



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

9th Session

9th Assembly

**HANSARD**  
Official Report

**FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1982**

**Pages 792 to 835**

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

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

## Speaker

The Honorable Donald M. Stewart, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 1877  
Hay River, N.W.T., XOE ORO  
Office 874-6522/2324  
Home 874-6560  
Office 873-7629-Yk  
(Hay River)

Appaqaq, Mr. Moses, M.L.A.  
Sanikiluaq, N.W.T.  
XOA OWO  
Office 266-8860  
Home 266-8931  
(Hudson Bay)

Arlooktoo, Mr. Joe, M.L.A.  
Lake Harbour, N.W.T.  
XOA ONO  
Phone 939-2363  
(Baffin South)

Braden, The Hon. George, M.L.A.  
Box 583  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
XOE 2N4  
Office 873-7123/7612  
Home 920-2282  
(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.  
XOE 0T0  
Office 873-7128/7129  
Home 979-2373 - Inuvik  
(Inuvik)  
Minister of Finance and Government Services

Curley, Mr. Tagak E.C., M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 36  
Rankin Inlet, N.W.T.  
XOC OGO  
Office 645-2866  
Home 645-2744  
(Keewatin South)

Cournoyea, Ms. Nellie J., M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 1184  
Inuvik, N.W.T.  
XOE 0T0  
Office 979-3510  
Home 979-2740  
(Western Arctic)

Evaluarjuk, Mr. Mark, M.L.A.  
Igloodik, N.W.T.  
XOA OLO  
Phone 934-8823  
(Foxe Basin)

Fraser, Mr. Peter C., M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 23  
Norman Wells, N.W.T.  
XOE OVO  
Phone 587-2299  
(Mackenzie Great Bear)

Kilabuk, Mr. Ipeelee, M.L.A.  
Pangnirtung, N.W.T.  
XOA ORO  
Phone 473-8827  
(Baffin Central)

McCallum, The Hon. Arnold J., M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 685  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
X1A 2N5  
Office 873-7658/7659  
Home 920-4557  
(Slave River)  
Minister of Economic Development  
and Tourism

MacQuarrie, Mr. Robert H., M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 2895  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
X1A 2R2  
Office 873-7918  
Home 873-8857  
(Yellowknife Centre)

McLaughlin, Mr. Bruce, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 555  
Pine Point, N.W.T.  
XOE OWO  
Office 393-2939  
Home 393-2226  
(Pine Point)

Nerysoo, The Hon. Richard W., M.L.A.  
Laing Bldg., 6th floor,  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
X1A 2L9  
Office 873-7113/7455  
Home 873-5310  
(Mackenzie Delta)  
Minister of Renewable Resources and Energy

Noah, Mr. William, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 21  
Baker Lake, N.W.T.  
XOC OAO  
Hamlet Office 793-2874  
Office 793-2912  
Home 793-2716  
(Keewatin North)

Patterson, The Hon. Dennis G., M.L.A.  
Box 310  
Frobisher Bay, N.W.T.  
XOA 0H0  
Office 873-5342  
Home 873-2082 - Yellowknife  
Home 979-6618 - Frobisher Bay  
(Frobisher Bay)  
Minister of Education

Pudluk, Mr. Ludy, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 22  
Resolute Bay, N.W.T.  
XOA OVO  
Phone 252-3737  
(High Arctic)

Sayine, Mr. Robert, M.L.A.  
Fort Resolution, N.W.T.  
XOE OMO  
Hamlet Office 394-4556  
Home 394-3201  
(Great Slave East)

Sibbeston, Mr. Nick G., M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 560  
Fort Simpson, N.W.T.  
XOE ONO  
Phone 695-2565  
(Mackenzie Liard)

Sorensen, Mrs. Lynda M., M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 2348  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
X1A 2P7  
Office 873-7920  
Home 873-5086  
(Yellowknife South)

Tologanak, The Hon. Kane, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 223  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
X1A 2N2  
Office 873-7962/7963  
Home 873-4824  
(Central Arctic)  
Minister of Health and Social Services

Wah-Shee, The Hon. James J., M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 471  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
X1A 2N4  
Office 873-7139/7140  
Home 873-8012  
(Rae - Lac La Martre)  
Minister of Local Government and Aboriginal  
Rights and Constitutional Development

## Officers

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

Clerk Assistant  
Mr. David M. Hamilton  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
XOE 1H0

Law Clerk  
Mr. Peter C. Fuglsang  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
XOE 1H0

Editor of Hansard  
Mrs. Marie J. Coe  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
XOE 1H0

Sergeant-at-Arms  
S/Sgt. David Williamson  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
XOE 1H0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

26 November 1982

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	792
Hon. John Munro's Statement to the Legislative Assembly	792, 812
Replies to the Commissioner's Address	
- Comments Relative to Mr. Remnant's Resignation	792
Tabling of Documents	797
Notices of Motion	797
Motions	799
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Policy Statement of the Hon. John Munro, PC, MP	812 816
Report of the Committee of the Whole of:	
- Policy Statement of the Hon. John Munro, PC, MP	833
Prorogation	835

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1982

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Arlooktoo, Hon. George Braden, Hon. Tom Butters, Mr. Curley, Ms Cournoyea, Mr. Evaluarjuk, Mr. Fraser, Mr. MacQuarrie, Mr. McLaughlin, Hon. Dennis Patterson, Mr. Pudluk, 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): Orders of the day for Friday, November the 26th, Item 2, the Hon. John Munro's statement to the Legislative Assembly.

ITEM NO. 2: HON. JOHN MUNRO'S STATEMENT TO THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Mr. Minister. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members are aware that this morning the Hon. John Munro made a statement in Ottawa concerning a number of issues of importance and great significance to the people of the Northwest Territories. I do not propose at this time that the government is going to make a statement on the substance of those significant remarks, which you and other Members are aware cover the topics of division of the Northwest Territories, the evolution toward responsible government, the formula for financing and, finally, discretionary revenues, but I would propose, Mr. Speaker, that under tabling of documents I will be tabling with this House the letter of transmittal from Mr. Munro to myself and the attached paper, which describes in detail the federal decision and the position on each of the subject areas I just mentioned.

Later on this evening, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Minister will be addressing this House and that arrangements have been made for some comment by Members and at that time the government will be making its response known to this chamber and to the public. So, Mr. Speaker, that is all that the government wishes to indicate at this point in time. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Braden. Item 3, replies to the Commissioner's Address. Are there any replies to the Commissioner's Address, first? No replies.

ITEM NO. 3: REPLIES TO THE COMMISSIONER'S ADDRESS

Comments Relative To Mr. Remnant's Resignation

Then I will accept comments relative to the resignation of Mr. Remnant. Mr. Butters.

Changes In Assembly During Mr. Remnant's Tenure

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last night I indicated I would not wish to speak with regard to Mr. Remnant's departure because I think your words so ably and accurately said for all of us how we feel about our Clerk and he must have recognized the silent seconding, as it were, of your sentiments and the expression of your words to Mr. Remnant and to Mrs. Remnant. I was very impressed, too, when I heard you speak, because you put into context some of the things that are happening to us today. You indicated that when Mr. Remnant came on as Clerk of the Council in those days, in 1963, there were four elected Members and five appointed Members. As I have mentioned to the House, in those days the Council of the Northwest Territories was run and directed by appointed Members of the Council. I have tried to, from time to time in this House, assure my colleagues that this is a government in change -- in radical change -- that we are not a government standing still, we are not an Assembly standing still and Mr. Remnant is

not a Methuselah. He is a young man and yet in his time he has seen us move from a Council in which there were, as I say, four elected Members and five appointed Members. In fact, Mr. Remnant, in his short space of time, some 20 years, has seen a movement toward representative government, to responsible government and as I think we will be hearing tonight, to accountable government, and that is a quantum leap in the evolution of constitutional development in government in this territory. So he has seen a very great deal in the short, few years that it has been his privilege to serve the Members of the Northwest Territories Council and Assembly and, likewise, it is our privilege to have worked with him.

#### Early Advice Of Clerk To Inexperienced Member

I first met Binx and Mamie back in the late 1950s and he was a northern service officer then with the federal department. Then I lost track of him and when I came into the House toward the end of the 1960s I met him again and he had, as you pointed out, served for some seven years. I approached him and asked him what to do and how to get along and I can remember some of the advice that he gave me in those days. I remember one of the first things he said. "Somewhere right now there is a committee or a panel deciding your future, only you have not been invited." I think that we still complain about that today, but in the 1960s and the early 1970s that was the rule and not the exception. Too, coming in as an inexperienced Member to the House, everything is strange and so I remember asking him on debate and on the procedures of the House. One of the things he said about that, "When the matters raised in the House are non-controversial, beautifully co-ordinated and rationally objective, be assured that not much of anything is going on." I think that the Ninth Assembly has been a very productive House and certainly those conditions could never be applied to this House.

Mr. Remnant has served in many committee and caucus meetings. Members will recollect that he owns -- I do not know how many, but I think he only owns one -- a pipe which smells just as bad unlit as lit and in some of the caucus and committee meetings that we sit in it is sometimes a little difficult to live with that pipe. But I remember one time I mentioned to him -- because I am an addict, I mentioned to him, "Mr. Clerk, smoking makes me sick." Binx replied and said, "Well then, Thomas...", and he is the only one I know that calls me Thomas -- you know, you look at my title here, Thomas Butters, so obviously I know who titles these things -- but he said, "Well then, Thomas, why do you not give it up?"

---Laughter

So I did not get very far along with that suggestion.

Now, when I became a Member of the Executive Committee of the Eighth Assembly, he offered me the following advice, and I found this to be very good advice too. "Well, I will tell you one thing. You will be reading more, and you will be enjoying it less." That is a truism for Members on the Executive Committee. Now, truly Mr. Remnant has seen many changes in the Council of the Northwest Territories, and he has, particularly, noted many milestones in our evolution; first, to representative government; more recently, to responsible government. In so saying, I recognize how fortunate we all are that Mr. Remnant has not arrived at that awkward age -- and that is, that he is too old to begin a new career, and thank God he is too young to write his memoirs.

---Laughter

But seriously, Mr. Speaker, Binx Remnant has been a loyal, effective, and industrious Clerk of a continuum of successive Assemblies. He has served many Members, elected and appointed in many Houses, with fairness, concern and courtesy, for many, many years. I am sure all Members regret that he has decided to resign his post for the Assembly of the Northwest Territories and move to Manitoba. We all wish him many long years of service within the ropes of that Assembly, and to his wife Mamie and himself, good health and a long life.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Are there any other comments? Mr. MacQuarrie.

#### Clerk's Ability To Deal With A Great Range Of Matters

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a former Speaker, myself, of this Assembly, I had close associations with Mr. Remnant, and I would say that as Speaker I saw the great range of matters that Mr. Remnant had to deal with. In working with him, I was impressed by the ability that he had to deal with a great many different matters, but even more impressed with his knowledge of history and knowledge of rules and procedure.

As the chairman of the standing committee on legislation, I would like to say thank you for the work he has done for that committee; and as an ordinary MLA for Yellowknife Centre I would like to wish him very well in his new position as Clerk of the Manitoba legislature. I am sure that as long as there are still some of the same Members sitting in this House, the image of Binx Remnant will always be with us here, and that image was absolutely captured by a photographer for News/North. It appears in the paper today, and I am sure that is the way all of us will remember him: striding down the walkway, bent slightly forward, determined, resolute, and the tails of his gown flying behind him -- and that image will be with us, and it is a pleasant image. We regret that the person himself will not be longer with us. Thank you very much for everything, Mr. Remnant.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Mr. Patterson.

Clerk Has Worked Loyal For Members

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As one of the newer Members to this House, I would like to also take this opportunity to express my feelings about Mr. Remnant, and my own personal gratitude for all he has done for me, particularly in making the job of a new Member much more easy. I cannot help but recalling, Mr. Speaker, as a green Member of the Legislative Assembly, appearing for the first caucus meeting that we held prior to the opening of the first session of the Ninth Assembly. I think many of us were determined to change things around, and full of ideas of reform, and suspicious of any existing conventions and practices, and determined that everything should be questioned. I even recall now, with some embarrassment, that I was amongst a few Members who questioned whether or not our Clerk should be present at that first caucus meeting. We were quickly advised by other, more senior Members that indeed the Clerk works for us, and there is no need to be concerned about his presence in our caucus. Of course, he did agree that he should stay, and I have now come to realize that that was a very foolish apprehension on our part. In fact not only does Mr. Remnant work for us, but he works extremely loyally, and entirely for us, and I would like to take this opportunity to perhaps apologize to Mr. Remnant for not fully appreciating that when I first arrived in this House, but I certainly do now, and I can recount many instances where he has been of invaluable aid to me personally.

When I first came into this Assembly, I made an awful lot of motions -- I do not mean movements, I mean motions and resolutions -- and I can tell that I very quickly learned that Mr. Remnant would be an invaluable adviser and assistant to me in drawing up some of the many motions that I presented to this House. So I am very grateful for his help to me personally, and the intensity with which he devoted himself to requests from any Members. I have always valued any dealings I have had with Mr. Remnant. He is a fascinating source of historical insight, and I personally will very much miss having the opportunity to get his advice formally and informally on the many issues which we will be dealing with in the coming years, because he has the advantage of having seen this Council develop to a Legislative Assembly, and now well on the road to responsible government.

I learn more about Mr. Remnant every day, and I was impressed to discover the other day that indeed he was amongst the group of civil servants -- I guess at that time he was chairman of the Council, not really a civil servant in the ordinary sense -- who came up with Commissioner Hodgson to establish this government, in Yellowknife. There are not that great a number of those people around any more, and I am saddened that we have lost another one, although I think the Manitoba legislature should be very grateful they have found someone of his calibre, experience and personal charm.

Mr. Speaker, I did observe at the close of our winter session last year a little bit of an historic event, I thought, in that Mr. Remnant, in all his many long years of service, in that session for the very first time had missed one session of the House due to illness. I think that record over his length of service shows the dedication he put to his job, so I join with other Members, I know, in wishing him continued good health in the future. He is not as young as he looks, I discovered as well in getting to know him, but I wish that he continues to enjoy the youthfulness he exhibits in his work, and wish him and his family all the best in the future. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Replies. Mr. Sibbeston.

Mr. Sibbeston's Comments

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, I too want to say a few remarks about Mr. Remnant. I have known Binx since about 1970, when I was first elected, and I must say that I have always admired his hard work and his ability to get things done in a very efficient and good manner, because I am aware that he is given the task, on behalf of the Assembly, to set up for assemblies all throughout the North and he is usually able to do that and everything is set up properly. I have always admired that about him.

I was going to note that we are going to miss Mr. Remnant in this House. He is, I think, one of the features of this House, particularly him walking very quickly, gliding through the House with his robes and there is even some thinking that all of these robes create a lift effect, something like a hovercraft, and he gets around the House very quickly. I guess I must say, truthfully, that I would have liked to see him wear a nice Dene-made cloak...

---Laughter

...to do his flying around, but -- and I certainly know he was capable of that, if that was to be the case.

I wanted to say, too, that I think he is coming from a very Liberal-Conservative type House to an NDP one and I am sure he will do well. I always think that...

MR. McLAUGHLIN: One man's opinion.

MR. SIBBESTON: ...I always think that the NDP is a little bit better or higher than the other parties. They are much more socially conscious. They really represent the underdogs and so forth. So, I think Binx has many of these characteristics and will fit in very well with the NDP government in Manitoba.

I want to say, too, that when I heard Mr. Remnant was leaving, I wondered whether I should maybe myself feel a little bit badly, because I thought maybe I may have insulted him recently in caucus or in the Assembly, but I was glad that he says that his job is the result of initiatives he took in August. So I do not feel badly about that and I am sure that the concerns that I raised -- I am sure that he was capable of making some of the corrections that I talked about. So, I want to wish Mr. Remnant and his wife well and if things come to pass in the North some day that we have a similar type of government in the North here, we would welcome you back here. Mahsi.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Replies. Mrs. Sorensen.

Unofficial Ambassadors

MRS. SORENSEN: Binx, I too want to say good-bye to you and Mamie. I see she is out there in the audience. The other Members have expressed for me the feelings that we all feel for the service that you have given and, as well, the service that Mamie has given. But I do not want you to think that you are going to get away scot-free, and the job that I am going to offer you now does not come with any pay, but it does have a tremendous responsibility -- in fact there are two jobs. The first one is, I would certainly like you to be the unofficial ambassadors -- both you and Mamie -- for the North, because I think that...

---Applause

...that you can tell those southerners, and particularly the Manitobans, what is going on up here, but you have got to come back periodically. A lot of people have made the mistake of being northern experts and are not in touch with what is going on. So we are going...

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Not even David Searle.

MRS. SORENSEN: ...we are going to have to get both of you back here for the ball. It will be one ball that you have not organized, so we are going to have to get you back here for that.

The other thing is we expect -- and I know I am speaking now on behalf of Tagak Curley, who was not able to be here today -- we expect you to be our secret agent in the whole takeover and annexation of Churchill and...

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

---Laughter

---Applause

MRS. SORENSEN: ...and we expect to get periodic updates on what the status is on that annexation and we expect you to do a very good, hard job for us with that goal. Binx, Mamie, thanks a lot and we are really going to miss you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Replies. Mr. McLaughlin.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too, as a new Member in this Assembly, would like to thank Binx very much for all the help he gave me and I would also like to say how I regret that some of the advice he gave me I did not take.

---Laughter

My performance in the last few days trying to get unanimous consent to motions is a demonstration that I still have not learned to take his advice on some of these things.

I would also like to say of Mrs. Remnant that Mamie has always been a very good person to go and talk to at coffee break. She is often in the House watching what goes on. She always appears very interested, but I think really she is just here because it is the only chance she gets to see her husband especially when we are in session.

---Laughter

#### Advice To Chairman Of Caucus

I think I would like to just relay one thing that to me is an example of how Mr. Remnant -- even though the Assembly has changed, that he is aware of the changes and aware of the constancy that goes on. In caucus, when I first became the chairman, he gave me some advice about how difficult the job would be and stuff like that -- and I am still learning that job -- and one of the interesting things he told me was that it is very difficult to get consensus on anything, even though this is supposed to be a consensus House. I have to go back to the first meeting which I chaired. We were meeting in the morning and Members had agreed at the previous caucus meeting, when Mr. McCallum was still chairman, that there would not be any rules in the caucus, that no minutes should be kept, that no records should be kept or anything. Mr. Remnant advised me that he would, in fact, take notes and refer to them and, in fact, it soon became apparent that we did need minutes because Members' memories are extremely short when it comes to caucus decisions and agreements as to what they want to do, which I have found out recently, trying to pass some of the motions which caucus agreed to.

The other thing is, at that time he said also it would be very difficult to get Members to figure out what they are going to do if we did not have any kind of procedure in caucus at all and I still remember that first caucus meeting. We only had a few things on the agenda and we could easily have done them in the morning, but one of the first things on the agenda was whether we should meet in the afternoon or not. In the end we had to meet in the afternoon because it took us all morning to decide whether we were going to meet in the morning and the afternoon or not.

---Laughter



So, Mr. Remnant's advice has been very accurate. He has been flexible from Assembly to Assembly and I think he has been very cognizant of the fact that Members are, in fact, Members and the Members are politicians and you cannot get them to go anywhere. It is like trying to herd sheep without a fence. So, I would like to thank Mr. Remnant for all the help he has given me as a new Member and as caucus chairman and for the excellent work he has done as secretary to the committees which I have served on. I would like to wish him and Mamie the best of luck in Winnipeg. Despite the party which is in power there, I am sure he will enjoy Manitoba and I am sure that the Members of the Legislative Assembly in Manitoba will enjoy having Mr. Remnant as the Clerk. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Are there any other replies? Mr. Tologanak.

Mr. Tologanak's Comments

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have known Binx -- I saw him get off the plane, and he is just about the same size as Stu Hodgson -- the plane that landed in Coppermine on our ice strip, and we had only three weeks to get that ice strip ready. I used to get phone calls from someone, I cannot remember his name now; he has moved to BC or somewhere. But I remember I told my wife, "I will never wear mukluks when I see that guy again." So I have never worn mukluks any more, because, you know, my neck got sore that day in Coppermine. But I want to assure Members today that Binx is not going to Winnipeg without leaving us something. This morning, during caucus meeting, he gave me his muskrat coat. I guess he has been fighting with somebody or whatever; he had a tear on his sleeve and his back, and so we are going to sew it up for him so he looks like a northerner that is going to Manitoba. But Binx, and Mamie, you have been an inspiration to me for all the work that you have been doing over the years. You know, the communities usually look at the Commissioner and look at the Ministers as the Government of the Northwest Territories, and I hope, by saying this, that I will not offend you or anyone else, but, Binx, you have been a real backbone to this country over the last 20 years. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Are there any further replies?

We will proceed then on to Item 4, oral questions.

Item 5, written questions and returns. Are there any returns today?

Item 6, petitions.

Item 7, tabling of documents.

ITEM NO. 7: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table the document referred to earlier on under Item 2. Tabled Document 40-82(3), Letter and Statement from Hon. John Munro PC, MP. It includes the letter of transmittal from the Hon. John Munro to myself, and supporting documents.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Tabling of documents. Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table Tabled Document 41-82(3), Economic Development Options for the Northwest Territories, written by Swarn Singh Upal, a former employee of this government.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Tabling of documents.

Item 8, reports of standing and special committees.

Item 9, notices of motion.

ITEM NO. 9: NOTICES OF MOTION

Mr. McLaughlin.

Notice Of Motion 45-82(3): Transportation Expenses For Members And Spouses

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to give notice that at the appropriate time I will seek unanimous consent -- foolish though that may be -- to move that this Assembly recommend to the Members' Services Board that it authorize payment of transportation expenses for spouses of MLAs to travel to the opening of the winter session and for MLAs to travel to their places of residence on the second weekend following the opening of the session. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Notices of motion. Item 11, motions. Motion 19-82(3), Mr. Curley. Mr. Curley is not here. Motion 32-82(3), Mr. Kilabuk. Mr. Kilabuk is not present. Motion 40-82(3), Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. MacQUARRIE: There is no quorum, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: We will stand recessed.

---RECESS

MR. SPEAKER: I call the House back to order. We were dealing with Item 11, motions, on your orders of the day.

ITEM NO. 11: MOTIONS

Motion 40-82(3), Mr. Sibbeston.

Motion 40-82(3): Appointment To Electoral District Boundaries Commission

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker:

I MOVE, seconded by Mr. Wah-Shee, that this Assembly recommend to the Commissioner that Mr. James Antoine be appointed to the electoral district boundaries commission, in the event that such a commission is established by the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Your motion is in order. I think that probably your statement is not completely correct, inasmuch as it has already been passed by the House. Possibly your seconder could amend the motion, and it probably should conclude with "district boundaries commission", and leave the rest off, but that is up to you. Your motion is in order. Proceed.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, Mr. James Antoine, the person whom I am recommending that this Assembly recommend to be appointed to the boundaries commission, is a resident of my constituency of Mackenzie Liard. He is presently also the chief of the Fort Simpson Dene band. He is also, on the recommendation of this House, on the board of directors of the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation. I am recommending Mr. Antoine because he is knowledgeable about the views of this Assembly. He is a respected person amongst the Dene and Metis people throughout the Deh Cho, the Sah Tu, and further down the Mackenzie River.

Very importantly, Mr. Speaker, he is able to devote the time necessary in the next few months to accomplish the job of the boundaries commission. If the native people in the western part of the NWT are to have respect and trust of the work of the boundaries commission, it is important to have a person whom they respect, on the boundaries commission. Mr. Jim Antoine, I believe, will provide that. You will have participation of Dene and Metis people, and I can say in the last few years I feel that we have turned this government around so that this government is certainly more credible than it was three or four years ago. I am of the view that if we continue in this direction, that if we continue to do such things as have Dene persons, as Mr. Jim Antoine, on the boundaries commission, that the results of the commission's report also will have the confidence of the people.

What is at issue here, Mr. Speaker, is whether this Assembly is prepared to support a person such as Mr. Antoine, and I feel that the people of the West, people in our part of the North, really do deserve to have a person of Mr. Antoine's stature on the boundaries commission. I can say that in the past the Dene in particular have not been served very well, particularly on federal bodies and commissions, but in many ways this is changing. The territorial government has done a lot better on its commissions, its boards of directors, and bodies.

Concerns Regarding Mr. Antoine

I know some of the arguments that have been raised against having someone like Jim Antoine on the boundaries commission, but I do not agree with them. One of the concerns, I think, that has been told to me privately, is that there should not be a person from my constituency on the boundaries commission, because my area is an area that wants to have another representative. There is also somebody who said that maybe Jim Antoine is my relative. I can say to these people that Mr. Antoine is not my relative, and I feel that we are perfectly in order to have someone from my constituency on the boundaries commission. We are a part of the North, and we have aspirations and hopes for the future, just like anybody else.

Involvement Of Dene And Metis People

On the other hand, I feel that there are good arguments to have someone like Mr. Jim Antoine on the boundaries commission. I feel he is a strong, and knowledgeable, and interested person, who would serve the people of the North very well on the commission. Mr. Chairman, with the recommendation of Mr. Antoine, too, I feel we have a chance to have a Dene chief involved in the boundaries commission, and I think that we should grab at the opportunity to have someone of his position on the boundaries commission. Three or four years ago, you would not have had Dene persons like Mr. Antoine being interested in being on a boundaries commission. I can say too, three or four years ago, when the last boundaries commission was in existence, there were no Dene people making representations to the boundaries commission. So we have a chance to change all this. If someone

like Mr. Antoine is on the boundaries commission, you will have native people in the western part of the North very anxious to make representation. You will have the involvement of the Dene and Metis people, and likewise the results finally will be trusted by the people. So I encourage all Members here, I really do feel that Mr. Antoine is, and will be, a fair-minded person, and will do justice to the people of the North.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. Mr. Wah-Shee, as seconder.

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Mr. Speaker, I will not speak on this motion. I would like to indicate that, as seconder, I will be supporting the mover of the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Mr. Butters.

Amendment To Motion 40-82(3), Carried

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move a brief amendment to the motion. I would like to move that the last three words in the motion, "by the Assembly," be deleted. I need a seconder, do I not, before I speak to it?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Do I have a seconder for that motion? Mrs. Sorensen. To the amendment. Are you ready for the question? Mr. Patterson, to the amendment.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, could you read the motion as amended, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The motion as amended would read, "I move that this Legislative Assembly recommend to the Commissioner that Mr. James Antoine be appointed to the electoral district boundaries commission in the event that such a commission is established." Is that not correct, Mr. Butters?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: That is correct, and by way of further explanation the reason for the amendment is that the ordinance does not see the commission being established by the Assembly, it sees it being established by the Commissioner.

MR. SPEAKER: That is correct. It is just to bring the motion technically correct. Mr. Curley, to the amendment.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would want to get a clarification whether that motion is really not out of order in the first place, because the Assembly cannot establish such a commission.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, Mr. Curley, I looked at this particular point, but being that the main thrust of the motion was in the appointment of a person, this was a tag end, and really was not part of the main motion. Therefore, although I indicated to the movers of the motion that I hoped that they would correct it, it really was not out of order, because the main point of the motion was all right. We often have to amend motions in the House, because of slight technical details, and I felt that this was one. To the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

---Carried

To the motion as amended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. Ms Cournoyea.

Commission Should Be Totally Unbiased

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say I cannot support the motion, and the reasons being, although Mr. Sibbeston has tried to relate many things to us as being the positive part of it, the arguments that have been put forth in this Legislative Assembly that if there is a boundaries commission to be established, then in all instances it should be one that is totally unbiased.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Hear, hear!

MS COURNOYEA: I cannot help but think that, first of all, the particular mover of the motion has come before this Legislative Assembly and put forth not only the direction of forming a boundaries commission so that he may have part of his constituents -- or hopes to have part of his constituents separated from his present constituency, but on top of that, he has proposed to put one individual in that body that is to establish the boundaries commission. I would have thought, with the concerns that were raised in this Legislative Assembly that Mr. Sibbeston would not want to put a member of his constituency in such a critical position, and a position that probably would lend more to the fear, of a person such as myself, of setting up a position to accommodate his own self-interest.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, I have no objection to redrawing lines, and staying at 22 Members of this Legislative Assembly. However, I do object to certain individuals in this Legislative Assembly...

AN HON. MEMBER: To the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

MS COURNOYEA: ...to not only setting up a commission to accommodate themselves, but also asking us to appoint members that would be biased in their favour. Surely, Mr. Speaker, being a person as he is with such honour, I am sure he could see that any kind of fear that we would have would be reinforced by this motion that he has put forward in recommending Mr. James Antoine. Mr. James Antoine, as far as I am concerned, is a person of high esteem. However, he does in fact come from that particular area, and that particular constituency, and may even be interested in running in the remake of that particular constituency. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support such a recommendation, in fairness to Mr. Antoine himself.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion as amended. Mrs. Sorensen.

#### Ability To Compromise On Issues

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I have thought long and hard about this recommendation and I have decided to support the recommendation that Mr. Sibbeston has brought forward. I have known Jim Antoine for some time and before that I knew of him and I know that he is a very well-respected Dene, not only in the Mackenzie Liard, but within the Mackenzie as a whole. He is a hard worker and he has a very good reputation and although I have not always agreed with the things that Mr. Antoine has said about the white people, I think that there has been a reason for many of the things that he has said. I think that he demonstrated his ability to come to terms with some of those problems that he has with white people at the last constitutional conference that we held here in Yellowknife and I was very impressed with the ability that he had to compromise on certain issues.

I do have confidence that he will represent the entire NWT when he looks, on our behalf, at all of the constituencies in this redistribution and to defend him, I would say that it would not really matter who we recommend, not matter where they came from, there would be a call from someone else that that person may have a conflict of interest. If I were to recommend that a person should be on the boundaries commission and that person were from Yellowknife, then there would be calls from other constituencies that there was a conflict of interest. If we were to recommend someone from Sanikiluaq the same thing would be raised by other Members. So, I do not think it really would matter who we recommend. Now, the only option that we would have would be to recommend someone who was seen to be independent -- someone from the South -- and I do not think we want to do that. I think that this is a northern issue and that we have to find someone from the North. I would have to say that of all the people whose names have come forward, that Jim Antoine is a strong western representative and I support him wholeheartedly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Mr. Evaluarjuk.

MR. EVALUARJUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make a brief comment. I will not be in support of this motion, for the reason that we have not made any agreement in the East and I will say that the eastern people will not be in support of this motion. Also, I am aware of what the mover of the motion is trying to do; we would also like to provide our own people to that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Evaluarjuk. Mr. Toïoganak.

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have been, in the last couple of weeks, as a Member from Kitikmeot region fighting with my friends from the East, and the people who are predominantly Inuit. I have tried to convince my friends from the East that the Kitikmeot region has never been really justified in any other organization; not only from the East but the North, and the West. Finally, the people from the South are recognizing me, are recognizing those people in the Kitikmeot. I want to ask, Mr. Speaker, what is the fear of those people in Kitikmeot, of at least listening to them? Give them a chance to be listened to. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Arlooktoo.

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not be voting for this. This has been talked about for three weeks now, and I have not even voted for it to date. I would just like to inform you that I will not be voting for it. Every time we do not want to agree with something -- it does not matter who you are. My colleague has received a telex from the eastern area saying that they will not be for this motion. Since I am from the East, too, I will not be voting for it. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to say, first of all, that I have nothing against Jim Antoine personally, and indeed I have nothing against a Dene person being appointed to this boundaries commission, should it be established.

Mr. Speaker, I hate to be unduly moralistic -- that is my friend from Yellowknife Centre's department...

MR. MacQUARRIE: You take over the role for a while.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: ...but I am going to briefly comment on some of the moral and philosophical issues that I think are involved in this motion. I do not want to preach about integrity and credibility, and I certainly do not want to impute motives to anyone...

MRS. SORENSEN: To the motion!

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: ...however, Mr. Speaker, let me say this. As elected officials, we must be very, very careful what we say about electoral boundaries, and the closer we get to an election, the more careful we have to be. It is fine for some to say that the government is now more credible to the people...

AN HON. MEMBER: To the motion!

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I am just responding to the remarks of Mr. Sibbeston in introducing this motion. It is fine for him to say that the government is more credible to the people, but if we are capable as a Legislative Assembly of being manipulated by any single interest, or if we appear to be capable of being manipulated by any single interest, then we are not acting responsibly.

Motion Will Appear As A Set-Up

Now I respect Mr. Sibbeston, Mr. Speaker; he says exactly what he thinks, and often what he feels, but, with respect, I think he has gone too far on this motion. For a sitting Member to recognize a well-known, close associate, a person who is known to be a friend of Mr. Sibbeston's, to be our Assembly's one representative on a commission which he has already stated should be established to create a new seat in his constituency, has to look like a set-up to the average person, and, Mr. Speaker, in no way is this intended to be a reflection on Mr. Antoine. However, I believe that if this Assembly were to recommend him on the motion of Mr. Sibbeston himself, we would be doing Mr. Antoine a profound disservice. We would be putting him in a position where he would invite criticism no matter what he says or does about the Mackenzie Liard constituency...

MR. MacQUARRIE: Hear, hear!

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: ...and there is a saying in law, Mr. Speaker...

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Are you going to be doing my people an injustice?

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: ...there is a saying in law, Mr. Speaker, that justice...

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Are you going to do my people an injustice?

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: ...that justice must be seen to be done.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please, order!

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: I thought you were a lawyer.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Justice must be done and it must also be seen to be done, Mr. Speaker, and it is that aspect that I am concerned about. If this appointment is approved by this Assembly, I am concerned that it is not going to look good and I quite frankly predict that it will not help Mr. Sibbeston in any way to achieve his goals to have someone clearly identified with him as this Assembly's representative on this commission.

In speaking to this motion to establish a boundaries commission, Mr. Speaker, over the past week or so, I have been concerned about fairness, impartiality and the appearance of fairness, impartiality and objectivity. I have been very worried that Members who are promoting this boundaries commission are not looking beyond their own ridings. I have been worried about balance and I have stated that it is clearly wrong to tinker with a few ridings, such as Mr. Sibbeston's riding or Mr. Tologanak's riding...

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: What are you worried about?

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: ...or the Yellowknife ridings that appear to be too big.

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: What are you worried about?

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: If we are to move to increase the size of this Assembly from 22 to 23 or 24 or 25, we have to erase the entire electoral boundaries map and start afresh.

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: What are you worried about?

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: It is only if we agree to make no increases that we can tinker with one or two ridings and that was the first amendment I made, Mr. Speaker, and it was ruled out of order.

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: To the motion, Mr. Speaker.

#### Commission Should Not Be Vulnerable To Political Influence

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: I tried. With this motion Mr. Sibbeston is providing the realization of my own worst fears about this process, nominating someone who will at least appear to be in a position to especially influence. If this Legislative Assembly is going to appoint representatives to the boundary commission, Mr. Speaker, I want to be satisfied that whoever it is is not going to be recommended because of the interests that person represents, but because that person will be fair and objective. We do not want anyone on the commission, Mr. Speaker, who will appear to be vulnerable to political influence. Precisely the reasons Mr. Sibbeston uses to justify this recommendation are the reasons why I say we should vote to reject this nomination and I will say it again, Mr. Speaker, and I hope whoever reports this mentions this, that is no reflection on Mr. Antoine or Mr. Sibbeston. I am concerned about the appearances of fairness and impartiality and I just think Mr. Sibbeston, with all respect to him, is too wrapped up in his own particular concerns about his own particular constituency. He represents his constituency very well, but the commission members should be appointed by this Assembly for their receptivity to all viewpoints -- for their objectivity and fairness. I am speaking for my constituents, Mr. Speaker, most of whom do not know Mr. Antoine; my constituents are going to find it very hard to believe that Mr. Antoine is not Nick Sibbeston's man on the boundaries commission...

MRS. SORENSEN: He is mine, too, Dennis.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: ...put there to ensure that Fort Providence gets a new Member, as Mr. Sibbeston wants. Whether it is true or not, I am convinced that the public is going to see

it that way and for Mr. Antoine's sake and for Mr. Sibbeston's sake and for the credibility of this Legislative Assembly, I regret I must appeal to all fair minded Members, on a recorded vote, to stand up to vote against this motion.

Telex From Baffin Regional Council

Just before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express the views of my constituents on this matter. I would like to read a telex I received yesterday. "The Baffin Regional Council is opposed to the formation of an electoral boundaries commission at this time...."

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Are you people afraid of Kitikmeot?

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: "The BRC strongly feels that the highest priority should be given to continuing the process for division of the NWT and not rearranging political boundaries within the NWT as a whole...."

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Are you scared of Kitikmeot?

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: "In addition, the..."

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson, I am sorry. I have given you a great deal of leeway -- but please, to the motion.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, the last...

MR. SPEAKER: You are going back to the ordinance and it has been passed. So, just to this motion, please.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: The last paragraph of this telex is relevant to the motion, Mr. Speaker, because it deals with the question of time and...

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Are you people scared of Kitikmeot?

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: ...I wish to submit that this matter has been dealt with in undue haste by this Assembly. I am quoting from the telex: "The extreme haste within which the boundaries commission is expected to report to the Assembly will not allow time for all regions to be adequately consulted on this important issue."

Mr. Speaker, I do not think this Assembly has had time to properly consider an appropriate representative on the boundaries commission. I believe, for example, that we could well have started out at least with the former members of the boundaries commission, who have already had a wealth of experience in travelling throughout the Northwest Territories, recommending the...

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: I am glad you recognize that.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: ...increase from 15 to 22 and I regret very much that we have not had an opportunity to discuss this properly in caucus. I would have recommended that Mr. Louis Tapardjuk, who had already served with distinction on the previous boundary commission -- which I think did a very good job -- should have been nominated by this Assembly as a first choice, because of the experience he had in the previous commission.

MR. FRASER: Question.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Sibbeston's constituents were already represented very ably by the late Ted Trindell, who is from Mr. Sibbeston's home town, like Mr. Antoine, and home constituency and for some reason -- I am sure there are very good reasons -- Mr. Trindell decided to recommend that Fort Providence should remain in the...

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Well, take a look at mine.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: ...Mackenzie Liard constituency.

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Take a look at mine.



HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: So I ask Members to vote against this motion for the reasons given -- for the appearance of justice and impartiality that other Members have been talking about. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. With respect to naming someone to this commission, the motion that carried in the House establishing a commission in the first place -- I voted against it, because I felt that what should be a fair and impartial process and be seen to be that was getting out of hand. It was becoming a political process that was getting out of hand and I disapproved of that and, therefore, voted against it.

Putting Nominee In An Impossible Position

Now, specifically, in that debate I said that if there were to be an increase in seats from 22 to 25 I would want to see one of those seats as a Yellowknife seat and therefore I can imagine the hue and cry that would have gone up if I had pre-empted a consultative process and rushed into this House and nominated the mayor of Yellowknife as the person to sit on that commission and that hue and cry would have been justified.

MRS. SORENSEN: No way. He is a good man.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Now, I can only say that this motion displays the same sort of thing...

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MacQUARRIE: ...and, again, I know Jim Antoine and I believe he is a decent gentleman, but he is the chief of the area in Fort Simpson. Mr. Sibbeston, in the debate, said specifically that that area needs another seat and I cannot believe, therefore, that his presence on the commission would give that commission the kind of credibility that it needs. Even if Mr. Antoine himself performed impartially, and I am sure he would, I agree with Mr. Patterson, that no matter what he said or did, he would be believed by some people to be doing the wrong sort of thing and we would be putting him in an impossible position. Generally speaking, I endorse nearly everything that my good friend from Frobisher Bay said and I also will vote against the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: To the motion. Mr. Curley.

Further Amendment To Motion 40-82(3), Ruled Out Of Order

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to see if my amendment is in order. If not, then I would like to speak to the motion. My amendment would be after the word "that" on the second line, add the following words: "one of the following: Bryan Pearson, Robert Kuptana, Peter Ernerk, Meeka Wilson, Mike Panika or James Antoine be appointed to the boundaries commission."

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Out of order already.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Curley, I have to rule your motion out of order. The legislation is very specific, it asks for one recommendation from the House. You are providing more than one. Secondly, I suggest to you that the main thrust of this motion is to appoint Mr. James Antoine, and when you deviate from that, I think your amendment then defeats the motion entirely, although you did tie him in at the end, for the reason I gave previously, that we have to have one. You cannot have four or five options. I would have to rule that your motion is out of order. Do you wish to speak to the motion, now, please?

MR. CURLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was not actually dealing with the legislation as such, but this was only a recommendation. I thought it would have been in order, because a recommendation is a recommendation, and the Commissioner would have to appoint one of the following. So could I have a clarification of whether or not this motion is really a recommendation, and therefore not actually asking that that person be a permanent one?

MR. SPEAKER: No, Mr. Curley, I am afraid that I cannot agree with your amendment. I feel that your amendment destroys the whole thrust of the motion. It does not stay within the requirements of the ordinance, where we recommend one person. So I still maintain that your amendment is out of order. Do you wish to speak to Motion 40-82(3)?

MR. CURLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. One of my good friends from Coral Harbour was one of the candidates that I would have wanted to recommend, because I think he would have represented me well.

---Laughter

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: I will support you, I will support you.

MRS. SORENSEN: What, you have friends?

MR. CURLEY: In this commission, if it is going to do a fair job -- I think it would have done well if one of our friends would have been put in there -- because my belief is that this electoral commission, if created...

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: To the motion, Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: ...is going to be a non-biased one, and I hope that will be the case. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the motion at this time. I think this is not a surprise. I do not think I have to repeat that, and I will not go too far into elaborating it.

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: It is a good thing he got a free ride.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe that really we should have had more time; study the motion in committee of the whole, which would have been my preference, because we would have wanted to come to some sort of a better consensus on the issue, because we simply should not allow that the division be exercised in this House, or be evident. Obviously right this moment we have a commission which is not well received by all Members of the Assembly, and now to try and put one of the strong proponents to create a new seat...

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: There are only three of you.

MR. CURLEY: ...or more seats, or increase the size of the Assembly, recommend his own personal friend -- I do not think seems to be the best at this time. I can understand if I have the absolute need to persuade the other members of the commission, I maybe would want to have a personal friend of mine being involved in it...

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Your brother in Coral Harbour...

MR. CURLEY: ...but I see that if the commission is going to be established -- that it should be seen to be a non-biased one. It should be a fair commission.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

Commission Must Be Neutral

MR. CURLEY: So I would think that to try and invite someone from your riding, who you know is going to represent you and support you, is really not giving the commission a fair chance to do its work, because you are going to be subjecting that commission to criticism, and I do not think the commission should have that. I do not believe that it should. Although I opposed the commission in the first place, once it is established it has to be neutral.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. CURLEY: It should be neutral. It should not be seen to be preferring one person, and that one of the Members has a strong access, an open door, unlike any other Members of the Assembly. So, on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against this motion. Before I do that, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that other members of the commission be established. If it is going to be established, I would urge the government take the responsibility to seriously look at appointing a member from the Eastern Arctic.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. CURLEY: I will not recommend -- if they want to go and...

MR. MacQUARRIE: What is the name in Coral Harbour?

MR. CURLEY: ...if they want to appoint a personal friend of mine, they certainly can ask for my advice and I will be awaiting for them to consult me. I am not...

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Is she a Liberal?

---Laughter

MR. MacQUARRIE: No, but quite generous, thank you.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I am glad to see the Members on the other side are looking for a Liberal member, since they have established a policy of six and five...

AN HON. MEMBER: To the motion, Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: ...they should be proud of themselves.

Motion To Refer Motion 40-82(3) To Committee Of the Whole, Defeated

Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against it, but before I do that I would like to move that this motion be referred to the committee of the whole.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion to refer to committee of the whole. Is there a seconder? Mr. Patterson.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not debatable. The motion to refer is not debatable. You have asked for a recorded vote on referral? Recorded vote then, Mr. Clerk. All those in favour of the motion to refer it.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Mr. Evaluarjuk, Mr. Arlooktoo, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Pudluk, Ms Cournoyea, Mr. Curley.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Please stand.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Mr. Tologanak, Mr. Sibbeston, Mr. Sayine, Mr. Wah-Shee, Mr. Braden, Mr. Butters, Mr. McLaughlin, Mrs. Sorensen, Mr. MacQuarrie, Mr. Fraser.

MR. SPEAKER: Abstentions? The motion is defeated.

---Defeated

To the motion. Mr. McLaughlin.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am very concerned to make sure that the people of the Northwest Territories are all represented in this boundaries commission and I am in favour of having good Dene representation on this boundaries commission. I am sure that if we were moving right now that someone from the Eastern Arctic should be appointed and then hopefully a Dene would be appointed later we would not be having all this problem right now.

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Hear, hear!

MR. McLAUGHLIN: I think that Mr. Antoine can capably represent the Dene people of the Northwest Territories on this commission and I find it impossible to believe that you could find a responsible leader in the Dene community to appoint to the boundaries commission who is not a friend of Mr. Sibbeston, because Mr. Sibbeston has a camaraderie with all those people.

MRS. SORENSEN: A well-liked man.

MR. CURLEY: Ask Pete.

---Laughter

MR. McLAUGHLIN: We all like Mr. Sibbeston. I said responsible.

MRS. SORENSEN: And a leader.

---Laughter

MR. MacQUARRIE: That is his father.

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Why do you not appoint my daughter?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: I said friends, not uncles.

---Laughter

Further Amendment To Motion 40-82(3)

Mr. Speaker, because I am concerned and other Members on this side of the House have agreed all along with points that this boundaries commission should have equal representation, I therefore would like to move an amendment to the motion, as follows: And further, that this Assembly strongly recommend that a resident of the Eastern Arctic be appointed to the third position on the commission.

MRS. SORENSEN: Hear, hear!

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Your amendment is in order. Do we have a seconder? Mr. Tologanak.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, can you read the amendment again, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment reads: And further, that this Assembly strongly recommend that a resident of the Eastern Arctic be appointed to the third position on the commission.

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Question.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: That includes Coral Harbour, Mr. Curley.

MR. SPEAKER: To the amendment. Mr. Wah-Shee.

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, I second the amendment.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: I had already received Mr. Tologanak as seconder, Mr. Wah-Shee.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Another good westerner.

MR. SPEAKER: To the amendment. Mr. Patterson.

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Easterner. This is the last that you were going to say.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, let me say I am delighted to hear and see that finally the mover of this motion has recognized...

MRS. SORENSEN: Oh, Patterson, we agreed to this in caucus. Cut it out. Sit down.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: ...that there are some interests in the other part of the Northwest Territories who are involved with this boundaries commission issue.

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: You are finally coming home, are you?

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: So far it has all been western ridings, western concerns and I am delighted that finally Mr. McLaughlin, the minute before this motion appears to be adopted, is coming to his senses, because when I proposed an amendment in committee of the whole that would have recognized the principle of balance in seats between the East and the West, Mr. McLaughlin stood up to oppose it.

I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that one of the reasons that I have been so concerned about this whole boundaries commission movement is that I feel that it is designed to add western seats and distort the delicate balance that is now in place in this commission, after the hard work of the previous boundaries commission and so...

MR. SPEAKER: Please, Mr. Patterson, you will have to stay to the amendment, please. We have heard these things before. Could you stay to the amendment, please?

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: I am pleased to see that there is at least some recognition that there are other interests at stake in this boundary commission and I am pleased to say I will support this amendment. Thank you.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Now!

---Applause

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. PUDLUK: Recorded vote.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour?

MR. PUDLUK: Recorded vote.

Further Amendment To Motion 40-82(3), Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Recorded vote. Those in favour, please stand.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Mr. Patterson, Mr. Pudluk, Mr. Tologanak, Mr. Sibbeston, Mr. Sayine, Mr. Wah-Shee, Mr. Braden, Mr. Butters, Mr. McLaughlin, Mrs. Sorensen, Mr. Fraser.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Abstentions?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Mr. Evaluarjuk, Mr. Arlooktoo, Ms Cournoyea, Mr. Curley, Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The amendment is carried.

---Carried

---Applause

To the motion as amended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. You have asked for a recorded vote. Mr. Sibbeston, do you wish to close the debate?

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words in closing, lest people think that I have done something terrible and appointed my best friend to what is supposed to be an independent boundaries commission. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that I do not appreciate some of the remarks that have been made by the Eastern Arctic Members, suggesting that I have been...

MR. CURLEY: Since when?

MR. SIBBESTON: Please, give me a chance -- suggesting that I have been bad and have done something wrong in appointing my friend. It has been suggested a number of times that Jim Antoine is my friend. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that I know Jim Antoine. He is a lot younger than me. I cannot say that we are friends. We do not visit one another. The relationship that we have is a business type of relationship. I can say that I have co-operated in the last few years with the chief of Fort Simpson, Jim Antoine, on a number of matters. I have co-operated and I have been of help where I can, but it has always been a business relationship. It just seems to me that I am somehow being criticized for suggesting such a good, strong Dene person to the boundaries commission. I cannot help it if my area does have a good number of Dene leaders. We have Harry Deneron, we have Joachim Bonnetrouge; I could have appointed any one of these, but I have not. I have asked Jim Antoine in this case because I think he would do a very good job and he says he is available and prepared to spend four, five, six months or whatever is necessary to do the work.

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Sounds like Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: You do not have that much time.

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: You never do. Never in Yellowknife.

MR. SIBBESTON: So, Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members, particularly the Members of the Eastern Arctic, particularly the Inuit people, whom you would think would be sensitive to a thing like this -- for the very first time, I think this Assembly is suggesting that we have a very good Dene person that is very involved. I do not want to discredit Ted Trindell, but he was older and he was not involved, as someone like Jim Antoine was. I would think the Eastern Arctic Members, particularly the Inuit people, would be very happy that native people in the western part here are trying to get good representation on the boundaries commission. Likewise, I wish them well, that they may get a good Inuit person who is knowledgeable, who knows about this Assembly, what their views are and is clued in and plugged into the views of the Eastern Arctic Members. So I hope that once two persons of the boundaries commission are appointed -- Mr. Antoine and a judge -- that they will decide and get a good Eastern Arctic Inuit person. Then you will have an Inuit, a Dene and a white person who can go around the North and do a good job.

Relationship Is Strictly A Business One

As I said, I know Jim Antoine is a very clear-minded person. Our relationship is strictly on a business basis. It is true, when you come from the same community you do know persons and there is a certain amount of friendliness, as it were, but Jim is not my best friend. Jim is not a friend. We do not visit. It is only a business relationship and so I certainly want to dispel the view that I have somehow done wrong in suggesting that my best friend be appointed to the boundaries commission. That is not the case. So I urge you to change your minds, be fair and be supportive of the native people like us so that we can get a good boundaries commission. Talking about fair-mindedness and so forth -- I do not know whether this is going to be out of order, but where was your sense of morality and fairness this afternoon?

MR. CURLEY: To the motion.

MS COURNOYEA: To the motion.

MR. SIBBESTON: You may see that two persons leave for Europe to represent the Inuit people -- you take steps and walk out of this Assembly, thus disrupting the affairs of this House. That is not fair.

---Applause

MR. CURLEY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order, Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Privilege, Mr. Speaker. I resent the comment made by the honourable Member that the Inuit people are being unfair and unreasonable. We are dealing with an issue, not individuals, Mr. Speaker.

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: I am also Inuit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion 40-82(3), Carried As Amended

MR. SPEAKER: A recorded vote has been called. All those in favour, please stand.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Mr. Tologanak, Mr. Sibbeston, Mr. Sayine, Mr. Wah-Shee, Mr. Braden, Mr. Butters, Mr. McLaughlin, Mrs. Sorensen, Mr. Fraser.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please stand.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Mr. Evaluarjuk, Mr. Arlooktoo, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Pudluk, Ms Cournoyea, Mr. Curley, Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. SPEAKER: Abstentions? The motion is carried.

---Carried

---Applause

Just one moment, please. Do I have unanimous consent to leave Item 11, motions, at this time, and proceed with the statement from the Hon. John Munro?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

---Applause

REVERT TO ITEM NO. 2: HON. JOHN MUNRO'S STATEMENT TO THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk will you ascertain if the Minister is ready? Fellow colleagues, please sit. It is an honour at this time to recognize the Hon. John Munro. He has a statement for the Legislative Assembly. Mr. Munro, you have the podium.

---Applause

Hon. John Munro's Statement To The Legislative Assembly

HON. JOHN MUNRO: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Members of the Assembly, I am very pleased indeed on this occasion to be back in Yellowknife, and I very much welcome this opportunity you have given me to speak to you tonight. I am sure you are aware of events that have occurred during the course of the day that add some real significance to this particular meeting. I understand that many of you might have been on the verge of leaving, and you were kind enough to stay over for a day or so to give me this opportunity. I would have liked to have come here first, really, to make this announcement, but events were such that I had to make them in Ottawa today.

A series of important events in the last year, particularly in recent months, has created new political expectations and momentum for change. Now, these are the things I would like to talk about tonight, but first let me begin by saying that the announcement of four new policy thrusts which I made earlier today in Ottawa I think has tremendous significance. The first of the new developments I have come here to elaborate on is the decision to accept the principle of dividing the NWT.

---Applause

Division Of The Northwest Territories

It was here in the North that the impetus for division began. It is here that it will take shape. The map of Canada, and the political life of Canada, will eventually reflect the change in direction northerners have chosen, but the impact of division will be felt most directly among your constituents. You have made your views known, the Government of Canada has listened to your views, weighed the alternatives, and accepted that division is the way northerners want to go. When and how division occurs will also be up to northerners. What you decide will be linked to the great progress we have made together, I think, over the last decade and a half.

Just a little history. In 1967, the year of Canada's centennial, the territorial Council was still located in Ottawa. Almost half of its Members were federal public servants. For the most part, the Council carried out its business far from the NWT. Today, this Assembly is fully elected, and more than half of its Members are native Canadians. You have an Executive Committee whose Members are almost entirely elected Members of Council, with only two appointed officials, both of whom live and work in the Territories. I think that you will agree that this is remarkable progress in only 15 years.

Recommendations Of The Carrothers Commission

One of my predecessors, the Hon. Jean Chrétien, paid tribute in a similar meeting here in 1969. He paid tribute to the work of the advisory commission on the development of government in the Northwest Territories. You will remember that that commission was headed by Dr. A.W. Carrothers, who was appointed in 1965 at the request of the territorial Council. Its mandate was to advise the federal government on the steps that were required to establish a greater degree of self-government in the NWT. Many of the recommendations then of that commission's report were given immediate consideration by the federal cabinet of the day, and implemented right away. Other recommendations were implemented over the following years. Much of the present governmental structure in the NWT was inspired by the Carrothers report.

Common Objective Of Federal And Territorial Leaders

The point, then, that I would like to make is that the federal government and the political leadership in the NWT have shared a common objective over the last decade or so. We both want to encourage the devolution of program responsibility to the elected representatives of the territorial government. We both want to encourage the development of political institutions that



are politically accountable and responsible to the needs of the northern people. The Drury Commission, which reported in March 1980, reinforced these objectives with its recommendations for the devolution of political and administrative authority to local and regional governments. You will recall that Mr. Drury also recommended that a forum be established within the Government of the NWT to examine and advise on the question of dividing the territory into two or more units.

Other initiatives have originated with the Legislative Assembly. I am thinking of the special committee on unity, which was set up three years ago in response to the concerns expressed by representatives of constituencies in the Eastern Arctic. An important conclusion of the committee's report, as accepted later by this Assembly, was that the Assembly regards the present geopolitical structure in the NWT to be a temporary one. You concluded that the structures and practices of government in the North should be determined by the people of the North -- in other words, by the Inuit, the Metis and the Dene, and by others who were born in the North or who have demonstrated a commitment to northern living. You wanted to negotiate changes in present structures that would be acceptable to northerners. All of these conclusions were confirmed through democratic procedures here in the North. The initiatives taken by the special committee on unity and approved by this Assembly I think demonstrate political courage.

The initiative taken by the special committee did not stop with the demand for changes in political structures. It also prompted the declaration by this Assembly of your commitment in principle to the political division of the Northwest Territories. Now, I believe that this declaration must be seen as a clear reflection of a feeling of isolation on the part of certain regions of the North, and of a desire for new political structures that will be more responsive to the needs of the population. The results then, too, of the plebiscite held last April seemed to confirm such conclusions. The results clearly indicate that people of the Eastern Arctic are not satisfied with the status quo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. JOHN MUNRO: While it is true that more Inuit have been elected to the territorial government, the great distances and the obvious geographic and economic differences between the eastern regions and the western Mackenzie Delta region are undeniable. Both governments have recognized the need to decentralize the administration of government services. Government must be close to the people it serves. Whether this can be achieved by regional governments or by new territories is the subject of ongoing debate in the North. Quite rightly, you have been seeking an indication from the federal government on how it views this matter.

#### Conditions To Be Met Before Division

I am now in a position to announce here today that the federal government, as I have said, accepts the principle of dividing the Northwest Territories, and is prepared to take further concrete steps once some reasonable conditions are met. I am sure that you support these conditions because they contribute to the kind of institutions and relationships which Members of this Assembly have declared themselves as wanting to build, both now and in the future.

They are: first, that residents of the NWT reach a consensus on boundaries and the future location of any new administrative centres. Second, that there will be a settlement of comprehensive native land claims. Third, that a consensus on the distribution of powers can be developed with respect to local, regional, and territorial levels of government; and fourth, that a majority of NWT residents continue to support division. I emphasize and I know that your future in the NWT as one or two territories is yours to determine. I can tell you that the federal government entirely supports you. I think I understand your aspirations. How could I be other than impressed by the determination of northerners to establish institutions that reflect northern interests, cultures, and conditions?

---Applause

As northerners, you are well aware of the plebiscite, and I think you would agree it was a beginning, but it did leave many questions unanswered. These questions deal with the form of government you want to have, not boundaries.

#### Responsible And Politically Accountable Government

In this regard, I am pleased to confirm the second element of the new policy thrust: namely, the commitment of the Government of Canada to the principle of responsible and politically accountable government in the Territories.

---Applause

In view of the demographic diversity of the NWT, the political structures and processes you choose, while they adhere to the principles of responsible government, may not necessarily conform to classic parliamentary models in other parts of Canada. The job of working this out can only be done here in the North. You have already taken the first steps in approaching this task. Northerners have organized a constitutional alliance whose members include the Metis Association, the Dene Nation, the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, the Committee for Aboriginal Peoples Entitlement, and this territorial Assembly. I know that the alliance, if it is to be the vehicle for achieving a consensus, will ensure that all northern groups and individuals will have an ample opportunity to express their views...

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Hear, hear!

HON. JOHN MUNRO: ...but I presume you, as elected representatives of northerners, will want to shape and guide that important process.

#### Formula Financing

Now, may I turn to the third element of the new policy direction for the North? That is the decision to move to formula financing. My foregoing remarks demonstrate that the federal government is committed to the development of responsible and politically accountable institutions of government here in the North. As an immediate and practical example of this commitment, the federal government will move rapidly to replace current arrangements for determining deficit grants to the NWT with a system of formula financing.

---Applause

This new approach is in keeping with the steady progress in the development of responsible government. In effect, it keeps the faith with respect to our commitment for full responsible government. What will formula financing mean to the NWT? First of all, formula financing will enable your government to plan. Second, it will provide you with a predictable cash flow. Third, it will free you from the present bureaucratic process for program planning and fiscal accountability.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

---Applause

HON. JOHN MUNRO: It will confirm that planning and political accountability rest with you, the Government of the Northwest Territories. Fourth, it will provide you with the incentive to increase your own revenues. If you decide to raise new revenues from sales tax or some other instrument, you will benefit 100 per cent. You will not, as now, be penalized by a corresponding reduction in your annual grant.

---Applause

The endorsement of the principle of division, then, and of responsible government, are two solid building blocks toward the creation of northern governments that can be fully accountable to their electorate. Formula financing, then, is concrete evidence that this will be a reality. I must caution, however, that the agenda for political and constitutional change is not open-ended. Provincial status is not a realistic option for the NWT at this time. The relatively small population base, the relative lack of taxable income, the vast territories that are associated with small population, the high cost of public administration -- these are factors which even the most ardent advocates of provincehood must pause to consider, and I know they do from talking to many northerners.

There is also the matter of federal government priorities and obligations to protect the national interest. In keeping with these responsibilities, the federal government must maintain its ownership and control over land and over non-renewable resources in the North. I am now, however, better equipped than ever to ensure that northerners will share the benefits.

#### Discretionary Revenues

In this regard, I would like to address the fourth element of the new policy direction, and that is the decision to establish and distribute discretionary revenues. Over the past few years you and your constituents have frequently voiced to me their concerns about the costs they incur in

support of resource development. It is your perception that these territorial costs are excessive in view of the flow of benefits to the South. The federal government recognizes the merits of your complaint, and I am pleased to announce that I have been authorized to develop some proposals to help offset those costs, thereby increasing net benefits to the North from resource development.

---Applause

I have an open mind on this subject and I shall ask your views. Clearly, it will have to be some device that is over and above your normal transfer payment. Perhaps the concept of a heritage fund as developed in Yukon a few years back could serve as a model. The government recognizes that the territorial government should receive a certain level of discretionary revenues to cover up-front costs. In any event, the purpose and the goal will be to redress the perceived imbalance between the costs and benefits attached to major resource projects.

Members of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, since I was appointed Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development more than two years ago, I have been able to travel extensively in the North. I have met you in this chamber, in schools, gyms and town halls. I have also met some of you in your homes. I have come to appreciate your desire to run your own affairs with less interference from Ottawa and from federal bureaucrats. I do believe that the steps we have taken together in the last year or two, and the four new policy thrusts I have announced today, will enable you to realize your legitimate objectives for responsible and politically accountable government.

#### New Approach Reflects Uniqueness Of North

The fresh approach to political institutions and to geopolitical units that you are now seeking to devise will reflect the uniqueness of the North. It will reflect, first of all, the distinctive cultural communities which are found across the North. It will be sensitive to the needs of both native and non-native groups and communities. It will respect the kind of society to which Canada aspires under the provisions of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, but there is no reason why the new structures and the new institutions should mirror those which have been established in the Canadian South.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a turning point in the rich and vibrant history of Canada's North. Just as you and your forefathers have made this the place it is today, you will decide what it will be tomorrow. In doing so, you will also contribute to the fulfilment of confederation, and in that connection I think it is appropriate to say that a new first will soon be witnessed by us all, when this territorial government will be represented on an equal basis with other first ministers at the invitation of the Prime Minister of Canada...

---Applause

...at the next constitutional conference dealing directly with aboriginal rights.

---Applause

Now, of course, it is up to you to make choices. In a sense, the ball is now in your court. Choices that must be met, you will have to meet. The needs and aspirations of the people of the North, you will have to meet, so the challenge is real -- very real for you, but the determination and skill you have shown persuades me that you will succeed, and perhaps most appropriate is a slogan I saw, an ad purchased by the Northwest Territories government in a paper on the plane coming up. I thought it was so appropriate for what we have all tried to achieve and witness here today. The slogan was, "The North is now"...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. JOHN MUNRO: ...and perhaps there is a great deal of truth to that, so as you meet that challenge, may I offer you a friendly and helpful ear, and any help you feel I can provide. Thank you very much.

---Applause

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Do I have unanimous consent to go to committee of the whole? Item 14?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

ITEM NO. 14: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS, RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE LEGISLATURE AND OTHER MATTERS

---

MR. SPEAKER: We will resolve, then, into committee of the whole, with Mr. Fraser in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER POLICY STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN MUNRO, PC, MP

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I call the committee to order. For the Members, I would like to just mention that the Chair will recognize three questions from each Member, and after your third question I will go on to another Member, and then if nobody wishes to speak maybe the other Members who have already had their third question can go back. I will start off with Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Chairman, just in terms of procedure, the government does not really have questions, but I wonder if it would be agreeable to this committee to allow myself, Mr. Wah-Shee and Mr. Butters to make very brief statements on behalf of the government. We do not propose to ask any questions, but would it be agreeable if we could make a brief statement?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Proceed, Mr. Braden.

Hon. George Braden's Comments On Behalf Of The Government

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First I would like to welcome the Minister and his staff to Yellowknife on what is for us an historic occasion, and I could not help but observe that, it is pretty tough, Mr. Chairman, in the Northwest Territories these days not to have a lot of appreciation for what the Liberal Government of Canada is doing in this part of the country. Mr. Chairman, the Minister has made a number of announcements in the last few weeks and months which very much reflect the desire of this Assembly and the desire of the people of the Territories, and I would say also that, you know, given the pressure that some of us have been getting since this morning at 8:00 o'clock, it is getting pretty tough not to think about joining the party...

MRS. SORENSEN: Hear, hear!

---Laughter

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: ...but nevertheless, when we are gathered here in this chamber, Mr. Chairman, you all know that we are all completely non-partisan...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: ...and our desire is only to do what is best for the people of the Northwest Territories.

---Applause

So I will start my statement by saying the Government of the Northwest Territories, Mr. Chairman, is encouraged by the positive approach taken by the Minister and his colleagues on the question of division of the Northwest Territories. This is a first step, a real step, in the beginning of an historical process that will shape a new North and what we believe to be a major contribution to our great nation of Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: While it is realized that a great deal of hard work lies ahead, I am confident that with continued co-operation between the territorial and federal governments, the task at hand will be completed, and that the aspirations of all people in the Northwest Territories will be served. It goes without saying, Mr. Chairman, that our government is prepared to make the kind of commitment necessary to undertake the job at hand, but it should be stated or understood that, although it has been indicated that continued public support is a condition of division, the federal government must appreciate that the people of the Northwest Territories have expressed their desire to divide, and this government, and I think -- I know I can say that this Legislature remains firmly committed to this objective.

---Applause

Mr. Chairman, it should also be stated -- and I guess I would be remiss if I did not do this, but -- adequate funding must be made available...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

---Applause

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: ...to this territorial government in order that some of the preliminary work can be done, but also, when we get to implementation, that we can achieve division efficiently and effectively.

In addition, it is hoped that a satisfactory settlement of land claims can be negotiated between the Government of Canada and claimants as quickly as possible, and that all sides to these negotiations will approach the talks with a renewed sense of purpose. I would just say offhand, Mr. Chairman, that in discussing this particular condition or caveat with some of my colleagues, I think we should indicate to our Minister of Indian Affairs that there may be some room for manoeuvring here. There are some of my colleagues who feel that we may be able to proceed in some ways with division even in the absence of settlement of native claims.

#### Federal Commitment To Responsible Government

It is of significant interest to myself and the territorial government's Executive Committee that the federal cabinet has decided to reconfirm its commitment to the principle of responsible government in the Northwest Territories. Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated today that the federal government has seen fit to enact legislative changes to the Yukon Act to redefine the role of the Commissioner, and that similar amendments are not being made to the Northwest Territories Act at this time. Now, while I recognize that there are certain special circumstances surrounding this particular position or decision, we in the Territories must seek assurances, Mr. Chairman, that the absence of legislative change to the Northwest Territories Act does not preclude the evolutionary process toward fully responsible government by practice or by convention, and I think we have that situation in Yukon at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, I indicated I would be brief. I have my colleagues -- Mr. Wah-Shee will speak next, and then Mr. Butters, but I would just like to conclude by stating how pleased we are with the positive action taken by the federal government, and I would like to pay special tribute to Mr. Munro. When he first got this job I recall a friend of mine, Mr. Drury, saying to the Prime Minister that it is important that whoever takes on this job stays in it, and I think that during the last few months we have seen how important it is to have a Minister who has come to know the North and who remains with the portfolio and who is able to work through the cabinet system and to provide some of the decisions that are required for our evolution.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. If it is agreeable to the committee, I would ask Mr. Wah-Shee to make a statement. Thank you.

---Applause

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

#### Hon. James Wah-Shee's Comments On Behalf Of The Government

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. People of all northern cultures share the desire and the determination that their homeland move as quickly as possible toward the goal of equal partners in confederation with full provincial status. It is a message that this Assembly and

many other responsible northern institutions have presented frequently and regularly to yourself and your predecessors, and many of your colleagues over the years. This message included the following points: that the Northwest Territories be divided into two distinct political jurisdictions; that public government in each area evolve at its own pace and in a manner acceptable to their residents; and that boundary proposals, the style and structure of governments and divisions of power be developed by the citizens of the North and not be imposed by Ottawa.

Consequently, the news you bring us tonight is encouraging. The policy you have outlined goes a long way toward meeting the goals and objectives of northern people. We are aware of some of the obstacles you had to overcome and that considerable personal commitment was required. I join with my colleagues in expressing our appreciation.

As you have obviously come to realize, this Assembly, the native organizations and northerners in general have not been idle while waiting for the federal decision paper on constitutional development. In the course of this year alone, the people of the North have voted in favour of division, the Assembly has formally accepted the result and has adopted its own position and has mandated a working group called "The Northwest Territories Constitutional Alliance". This alliance is providing a forum to facilitate public participation in the process of political development and to develop a general proposal or blueprint for constitutional and political development acceptable to all. The constitutional alliance will be meeting with ministers in Ottawa some time next week to discuss areas of mutual concerns regarding political evolution in the North. We hope that the Government of Canada recognizes that special funding will be required and is ready to respond positively to our request. We will be pursuing this matter further during our Ottawa meeting.

#### No Additional Powers Transferred To NWT

I firmly believe the Minister's statement is a very large, positive step in the direction of responsible government in the NWT. The fact that negotiations of land claims and the development of proposals for political evolutions can take place at the same time should promote progress in both areas. Let us not forget that progressive as the policy statement is, it does not include the transfer of any additional powers to the Northwest Territories. Provincial status is still around the corner.

I know that the Assembly, the alliance and the people of the North will make every effort to meet the preconditions required to qualify for provincial status. I trust that we will continue to receive the encouragement, understanding and support from the federal government that is vitally important if we are to succeed. Thank you very much.

---Applause

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

#### Hon. Tom Butters' Comments On Behalf Of The Government

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, we are very encouraged by the announcements you made today and as territorial Minister responsible for Finance, I am particularly pleased with those that relate to the introduction of new financial arrangements between the territorial government and the Government of Canada. The federal government's acceptance of a formula-based financing approach is a milestone on the road toward more autonomous government in the North. It will allow us to determine our own priorities and to take full accountability for determining how the money is spent and will, as the Minister stated, eliminate the unsatisfactory arrangement of negotiating expenditures at a federal-territorial committee level. While formula financing will carry with it significant financial risks for the Government of the Northwest Territories, these are the risks, the accountabilities, that our government is willing to accept in order to introduce predictability of revenue and responsible expenditure planning. I believe this arrangement will be beneficial to both parties. It will provide the opportunity for the type of advanced financial planning that is presently not possible and should pave the way toward improving the financial relationships between our respective governments.

It is important to understand that introduction of a formula financing approach will not eliminate the need for deliberation between the two governments. A negotiation element will continue to be required, but I am confident that the new arrangement will provide a far superior framework for

those discussions. Both myself and the Government of the Northwest Territories look forward to the ongoing discussions over the next few months in which we will actively participate in the development of an appropriate formula. Over the past years the Minister and I and our officials have done a lot of work to develop a basis by which the financial relationship between the Territories and the federal government would support the development of a more responsible government in the North. The federal-territorial task force that was formed to recommend an alternative funding approach recommended using a fixed tax rate formula and identified the need to use an appropriate base and escalator. These principles must be considered as basic requirements in the development of an equitable formula financing arrangement. As a matter of fact, it is vital that this government be assured these principles will be applied so that the revenue rate decisions we will be making can be done in an atmosphere of fiscal responsibility.

#### Territorial Government Funding Reserve

I was pleased to see that the federal government has recognized the need for the establishment of a territorial government funding reserve, independent of other funding sources, to enable the people of the Territories not only to offset the impacts, but to benefit from the resource development projects. We seriously believe this need can be related to discussions on resource revenue sharing and would be anxious to participate in development of proposals of this nature to help offset the perception that benefits from northern development are received primarily by southerners. The sheltering of incremental revenues related to resource development, providing for a flow of discretionary money, without affecting the level of the operating grant, is a model that we also believe would support the objectives of the territorial government.

In closing, Mr. Minister, I extend to you and your cabinet colleagues the sincere appreciation of the Executive Committee of the Northwest Territories for these most welcome decisions and we congratulate you on your successful efforts on our behalf. Thank you.

---Applause

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

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I just want to welcome the Minister to Denendeh once again. I was passed a note when you were making your speech, Mr. Munro. Someone was wondering whether I was now going to become a Liberal, with all the good things you are saying, and I said, "Well, I am pretty tough to please, but everything is negotiable, as they say."

I was also, too, going to give you a little pamphlet that has been put out today by the western Constitutional Alliance. It is called, "Denendeh - The Path to Public Government" and I must say, I do not know if it is purposefully done or not, but it is done in Liberal red colours -- I do not know -- but it is beautiful, so I will give it to you.

Now, on a more serious note, I have a couple of questions. The first is: If political development only takes place after the settlement of claims, what are the implications if claims cannot be settled? Do you see the possibility of the land claims being very closely tied to constitutional development and do you see a situation where some of the aboriginal rights that native people obtain could be very closely meshed in or tied in with constitutional development?

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

HON. JOHN MUNRO: Thank you. Well, if I might, Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer Nick and it will take me about two minutes to just give two quick answers to, in a sense, questions that I interpreted somewhat as questions by Mr. Braden, Mr. Wah-Shee and Mr. Butters. It will only take me a minute or two. It might be of the nature that they would regard as positive, but, yes, Mr. Sibbeston, I just wanted to try to answer your questions and first I want to thank you for the suggestion that we might be able to negotiate you into the Liberal party. We are prepared to undertake that endeavour as soon as this meeting is concluded, Nick, so I will be around to see you.

---Applause

Do not ever suggest -- challenge a negotiation to an ex-Labour Minister, because I just have to accept it.

### Pressure To Conclude Land Claims Negotiations

Your question: If division only after land claims, what if land claims are not settled? Well, in a sense Mr. Braden suggested that perhaps there is some room for manoeuvring. Perhaps it does not have to be quite so starkly portrayed as a condition before we move on to division and, yes, I would like to respond positively to that and say that if land claims settlements should become endlessly protracted to the point where it does not look like we are going to get settlement and all of us become somewhat discouraged -- well, we do not want all the evolution in terms of the establishment of new political institutions -- or political institutions here in the Northwest Territories with a good deal more power, to be endlessly delayed, of course, then, we will have to talk about it and I do not mean to say that that condition is incarcerated in granite. So I do not think we could say that if land claims are not settled, that division is just put off endlessly, but I do think -- I do think and I think you would agree and I think Mr. Braden suggested that tying it in as a condition, at least for the immediate and short-term future, is a reasonable one.

As I mentioned in the press conference this morning, we knew, as a government, and I knew when this was adopted that it would put pressure on us, as a government -- it might put pressure on the other people at the negotiation table in these land claims too, but now that we have made these commitments, as a government, to meet your requests, now there will be a legitimate desire for people to get on with division, to get on with these policy thrusts. They will look to land claims and absolutely insist that the government keep the negotiator at the table; that the government adopt an attitude of flexibility, and I trust they may do the same with the others that are at the table that we are negotiating with. So the pressure is on all of us to a much greater extent, then, and my feeling is that, being somewhat pragmatic, pressure can lead to conclusions. If there is not a sense of urgency, people tend to protract negotiations endlessly. So the pressure is there, in the sense your government -- by the demands for this endorsement of this principle of division. Not only have you done it yourself, but you have asked us to do it. We have both, together, put pressure on ourselves to do everything possible to bring those land claims to a conclusion. So let us leave it as a condition for now. It will make division so much easier if we can get these land claims settled prior to actual division taking place.

### Land Claims Not Tied In To Constitutional Discussions

Now, your second question -- you know, land claims tied to the constitutional process. Well, we have kept them separate, and I do not think they would have progressed as far as they have -- and some are progressing rather well -- if we had not. If they had got tied into the constitutional discussions that first ministers are having, then I do not think there would be any hope of getting them settled, and I think you would have to agree with that. This constitutional process of first ministers may go on for years, and probably will -- depending on the subject matters we are discussing. The North does not want to wait that long, and I do not believe that if we had tied in these policy thrusts -- you could argue that they all have something to do with constitutional development: the whole question of responsible and politically accountable government in the Northwest Territories, and a commitment that it does not have to be a type of Canadian parliamentary model like the rest of the country. It may have unique features that you will work out yourself here. That is a constitutional commitment that we made with you outside the first ministers' discussions.

Now, because many of you have said to me that really provincial premiers -- you, as an Assembly, and your Executive Committee are not totally committed that they should have views with respect to what your aspirations are. You have your aspirations realized by bilateral discussions with the federal government -- that would be your choice, rather than get involved with 10 other governments determining what your rights should be. It may not be in the interests of certain provinces that territorial governments assume almost all the powers analogous to what a province may have.

So I do not think you want -- and I have interpreted, and I would not have made the announcements today if I thought for one minute you wanted those types of announcements determined, or some of them determined, within the context of constitutional discussions at a First Ministers' Conference. Indeed, I have interpreted it quite the other way. So no, they are not tied in in that way, and so that land claims, in itself, is another thing that can develop to a speedy conclusion without necessarily tying it in to constitutional discussions. If the native people at the negotiation table feel that their territorial government, which is majority native -- if they feel that we are moving on questions such as division, if they see that there is a commitment that native representation will be substantial in all political institutions in the North, they



may be prepared to go ahead and commit themselves to a settlement without worrying about the political institutions that can be more readily handled outside land claims. We can handle them ourselves bilaterally to a very significant degree in those constitutional discussions without involving them in the first ministers' discussions. I hope that tries to answer your question, and to a degree to deal, I think, with some of the points that you raised, Mr. Braden.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Mr. Sibbeston, one more question.

MR. SIBBESTON: Just one more question. Let us talk about land and resources, Mr. Munro. I think you said somewhere that you did not foresee turning over all the land and resources to the government here in the North. I hope, in saying this, that you are not foreclosing a possibility of the Dene and the Metis -- in the western part here, anyway -- getting ownership of lands and resources.

As I understand it, the Dene and Metis are zeroing in on this very fundamental and important thing. They see this as most important to their aboriginal rights, and they are trying to deal with lands and resources as a first priority in their negotiations. I am sure they have high hopes that eventually certain lands and resources will be recognized as belonging to the Dene and Metis. Do you see that happening? Could the Dene Nation through land claims negotiations, get lands and resources that are outside of the lands and resources that will eventually be turned over to this Denendeh government?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you.

#### Ownership And Jurisdiction Over Land And Resources

HON. JOHN MUNRO: To answer your question, can I just make it quite clear that when I was talking about land resources I was talking about it in the constitutional sense of division of powers as between the territorial governments of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon? There were provinces, earlier on, that had provincehood without ownership of land and resources -- that was subsequently transferred. So that I am just saying that the federal government would not be prepared at this stage to turn over the jurisdiction of land and resources to another government. Even if we did turn it over to the territorial government, it would be similar to the provinces -- the ownership would be in the Crown -- in the right of the Territories, as opposed to the crown right of Canada, but in that sense the jurisdiction over it would remain with governmental institutions here in the North. It would not be to any particular group within the Territories. It would be to a government who represents all the people, not any specific element of the people. We are talking about the jurisdiction over land and resources. The actual ownership -- that you are getting into -- it is now a question of private ownership which we recognize in this country, and that is something quite different -- and may I just say that it is one of the rationales behind the land claims decision. We may negotiate land claims settlements, indeed as we are in the process of doing under the agreement in principle with COPE, in James Bay and in other areas, with surface and subsurface rights, analogous to fee simple ownership of some land. That, in a sense, is the transfer of lands to a collective entity, or to an individual. In this case, land claims, it is to a collective entity. Even if we negotiate a land claim settlement, say with the Dene, to take over certain ownership of certain land and so on, presumably they will have to submit to the jurisdiction of the Northwest Territories with respect to their laws and whatever their constitutional powers are. They will not -- and it is in that sense we talked about -- the federal government is not prepared to turn over jurisdiction, not prepared to turn over the ownership that is non-private to the territorial governments at this time, and the reason I said that is what is here.

I question whether northerners, when they look at the great distances and the limited number of people, and the very heavy up-front financial commitment that is going to be required by the federal government now and in the future -- for instance, this year I guess it is in the order of \$300 million to the territorial government; undoubtedly, under this formula for funding, it will carry on. Now, it is because the development of the Northwest Territories is going to require mammoth amounts of up-front moneys before there is any revenue. Even private investors -- oil companies -- it is all money outlays in exploration. Very little revenues are being brought in, either privately or publicly, at this stage. So there is nothing to share, even if you had the ownership -- and while we are expecting a heavy up-front commitment for the public infrastructure, as well as private investment, it is not realistic to think that the people that are doing it will turn over the ownership -- and that it just somehow a reality to me -- but if all the other powers, in terms of full political accountability, are turned over pretty well, except that, then you are going to impact mightily on that particular area also. Those are just the facts of political life.

So, to a degree the answer to that question deals again, Mr. Braden, with what you and Mr. Wah-Shee raised in your comments. I think Mr. Braden made note of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that the Northwest Territories Act was not being amended but the Yukon Act was, and hoped that that would not preclude the devolution to full responsible and politically accountable government in the Territories, as indeed in the Yukon. Well, you are quite right. It will not prevent it, Mr. Braden. In fact, I think you and I would agree tomorrow, "Let us amend the Northwest Territories Act", if we knew exactly how to do it. There is a party system in the Yukon, that we have got; and that is an old tried and true model that I do not think the Territories necessarily wants to adopt. If you were prepared to adopt it now, we could probably do it now. You do not want to do it that way, and we agree with you, so let us find a model you do want and then go amend the Northwest Territories Act -- but in the meantime we will go along with you, just the way you are proceeding now. You are almost achieving de facto responsible government now, with the formula financing and so on, and without having to amend your act until you get the model you want. So, as long as you achieve your purposes, you know, it does not really matter that much until you work out the model. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Federal Government Decision On Division

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Munro, first of all, I would like to thank you for taking this time to come North and to make the announcement here. I think that that has been one of the things that have been very different about your ministry. You have listened to us when we said we want to be involved in the announcements and you have certainly taken that to heart, both with the decision on the Norman Wells pipeline and now this very important constitutional development paper, and I certainly -- and I know my colleagues do -- thank you for that.

My first question deals with the issue of division. I know that you are aware of the fact that I voted "No" in the plebiscite, and I also campaigned very vigorously on a no vote. The federal government, however, has responded -- and quite rightly so -- to the majority of people in the Northwest Territories requesting division, and I feel personally that, because it was a majority decision request, that you have as the federal government responded in the right way. I, in fact, predicted and discussed it with you that, if the vote was "Yes", that you should move to divide the Territories because not only would you be responding to the majority of people in the North, and so would be pleasing the majority, not only as a federal government but as a Liberal Government, but you would also be moving in the national interest.

Your conditions, Mr. Minister, have certainly met my concern as a non-supporter of division, and I maintain that position. I also feel that my constituents, for the most part, still maintain that position; they voted six to one against division. But the condition -- the first one, in particular, that I am pleased with is the one where you, in your own words, say that you are throwing it back into our ball court, and that is the question of deciding where the boundary is. I would like to say that certainly the people of the Western Arctic will be making a very strong case for the 1963 federal government boundary, and we will be doing everything that we can to make sure that that is the boundary that comes out of the deliberations. I think that the federal government has been wise to stay out of that very political and very sensitive issue, and I think that once we have come to a consensus up here you will be able to step in and help us effect division.

The next most important condition, as far as I am concerned, is the fact that you are asking for continued support of the people of the Northwest Territories for division, and I think that that is very important, Mr. Minister, for the people that I represent, and mostly because of the boundary. The Central Arctic and the Western Arctic people are not clearly in either camp. They are not in the Eastern Arctic and they are not necessarily in the Western Arctic. We are still in the Western Arctic. We still have the opportunity here to woo them, to make a presentation to the people of the Central Arctic to join forces with the people of the Southern Mackenzie and create a government, whether it be Denendeh or some other name, but a government, and the same goes for Nellie Cournoyea's constituency in that area known as COPE. I think that we still have the opportunity to bring them onside with the people of the Southern Mackenzie, and so if that happens or, dependent on what boundary comes out, we may choose to have another plebiscite, another attempt at going back to the people. Therefore I support the fact that you say you will see to it that the people of the North, when that day comes to make the decision, still support it. Mr. Minister, I think that your conditions are realistic, and I think that although they mean...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mrs. Sorensen, do I hear a question?

MRS. SORENSEN: Yes, it is coming up, Mr. Chairman.

---Laughter

These are my constituents. I have to make sure they know my position.

Status Quo Except For Division

My question, Mr. Minister, revolves around the fact that it has been said that nothing has really changed -- we heard that on the radio today -- that division may happen but it really still is the status quo. It was not my impression that northerners, particularly the Eastern Arctic, were asking for more powers and stronger powers. They were simply asking for division, for their own territorial government, and for the right to take it one step at a time. Now, is that your impression, and how do you respond to that claim that it does not mean anything anyway, which has been on the news today? That is my first question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Minister, I do not think there was a question there. I think it was just an analysis of your presentation, but...

---Laughter

...if you find a question there, go ahead and answer it.

HON. JOHN MUNRO: I find a question there, because I am trying to -- and happily finding one, I think, in the sense that, you know, I must say I am getting a little paranoid with the media of this country sometimes. If a Minister of this government in Ottawa makes an announcement that seems to receive the hearty endorsement of a lot of people, and certainly there are a lot of northerners that have indicated they are pretty happy with this one, I sometimes think there is a calculated desire of some element of the media to belittle it, because it does not have the element of confrontation. Confrontation is a terribly intriguing type of public behaviour pattern to create in a country, because it means perpetual headlines and so on. Anything that works falls off the back pages rather rapidly, and it gets no note. So if somehow these two levels of government, the Territories and the federal government, if their positions can be either misinterpreted or irritations be caused by the two that really are not there to start with, then of course you will get the confrontations. It is something I think that we have proven, and I must say, one of the more happy experiences of my ministry, that we have been able to work so well together. I do want to indicate to the entire Executive Committee and to the Assembly here what a pleasure it is -- despite all the difficult problems -- what a pleasure it has been to work with you over the past two years.

#### Significance Of Federal Endorsement Of Division

Let me just say that, no, I think that is nonsense. The fact of the matter is that we responded as a federal government in precisely the way you asked us to, in the sense that your leadership, northerners, said, "Give us an indication -- do not tell it, give us an indication whether you support the principle of division. We will carry it from there, but we want to know whether, no matter what we do, you are going to oppose it." Several northerners felt that we would never, as a federal government, endorse the principle of division, no matter what they did here, and some were believing that right up to the day before the announcement was made. So that is exactly what we did, and it is tremendously significant, because you now can go ahead. Now we will have to meet legitimate demands for funding; we will have to look at it. We will have to bargain with you with respect to it, because we know, now that we, along with yourself, recognize it as the principle, we indeed must cope with it, so it is tremendously significant.

We could not have gone further if we had wanted to. We could not have gone further if we had wanted to, because many of those conditions are ones that we knew in advance were acceptable to most northerners, because many of the native organizations have indicated to me that they want to get the ducks in a row, they want to get ready for division, they want to know that we are prepared to support it, but they do not want it in actual reality until a very determined effort has been made to settle land claims, so that is why we put that in.

The other ones -- there is really no problem. The jurisdiction one, for instance, is quite different than responsible government, and I think this deals in a sense with, Mr. Wah-Shee, the point you raised about new powers. We are prepared to discuss new powers, but really what you have asked for now is responsible government, at least de facto. We are going to do it in law in the Yukon, as Mr. Braden indicated. You wanted that, and we are prepared to go along with that, and endorse that, politically accountable government, responsible government. Responsible government as we know it is where an Executive Committee is elected, and there are elected people on it, and they are appointed by the elected Members of the Assembly, and they are accountable to the elected Members of the Assembly. That is the definition of responsible government. So that we agree with, and support you on it, and indeed are now prepared to adopt things like formula funding to be sure of an Executive Committee that is fully accountable to the elected Members of the territorial Assembly. That is responsible government.

#### More Powers For Responsible Government

The issue of what powers they have is something different. It is something quite different than that, and we have said we are prepared to argue that and, of course, to answer you and Mr. Braden, we are prepared, now that we have met the formula financing challenge, now that we have said we support you in full responsible government, if you want more powers, we are prepared to negotiate that. There are precious few you have not really got now, but there are some. The ones you have not are directly related to land. We might be able to devise consultative agencies,

administrative agencies, in which we all participate to a degree that we might even be able to solve that one without having to confront on the ownership of land and resources for the foreseeable future.

So I just want to be very positive with you in terms of what I am saying there, in terms of negotiating the devolution. There are a few matters, I believe the Commissioner is aware of, which you have indicated you wish to take over in the near future. I suggested, finally, that it should not be held, in terms of turning over those authorities, until such time as we made these decisions at the federal cabinet level that you wanted us to make. Now that we have made them, we can deal with those, and deal with them rather rapidly.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you.

HON. JOHN MUNRO: Sorry, Mr. Chairman, but Lynda Sorensen did give me an opportunity to clarify a few matters and I appreciate you giving me the latitude to do so.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Curley, please.

MR. CURLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, you know, we are at least encouraged that the federal government has responded to the major concerns of the people of the NWT and this Legislative Assembly. I think I would just like to state that although the conditions that are put in there are, possibly, not impossible to pursue as an objective by the people of the NWT -- that is, if they pursue them vigorously, with determination, it is possibly possible that we can achieve them, but the thing is, I do not think we can achieve them alone. I see, for one thing, the clear distinction between political development and settlement of the aboriginal claims. I think you have put them, possibly, in the proper perspective, although it may not be acceptable to many of the native organizations, because they have been asking for greater political involvement through the claims process. I think the government has been aware of that. Now, although these conditions look simple -- that there must be consensus on the boundaries, for one thing, that there must be a settlement of native claims, and that there must be consensus on distribution of powers, local, regional and territorial -- many of these, if you really analyse these issues, have political and federal government implications in them. I think I can say the objectives look good and we can probably pursue them and probably settle them; I think we can try and do that. The thing is, how soon is the federal government going to come out with the necessary legislation and sign an agreement in principle, when we have the experience of difficulty with the federal government backing out of the agreements in principle that they have signed?

#### Separation Of Land Claims And Political Development

So what I am trying to say to you is although you have separated the land claims from the political process in terms of northern development and you are telling us, "You go and settle your claims first and then we will talk division", that is really instituting a whole issue here. People out there, the constituents of Yellowknife, might think "Look, now native people have got to settle their claims", that they have got to get their act together and work hard and settle their land claims settlement. The thing is, if you are really separating the land claims settlement from the political development, I think it should be separately and not be conditional upon the political development and division issue. How can you separate the political development and the division issue when you are saying to us, "You cannot have a greater political entity and divide the Territories -- you cannot do it unless you settle your claims?" Now, to me that is sort of a catch-22 situation again, because there might eventually be reluctance by the native organizations to settle claims, because they now know, for one thing, they cannot have political development without claims. So what do we really mean when we say it is separating the two issues here? I think we are really complicating the problem more than it actually appears to be. That was the first question.

#### Definition Of Consensus

The second question that I have has to do with the condition that there must be consensus for a boundaries issue -- again, another catch-22 situation. To those people who do not support the division, that is a big plus for them, because the question remains: How are we going to define the consensus -- by what means? Is it going to be by this majority vote here, like we did on the setting up of an electoral boundaries commission? The vote was 10 to nine. Would that be a fair consensus? Would that be acceptable and if that is not acceptable would we go again on another plebiscite and so on or shall we continue to struggle and try to persuade each other? What is going to be the nature of the standard as far as the federal government is concerned on this consensus that the federal government is trying to tell us to do? Thank you.

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

Political Questions Not Determined By Non-Elected Negotiators

HON. JOHN MUNRO: Well, let me just say to Mr. Curley, Mr. Chairman, and through him to the rest of the Assembly, and I would appreciate getting responses to this, not necessarily tonight -- if land claims are tied into the political question of division; if land claims are put off until division is settled and implemented; if land claims are put off until questions of aboriginal rights and their definition are settled at the First Ministers' Conferences; if land claims are put off until constitutional deliberations on the political institutions of government here in the North -- if it is put off until all those, do not expect to have land claims settled in the foreseeable future. You are not going to get them settled, because, for one thing, the negotiators that we put at the table on land claims -- we are not prepared, as a government and I doubt if the territorial government would want us to, we are not prepared to turn over to a non-elected negotiator, questions that are essentially political questions for determination by the political institutions in the North and our own, as a federal government. I think it is fraught with difficulty and my understanding was that there was a feeling in the North -- and still is -- that the first thing you wanted us to approach in a substantive way was this whole fundamental question of land claims, and get on with it.

That is why the first six or seven months I got the moneys to fund the native organizations to do their research and got negotiators and we are trying to proceed, perhaps not as quickly as some would like, but we certainly are doing our best to emphasize it -- we got the financial commitments from the government to settle these land claims, with the moneys necessary for the next 10 to 20 years. That has all been set in place in Ottawa. We are ready for these settlements financially, even with the economic times we are facing. So I just keep coming back to that and if you decide differently, well, then, you are not going to get land claims settled quickly and I am fearful that if you do not get land claims settled quickly -- first and get them determined, then you are very unlikely to be able to wrestle with any other of the questions and certainly the uncertainty will continue in terms of investors coming in here and doing any of the things you want in terms of job creation.

Parallel Process For Constitutional Questions

The second point I would like to make is this; that you can have a parallel process for determining the constitutional question here in the North, the political institutions in the North. We have used the parallel process outside the land claims for the last two years. The commitments of the federal government as set out here tonight -- many of them were fundamentally constitutional questions that were answered, that the two levels of government have been able to come to an agreement on, with native input there through this Assembly and that the native spokesmen here have reflected many of the feelings of their leadership at the negotiation table. So you can continue to avail yourself of this process to settle some of the political institutional questions that are constitutional in nature without getting them involved in First Ministers' Conferences, which involve provincial people, because you do not necessarily want to have a determination as to your rights in any event. So take advantage of the bilateral process outside the land claims -- and I thought that there was still a majority will in the Territories to do precisely that.

Your third question, about consensus -- now, when we said consensus -- obviously, when 56 per cent of the people of the Territories vote in favour of division and then the federal government responds -- as indeed, you, as an Assembly, have asked us to; you say you endorse the principle of division and we say "yes", obviously we regard 56 per cent as a pretty good expression of consensus. We are not like totalitarian states; in a democracy you are never going to get 95 per cent votes and that type of thing, nor do we want to, but a majority expression -- a significant majority expression of a certain direction is what we are talking about in consensus.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Curley, one more question.

MR. CURLEY: I think that my particular concerns will have to be analysed further as to how the whole thing is going to evolve, because I think there are going to be some implications; that is for sure, because although we are definitely separating the claims process and political, we cannot reverse it. I see some of the improvements that you have announced today for responsible government, to the present system, to the status quo, in giving some direction -- possibly more direct improvements to the present arrangement that Ottawa has with this government. But for instance, these improvements that you announced to this government, in terms of responsible government, are given without any conditions. You know, that concerns me. Why is it not tied

into the settlement of land claims, for instance? Are we trying to improve this government so in the event that, in time, there might not be a desire then for the people of the NWT to divide the Territories? Would the present set of policy announcements that you have given eventually persuade the people to think twice about division because there are no conditions attached to them? What you have given are sort of impossible conditions, I say, to settle claims before we go on with the broader issue of division. Why is there a difference in there?

#### Boundaries Question Is A Major Factor

HON. JOHN MUNRO: Well, I have already tried -- through you, Mr. Chairman -- to answer your question on land claims. It was to build pressure on us all to get on with the land claims settlement, and I frankly feel -- and I am subject to correction by many of you here, but I really feel you are going to have frightful difficulties trying to resolve the fundamental question of division without having substantially more progress on land claims. But even if I am wrong on that, I do not think that is the major condition -- if the word "condition" bothers you -- I do not think that is it. I think the fundamental question facing the Territories is the boundaries question for division, and I think you agree with me. You are going to have to resolve that yourself. You wanted an interpretation from us -- whether we were for division -- and once you got that then you would have to determine the boundaries question, and I think once you determine that you are going to find that the other conditions are very easily resolvable. I think if you resolve the boundaries question a very significant irritation could disappear from the negotiation table in land claims. So I think you should regard that one as essential, and you are facing that one whether I said it was a condition or not.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Minister. I have Mr. MacQuarrie next.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, earlier in his speech Mr. Braden said that the Government of the Northwest Territories is encouraged by what has taken place, and I am to some extent. I want to be optimistic, and I have no doubt about your own personal understanding of the northern situation and your good will, but we are dealing not only with you but with the federal government as a whole -- the Prime Minister, all the cabinet, the other parties, the bureaucracy -- and so you may forgive me if I am a little bit sceptical about what we see, and wonder whether there are some difficulties that are not immediately apparent. I find the presentation very clever. It certainly seems to have many advantages for the federal government. I am not entirely sure how many for the people of the Northwest Territories.

#### Principle Of Division Implicit Since 1870

My first question: I notice, in reading the paper, that there is a subtle difference between the wording of what I presume is the cabinet decision at the beginning of the paper and then the wording with respect to division in the latter part, in the background and implications material. I notice this decision says, "The federal government has accepted, in principle, subdivision of the present Northwest Territories," -- and I say that in principle that has been implicit ever since 1870, when the federal government acquired the Territories, that there has been that kind of understanding. Indeed, I think the Rupert's Land Act kind of called for the establishment of governments from time to time, as people demanded them. It is only in the body that you do talk quite specifically about division into two territories, and you did that in your speech as well.

So what would help to allay my misgivings, I guess, is if we not only heard an endorsement by the federal government but some significant action as well, and so I will put the ball back into your court. There is no question at all that in order to meet some of the conditions you outline -- for instance determining a boundary among ourselves before the federal government will accept division, determining the distribution of powers from territorial government to regional government to local government, consulting with people on the style of government -- all of that will take a great deal of money, Mr. Minister, and it is money that is not included in the Government of the Northwest Territories ordinary budget for government programs, nor is it included in the land claims money that is given to native associations in order to settle their land claims. So, where will it come from? I know that the Constitutional Alliance is travelling to Ottawa on Monday, and one thing that they will be looking for specifically is an adequate budget in order to deal with these very kinds of things. So my question is what kind of reception is the government planning to give the alliance this coming week?

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

HON. JOHN MUNRO: Well, to answer Mr. MacQuarrie's last question. If they are coming to Ottawa, they are going to raise certain points -- I am not going to prejudge it. I will try to be as helpful as possible with respect to matters they raise, as I usually try to be, and I am realistic enough that if it is to undertake certain things for which there is no financial provision, and there is no way that the territorial government has a means of financing at this time -- well, we will have to look at it seriously; but I cannot give a specific commitment today before I have heard what I am asked to give a specific commitment for, see a document and so on. I am sure Mr. MacQuarrie is aware of that. But I can assure you I will try to be as constructive as possible when they come to see me and I hear what proposition it is they want to put before me.

I am not quite sure about your other. I keep coming back to the situation that the federal government -- I appreciate the support I got from my colleagues at the cabinet table, but as I interpret it I have come and stated quite clearly what it is you wanted me to respond -- I do not think you wanted me to say that we are for division irrespective of whether we have any agreement on powers, that I am for division irrespective of whether land claims are ever settled. I do not think that you would want that. Certainly, it would not have made any sense to say, "We are for land claims", when we do not even -- you know, if we are for division before we know that we have got ahead with the boundaries question. So I just think that those are conditions that are fully acceptable to the territorial government, because that was my interpretation, that was my understanding. I think the boundaries, as I say, is the difficult one. I have told Mr. Braden, in answer to his question, that the best I could predict -- he said, "Maybe there is room for manoeuvrability there." I think there probably is -- but let us try to get the land claims settlement. It would be so much easier for all of us.

On your question of the distinction between division and subdivision, there is a subtle difference there. You know, if it is division it is dividing into two, and that seems to be the way we are going and mainly talking, but I do not think we should preclude the possibility of division into more than two, if that should be the will of the people in the Territories. So, you know, it has got that flexibility to it.

MR. MacQUARRIE: A second question.

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

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, a second question. I think, with the funding, that people of the North will see that as a sign of the government's good faith, if we are successful in that pursuit.

#### Third Party Decision On Boundary Issue

Second question. You have said the ball is in our court, but in the boundary matter I am afraid you might have served an ace. Boundary issues throughout history and throughout the world have not generally been resolved by peoples who are competing over particular areas by peaceful means, and it becomes necessary from time to time for a neutral third party to decide. Indeed, that is what happened, I know, in around 1905. There were demands by Manitoba to acquire part of what was then the Northwest Territories -- and I know that Haultain wanted only one territory, and yet the federal government arbitrarily made a decision to have two provinces, Alberta and Saskatchewan. So I would like to know how hard the federal government is in that position. You are saying we must settle it by ourselves, and if we cannot there is not going to be division. Would the federal government position be -- at least, supposing we gave it a real good go and could not resolve it ourselves, and we asked the federal government then to establish a boundary commission? Is that understood in your position?

HON. JOHN MUNRO: Well, actually -- of course if you asked us to try to settle...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. You are forgetting, Mr. Minister, I have a button. I can cut you off. Will you address the Chair, please?

HON. JOHN MUNRO: All right, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Parliamentary procedure.

HON. JOHN MUNRO: Mr. MacQuarrie, I just could not resist saying, you know, you have resolved so many questions yourselves in the Territories, of very contentious nature, with your very admirable forums that you have had, the Constitutional Alliance, and coming to grips with questions like residence and so on that would frustrate many people in southern Canada or in any country in the free world. You have been able to cope in a very, very constructive fashion --



and I am not just dealing in flattery, I sincerely feel that. So if you have been able to deal with questions like that, I think you will be able to deal with questions of boundary. But it is strange -- you know, when you have talked about wanting things like formula financing, and insisting, as indeed you should, on responsible government and a government that is politically responsible, and at the same time say, "Well, gee, you know, we want the decision making powers and we can handle it," -- and at the same time say, well, you know, we may be dealing you an ace. What are you saying? That on one hand you are for full responsible government, and politically accountable government, but you still want the federal bureaucracy in Ottawa to come in and settle the questions for you? A little bit of inconsistency there...

MR. MacQUARRIE: Only if we cannot on our own.

HON. JOHN MUNRO: Only if you cannot succeed. Well, you know, I do not think that is full responsible, politically accountable government, because you have told me you want to settle problems of that kind yourself. If this government here, if the Assembly and the Executive Committee that they elect to act for them as a government, if they come and say, as a duly elected body, they want us to do it -- well, then I do not know how we could ignore it. I do not think they will do that, though.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. Your final question?

MR. MacQUARRIE: My third question. I note on page three, under support for division, the statement, "that its willingness to divide the NWT must be subject to continued support by the majority of residents in the NWT". We know that this is not going to happen within the next year, and therefore, without question, you have made division a major issue in the next territorial election -- in the Western Arctic at least -- and that is fair game. It possibly means that some of us who supported division will not be back the next time, but that is the way things go.

#### Majority Vote Of The Total Territory

My question related to that is, does that statement mean that the establishment of an Eastern Arctic territory is dependent on a majority vote always in the total territory? There could be subsequent events that bring about a new plebiscite or something else. Does it mean that the Eastern Arctic territory is subject to the will of the West, in a sense, ultimately and finally?

HON. JOHN MUNRO: I see your difficulty...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Minister.

HON. JOHN MUNRO: I do not want to be contentious. To say by putting this in, some of you may not be back next time because you voted for division, do you mean by that we should have left that out?

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes.

HON. JOHN MUNRO: Yes, we could have left that condition out, and then if your constituents were angry at you for voting for division, you could always have blamed the federal government. That type of technique has been used frequently with considerable success throughout Canada, and there is no reason why you should not try it...

---Laughter

...but I am just telling you that, you know, I think any time a majority of people anywhere, during the decision making process, if there should be a change of view -- you know, that government policies change. But in fairness to yourself, I can see where you are coming from on that, and sure, it is a concern, but we did not mean to -- it was not any devious design to somehow put all these conditions in to stretch out the whole question of division and always inject it as a political issue in every election. I think the territorial government -- that you have had your plebiscites, you have had your constitutional forums -- I think it is pretty far-fetched to think it is not going to be an issue in the next election whatever we did. It has been a pervasive issue in the political environment of this part of the country for a long time and it is likely to continue to be so.

I think what we are really talking about there is that, for instance, if in the Eastern Arctic -- not setting the West against the East, and I agree with you, that would be undesirable -- but the Western Arctic, for instance -- and it is unlikely, I think -- but if the Eastern Arctic should have a change in view, does that mean that we should just continue to blindly go ahead and obviously -- you shake your head -- you obviously indicate, no, we should not go blindly ahead if the Eastern Arctic changed its view. Well, this permits us to change course.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Minister. I would just like to remind Members that it is getting pretty late and everybody has had a long day. Could you keep your questions short and to the point? I have about five more indications to ask questions. The next on my list is Mr. Patterson, please.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just briefly, Mr. Minister, before my questions, I would like to say that I do feel this is a great day in the history of the Northwest Territories. I am optimistic that we can move ahead now that the federal government has given us an idea of the path that we must follow to achieve our aspirations, and I would like to just mention that I believe that the boundary and capital issue is the simple one. I do not think that is going to be a problem at all. I always say there is lots of land for everyone in the Northwest Territories, and we need not argue too much on that. As for the capital, I think everyone is going to support Frobisher Bay as the logical choice for the capital of Nunavut.

---Laughter

Seriously, though, Mr. Minister, we do have a detailed work plan for public consultation on the boundary, on the location of the capital, on the issue of the form of the government, and the question you are concerned about, the jurisdictions between the various levels of government. I just think all we need is some financial help to get this process on the road and we can start to work right away, and I am pleased that you are willing to discuss that with us immediately, next week in Ottawa. So I will not pursue that.

#### Nunavut And Settlement Of Claims In East

I would like, however, to just say, on the subject of land claims, that I think your statement has provided a great impetus to the ITC claim, because, as you know, the Nunavut territory is a cornerstone of the ITC claim. I believe that that claim is tied very much to the division issue, and you have clearly indicated that this is a very real possibility.

My only concern -- I think it was mentioned briefly by other Members -- is that I think we are going to make great progress now in the Eastern Arctic in land claims, but I am just very concerned that we might -- if your condition is interpreted too narrowly, we might possibly be held up if there is not the same progress with the Dene claim, for example, which I think everyone would agree is, unfortunately, not as far advanced as the other claims in the territory. I guess what I would like to ask specifically is, can you see if this eventuates -- which I hope it does not, I hope all claims proceed rapidly now, but if that is not the case, is it possible that your condition might allow the Nunavut territory to proceed if land claims are settled with ITC and with COPE even if perhaps the same progress had not been made elsewhere? It seems to me the status quo could remain in the western part of the Northwest Territories, and we could go ahead and establish Nunavut.

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

HON. JOHN MUNRO: Mr. Chairman, I am going to try, because of the time -- and I am sure you are all getting tired -- to keep my answers very short. I have endeavoured to answer that question. Let me just say that I think Mr. Braden raised it earlier on, Mr. Patterson. Was there room for manoeuvrability there? I indicated that we are always prepared to talk and discuss that. If, unfortunately, eventualities of the kind you describe do occur and it seems that their land claims just are not proceeding and it is frustrating the will of the North in terms of getting on with division, then we would have to sit down and work something out with you, and we would try to do so.

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

#### Further Departmental Responsibilities

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Minister. I was intrigued with your statement about our own political development in the Northwest Territories, with the Executive Committee, toward responsible government, that you would go along with whatever directions we have taken so far. Can I ask you specifically, do I take it that it may be possible within the scope of this announcement for us to negotiate further assumption of departmental responsibilities presently held by the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner, assumption of those responsibilities to the elected Members?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Minister.

HON. JOHN MUNRO: It may very well be that you and the Assembly will push forward and ask for further devolution of responsibilities for certain programs, and we would try to be as positive as we can. I know that there are one or two that we have held in abeyance; I do not think that they have been resolved yet. So the answer to that is yes.

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

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I will try not to spend a lot of time on boundaries. I think I am the only one that knows where the boundary is, and have no question about that, and I also feel that there have been certain actions taken to ascertain that. However, we all have to live with the political aspirations of others, whether it be up for ransom for economic reasons or their own reasons for wanting things to go in their direction, and we all live with that. I just hope that I can make it clear that the boundary is no question to me, and it is not the West. It was made in 1975 and it remains the same.

In terms of the Yukon, when you were discussing the claims you mentioned the claim of the Council of Yukon Indians must be settled before further evolution of government. You failed to mention the Inuvialuit claim as well, and I was wondering why you -- was that an oversight?

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

HON. JOHN MUNRO: With reference to the Yukon, no, I guess it was in a sense an oversight, and I think we felt that -- we have an agreement in principle with regard to COPE, I think we are going to get it settled. I am not sure why I did not add to the Council of Yukon Indians, COPE, if that is your argument. I would be glad to discuss it with you.

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

#### Back Tax Exemption For Hunters And Trappers

MS COURNOYEA: No, I thought perhaps it was just an oversight on your part, or else we were so advanced that you figured we would be finished before anything else could possibly happen.

---Applause

I understand that you had a sacrificial lamb going from the NDP party to the Liberal floor. However, I was hoping when you came up, as part of your announcements on money problems, fiscal responsibilities, impact funding, you would also come up with a very, very favourable announcement in respect to the hunters' and trappers' concern. I did get a letter from you in which you stated that we should process the necessary papers to file for them, but I would like to assure you that has been done quite some time ago, and I am wondering when your government will be making an announcement to exempt these people from back taxes and if you will be doing that.

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

HON. JOHN MUNRO: I hope so. I have urged the new Minister of National Revenue to give very serious consideration to a remission order with respect to back years, but the decision has not been made yet.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Minister. I have next on the list Mr. McLaughlin.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I would like to say I am glad to see that between now and when the Minister met with us in Hay River, that he looks a lot happier and in a lot better health than he was then and that I am glad that remaining in this portfolio has done that for him. I hope that the Minister will remain in this portfolio and I am sure all Members would urge the Prime Minister to maintain Mr. Munro in this portfolio.

---Applause

#### NCPC Costs And The Penner Report

Mr. Chairman, I have a specific request in the question I have to the Minister. He has alluded to the fact that this federal government is now very open to us taking on more responsibilities. A great concern in my community right now, where Pine Point Mines Limited mines base metals, lead and zinc, and with the present demand for lead-zinc being so poor, there is a problem in my constituency, which will become a problem for all of the people of the Northwest Territories very shortly. Specifically it has to do with the overhead that that mine has to operate under, given

the difficulties with the economic demand for their product right now. The ore body there is vast and has high grade ore and many years reserves when the price of lead-zinc is under normal conditions, but right now one of the major overheads there is power. The Northern Canada Power Commission, which is a federal crown corporation, is one of the biggest difficulties this mine has to deal with right now. I think the Minister is aware that 120 per cent of the cost to operate the Talston dam is borne by the mine, plus they are also charged for the energy as they use it. When the mine went on a big cost-saving kick over a year ago to try to cut down their overhead, NCPC jacked up their rates in order to make sure they took the same amount of revenue from Pine Point Mines Limited and then subsequently, this June, they hit them with another 19 per cent. This is enough, Mr. Chairman, to probably be one of the major contributing factors to the possible shut-down of the concentrator at Pine Point if the price of lead-zinc does not rise, and it is not likely to during this winter. I would like to ask you, Mr. Minister, if you would push in cabinet full approval of the Penner report on NCPC to turn over to this government a debt-free crown corporation so that we can operate the electrical distribution in the Northwest Territories for all our residents, because, I tell you, Mr. Minister, that if Pine Point mine does remove its demand for power at its concentrator, there will not be any profits at the Taltson dam to subsidize all the diesel generators in the Northwest Territories. I would like to see you address to the cabinet as soon as possible the urgency to follow through on the Penner report, to turn NCPC over to the Yukon and the Northwest Territories governments.

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

HON. JOHN MUNRO: Well, I am just wondering, Mr. Chairman, if I could not take that as a representation, Mr. McLaughlin. You see, the Penner report is falling into the overall cabinet document that I will be next taking into cabinet, dealing with the whole second phase of the energy strategy for the North that we have worked on through our mutual task forces here in the Territories, with the federal government. The Penner report will be considered in that context, for the longer term solutions. The first phase, as you are aware, was the continued subsidization programs of the federal government. Then we moved off and we have continued those programs and then we moved off to the northern benefits, which have continued, which is supposed to be of some help in meeting that increased cost, at least at the consumer level. Now the Penner report calls for just one item, the wipe out of \$200 million of debt. That will cost the federal government another \$17 million or \$18 million in interest payments a year, plus many other items. It is a desirable thing -- no question about it -- but it is another very significant cost item that we have to rank in the priorities of the two things the Territories have on their plate that they want us to finance. We are already developing quite a shopping list here tonight. So it is just really in the whole financial package in terms of the envelope system and how much money we can altogether get out of the system -- is part of the answer. The other is we have to formulate the Hart decision in that essential phase of the energy document -- that we have to get a decision on that federally.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to speak in Inuktitut.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): By all means, Mr. Pudluk.

#### Arctic Islands And Federal Boundary Line

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am not very happy about the boundaries issue. There are three boundary lines drawn up here, the West and ITC's boundary line and the federal government's boundary line for the Territories. I wrote a letter to the Minister. Maybe he has not received it. Maybe he can answer me later or some other time. In the statement he made a little while ago, he said that the federal government would not mind if they draw up new boundary lines, but the boundary line that was drawn up by the federal government involved the Arctic Islands. The boundary line is drawn right by my settlement. The two settlements up there have a concern in the future as to where we are going to be. What was the feeling of the federal government about boundary issues? I would like to ask him: What was your reason for drawing up the boundary lines in the Arctic Islands? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Pudluk. Mr. Minister.

HON. JOHN MUNRO: Mr. Pudluk, I do not know what you exactly mean by drawing up the boundaries on the Arctic Islands.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: On that report I saw three -- two lines which were drawn by the federal government and ITC. I think the federal government tried to preserve those Arctic Islands. I think you got my question wrong.

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

HON. JOHN MUNRO: Well, thank you. Mr. Pudluk, I would like to talk to you about this line that you are referring to, if I may, without taking up the entire -- because I am not sure what line you are referring to in terms of the High Arctic. It is possible -- there is no final determination being made, but it is possible that the federal government would want to -- in terms of the very High Arctic, we would want to keep jurisdiction, if that is what you mean, but there is no finality to that and I am not aware of any line.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Mr. Chairman, I just wanted some clarification. The people that dealt with the division of the Territories -- the report that they have published states -- I just wanted to understand what the lines were about. Maybe the lines were not there -- maybe if the federal government had something else in mind, maybe they would not have drawn up the lines. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Minister, I think he is referring to the impact committee's report. They had a bunch of lines all over three different proposals, but nothing was finalized. Mr. Minister.

HON. JOHN MUNRO: The Commissioner is indicating to me that the lines that Mr. Pudluk was referring to, were not federal lines - but, in any event, Mr. Pudluk, would you please let me talk to you bilaterally, and see if I cannot settle it with you?

MR. PUDLUK: Sure.

HON. JOHN MUNRO: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Minister. As the last speaker I have on my list -- now, I just wondered if we could thank the Minister for his time, and if the Sergeant-at-Arms would escort him out?

---Applause

Is it agreed at this time that we report progress?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Qujannamiik.

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Fraser.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF POLICY STATEMENT OF THE HON. JOHN MUNRO, PC, MP

MR. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been considering the presentation by the Hon. John Munro, Minister of Indian Affairs, and wish to report this matter concluded.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Fraser. We have exceeded our sitting hours. There are still items on the order paper.

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Forget it.

MR. SPEAKER: What is your desire?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Prorogation.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I have one important motion I would hope could be dealt with quickly.

MR. SPEAKER: Inasmuch as we are beyond our sitting hours, do I have unanimous consent to continue sitting?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: We have a nay. Unanimous consent has been refused. The other alternative is that we can sit on Monday.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, prorogation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: Will I have a quorum? Will those indicate by raising their hands -- those that would be present on Monday to complete the business of the House? It is obvious that we will not have a quorum. Mr. Clerk, will you see if the Commissioner is ready for prorogation?

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order!

Commissioner's Closing Remarks

COMMISSIONER PARKER: Please be seated. Mr. Speaker, Members of the Legislative Assembly, I would like to reassure you that I have only very brief remarks to make. You have had a long and interesting evening. I must, though, take this opportunity, because it is the last opportunity before this House that I will have to pass along my tribute to William Henry Remnant, otherwise known as Binx Remnant.

AN HON. MEMBER: William?!

AN HON. MEMBER: Henry?!

Tribute To Mr. Remnant

COMMISSIONER PARKER: I have heard in this House excellent and deserving tribute for Mr. Remnant, noting his hard work, the long hours that he has put in, and his great dedication. In addition to all of those things, he is tremendously thorough. He has very considerable ability, which he has displayed on many occasions. He has shown that he can change with the times. He has grown with the Legislature -- not upwards, fortunately.

---Laughter

He has grown in stature with the Legislature. He has recognized the changes in this House. He should be, and I am sure he is, proud of his long service. He is taking a step up to a provincial house. Things just might be a bit more routine there than they are here, and I am sure that he will miss the kinds of surprises that have been thrust on him from time to time. My very best wishes to Binx and to Mamie in their new location.

I would like to remind Members that consensus is a two-way street.

MRS. SORENSEN: Hear, hear!

COMMISSIONER PARKER: Give and take -- well, I would like to underline the give and the take, and we have a lot of both. Consensus is a fragile thing, but until it is replaced we must all work hard to make it work. You have come close to the breaking point a time or two at this session, but fortunately consideration for others -- not restraint, but consideration for others, supported by some good humour, has so far saved the day -- but I must underline the fact that if you are going to make it work you have to keep on working at it, and you must continue to consider the view of the other person.

This has been a busy and productive session, and you should not forget that. You have passed important legislation as a result of hard work done by committees. You have modified somewhat the report on education, and you must realize that you have placed a heavy burden on the Executive Committee and the administration, but it is a burden that they must accept and will accept. In addition, the Executive Committee and the administration must deliver on its promise of assistance to employees of hamlets and housing associations, and so forth.

The Hon. John Munro has made important statements today. Likely, these will be viewed in the future as historic statements. The ball has been placed in our own northern court. We ourselves must fashion the kind of government we want: perhaps this is the most important thing that was said today. The people of the North must deliver. I, for one, believe that this can be done, and that the people will rise to the occasion.

Time And Place Of Next Session

I would like to advise you that the next session of this House will convene in Yellowknife on January 26th, 1983.

ITEM NO. 16: PROROGATION

As Commissioner of the Northwest Territories, I prorogue this session of the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories.

---Applause

---PROROGATION

**INTERNAL**

In-service Library  
1st Floor Laing Bldg. ✓



Available from the  
Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories,  
Yellowknife, N.W.T. at 50c per day, \$5.00 per session and \$12.50 per year.  
Published under the Authority of the Commissioner  
of the Northwest Territories