorensen, go ahead.

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I would disagree. I think that if this question...

---Laughter

...if this question that I have posed cannot be answered, then this motion has to be passed, because it is dependent upon whether we have the financial resources to do the things that the Dene people want...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Absolutely.

MRS. SORENSEN: ...to be done that will dictate whether we do them or not; not our political will to do them, but whether we have the finances to do them. If the Minister of Finance can give me those reassurances that he can find within our budget the amount of dollars to do that, then I say hallelujah, let us go ahead, but I want to hear from the Minister of Finance. I want to hear him give that commitment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Mr. Minister, Mr. Butters.

Native Languages Will Take First Priority

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, the Member referred to the motion, or the amendment, which was declared out of order, and I would like to do the same thing. The prioritization that is required by that amendment, I am quite sure can be met by the government. We will be in the very near future setting the priorities for this government's budget of 1982-1983, and if the amendment is reintroduced and does pass, the native languages aspect will take first priority in the determination of the expenditures.

---Applause

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

MRS. SORENSEN: I am glad to hear the Minister of Finance give that kind of reassurance. However, I am still disturbed in view of the fact that we have a \$10 million B level submission now before the federal government that deals with our last years priorities, that has not yet been addressed by the federal government. So we were not even able to find last years priorities within the \$300 million that we have in the consolidated revenue fund.

So history again proves that we have a difficult problem here, and making language a number one priority still does not mean that we are going to find the money. I do not know what further assurances the Minister can give me. I recognize that that is a problem, but the difficulty I have is facing the reality of the situation, and I guess that will always be a difficulty, but I see that the Minister has his hand up, so perhaps he can further reassure the finance committee on that note.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Just to say, Mr. Chairman, that the \$5.3 million which is being required or requested under B level is for new programs. I understand the program that we are discussing here is already an active program of this government. If the amendment were to pass it would just mean that that active program would have an increased and first priority and be funded to a much larger extent than it has been in the past. It is not a new program. It is already in place.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Butters. To the motion, Mr. McCallum.

Not Taking Away From Land Claims Negotiations

HON. ARNOLD MCCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I believe that this government should take a role in the cultural development, the revival and the preservation of native languages. In addition to serving its purposes, which the Executive Committee, because of firm commitment, not because of a lack of it, but because of a firm commitment, made in initiating this study, getting it under way, developed the idea and looked to its responsibilities as a provider of services, as a communicator, as a developer in its department. I would suggest to Members that the Executive Committee has made many efforts -- and in some departments it is reflected within this years budget in those areas, but I do not think that this government's responsibilities should be solely that in the areas of communications and the provider of services. I think that we have to begin to look at the total aspect of languages and to suggest that we are taking something away from negotiators of land claims, or we have a fear of that, that is not so.

Nobody on the Executive Committee that I know of has a fear of those people who are now negotiating for land claims, that we are in awe of them or fear that they are going to take over. I think it is absolutely right that they should

be involved, but that does not mean that this government should not be doing this. I believe that this government should be committing more of its funding to those kinds of things, and to say that we have a lack of commitment on the part of the Executive Members to address these problems is not correct.

I find it increasingly amusing whenever we get into a committee report where Executive Committee Members raise questions about recommendations of these committee reports. The "musk-ox syndrome" comes out. The Members come together...

---Laughter

...but the Members of the committee in coming and asking questions of Executive Committee Members and if we would dare vote as a block, then it is wrong. It is all right to give, but it is not very good to receive, and so if we raise questions of committee Members' reports as an Executive, I think we are well within our rights to do so. I do not think that threatens the committee. If it is all right one way, Jack, it has got to be all right the other way.

---Applause

Source Changes But Intent Does Not

I think what we are asking here to do, we are saying that we believe that the source changes, but the intent does not, and I think that we, as a government, have a responsibility not only in the areas that the Executive Committee have already identified, but we have responsibilities in cultural development, revival of native languages, and preservation of those languages.

If native groups or organizations or claimants who are now negotiating for those things in their claims, if they can do even more, that is fine but there is nothing to suggest that we cannot, and I do not think that this motion was predicted. The reason why, as the chairperson had said, the recommendation on page four did not come up first was on the hopes that this one would go through and we would have a split, but if this was to be defeated, they would be all set to go back to recommendation four and rewrite it and make the recommendation -- not the one that is in the paper in the committee report, but a new one.

I think that in this particular motion that we are being told to keep away from the cultural development, revival of native languages and the preservation of those native languages, and I say that is wrong. That is what it says. If that is not what it means, then change it. We had a chance to change it and it was turned down.

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

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just cannot help wondering if the honourable Minister, who just spoke has found a cure for the "musk-ox syndrome" which is prevalent on the sixth floor and if so...

---Laughter

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: It is contagious.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: ...will his Department of Health extend coverage for the cure of this for anyone suffering from it?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: As soon as we get it.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I have Mr. Sibbeston after the break. We will take 15 minutes, please.

---SHORT RECESS

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The Chair recognizes a quorum. The committee will come back to order. I have Mr. Sibbeston next. To the motion.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, all I wanted to say is let us get on with defeating the recommendation and then dealing with a new recommendation which will be proposed by Mr. Wah-Shee. I think to do otherwise is to support the present status quo and to say that we are more or less happy with the present set-up, or else we cannot do any more than what presently is. So, I am sure the Dene Nation, on behalf of the Dene and Metis, will be getting funds from the federal government through the regular channels such as trying to establish the Dene radio and TV network, and also through the land claims as a result of that, in getting people economically and socially on their feet in that way will be promoting and developing the culture and languages. So I just say we ought to now vote on the recommendation, defeat it, and go on.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Do I hear questions? Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MACQUARRIE: Yes. Well, for the other side, I will try to be brief. I say that such a priority as suggested by Mr. Wah-Shee is either serious or it is not. If it is serious, then it obviously requires not just a statement, but a major commitment of time on the part of Executive Committee Members, a major commitment of money, the creation of an apparatus to implement whatever is decided upon, a major commitment of personnel. I just personally feel that the Executive Committee already has a plateful and I feel that while the matter in question is of a great deal of importance that it would be better handled, better served, by the method recommended by the standing committee on finance.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Mr. MacQuarrie. Question being called. Mr. Wah-Shee. To the motion.

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Yes. Mr. Chairman, I have already indicated that I cannot support the recommendation from the standing committee as it is. I would prefer to see the recommendation amended to reflect a real commitment toward the aboriginal languages of the Territories. Also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask for a recorded vote.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Wah-Shee. A recorded vote has been requested. Mr. Stewart. To the motion.

HON. DON STEWART: In view of the possible conflict of interest in having to make a ruling on this as Speaker or as a Member, I will not take part in this vote.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): For what reason, Mr. Stewart?

---Laughter

HON. DON STEWART: Well, it is very difficult to be requested to make a decision relative to the motion and then show favoritism for the motion or to negate the motion, so I am taking a position of neutrality and I am not going to vote on this motion one way or another.

Motion To Support Advancement Of Money From Federal Government For Development Of Native Languages, Defeated

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Where does that leave me if I have to break a tie? I am on the finance committee, too. A recorded vote has been requested. To the motion. All in favour please stand.

CLERK ASSISTANT (Mr. Hamilton): Ms Cournoyea, Mrs. Sorensen, Mr. MacQuarrie.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Down. Opposed, please stand.

CLERK ASSISTANT (Mr. Hamilton): Mr. Patterson, Mr. Tologanak, Mr. Sibbeston, Mr. Sayine, Mr. McCallum, Mr. Wah-Shee, Mr. Braden, Mr. Butters.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Abstentions, please stand.

CLERK ASSISTANT (Mr. Hamilton): Mr. Kilabuk, Mr. Appaqaq, Mr. Stewart.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The recommendation number five has been defeated.

---Defeated

Mr. Wah-Shee.

Motion That Consolidated Revenue Fund Provide Money For Native Culture And Language Preservation

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the following recommendation. Your committee therefore recommends that money for the cultural development, revival and preservation of native languages should be found from within the consolidated revenue fund of the territorial government, and that such language development be treated as a first priority for the 1982-83 budget.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Wah-Shee. Can we have a copy of that, please?

AN HON. MEMBER: You have already got one.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Point of order?

MRS. SORENSEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Point of order. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Wah-Shee, in his motion, made reference to "your committee". I believe that this is a new motion, and he should be making it on behalf of himself or the Executive Committee, not on behalf of what I see to be the standing committee on finance. It is just a wording problem, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): If we get the motion, Mrs. Sorensen, we can decide. Mr. Wah-Shee, do you care to change that wording? What committee are you talking about?

Motion Reworded

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some changes to that: "This House therefore recommends to the Executive Committee that money for the cultural development, revival..." etc. Would that be in order, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Stand by one minute. Mr. Wah-Shee, your motion -- I presume this is a motion -- is in order. Proceed. Mr. Wah-Shee.

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Mr. Chairman, I do believe I have indicated earlier the reasons why I would like to make the following motion. I feel that the priorities that have been recommended by the standing committee are not sufficient. They do not indicate outright that funds should be made available to the language development, and they have indicated that other priorities should be in place, but there has been no indication that this government should make funds available toward the development of native languages, and that is the reason why I opposed the recommendation, and in its place I am putting forth this particular motion. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Wah-Shee. To the motion. Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: Right. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important for this government to be involved and take new initiatives in the area of language and culture of, particularly, the Dene people. As you know, I have been saying for a couple of years now that there is some real reservation, or concern from my constituents about this government. I think this new initiative could do a lot to make the people feel and think that this government is, perhaps, their government, that they could accept it and identify with it, and so forth.

I just want to say that, of course there is concern as to where moneys will come for this, and I am pleased that it is indicated as a number one priority of this government for next years budget. I am sure -- and trust -- that a number of millions of dollars will be found from somewhere in the moneys that are presently allotted to this government. I would say that if there is commitment and a sincere desire, that that in itself is worth quite a few millions of dollars.

Hiring Native People In All Levels Of Government

I do think that there is a great deal that can be done without any additional moneys, and I just want to point out some of the things that could be done almost tomorrow or later this afternoon if, you know, the Executive Committee really wanted to. I think that one area that you could enhance the native cultures and languages and the adoption by government of native languages is in the area of appointments. I think the government could do a bit better -- well, I should not say just "a bit better", but could do a lot better in the area of hiring native people throughout all levels of government, and particularly if there is some emphasis or some program of trying to hire people who speak the native language. If there was some incentive, perhaps even give them a couple of hundred dollars or a thousand dollars more a year if they can speak one of the Dene languages.

Another way is to cut programs. Through the course of time, maybe there are some programs that are no longer relevant or useful to the people of the North. Perhaps an intense, in-depth review can be had of government programs to see if some money can be saved.

Dene Names For Buildings

Another thing that can be done in order to enhance the Dene languages and culture, I think, is such things as naming buildings. I must say that I was in Fort Smith last week, and visited AVTC, and I was almost shocked, I guess, to see that one of the buildings was given an Inuit name, and I really was surprised and thought, "Goodness, the Dene are being taken over by white people. Now the Inuit are also overtaking us and putting their names on buildings in our parts of the North." Another area is such things as naming schools, as an example, in Hay River, this Diamond Jenness School. Surely a more original name could be had for a school like this. I understand it was designed by an Indian person from the South. In Simpson, the school there is named after Thomas Simpson, who was the nephew of the governor of the Hudson's Bay Company, Mr. Simpson. I think it could do a lot to enhance, or promote the Dene people if the school was given a Dene name. The other thing I intend to do during my time here is to change my area where I come from, from Mackenzie Liard to "Member for Deh Cho". So I think these little things can be done which help. Another thing to consider is symbols of the North. At the moment the polar bear is the symbol of the North. While this is fine, I think that the government could promote another symbol for the North, you know, perhaps not to replace the polar bear, but another symbol for this part of the North. Maybe a buffalo, maybe Arnold McCallum would like that, or else a black bear or a beaver, or anything like nice and flowery sewing designs that are made by Dene women could become a symbol for people and things as part of the North.

The extent to which this government appears to be willing to take on Inuit things, I guess, is exemplified in Hay River here. I notice in town here that there is a monument, an Inukshuk model, a symbol of some sort, which I think has been here since the Arctic Winter Games. This being a Dene area, again, I guess it is another example of being overtaken by the Inuit people. Even if you put up a bow and arrow symbol, it would be something Dene, and something from this area.

So, that is the extent of my comments, and I really am optimistic about this motion. I think this may be the motion which launches this government into a whole new initiative of enhancing and promoting the Dene languages and culture, and I am very pleased about it and look forward to seeing results in the next few months and years.

---Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. Mrs. Sorensen. To the motion.

MRS. SORENSEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I feel very good about the debate which has taken place today, and I would like to speak in support -- personally, not on behalf of the standing committee on finance, but personally -- in support of this motion. I know that, as the proposer of the previous motion, some Members may feel that there was not the desire of myself, and perhaps some Members of my committee, to see native languages move ahead, to see the development of those languages, but I say very emphatically, Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely to the contrary. Your committee takes its role very seriously. I, as a Member of that committee and its chairman, take that role very seriously, and last year we made, and this House adopted, language as a priority, and we wished absolutely to see that priority carried out. Perhaps now, as a result of the deliberations that have gone on today, we will see that dream come true.

A Department Of Language

Last year, when I spoke to the motion that maybe languages had priority, I mentioned the fact that personally I felt that there was room for a department of language within the territorial government, and, Mr. Chairman, I would like to reintroduce that idea, because I personally feel that a department of language, with a division for the Inuktitut language and a division for the Dene language, with a deputy minister of languages and with chiefs for both divisions, with a team of experts who are knowledgeable in the development of languages, with researchers, and with the proper equipment, that we can do this job.

The reason that I feel a department of language is important is because it will focus, and it will announce to the people of the North, and in particular to the native people, that we have prioritized their languages and the development of those languages along with Local Government, Economic Development, Health, Social Services and the other departments, that if we make a department of language, we will, in fact, be saying to the people of the North that languages are as important as the other departments. With that, Mr. Chairman, I will ask other Members to support this, as I know they will, and I will be looking forward to reviewing the main estimates this fall, and will be looking forward to seeing money being allotted for this very important priority. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. To the motion.
Mr. Patterson.

Sacrifices Will Be Necessary

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: I support the motion, Mr. Chairman, and I think that we must at the same time recognize that in supporting this motion we are accepting that there will have to be cutbacks in existing programs, to make way for the initiatives that are so obviously going to be required. I hope that all Members, if this motion passes, will recognize that the Executive Committee

certainly appears committed to taking the necessary steps, but will have to, perhaps, make sacrifices in other government programs. So, I support this motion with the full understanding that it is going to cause hardships in other areas, but I cannot think of a more important priority. I think our languages and our people are our greatest natural resource and as Members may know, I have been very concerned that this government has not done more to date. So, I applaud this motion and to the extent that it is going to provide a challenge to the Department of Education to provide native teachers and to provide education in both English and French and the native languages, I am confident that we will be able to rise to the challenge. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

Motion That Consolidated Revenue Fund Provide For Native Culture And Language Preservation, Carried

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

---Carried

Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I would like to abstain from this motion on the basis of the practicality that I believe language is one of the major priorities, but I do not believe, at this point of development in the Northwest Territories that it is a first priority.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Let the record show Ms Cournoyea abstained from that motion. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MACQUARRIE: Yes. I would like it noted that I have abstained as well, for essentially the same reason, that I support the idea, but whether that should be a priority of this government at this time is a serious question to me.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Let the record show Mr. MacQuarrie, abstention. Mrs. Sorensen.

Motion That Executive Committee Develops Policy Concerning Languages

MRS. SORENSEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We would go back then to page four and on behalf of the standing committee on finance, I recommend to the Executive Committee that it develops a language policy concerning languages as a vehicle of government service and for training and teaching purposes.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Is that the recommendation number three or number four? What have you got it numbered?

MRS. SORENSEN: Well, it follows what the last one was. I do not know.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I do not even know what the last one was.

MRS. SORENSEN: I think it is number -- I do not know. We did not number them, big mistake.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Okay. Anyway, that recommendation that they just put forth is found on page four, so it would be recommendation number five. Did you read that recommendation as it is presented on this report or did you change some of the words?

MRS. SORENSEN: I changed some of the words, just to make it acceptable to the Chair.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Can we have a copy, then, of the change?

MRS. SORENSEN: I have not written it out. Mr. Chairman, can I just read it?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Yes. If you will just read it again, maybe we can pick it up here, Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: The standing committee on finance recommends that the Executive Committee develops a language policy concerning languages as a vehicle of government service and for training and teaching purposes.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Got you.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Question being called. All in favour? Mr. Sibbeston. Mrs. Sorensen, it is your motion. You can speak to it first. Mrs. Sorensen.

Interpreter Corps Operating Without Policy

MRS. SORENSEN: This is simply a motion to do a bit of housekeeping. We had proposed last year, and I believe individual Members have also proposed that it is very difficult for the interpreter corps, for instance, to operate without a policy. The interpreter corps was instituted I believe on a trial basis and since then it has been operating under very little, in fact no policy, with respect to where it is going and whether it is, indeed, going to continue, if we were to lose for instance, the non-English speaking Members from the Legislative Assembly. I think it is just important that we have a policy that outlines our commitment in this area and as well, outlines our commitment to the services of languages in the various departments. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Just so we get this straight, before I let another Member speak, I will read the recommendation back as we understand it here. Your committee recommends that the Executive Committee develops a language policy concerning languages as a vehicle of government service and for training and teaching purposes. Am I right on that Mrs. Sorensen? You have dropped out "interpreter corps, information to public"? You have dropped that out? It is left in, is it?

MRS. SORENSEN: Well, it is just in there to explain what we mean by government service. So, that is why I dropped it.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Mr. Sibbeston. To the motion.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I think this recommendation here is fine and I have been thinking for the last few minutes as to whether it is perhaps too general and whether maybe we should add some other specific direction, as it were, to the Executive. You know, something to the effect that maybe the Department of Information be transformed into a Dene language or a native language secretariat, to be established or headed by a person fluent in one of the native languages or simply to leave the Department of Information the way it is, and then a new native languages secretariat established and staffed by a person fluent in a native language. That is what I have been considering, but I am not certain whether it is necessary. I would like to know offhand what the Executive Committee Members feel they will be able to do if the recommendation passes, just to give us some idea of what may happen with this recommendation.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston, Mr. Wah-Shee, Mr. Braden.

Concept Of A Language Commission

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Chairman, over the last year the planning and priorities committee has examined various issues that have to do with the development of language and so on. We commissioned the Ross report, which we received about three months ago. We also have, as you know, reviewed the interpreter corps and are going on to identify possible areas where we can make some improvements. We have in our discussions, examined the issue of language from two perspectives. The one was language services within government, and the actual development of Dene languages or Inuktitut outside of institutions of government, if I can make that clear distinction. I know there is probably a grey area in between, but as I recall it, Mr. Chairman, we identified a definite need to develop a policy concerning languages and looking at how government services could be better provided. In our preliminary decision making we decided against a department of languages. We preferred the concept of a language commission based on legislation to foster languages in all sectors of the Northwest Territories. We as you are aware, did not implement the language commission, for lack of revenue in this present fiscal year, but in our decision making process, this is the kind of direction we were going in.

We think that a language commission would provide a greater scope than would a department of languages. I would hope that the government could institute enough policies so that each department itself could provide the necessary and proper interpreter services. You know, our friend over there in the Department of Education, has got a major job to do with respect to schools, but I really do not know if a department of languages is the route to go. I think we would much prefer to see a commission developed and with the kind of recommendation that we have just had in the previous motion, we have clearly got to place emphasis in that direction when we complete the analysis of the interpreter corps recommendations and the analysis of the Ross report. So, Mr. Chairman, that gives my colleague a bit of an indication as to the point the government is at in the decision making process. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Braden. To the motion. Are you ready for the question?

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

Motion That Executive Committee Develops Policy Concerning Languages, Carried

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

---Carried

Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are ready, then, to move on to the recommendations of the standing committee on finance concerning capital priorities for 1982-83 and you will find that on the bottom of page five of the report.

Motion That A Portion Of Capital Be Expended For Retrofit

The first motion that I will make is as follows. There is somewhat of a wording change to accommodate the Chair and I have written it here. On behalf of the standing committee on finance, I move that the Legislative Assembly recommends to the Executive Committee that it expend a portion of capital for retrofit.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. To the motion. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I really feel that during the last budget session we thoroughly discussed the need for upgrading our existing buildings and public works to make them energy conscious. Your standing committee feels very strongly that we should put at least a portion of our capital into this effort and I believe that most Members of the Legislature believe that as long as it is done in an orderly fashion and well thought out, that it should be a priority for capital spending as well.

We have also received from the government, a paper that was tabled in the dying moments of the last session that outlined that they could go ahead with such an undertaking and that they could identify a certain amount of funds within each capital budget each year for retrofitting and that they were obviously very much in agreement with that type of expenditure of funds. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Financial Management Board Has Moved To Implement Recommendation

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Just to welcome or to add that we welcome the motion and that the financial management board has already moved to implement this recommendation, being guided by the direction given by the committee in the budget session.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Butters. To the motion. Question being called. Mr. Braden, to the motion.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Chairman, if this is too technical, I will withdraw the question, but what does the committee mean by "a portion"?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: I believe, Mr. Chairman, that within the Department of Public Works, there are the experts available to give advice with respect to the amount of dollars it will take to retrofit certain buildings, and upon receiving that advice, then the capital planning committee and subsequent to that, the Executive Committee can make the decision on exactly how much it feels should be used. The standing committee on finance has no idea about the amount of dollars that it will take to bring specific buildings up to an energy conscious level, but it does feel that we must begin the process. I believe we have already begun the process, but we must continue the process of doing just that, but it is left entirely up to the Executive Committee just how much they feel should be expended.

The only provision I would make is that the materials and the labour for that same retrofitting should come from the community itself, where the public works that are being retrofitted are located, so that any moneys that might be diverted from building projects will still remain in the community and be used for purchasing of supplies and labour. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Motion That A Portion Of Capital Be Expended For Retrofit, Carried

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Question being called. All in favour, raise your hand. Down. Opposed? Motion is carried.

---Carried

Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The second recommendation that we have with respect to capital expenditures for 1982-83 is as follows...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Page?

Motion That High Emphasis Be Placed On Recreational Facilities, Subject To
O And M Moneys

MRS. SORENSEN: The top of page six. On behalf of the standing committee on finance, I move that the Legislative Assembly recommends that the Executive Committee place a high emphasis on recreation facilities for communities, in the capital plan, as long as money for operation and maintenance is planned for by both the government and the community.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. To the motion.
Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of discussion within the various sessions that we have held on the need for recreation facilities. This is the finance committee's way of seeing those discussions and those comments that have been made in replies to the Commissioner's Address, in comments with respect to why children are not staying in school, by the various Members, and in private conversations that MLA's have had with Members of the finance committee over the last couple of years, reflected in capital priorities.

The MLA's have talked about the need for good recreation facilities for a variety of reasons. Some have listed the fact that they feel that good recreational facilities should be attached to the school, that the school should have good recreational programs and that is one way of keeping our children in school and of attracting them to the school.

Others have mentioned that because many of the communities in the Northwest Territories are extremely isolated and that the winters are very long and very dark, that good recreation facilities are a necessity. They are not a luxury, they are a necessity. There is a need for swimming pools, skating rinks, bowling alleys, recreational facilities that allow for family play and will allow the people of the North to enjoy the long winter months playing together.

It is also a matter of good mental health, Mr. Chairman. We have experienced a significant problem in the Northwest Territories with alcoholism and we have also experienced the need and the desire in many of our communities to attack that problem. One of the methods that they have consistently used is good recreational programs as diversion.

We also have a big problem in the Northwest Territories with respect to young people who have dropped out of school and who have become involved with the law, and in fact, often spend time in our correctional institutes. Again, there is a need for facilities such as recreational facilities which will allow the courts to have diversionary methods of handling these problems at a community basis. So with that, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that Members would support this.

One final comment I would like to make. We have committed ourselves as a Legislative Assembly to getting the input of the regions in the capital plan. In the finance committee we have discussed that, and we feel that this will not at all usurp the role of the regions with respect to what input they have into what their priorities are. So we would simply say to the Executive Committee that when you are planning the capital, that you are made aware of those priorities and that you also make the regional areas aware of the priorities that

this Legislature has set, so that they are in tune with what we feel are territorial priorities, but they may differ somewhat with the regional priorities. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Mr. Wah-Shee, to the motion.

Proposed New Policy Regarding Recreational Facilities

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to indicate that the Department of Local Government is developing a new policy regarding the recreational facilities, and this particular policy proposal will be coming before the Executive Committee in June.

Motion That High Emphasis Be Placed On Recreational Facilities, Subject To O And M Moneys, Defeated

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): To the motion. Question being called. All in favour? Down. Opposed? Thank you. Recommendation number whatever did not pass. Mrs. Sorensen.

---Defeated

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, there is, on page six, another serious matter that the standing committee on finance would like to draw this House's attention to, and it concerns the commitment of this government and this Legislature to northern resident employment, northern purchase, and northern business opportunities.

Initially, we had agreed that we would put forth a definite motion to call for the development of a monitoring agency, but I have talked to the MLA's on my committee and we have agreed that perhaps we are somewhat premature in bringing this forward. We have sown the seeds, so to speak, with respect to other MLA's who are here, and we asked a series of questions and made a series of comments that Members of the House can take back to their communities and can consult with their constituents, with the municipalities, with community councils, with the local businessmen, with the corporations, and with the regional government employees that are situated in the various areas.

We do this because we feel that Members, perhaps, need the time to consider the importance of this. We wish to have a very good debate on the whole area of northern employment and northern purchase and northern business opportunities this fall. I am also under the impression that the government is planning to table legislation this fall concerning this whole area. Therefore, I think the discussion that will take place around that legislation and the discussion with respect to the development of a monitoring agency would probably better take place during the fall session.

That now does not preclude any Members from speaking today on an intellectual basis, I suppose, about the need for a monitoring agency, but I think the standing committee on finance has agreed that we would like to further develop our paper and mail it to all the Members of the Legislative Assembly for thought and discussion within their own constituencies and for input and we will bring it up again this fall. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. The middle of the page, on page six, says, "That concludes our recommendations." Are we going into 1983-84 now, or are we still in 1982-83?

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, we have concluded the discussion of the priorities for government spending for 1982-83, and we have moved into a specific discussion of an anticipated recommendation that we were presenting to the House, but which we have withdrawn.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Mr. Butters. I do not know what you are speaking to. It has been withdrawn, but speak to it anyway.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I am responding to the invitation of the chairman of the standing committee to say a few words on the particular item which she discussed and which was advanced by her on behalf of her committee, even if only tentatively at this time.

Communication Regarding Northern Entrepreneurs

I am concerned that northern entrepreneurs, for some reason or other are being overlooked or ignored by either this government or the federal government or private industry. I would ask of Members, in the interim until we meet again, that if such a situation comes to their attention, I would welcome a phone call and, in my absence, Mr. Morrison would receive a phone call to pursue such concern immediately. I have indicated to the senior staff of the Department of Economic Development that our department should be the cutting edge of the interests of private industry and the private individual within our government, and as a go-between to private industry, so I would welcome being informed of such situations. The sooner one hears about them, the more likely one can change them, if you act quickly.

I just have one other comment, which I guess is philosophical. I notice the word "ombudsman" is used in the text. I introduced a motion some years ago to establish an ombudsman in the Northwest Territories. The motion did not get anywhere, but I recollect what Judge Morrow said to me on the street. He said, "Why do you need an ombudsman in the Territories? Every Member that sits in the House is an ombudsman. That is why you are elected, to represent the interests and the concerns of the people of your constituency." So I think we all recognize that, and I think that probably the best ombudsmen that the people of the Territories have, are found right in this Assembly and right in this Chamber. If they do not act in the interests of the people, then they will not be around next time.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Butters. This concludes the 10th report of the standing committee on finance. Do we wish to report progress?
Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I want to step down from my role as chairman of the standing committee on finance, and I have a -- no, I mean, I am not resigning...

---Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Hurrah!

AN HON. MEMBER: We heard it in this House.

---Laughter

MRS. SORENSEN: I have a further priority, and I am not sure how I can go about this, but I would like to add a further priority for government spending...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I am sorry...

MRS. SORENSEN: ...for 1983...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mrs. Sorensen, we are dealing with this report, and this 10th report only.

MRS. SORENSEN: It seems to me that Members can amend or add to the priorities, as Mr. Wah-Shee did.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): If you can get unanimous consent, which I probably will.

MRS. SORENSEN: I do not understand why I need unanimous consent to make a motion concerning an additional priority for government spending. I could not do it before because I was sponsoring the report through, but now that my duties are finished, I would like to become a regular MLA again, and contribute.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Okay. We will let you become a regular MLA. Go ahead.

---Laughter

Proceed, Mrs. Sorensen. No back talk there, Fort Smith.

Motion That Energy Be Considered A Priority For Government Spending 1982-83

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Legislative Assembly recommends to the Executive Committee that it make energy a priority for government spending during 1982-83.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): May I have a copy of that, please?

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The motion reads: "I move that the Legislative Assembly recommends that the Executive Committee make energy a priority for government spending during 1982-83." To the motion. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, over the past few days I have been working on my submission that I will be making before the standing committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development concerning Northern Canada Power Commission, and I have been reading all of the documents that Mr. Nerysoo, as Minister of Energy, has tabled in this House concerning energy. I have been reading one specific document that he tabled during the last session, which we have not yet discussed, but which asks for specific direction in many of the areas that he has been working in, and probably a document that should have been discussed during this session.

I feel that November is too late for this House to give specific direction that he requires, and so, with this motion and with the adoption of this motion -- if I am so fortunate as to have it adopted -- some direction will therefore be given in this very, very important and crucial area in the Northwest Territories. Specifically, I would like to see this government put an emphasis, during 1982-83, on the further development of a northern energy strategy, and specifically with respect to that, I would like to see resources identified for the preparation of an energy alternative development plan on a community by community basis.

I think that that is a crucial area, where we must be working over the next couple of years in anticipation of energy problems which this country may be faced with, and specifically I am referring to an energy shortage. We must have alternatives on standby, with respect to the fact that the faster we change from our tremendous dependence on fuel oil in the Northwest Territories, the better it is, both economically and otherwise, for this government.

The second area that I would like to see resources being made available under this priority is for the territorial share of the federal cost sharing program, which offers funds for energy demonstration projects, and that an emphasis be placed, for purposes of funding, on communities faced with thermal generation and high oil space heating inputs. That comes directly out of the report. That was a very strong recommendation that Mr. Nerysoo made, and which I certainly recognize a need for.

Building Code Appropriate To The North

Further, I feel that resources should be made available to begin work on an appropriate northern building code, which takes into consideration the high energy costs for home heating and the need for appropriate northern construction design. We are now working, for the most part, under the Canadian building code. I suppose CMHC has certain rules and regulations, but we do not have our own northern building code, and I think, time and time again, it has been established by our Housing Corporation that there is a need for more appropriate minimum standards that go above and beyond the Canadian minimum standards. So I feel our government should be initiating work in this area as quickly as possible.

Of course, finally, I think that we should continue to put our resources into increased conservation, education and information dissemination to the public. I think that we have experienced over this winter a decrease in our consumption levels. Some say it is due to the mild winter. Others say it could be due to the amount and perseverance of the various people at the local level, who have taken it upon themselves to run energy conservation programs, and to the program that we now see on television and hear on radio with respect to conservation information.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): It could have been the whisky.

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Motion That Energy Be Considered A Priority For Government Spending 1982-83
Carried

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. To the motion. The question is called. All in favour? Down. Opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Do you wish that we report progress?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Agreed.

---Agreed

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF 10TH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE
ON FINANCE

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Fraser.

MR. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, the committee has been considering the 10th Report of the Standing Committee on Finance, and wishes to report this matter being concluded, the report approved with amendments, as recorded in the proceedings of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Fraser. I suppose toward the end of these meetings we allow indiscretions. The subject that was in committee was, "Standing Committee on Finance 10th Report on Spending Priorities for 1982-83, Operations/Capital", the title of the paper, and the committee should have been restricted to that. That is number one for today, Mrs. Sorensen, but you evidently got away with it. Mr. Clerk, announcements and orders of the day.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Yes, Mr. Speaker. For the benefit of Members of the special committee on education, the charter to Fort Resolution this evening will depart at 7:00 p.m. from the airport. A bus will pick up the passengers for that charter at 6:45 p.m. at the Ptarmigan Inn and at the Mackenzie Place. Tomorrow, the special committee on impact will meet in the caucus room at 9:00 a.m. Caucus will convene at the same location at 11:00 a.m.

ITEM NO. 11: ORDERS OF THE DAY

Orders of the day, 1:00 p.m., Wednesday, May 27, 1981.

1. Prayer
2. Replies to the Commissioner's Address
3. Oral Questions
4. Questions and Returns
5. Petitions
6. Tabling of Documents
7. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
8. Notices of Motion
9. Motions
10. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills, Recommendations to the Legislature and Other Matters: Sessional Paper 1-81(2); Hudson's Bay Company operations and activities in the Northwest Territories
11. Prorogation

MR. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, just to add to your comments on Mrs. Sorensen's adding to the report. In Frobisher Bay we were dealing with the unity committee, and I believe Mr. Patterson wanted to add to the report, and I ruled him out of order. My decision was challenged, and you let the Member add to that report, which is exactly what I said when Mrs. Sorensen wanted to go ahead with adding to this report. I said, "The Speaker overruled me in Frobisher Bay, so maybe I will let it go." Thank you.

---Laughter

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: It only goes to prove, Mr. Fraser, that none of us is perfect.

---Laughter

This House will stand adjourned until 1:00 p.m., May the 27th.

---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