



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

**10th Session**

**9th Assembly**

**HANSARD**

Official Report

**DAY 12**

**THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1983**

**Pages 387 to 416**

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 OT0  
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)

Cournoyey, Ms. Nellie J., M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 1184  
Inuvik, N.W.T.  
XOE OT0  
Office 979-3510  
Home 979-2740  
(Western Arctic)

Evaluarjuk, Mr. Mark, M.L.A.  
Igloodiik, 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

Patterson, The Hon. Dennis G., M.L.A.  
Box 310  
Frobisher Bay, N.W.T.  
XOA OH0  
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

Wray, Mr. Gordon L., M.L.A.  
General Delivery  
Baker Lake, N.W.T.  
XOC OAO  
Home 793-2700  
(Keewatin North)

## Officers

Acting Clerk  
Mr. David M. Hamilton  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

Acting Clerk Assistant (Procedures)  
Mrs. Susan Baldwin  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

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

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

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

17 February 1983

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	387
Returns	387
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Bill 1-83(1) Appropriation Ordinance, 1983-84	
- Department of Renewable Resources	388
Report of the Committee of the Whole of:	
- Bill 1-83(1) Appropriation Ordinance, 1983-84	415
Orders of the Day	415

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1983

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Appaqaq, Mr. Arlooktoo, Hon. George Braden, Hon. Tom Butters, Mr. Curley, Ms Cournoyea, Mr. Evaluarjuk, Mr. Fraser, Mr. MacQuarrie, Hon. Arnold McCallum, Mr. McLaughlin, Hon. Richard Nerysoo, Hon. Dennis Patterson, Mr. Pudluk, Mr. Sayine, Mr. Sibbeston, Mrs. Sorensen, Mr. Wray

ITEM NO. 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Fraser): I would like to recognize in the gallery, Dr. Harrison, chairman of the Science Advisory Board of the Northwest Territories, and the board members.

---Applause

Orders of the day.

Item 2, Members' replies.

Item 3, oral questions.

Item 4, written questions. Item 5, returns. Returns, Mr. Patterson.

ITEM NO. 5: RETURNS

Return To Question 25-83(1): Cape Dorset Radio Society

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a return to oral Question 25-83(1), asked by Mr. Arlooktoo on February 11th. The Department of Information has not yet received an application from the Cape Dorset Radio Society for a 1982-83 community radio grant. The grant is issued on a fiscal year basis, so the society is still eligible for a \$5000 grant up to March 31, 1983. They become eligible for another \$5000 grant beginning in April for fiscal year 1983-84. The department has communicated by telephone with the Cape Dorset Radio Society. They will be sending their application right away. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Item 5, returns. Are there any other returns? Mr. McCallum.

Return To Question 2-83(1): Funds For Water Pipeline Maintenance, Cape Dorset

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I have two returns. Return to oral Question 2-83(1), asked by Mr. Arlooktoo on February 3rd, concerning the water pipeline in Cape Dorset. I have the following reply: The community water supply pipeline was put out of service in late December 1982, as a result of the electrical power cable being damaged by a gunshot. A transformer replacement was subsequently required and had to be specially built. The line was out of service for about six weeks. It has been repaired at a cost of \$35,000 and is now back in operation. A continuous supply of water was provided by trucked service when the line was not operating. The Department of Public Works routinely budgets maintenance funds for all works. In 1983-84, \$5000 is proposed for maintenance of the water pipeline.

The Cape Dorset water supply system has been providing reliable and continuous service since 1972. The Department of Public Works has planned a normal 10 year analysis of the system, including the water supply line for the summer of 1983. Study results will contain recommendations for any renovations required to the system. These would be programmed through the normal capital planning process.

Return To Question 30-83(1): Building Of Bridge At Little Buffalo River

Mr. Speaker, I have a further reply to oral Question 30-83(1) that was asked by Mr. Sayine on February 15th. He is not here but I would like to read it into the record regardless and he would be able to get the answer. It concerns the bridge for Little Buffalo River. The response previously given when this question was asked in October 1980 was on the basis of the road reconstruction program being funded at the rate of about \$10 million per year at the time of transfer of the program from the federal government. The level of funding is currently much less than this figure and it is uncertain that there will be a significant increase at the time of the program transfer from the federal government. The bridge has been programmed for 1984 but its construction in 1984 will depend on the level of funding obtained from the federal government. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. McCallum. Mr. Patterson.

Further Return To Question 29-83(1): Comments Of Frobisher Bay Principal On CBC Radio

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Tuesday, February 15, the honourable Member for Keewatin North raised serious objections to comments made by Malcolm Farrow, principal of GREC at Frobisher Bay. Mr. Farrow has advised me that he regrets his remarks and apologizes to Mr. Wray for ascribing political motives to his statement made during the Education debate. A letter of reprimand is being sent to Mr. Farrow by the Commissioner concerning his intemperate remarks. The comments arose from the deep concern for education programs felt by the principal and members of his staff who are dedicated to providing the best possible education to the students in their school. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson.

Item 6, Ministers' statements.

Item 7, petitions.

Item 8, reports of standing and special committees.

Item 9, tabling of documents.

Item 10, notices of motion.

Item 11, notices of motion for first reading of bills.

Item 12, motions.

Item 13, first reading of bills.

Item 14, second reading of bills. Item 15, consideration in committee of the whole of bills, recommendations to the Legislature and other matters.

ITEM NO. 15: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS, RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE LEGISLATURE AND OTHER MATTERS

Bill 1-83(1), Bill 6-83(1), Bill 7-83(1), Bill 8-83(1), Bill 9-83(1), Bill 10-83(1), Bill 11-83(1), Bill 12-83(1). We will move into committee of the whole with Mr. Pudluk in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL 1-83(1), APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1983-84

Department Of Renewable Resources

Total O And M, Wildlife Service

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Now this committee will come to order. Mr. Minister. Mr. Nerysoo. Do you wish to invite your deputy minister?

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: No. I will have them invited back in after the motion has been dealt with.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. There was a motion on the floor at the time we left yesterday. I am going to ask the Clerk to read it again.

Motion To Express Loss Of Confidence In Government Wildlife Biologists, Restated

CLERK ASSISTANT (Mrs. Baldwin): Whereas false information provided by the Government of the Northwest Territories wildlife biologists regarding the Kaminuriak herd has misled people of the Keewatin and this Assembly for years regarding the exact size of the herd; now therefore, I move that this Assembly express its loss of confidence to those wildlife biologists that have carried out the caribou surveys for this government without consulting the users of the herds in the Keewatin communities.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. We are on page 11.06, wildlife service. To the motion. Mr. Minister.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: I would just like to clarify a couple of things -- as a result of the motion that has been suggested by Mr. Curley. In the comments that were made by Mr. Wray, Mr. Curley and Ms Cournoyea with regard to the Baker Lake case, the people associated with that particular case are no longer associated with this government. They have not been associated with this government since I became Minister of Renewable Resources.

The other thing I think that people have to realize is that with the expertise and with the biologists we have on staff to date, we have been able to come to agreements on a number of issues. Firstly, with the staff, with the present deputy minister, we have been able to support the agreement in principle on wildlife management reached between the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada and the federal government.

---Applause

The other thing is that we have been able to work out a working relationship with the Keewatin people by the formation of the wildlife federation. We were involved in promoting a majority participation of native people on the caribou management board, and we were successful in that. So I think I would be honest in stating that our recognition of the role of native people and my staff's recognition of that, is important in the direction that we are going. I would also like to state that I have every confidence in the work of my staff particularly in light of the past three years and the working relationship that I have been able to develop with them, and the work and the expertise that they have been able to give to me to make -- in some cases not positive decisions, but at least decisions that reflected the kinds of work that have been carried out. With regard to the numbers, I think we have of course had a major increase over the past year but it has been the staff that we have now on hand that are doing the work and we have improved our own capabilities.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. To the motion. Mr. Curley.

Newspaper Articles Re Declining Caribou Herds Quoted

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not want to prolong the debate on this motion but I would just like to again point out to the committee here that when the image of the native people was slowly declining and being abused by the wildlife biologists, in terms of putting the blame on the native people for the decline of the herds in the NWT, the government and its officials remained silent. They did not attempt to refute the accusation that was put on the native people. As a result, today we have difficulty getting back the credibility and the integrity that used to exist among the native people with respect to their relationship with nature and the wildlife.

Two sessions ago, December 1981, William Noah was quoted in the paper and it says here, "An MLA for Keewatin North strongly criticized the territorial government last Wednesday for misleading the Legislative Assembly about the decline of the Kaminuriak caribou herd." Mr. Noah was replying to the Commissioner, John Parker's opening Address to the fourth session of the Ninth Assembly. He said there was no evidence of decline in the Keewatin herd and he believed statements to that effect made by the territorial government director of Renewable Resources were politically motivated. So I would just like to indicate that there was at that time an expression of dissatisfaction.

When I look at some of the press coverage of the herds, Vancouver Sun, May 10, 1982, the headline is, "Death of Once Vast Caribou Herd Predicted if Kill Rate Continues", and it says that Cormack Gates says, "Inuit hunters of the Keewatin face a tough choice -- restrict the hunt and suffer shortages or hunt to heart's content until the whole Kaminuriak herd is dead. If you take the conservation approach, the annual caribou harvest will no longer meet basic needs and the slack will have to be taken up by the government departments, such as Social Services."

Mr. Chairman, I am just giving you some of the examples that have resulted as a result of the campaign. Here is the Edmonton Journal on March 29, 1982. The headline says, "Overhunting Shortens Caribou". These clippings are available for anybody who wants to read them. Then on the other news clipping, I believe this was News/North, the question is, "Is the Kaminuriak Herd Declining?" In that article William Noah is again quoted as having "disagreed with the position taken by the wildlife service".

So, Mr. Chairman, I just want to indicate to the House that we must do something about this problem, if we are to try and gain back for the native people the respect and credibility that once was there. Unless we address that and deal directly with the problem that we have been made to believe -- was the information and inaccurate wild estimates that the wildlife people used to give to us.

In the Globe and Mail, June 29, 1982, the headline reads, "Caribou Herds in Crisis" and it says in the opening remarks, "Yellowknife. The blame is thrown around wildly, with emotional stories and stupidity on both sides. 'The natives just run them down with their snowmobiles', snorts a white miner in disgust." The latter part of that article states "The Kaminuriak herd in the Eastern Arctic is the hardest hit, down to fewer than 40,000 animals, just from a high of 150,000 in the mid 1950s." I am just using a few examples here, Mr. Chairman, to try and at least put the blame exactly where it should be applied.

#### Knowledge And Experience Of Hunters In Communities Must Be Taken Seriously

In the Caribou News, published October 1982, one of the original wildlife biologists, Dr. Frank Banfield, who is now the director of the Museum of Natural Sciences in Ottawa was interviewed and I think his reaction to some of these wild estimates is very interesting because, although he did indicate in that article that there have been great improvements in the techniques as far as the surveys are concerned, he says that over the years the actual field technique has not changed that much. So I would like to quote from what he said in respect of the Kaminuriak herd, and I quote: "If they got the Kaminuriak herd to jump from 39,000 to 134,000, well obviously they came from somewhere else or previous estimates were very much out. What is questionable is what you do not know about a herd. Maybe you do not know where they calve. For the herd north of Wager Bay, I do not think they really know very well where they calve. It is an open topic." He went on to say, "There has been a difference of opinion between caribou biologists and the Inuit people from Baker Lake as to the status of these caribou north of Chesterfield Inlet. They have not been that well studied that any caribou biologist would claim he knew for sure what the story was."

So I think these are interesting Mr. Chairman, because not only do the Inuit now disagree with the way the surveys are conducted -- and I just wanted to make a reference to Dr. Banfield. He was the first biologist to discover the Kaminuriak calving grounds in 1948. At that time I think they were estimated to be over 100,000 -- 150,000 or so, and he went on to say something about the native people, and I quote, "Native people told me they calve there." As a result of that information he went and found out something about the calving ground. "Quite often the native people know where they are or have a good idea." So, Mr. Chairman, I think we must get serious about this particular concern, because if we do not do something about it we are going to continue to have a very, very real problem in getting credibility back to the people we want to work with in the Territories.

I also found some very interesting statistics provided to the Eighth Assembly by Dr. George Calef when he made a presentation on January 24, 1979, but the overwhelming concern was the Keewatin area because he believed that herd was declining for the last 10 years. The figures that he gave to the Assembly at that time were not at all disputed by any Member of the Legislature, and I would think that all these reports should be reassessed and put into much more reflective and -- if at all possible -- proper perspective so that we will not again ever have to put a wild guess on information provided by the wildlife biologists, because he claimed that out of the 40,000 Keewatin Kaminuriak herd that 16,000 are killed each year. I say that is a wild guess. I would

say that it really would be safer to say about 5000, but to assume that 16,000 of them are killed, including the hunts as well as the environment, the weather, wolves and whatnot, seems to be a little wild. So in that respect I think this Assembly deserves to try and correct the misleading information that reflects on the native people. I for one would like that expression of displeasure and, for all I am concerned, loss of confidence be put on the proper people, where it should be given.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like the other Members of the Assembly to express their support to this motion. Although the scientific studies of biologists will possibly continue to be carried out for years ahead I would say that the knowledge, experience and information that is presently in the communities with the elders and the hunters should also be taken seriously. Although we like the words, "consult with them", I think "consulting" is normally really too broad. I think there must be a real program established to allow the senior people in the community an opportunity to express their views in the proper forum, like we normally do with the Science Advisory Board: it is formal, it is recognized, it is acceptable. What we have with "consult the native people", is a wide-open door, you could maybe telephone to one person and you could call it a consultation -- "an extensive consultation". We are going to have to do better than that if we are going to gain back the respect we would like to have in the Territories. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. To the motion. Mr. Wray.

#### Proper Time To Make Public Statements

MR. WRAY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just one final short comment. I think perhaps what the Minister can do immediately to start to gain some of the credibility back on both sides is to make sure that no officials of his department, or indeed no people who are on contract to the department, make public statements or make accusations in the press...

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. WRAY: ...until we get the techniques straightened out, until we have the proper forums for consultation and until people generally are satisfied that, yes, this is the right information and these are the right numbers. They should not be taken into a public forum because when you take them into a public forum all that happens is that extreme positions are taken on both sides. One side says they are right and the other side says they are wrong. When you get that kind of situation it makes it very difficult for people to work together to try and reach a resolution. I think what has to be understood is that there is nobody more concerned with the caribou herds than the people of the Keewatin because their survival as a culture and their survival in general depends on the healthy state of those herds. So the stake for them is much higher than for anybody else. I think the biologists have to appreciate that and they have to understand that the people have concerns and ideas. They have very valid concerns and there should be an attempt to reach a mutual agreement before people start running to the press and the newspapers and making statements which will get us nowhere. So I think the Minister would agree that, to start with, we take this out of the public forum and we put it into the communities and into the hearing rooms where it should be and then perhaps we can start to work together to reach a solution and to find an answer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to express my concern on this issue, as I did November 2nd in my reply to the Commissioner's Address, when I noted that a recent issue of Caribou News had shown the Kaminuriak herd to be in a very healthy state. The estimate there was 105,000 to 158,000 and I said at that time that this was good news. It pointed out the need for biologists and scientists to give the proper credibility and the proper credence to the users of this resource. I agree totally with Mr. Wray and other Members that this government and the scientific community must acknowledge that the users of the caribou resource are those that have the greatest interest in its preservation and conservation and I think since the Baker Lake Kaminuriak issue of only a few years ago, we have made some considerable progress in coming around to this viewpoint.

#### Scientific Community Must Work In Partnership With Northern Experts

I can just cite a few examples within my own experience. Our government, Renewable Resources department, is supporting a harvesting study being done in Baffin region by the users, on the



basis that it is those users who have the most knowledge about animals being taken and have the most interest in monitoring that. This, I think, is the model that will be followed elsewhere in gathering kill data. I also think, Mr. Chairman, that our new deputy minister of Renewable Resources is a hunter and a trapper and a practical man and I was encouraged yesterday to hear him say that he had a healthy scepticism about letting scientists completely dictate the state of renewable resources in the Northwest Territories. I think this is a very positive development, that we have a northern person with that kind of experience directing those scientists. I have always worried about the possible tyranny of experts who tend sometimes to get too intoxicated with their own discipline and their own expertise and their own jargon and I think it is vital that this Assembly state very clearly to scientists and biologists operating in the Northwest Territories that their work must be tempered with reality, common sense and co-operation with the northern experts on these resources.

I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, with reference to this motion, that I suppose I have some difficulties about the value of condemning people who have now gone. I think we all recognize that studies are needed, provided there is a proper partnership between the scientific community and the users and my view is that we should think positively and express our support for wildlife research provided that those responsible do consult with, respect and work in partnership with those who have the greatest interest in the resource.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: I have no hesitation in supporting that principle and I am very pleased that it was raised by Keewatin Members because I think we should be pleased that the biologists were wrong. I think we can clearly accept that. I am not sure for what reasons; my own view is that it may well be that there was not enough data around in those days and biologists were operating on the basis of limited information, not only making what now appear to be erroneous conclusions but they made those conclusions without consulting the experts. I have myself spoken many times to elders from Baffin and Keewatin who have told me exactly why the biologists underestimated the population. The herds moved north. It is now well-known. I think the Inuit have been vindicated.

I would be a little bit hesitant about condemning biologists out of hand or even condemning the current biologists that are working for Renewable Resources because I do believe that science does play an important role in conservation. However, I fully support the sentiments that have led to this motion and I think now is the time to positively look at profiting from this unfortunate experience. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Detail On Past 10 Years Estimates Of Caribou Numbers

MR. MACQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I take this matter very seriously. In listening yesterday to the implications that have resulted from statistical surveys, implications that were outlined quite thoroughly by Ms Cournoyea, I appreciate the very deep seriousness of the matter. The motion calls information that was provided by wildlife biologists in the past, false and misleading, and in some of the supporting debate Members have stated that at times wildlife biologists were advocating certain measures. Now if the information is false and if there was neglect, failure to do a job thoroughly and so on, the implications have been serious and something serious should be done about it. I can also see that there is an assumption on the part of those who have declared support for the motion at the moment that all the previous years estimates have been erroneous and that most recent estimate is accurate. Therefore I would like to ask the Minister to give us more detail on the past several years estimates and how the most recent estimate was arrived at and since there is anomaly, a great discrepancy, how the Minister explains that discrepancy?

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

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: I do not have at the moment, all the information that Mr. MacQuarrie requires regarding the past statistics but I do know that the survey of the past year indicated a major increase in the Kaminuriak caribou herd. As was indicated yesterday there are still assessments being done with regard to that particular survey, I think mainly to try to interpret the rationale for the increase -- whether or not the Wager Bay caribou herd moved into the area or what other factors led to the major increase. That is basically what is being done right at the moment and it is being done not only by the officials in my department but jointly with other caribou biologists in other jurisdictions across Canada.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Supplementary, Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: With respect to the Minister, I find the answer rather vague and I would appreciate figures from 1973, a 10 year run -- it would not take long. Here was the estimate, here was the estimate, here was the estimate, then this years estimate and how did they make it and is it possible that it is in error? I would just like to hear specific explanations of those. This is not an attempt to defend but if there are not adequate answers, I think it is a serious matter too, so I would like to hear the answers to those questions.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: I think if you are looking for additional information I would be prepared to provide that information and to provide you with the manner in which the surveys were carried out and the mechanisms used for surveys as well. But to ask me how to identify or how to interpret that -- I am not the biologist and I am not the one that has done the survey. I would be prepared to provide that information to you as quickly as we can put it together.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: If you are unable to answer the question I would at least appreciate being able to ask someone who can answer the question. Certainly I would want that information before I vote on the motion.

MR. CURLEY: Point of order.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): A point of order, Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: The motion is dealing with the expression of this Assembly's loss of confidence and I do not really believe that an ordinary Member from Yellowknife Centre should be interested in obtaining -- he can do so during the regular question period or he can request information on the last 10 years results even after the motion has been dealt with. I do not think his question is related to the motion at all.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): The way I heard it, he wants the information from that file that was regarding this motion also. Do you have a further question, Mr. MacQuarrie?

MR. CURLEY: To the motion.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Well, I am not clear and I am being asked to express a loss of confidence in certain officials and I find it preposterous for somebody to tell me that I must not have access to information that can help me to determine whether I should have a loss of confidence in those officials or not. Surely that is unheard of in an Assembly like this and I know the Members who are suggesting that would not tolerate it in any other area. Why should I have a loss of confidence? I have to hear more information.

MR. CURLEY: Where have you been?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): To the motion. Mr. McCallum.

Amendment To Motion To Express Loss Of Confidence In Government Wildlife Biologists

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move an amendment to the motion. First, in the "whereas" clause, the second word, the word "false", I would move an amendment to delete the word "false" and replace it with the word "incomplete". Secondly, in the operative part of the motion the phrase "loss of confidence", I would like to replace it with the word "displeasure". Finally, Mr. Chairman, after the words "from the Keewatin communities", I would add another part to the operative part of the motion, "and further that this Assembly urge the Minister of Renewable Resources to ensure that all future research on the Kaminuriak herd is carried out in consultation with the people of the Keewatin communities who are the users of the herd."

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): The amendment is in order. To the amendment. Do you want to speak to your amendment, Mr. McCallum?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to belabour the point but I think that from the comments that have been made we are talking about what has occurred in the past. It very well may have been that there has been an overzealousness on the part of people. I think now that, as has already been referred to, there is a much better arrangement between the people of the Keewatin and other parts of the Territories and this government through its Renewable

Resources department. I think that the amendment expresses the committee's concern and with the operative part that I added to the motion, and knowing full well the personnel within the department itself will ensure that we are going to, as a government and as people within the service, deal properly with people who are using the herd. So I would call for the question.

MR. CURLEY: Hear, hear!

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): To the amendment. Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, the question I have is whether or not deleting the essential part of the resolution part, "loss of confidence", changes the intent of the motion. That "loss of confidence" means that you do not have any more confidence in them; whereas "displeasure" is rather just saying that I am disappointed because of a statement. I just would like you to explain to me whether or not that part of the amendment does change the original intent of the motion or not. I am not challenging your decision, I just want clarification in that from you.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): A point of order, Mr. McCallum?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the Member has asked you to reply to it but perhaps I could give the intent. The original motion was found to be in order. I think that what I am attempting to do to some degree is to make it less onerous, but the intent was still there.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): That is correct. The motion was in order and my ruling is the amendment is in order also. To the amendment, honourable Member for Mackenzie Liard. To the amendment.

#### Confrontation Between Southern Education And Northern Knowledge

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, the amendment certainly waters down the initial intent of the motion but if the people in question -- the game biologists and people like this -- are no longer here, it is no use. There is not much you can do to them. I guess this whole situation points out something that the native people have been very conscious about in the North. It is true. Formally educated people, with fancy degrees and so forth coming in from the South are given so much respect and weight by government and society in the South. This is the case it seems in all areas of life in the North. Oftentimes, people from the South with formal education and so forth are given so much more credit than people of the North who are not formally educated but have a life of experience. In matters of game, wildlife and land, I think it has to be recognized that people in the North, particularly native people, do know something. Obviously they know something because they have survived for thousands of years.

MR. CURLEY: Hear, hear!

MR. SIBBESTON: Oftentimes these people from the South with fancy degrees have resources and the weight of government to back them up and local people do not. It happens in all areas of life in the North because really what we have had in the last 50 years probably is a confrontation between southern education and knowledge, as opposed to that of the North. Oftentimes white people from the South with formal education are given more credit and weight and so win out when put beside a non-formally educated person from the North. It seems that for once it has been discovered that this supposedly smart man from the South has been found to be wrong and the people of the North were right.

As Mr. Wray indicated, the community of Baker Lake has suffered. They have lost a court case in the sense -- it is hard to say whether it was simply on this matter of caribou or not, but obviously they have been greatly and adversely affected by the information provided by wildlife officers who apparently worked for this government at the time. So in a sense these people from the South, smart educated people, have been wrong and in a sense have been caught for once when they were wrong, and the northern people were right. A certain amount of damage has been done.

I guess what we are obviously dealing with here is trying to right a wrong. Whether this motion and this amendment goes through, I think that this government owes it to the people of the North and to the people of Baker Lake, to try to correct a wrong. Certainly, the people that were involved may not be here; you cannot do much to them, you cannot fire them, but they should be fired in absentia, maybe. I do think this government should go to Baker Lake and publicly say

that they are sorry and if they have in any way been responsible for the people losing their court case, that this government should apologize. That would maybe ease the injustice or the hurts certainly that have been caused by the information provided by this government. That is the sort of thing that should be done.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. To the amendment. Mrs. Sorensen.

Proper Facts Must Be Provided

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I view myself as somewhat of a more neutral or objective person...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh, oh!

MRS. SORENSEN: ...with respect to the debate that is going on on the floor. I admit that I know very little about the hunting and trapping industry and even less about the wildlife surveys and the role of the biologists. What I do know however, is that even the paper from which Mr. Curley quoted in order to substantiate and support his case for this motion, stated that the reason for the increase in the Kaminuriak herd was either that the native people were right in their earlier counts or that there was an in-migration of the caribou from another herd.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): A point of order, Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Member is speaking to the motion as a whole and I believe she should be speaking to the amendment.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): That is correct. To the amendment.

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking to the amendment in that I am saying that I am not prepared to vote for an amendment that has us show displeasure or has us agreeing that information we have been provided for, has been incomplete. I say that if this amendment passes showing our displeasure with the wildlife biologists work, then we will be doing exactly what some Members have been accusing the biologists of having done in the past -- that is, jumping to conclusions before we perhaps have all the facts. I am still not convinced that the Kaminuriak herd has been incorrectly counted. I need that additional information.

MR. CURLEY: What for?

MRS. SORENSEN: Perhaps it has been due to an in-migration.

MR. PATTERSON: From where?

MR. CURLEY: Since when do you want that information?

MRS. SORENSEN: I think that as a responsible Legislature we have the responsibility to allow the Minister to carry out the studies to find out whether there was, in fact, an in-migration or whether counts were wrong that have been made in the previous years. So Mr. Chairman, I just cannot vote in a responsible manner on this -- in support of this amendment -- nor can I vote in support of the motion as it stands. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. To the amendment. Mr. Fraser.

MR. FRASER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I am not sure of the way the discussion is going now. I think we have to stick to the amendment, but could we get copies of the motion as amended?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Let us take a coffee break.

MR. FRASER: Translated copies too?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): And translated.

---SHORT RECESS

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): This committee will come back to order. I believe everybody has a copy of that amendment now. To the amendment. Are you ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Question has been called. Mr. Curley.

Amendment To Amendment To Motion To Express Loss Of Confidence In Government Wildlife Biologists

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the amendment. It is in the last paragraph to delete four words on the fifth line, the words "in consultation with the". Delete those four words and replace them with the words "includes Inuit".

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): The amendment to the amendment is in order. To the amendment to the amendment. Okay, we are going to ask Mr. Clerk to read it.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): The amendment to the amendment is in the fifth line of the third part of Mr. McCallum's amendment and is to take out the words "in consultation with the" and replace them with "includes Inuit". It would read, "herd is carried out includes Inuit people of the Keewatin".

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mr. Clerk. To the amendment to the amendment. Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I indicated earlier that "consultation" was too broad; a word that could be abused and which has been subject to abuse by many of the good-intentioned experts of the North. I think that if there is to be a proper future research on the Kaminuriak herd then it has to include Inuit people; consultation alone is not good enough.

So I think on that basis, to strike out the consultation and replace it with the fact that research should be carried out including Inuit people, is much better than to just consult with them. Mr. Chairman, consultation alone has not worked and it has never been effective. There have been research studies going on in terms of the wildlife in the region. It has not proven the best possible notion of properly dealing with the native people. So I think that to include them in research -- that is really, actually -- would ensure that they at least get the satisfaction out of the research carried out in the area, particularly when it deals with the herd which is the main source for the people in that area.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. To the amendment to the amendment. Mr. Evaluarjuk.

MR. EVALUARJUK: (Translation) Mr. Chairman, on the amendment to the amendment, I have a question to the mover. The word "Keewatin", would we change it to "the Inuit region"? The amendment is in regard to the Kaminuriak herd; should it be involving the whole of the Northwest Territories? If we replace it with the word "Inuit", that means we will be dealing with the whole of the Northwest Territories. It does not seem to be dealing with the whole of the Northwest Territories so we may have to remove the words "Kaminuriak herd" and replace it with the words "the whole of the Northwest Territories". I just wanted to get a clarification on the amendment. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): (Translation) Mr. Curley, could you clarify yourself? It is probably because the word "Keewatin" is still there. The way I understand it, the people of the Keewatin be included. Do I understand that correctly? Maybe you can clarify it further yourself.

MR. CURLEY: (Translation) The amendment is like this. We are talking about the Kaminuriak caribou herd because the Kaminuriak herd is the one that is declining according to the recent survey by the wildlife officers. If they are going to consult with the people -- if they take out the words "in consultation with the people of the Keewatin" -- removing the word "consultation" and including the words "the people of the Keewatin be included", the amendment that we have made to the amendment -- if you want to include all wildlife, we can make another motion after this motion is passed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): To the amendment to the amendment. Are you ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Amendment To Amendment To Motion To Express Loss Of Confidence In Government Wildlife Biologists,  
Carried

---

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): The question has been called. To the amendment to the amendment. All those in favour, please raise your hands. Down. Opposed? The amendment to the amendment is carried.

---Carried

To the amendment as amended.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Question.

Amendment To Motion To Express Loss Of Confidence In Government Wildlife Biologists, Carried As  
Amended

---

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): The question has been called. To the amendment as amended. The question has been called. All those in favour, please raise your hands. Down. Opposed? The amendment is carried as amended.

---Carried

To the motion. Mr. Patterson. As amended.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say, let us not quibble about numbers. As I see it, several years ago the estimates were 40,000 to 50,000. Is that agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Now the estimates are 100,000 to 150,000. Mrs. Sorensen seems to think that caribou came from Baffin Island -- or from the Bathurst herd -- and suddenly appeared in the Keewatin. The Inuit say the caribou were north of Baker Lake in the Wager Bay area and even up into Melville Peninsula. I believe that is what happened. I believe the biologists did not consider the possibility that the migration patterns could have changed so dramatically. I do not believe that 40,000 or 50,000 caribou suddenly visited the Keewatin this summer from Baffin Island, or from the West. I do not know much more about caribou than Mrs. Sorensen, but I know what I hear from the Inuit and I believe the Inuit. I think what we are doing basically here today is saying more credibility should be given to the experts, the hunters, the people who have lived on that land for 10,000 years.

I think we may not ever be able to get precise information on the numbers but I think we are dealing with a situation where the herd has apparently almost doubled and it is clear in my mind why. It does not have anything to do with any substantial in-migration. It has to do with basic errors of judgment from biologists who may not have been operating with complete scientific information and who may not have given enough credibility to the users of the herd. That is the principle of this motion, and I have no hesitation in supporting it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

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

MR. MacQUARRIE: I am glad it is clear in Mr. Patterson's mind, but it is certainly not clear in my mind. Certain people are being blamed for having had incomplete or false information and errors of judgment and that kind of thing. I am not clear in either case who is being blamed and who is being lauded, but someone else is being lauded for having come up with the correct figure this year.

Mr. Sibbeston put down "smart people from the South" a little while ago because they had certain estimates over the years which he now says are wrong. Well, I would like to know, is it another smart person from the South who this year said that it is a higher estimate? I simply want to know what is the basis for this kind of thing. I am not satisfied that the most recent count is the one that is absolutely correct, although I concede it may very well be. I am not satisfied that all the previous years of research have been wrong but I concede that that is entirely possible.

Request To Bring People Involved In Surveys Into Committee

I am dissatisfied with the Minister's answers to the questions that I put to him a little while ago. If the Minister were to count caribou in the same manner that he gives answers on counting caribou -- incomplete and imprecise as they are -- I would not be very confident in the result that he gave. I asked the Minister to bring in people who have been involved in this, and in some sense who are being smeared, and to give them the opportunity to answer some questions. If he will not do that, I merely ask him why will he not do that, since it is done in every other single department whose estimates we examine. That is a question to the Minister.

MR. CURLEY: To the motion, to the motion.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Let us take 15 minutes for coffee break.

---SHORT RECESS

Order please. Now this committee will come back to order. (Translation) I am going to speak Inuktitut for a moment. The question that Mr. MacQuarrie asked really does not go with the motion or it is not properly phrased. The surveys that have been done in the past, even if they do appear in front of the Members, they would be able to see them. If he saw them himself, I do not think he would believe the results either. I think that he would just go along with the wildlife services surveys or estimates.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Mr. MacQuarrie, point of order.

MR. MacQUARRIE: I believe the Chair should not engage in debate, but make a ruling, and I feel that the Chair is engaging in a debate against my position.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): If you are going to talk to the motion, go ahead. Go on to the motion, then. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Mr. Chairman, I understand that you are disallowing my question. I guess I have to accept that. I certainly do not like it; I do not think that it is a proper ruling. I would hope that the Minister himself -- not necessarily in answering any question that I asked -- on his own initiative would bring in people who could answer some of the questions that I raised. These are: How do experts account for the anomaly? Is it possible we are talking about two different herds, the one in the Wager Bay area and the Kaminuriak herd or just what are the facts in respect of that? That type of thing. There are a number of questions that I feel are important, but I see that I am not likely going to have much success in trying to get at that. It is a sad day for the Assembly when that kind of manoeuvre is used to prevent important information from surfacing.

With respect to the motion, I would say that -- since I cannot find out who reported the anomaly -- I am going to suppose that it is wildlife biologists who are engaged by our department. I would say that that is evidence that I should have some credibility in them if they are honest enough to report something that does not accord with previous findings. That can happen in statistical analysis. It is to their credit that it has surfaced, if that is the case.

Censuring Of Hired Scientific Experts

I would say that if it can be shown that there are people engaged by us in this work over the years who were lazy, incompetent, who did not have a good knowledge about how to go about counting caribou, using the best knowledge that was available, then such people should be censured. If there were people who adopted a political role and advocated certain actions publicly when they were employed by this government, then they should be censured. But if there are people who were sincere and dedicated and worked hard and were using the available scientific knowledge to the best of their ability, then there is no reason at all why they should be censured, and if this Assembly persists in doing it, what is going to happen is that we will be hiring experts who are inclined to give us the kind of answers that we would like to hear rather than the facts as they honestly see them, to the best of their ability, and that will be to the detriment of the Northwest Territories, to the people of the Northwest Territories, including those who are engaged in hunting caribou for a livelihood.

So it is possible under other circumstances that I could support this motion, but if I cannot get the kind of information that is important to me, I absolutely disapprove of voting to censure somebody under those circumstances. To me it is bloody outrageous, and there is no other word for it in my vocabulary; but I will vote against the motion.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Mr. Minister, how long will it take to get that information? Mr. Minister.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: To inform the honourable Member, this particular subject was brought before the Kaminuriak and Beverly management board. They found themselves in a predicament of not really knowing the circumstances of why the major increases did occur. They, themselves, requested the wildlife service of the Northwest Territories to do additional surveys so that they can be provided with additional answers to this particular increase, and they have not made a decision one way or the other as to how they can interpret this. As I mentioned earlier, they have indicated that they require further information. So that is basically the situation to date.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. To the motion as amended. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: One last comment, Mr. Chairman. If such a group has not yet decided how to interpret it, what it means and what should be done about it, then we should not be making a decision like this today, either.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman. Point of order.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): To the motion as amended. Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman. If the Member was listening to the debate yesterday, the motion has cost the image of the native people as a result of the kind of examples we have pointed out yesterday and today, including the Member for Keewatin North and former member for Keewatin North, Mr. Noah. He disagreed and he said publicly within the chamber he did not believe that the caribou herd had declined in the Keewatin region.

There are naturalist organizations that have eventually lobbied the federal government that native people are not capable of managing wildlife in the Territories. That is a result of the statements made by the former wildlife biologists who work for this government and this government never attempted to correct this misleading campaign going on in southern Canada. We are not only interested in the protection of the wildlife officials of this government. The motion is attempting to correct that part of the problem where the blame was stated continually on and on, to be overkill. You read some of the statements made by former officials. You read the presentation by Dr. George Calef to the Eighth Assembly -- the exact date is January 24, 1979. That will give you quite a bit of information of what he knew then. It does not mean that it was incorrect information or not accurate, but he used a lot of figures at that time. Do some research on your own and you will find that there is some information available.

#### Purpose Of The Motion

So this motion is really trying to at least put a stop to -- and this Assembly would support -- the present image that the native people have with respect to wildlife that it is their own fault. It was a deliberate campaign supported by some officials of the government. If we can only resolve that, we will get on to something else. Right now the people in my area, for instance, are not satisfied that the good will intentions that have been expressed are really strong enough unless some action has been taken. This motion attempts to do that. So therefore Mr. Speaker, I believe we can get rid of it quickly and get on with other more pressing matters. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. To the motion as amended. Mr. Fraser.

MR. FRASER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to retract my statement made yesterday. The Minister today made a statement that the people that did the survey are not with us anymore. I believe that it is true. I do not think we can condemn the Minister or his staff for something that is not here -- or is not with us anymore. Those people are gone. I am quite sure that the Minister and his officials would not see that this happens again. They are quite confident that they can keep an upper hand on all surveys done, so I will change my statement from yesterday and vote against the motion.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. To the motion as amended. Ms Cournoyea.



### Understanding Caribou Counts

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I was not going to speak again on this motion mainly because I felt that I had said all there was to say in regard to the effect that the publicity that was made in regard to the Kaminuriak herd and how it affected the people, not only in the Keewatin but in many other parts of the Northwest Territories. Just in terms of the understanding of how herd counts are done, I think I would like to express that it would be good to be able to relay that information, but it is a learning program unto itself. If Mr. MacQuarrie was going to ask about that I think he would spend about six months because it is so varied and it depends on whether you are working under contract for the government or whether the contract is for the oil company. They all do their stuff a little differently. So I do not think that kind of information, with due respect, would really help the decision on this matter because the issue is this. Even saying that the herd was down to 40,000 in population, that in itself alone would probably say, "Well, we counted that." But what happened subsequently and the issue that is coming from this motion and trying to be dealt with, is this. What was done with that information? Who was maligned by the issue? Whose reputation suffered? Consequently, where are we today because of that? With a bad reputation.

Some of these people who are no longer working with this government department are involved, in particular, with the negotiations in regard to the Porcupine caribou herd. They have the representation there and when we want to make the management agreement on that herd, we are still dealing with those people. Those particular people are of no credit to other biologists who have an honour in their profession because some biologists will say, "Just because you have a count this year, with the way the migrations go and the fluctuations of feeding areas, you can never really, unless you have the base line data from a long time ago, substantiate this fluctuation; it depends on weather and everything else." So a good biologist probably would never have made his reputation on a low count and I think that is what we are dealing with. People take an issue and they promote themselves with it and they create hysterics, and they attribute a possible phenomenon to someone else. I believe the same thing happened in Alaska when the herds moved into another area and there was a decline.

### An Issue Of Establishing Reputation

The issue is really not that it was 40,000 and 150,000; it is what was made of that. That reprimand should be publicized so that some of the people who have honour in their profession will not have to put up with the people who flamboyantly use their position and their title to promote themselves in society by using people who do not have the same kind of expertise, know-how and flamboyancy, and the desire for publicity that they have. I think that is the issue that we are dealing with.

It is an issue that gets people jobs. If I was a biologist and I wanted to be well-known -- I am competing with someone else so I have to be known. So if I am receptive, I will build my reputation on that; but there are a lot of people who do not do that. There are a lot of people who do the work and they are very serious about it, but there are some who are not. They are not finished with us because we are dealing with them today; because they are very well-known because of the statements that Mr. Curley referred to, which went all over Canada, and which we will have to deal with in the ongoing issue of how we are going to overcome the projects such as Greenpeace who are massively supplied with vast amounts of money. This issue will continue to come up time and time again. With this kind of reprimand toward that, the learned society of which these people are members, will know who you are talking about. You do not have to name names because they appear in public forums all over the place. They make it a profession to do that. The fact that they are no longer with the territorial government -- the effects of what they have done with the figures will be felt through a great period of time and it will take us a long time to get over these.

I urge you to support this motion, with the intention that this government is no longer going to tolerate that -- and it does not now -- but is displeased with the fact that it actually happened, and the fact that we are going to have to deal with it in our future negotiations. Thank you.

---Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): To the motion as amended. Mr. Arlooktoo.

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) I can support this motion. I am supporting it for this reason. If there was a survey on babies in the settlements, for native people, we would be able to make some reports on their survey and I would understand exactly what is going on, for the Inuit people.

Also, I know that before, in parts of Baffin region there were no caribou at all. Right now there are a lot of caribou in the Baffin region and also I am aware that the Baffin region caribou do not, I think, travel up to Keewatin. If they went to Baffin region to survey caribou the Inuit people would always be notified that there was going to be a survey done in the Baffin region, and I like that idea that they be notified ahead of time. I am supporting this motion for any native people in Keewatin and also I would like to apologize for those people in Keewatin region -- like last June, my friend was involved in that surveying done in the Keewatin region and I heard that there is misleading information on that survey. For those people who were involved in that survey done in the Keewatin, I would like to mention this, even though it is not really to the motion. For those surveys done, that was not really clarified; maybe it was mainly with the Baffin region being told that they have been overkilling caribou. That was around 1968 and that was happening in Baffin region. I do not think that that will be done again and also the hunters and trappers are really supporting this. That is all I have to say. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

Further Study Needed Before Officials May Be Censured

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I have been very moved by the comments of both Mr. Curley and Ms Cournoyea and other Inuit Members, and particularly the comments of Mr. Wray who I think has a very high emotional stake in this issue because, as he said, he spent two and a half years of his life involved in a court case. I am extremely disturbed with the territorial government and the Department of Renewable Resources if what Ms Cournoyea says is true, and if what Mr. Curley says is true. I can agree that if those government employees did exploit their positions, if they did cause the Inuit to be tarnished, if they did cause problems with aboriginal rights negotiations, then I say if that is true then they should be censured, that the department should be censured and that it should be done in this House.

The problem is, the person we have made responsible for the department, Mr. Nerysoo, has indicated to us that further studies have to be done; that we do not know why the herd has suddenly increased to between 105,000 and 158,000; that not enough time has elapsed since that discovery has been made and that indeed the caribou management committee that this House has sanctioned has called for those studies to be done.

It is my information that the caribou management group is representative of native groups who are involved with the caribou and the hunting and trapping industry. If they are calling for these studies to be done, and if we do not yet have the results of these studies, then I think it is only responsible that we wait before we censure the department biologists for giving us false information or incomplete information; that we only wait on those results and then make our decision in a rational way with respect to whether they should be censured or not. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): To the motion as amended. Are you ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. WRAY: Recorded vote.

Motion To Express Loss Of Confidence In Government Wildlife Biologists, Carried As Amended

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Recorded vote is requested. All those in favour of that motion as amended, please stand until your name is called.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Mr. Evaluarjuk, Mr. Arlooktoo, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Curley, Ms Cournoyea, Mr. Wray, Mr. Sibbeston, Mr. McCallum, Mr. Braden, Mr. Butters.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Opposed, please stand.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Mrs. Sorensen, Mr. MacQuarrie.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Abstentions.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Mr. Appaqaq, Mr. Nerysoo, Mr. McLaughlin.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): The motion as amended is carried, 10 to two.

---Carried

Total 0 And M, Wildlife Service, Agreed

So we are still on page 11.06. Wildlife service, \$8,066,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Detail Of Grants And Contributions

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Page 11.07, detail of grants and contributions, \$1,483,000. Honourable Member for Mackenzie Liard.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to find out about this disaster compensation in the amount of \$14,000, precisely what it is and whether it could provide for a little bit of a disaster that was done to one of my constituents, Baptiste Cazon, a couple of winters ago by some oil company from Calgary that rode roughshod over his trapline and he has not ever been compensated by anybody. I just want to know if this is the kind of disaster that this fund is intended for.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Before you reply, do you want to invite your deputy minister, Mr. Bourque, and Mr. Monaghan? Would you escort them in, please? I would like to welcome Mr. Bourque and Mr. Monaghan for appearing in this House. Mr. Minister, do you want to reply to that question?

Compensation Policy Being Developed

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: The intent of the policy itself is associated with those disasters which relate particularly to natural disasters, things like forest fires, floods, things like ice breaking away. What we are in the process of doing is developing a compensation policy to relate directly to resource development, its effects on the damage to traplines, trappers' cabins, to areas that surround a trapper's trapline, and that policy -- as Mr. Monaghan indicated yesterday -- will be completed or at least the initial document will be submitted to me at the end of March. In that policy there will be possibilities of Mr. Cazon submitting an application. However, if the Member could possibly discuss the particular item with me, we might be able to solve that issue if it has been almost two years. I am not going to say that we are going to come to a final conclusion but maybe we could find an alternative solution to this situation.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Honourable Member for Mackenzie Liard.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that with the increased level of activity with respect to companies coming north looking for oil and gas, that this government ought to have a policy in respect of losses sustained by trappers and hunters in the North. I am aware that other jurisdictions -- I believe in Alberta the government there has legislation and policies in effect which deal with losses to trappers and compensating them. Here in the North we do not have anything of that sort. A trapper who loses anything as a result of oil and gas exploration companies has no recourse, as it were, except writing and dealing with the company that was responsible.

It just seems to me that we are likely to see more of this kind of activity and perhaps more conflict between the land users and the land exploiters -- let us say the seekers of resources beneath the ground -- and to me there is need to have something in place to deal with this abuse, to deal with complaints and losses. I wonder if the Minister could tell us if something is in the works or if something like that is possible during his tenure as Minister of the department.

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

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Mr. Chairman, just to indicate to the Member that we are in the process of developing a compensation policy with regard to resource development. That policy should be tabled with me, I believe, close to the end of March, and at that time I will submit it to the Executive Committee for Executive Committee approval.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Mr. Wray.

Assistance For Caribou Hunt On Coats Island

MR. WRAY: Mr. Chairman, a question to the Minister. The people of Coral Harbour have requested for the fall, August and September, some assistance for a community caribou hunt for Coats Island. As you know, Coats Island is a fair distance from Coral Harbour and people usually go out on their own money and their own time, but they are not hunting for themselves, they are hunting for the community. Particularly if the weather turns bad, they have to turn back and they use their own money so they are not able to go again. I just wonder if any funds have been allocated to Coral Harbour for a community hunt on Coats Island.

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

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Yes, Mr. Chairman. As you can see, \$43,000 this year is being allocated to the organized caribou hunts, and that is a program in which communities can submit application for funding to help communities go on caribou hunts. You will note it is an increase of some \$21,000 this year. The \$22,000 that we have had over the past three years has not been sufficient to ensure that some of the applications that have come forward have been addressed, so the intent of adding the \$21,000 is to hopefully address some of the additional applications that come in for organized caribou hunts.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Mr. Wray.

MR. WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Am I given to understand that if the community of Coral Harbour submits an application, their application will be looked upon favourably?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Mr. Minister.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Yes, under the program certainly they are able to apply for the funding and hopefully receive the additional funding that is required.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Mr. Evaluarjuk.

Gasoline Subsidy Program

MR. EVALUARJUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask about the gasoline subsidy program. I have never heard of anybody getting assistance from this program when they go out hunting. I do not think the Executive or the senior people of the government notify the people of the communities -- last year not even one wildlife officer was aware of this -- because I do not think they do get any gasoline subsidies.

If you are not able to give me an answer at this time, I would like to receive a written answer from you explaining how much a person is eligible for, for the gas subsidy. I would like to know how much gas he would have to have bought before he can get any gas subsidy, because I do not believe that in the Baffin region area that they do get any subsidies. I would like to receive a written reply from your department stating for instance, Mr. Evaluarjuk received so much gas and he is eligible for a subsidy under this program. Maybe you should have this better explained to the communities so they will be more aware of this. If you understand me, that is my question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. I think that is on the gasoline subsidy program. Mr. Minister.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Just to indicate that I would be prepared to provide the information to Mr. Evaluarjuk on the amount of money that we have spent in the gasoline subsidy in the Baffin region and in particular in Igloolik and Hall Beach. But the whole distribution of the funds usually goes automatically to individual hunters and trappers who have traded fur in the stores or in the co-ops or who have sent them to the auctions in the South. It usually is an automatic payment, if I am correct, at the beginning of each year or when the hunter wants to go out in the fall. So it is an automatic payment.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Mr. Arlooktoo.

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the Minister, in regard to the organized caribou hunts, can this grant only be used for organized caribou hunts or can they also be used for beluga whales? I would like to get an answer on that. Is it only for organized caribou hunts?

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Mr. Chairman, yes, the funding allocation under that particular policy is directly associated with caribou hunts.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Detail of grants and contributions, \$1,483,000. Honourable Member for Mackenzie Liard.

#### Grant For Humane Trapping

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I see that we are giving \$2000 for humane trapping purposes. I just wonder about the merit of doing that. It just seems to me that it is not for the benefit of the people of the North in any way to contribute to any undertaking that is going to change the present trapping methods. The main trapping method, of course, is the leghold trap; and I take it when you talk about humane trapping, you are talking of Conibear traps and other systems of catching animals that will kill the animal instantly. From my experience, people of the North do not have too much use or sympathy for any other system of traps, and I am wondering what this government is doing contributing to that cause. Let us delete it.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Mr. Minister.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Just to indicate to the Member it is not that we are in opposition to the leghold trap or anything like that. There still does not seem to be another method for trapping in the Northwest Territories as appropriate as the leghold trap. It is our intention with the \$2000 -- and it has been indicated to me that it is not enough -- to look at some of the traps that have been either invented by trappers in southern Canada, or at new ideas of how we might improve the trapping methods in the North. It is an internal thing and we still think that we should pursue some research in that particular area.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Honourable Member for Mackenzie Liard.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I guess I am just a bit concerned about what some of your officials may be saying, or what their attitudes are in respect of humane traps. I image you have some pretty high-powered, fancy degree people sitting in offices of this government here, and I do not know what views or what sort of stuff they are putting out in respect of humane traps. It does concern me because maybe behind our backs, behind the backs of trappers of the North, you have officials that are in great support of promoting and devising other traps, which sitting in the office might sound very good and seem very good, but if you have to pack these big, clumsy, large traps on your back throughout the North in the bush and snow, it may not be such an easy and desirable thing.

I do not know how much the Minister knows about the attitudes and views of some of his staff that deal with the subject, but could the Minister assure me anyway that he does not have fancy degree people that have weird ideas about the kind of traps that should be imposed or brought into the North, to the detriment of the very simple and practical leghold traps?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Mr. Minister.

#### Funding Is For Testing Alternatives To Leghold Trap

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Mr. Chairman, I think I can assure the Member that there is no one in the department who is wholeheartedly promoting any mechanisms in the Northwest Territories. What we are trying to do now is to test what there is on the market or what has been invented. The individual who, in our opinion, has been most important in our research to date is a Dene person from Fort McPherson. He has been participating in various conferences across Canada, not necessarily promoting himself but at least testing the traps that are available. What he has found to date is that the traps that have been suggested are in fact exactly what you have indicated, bulky and really not suitable to the conditions in the North. Our effort is to attempt to look at other options and try to improve the trapping methods in the Northwest Territories. That does not mean that we are going to go out and legislate people to use new traps or use humane ways, but that at least we are attempting to test some of the trapping instruments that are available to us.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I certainly share the concerns of the Member for Mackenzie Liard.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Deh Cho.

MR. CURLEY: Deh Cho. Right. I do not know who is doing the testing, who qualifies in the wildlife service to test a humane trap that would be the best possible trap to be engaged in that kind of economy -- other than a hunter or trapper himself, I would think. When these so-called humane traps were introduced for a while as a test in my region, some of the hunters came back and said for each fox caught with those humane traps, you have to bring in a new trap to replace that, particularly when the fox has died a few days before. You could not get him out of there until you had thawed out the fox and are ready to sell it to the store. So as far as they were concerned, they pretty well had to buy a new trap for each fox caught. If we are going to be playing around with that, it has to be acceptable to the people who are engaging in that kind of an economic base in the North.

I have another question which I wanted to pursue further. Mr. Evaluarjuk was asking what this gasoline subsidy program is all about. How does it operate? Because there is no information; there are no brochures; there is no simple outline as to how to apply and take advantage of that \$218,000 for the people in the Eastern Arctic. When do they qualify, and who do they make the application out to? What is required of a hunter to be eligible for that subsidy? Some people in the Eastern Arctic will say they have never heard about it. I think that is what Mr. Evaluarjuk was trying to ask. Maybe the deputy minister or his official can explain. How would I go about applying and taking advantage of that subsidy if I was a hunter and trapper?

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

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: I would first like to respond to the issue on humane traps. The very comments that Mr. Curley has stated have been learned through the research that our wildlife officer and the Dene person in McPherson have carried out. What we have also found is that some of the traps that have been recommended, or at least been looked at, do not work. They either freeze or they snap prematurely; those kinds of things occur. We recognize the very problems that Mr. Curley has raised and the individual, in my opinion, is a good individual to be looking at these traps because he himself at one time spent 10 or 15 years trapping, so he has a fairly good idea of the trapping industry and the need to improve traps for hunters and trappers in the North. That has been our experience so far. The other question on the gasoline subsidy program, I will ask Mr. Bourque or Mr. Monaghan to answer.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Mr. Monaghan.

#### Program Of Gasoline Subsidy

MR. MONAGHAN: The gasoline subsidy which is paid at a rate of five per cent on fur produced over and above \$600 value is paid as an automatic tack-on to the fur incentive program, which is 10 per cent. So the 15 per cent is paid automatically; it is based on a search of fur records in the communities and export returns, if we have cleared the fur for the trapper. If they sell fur independently as private sales, we ask that they provide receipts of that or some notification similar to that to be included in the calculation. I have not personally been involved in the administration of this program; if we need more detail than that I can certainly get it quite quickly.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am not sure whether I understand all that. If I was an ordinary hunter and do not know about percentage of -- how to calculate all that kind of formula that you just mentioned. I am not sure a hunter would understand that so if you would give us some information as to how to apply and a short outline of the program you talked about, it would probably help if it was displayed in a community because lack of information is certainly probably preventing many of the people from applying and taking advantage of these two programs.

I think the fur incentive program is working but I am not sure whether gasoline subsidy is actually being taken advantage of, so this is where I think the confusion is. I notice that in your reply that you include the two of them together but I think we have to have written information if we are going to be able to take advantage of the incentives for gasoline subsidy. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Mr. Minister.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: I think we could take the advice of the honourable Member and provide that information. The department will draft an outline for both programs and translate it as well.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Honourable Member for Mackenzie Liard.

MR. SIBBESTON: I will defer to my colleague on my immediate right.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Mr. Wray.

MR. WRAY: Mr. Chairman, I have a question but I need some information first. How many hunters' and trappers' associations are in the Northwest Territories?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Mr. Minister.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: I am not quite sure of the number. I will ask the deputy minister to respond.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Mr. Bourque.

MR. BOURQUE: There are 42.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Mr. Wray.

Grant To Hunters' And Trappers' Associations Inappropriate

MR. WRAY: Supplementary, looking at the grants there has been \$148,000 allocated for hunters' and trappers' associations, which means roughly that each hunters' and trappers' association would qualify for about \$3500. Now, while there is an increase from last year I would suggest perhaps to the Minister that instead of looking at \$3500, we should be looking at closer to \$25,000 for hunters' and trappers' associations. The sum of \$3500 is really an inconsequential amount when you consider the importance and the role that those associations play in our communities. When you think of the work that they have to do and the fact that they operate with no personnel, they operate with very few facilities, \$3500 is really just a drop in the bucket. We spend more than \$3500 on hunting bags in Baker Lake.

I would think that, at least in the small and isolated communities where the hunters' and trappers' associations are playing a major role in the community, we should be looking at giving them somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$10,000, \$15,000, \$20,000, \$25,000, based on their needs, so that they could at least hire qualified people to work with them, qualified administrative help. We should in turn help them take advantage of the various programs and grants that are available to them. Not always does the game officer in that community know how to do that or in some cases not always is a game officer interested in doing that kind of work. If we are to get the hunters' and trappers' associations on a par within the communities with the other bodies that are community representatives, then we are going to have to start funding them appropriately. I would hope that when the budget is being prepared for next year that we look at a figure which is much more representative of what those hunters' and trappers' associations needs are, as opposed to a nominal sum of \$3500. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Mr. Appaqaq.

MR. APPAQAQ: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not have too much to say. A lot of time the information is not available to the HTAs in respect to the gasoline subsidy for hunters and trappers. I do not believe that the wildlife officers tell the people. Even if they are contractors or whoever is selling the gas, they probably get more information. I also know that in Sanikiluaq 10 gallons is \$46 and it is only good for half a day and the hunters and trappers do not get any subsidies in northern Quebec -- I have noticed that; 10 gallons is costing them \$46 and I am really impressed with this. I do not believe that the cost of gas -- because one time in my constituency the price of gas was really high and it was not my fault; it was the government's fault, not mine. I just wanted to make a comment on this matter. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Honourable Member for Mackenzie Liard.

Motion To Delete \$2000 For Humane Trapping And Add To HTA Allotment, Bill 1-83(1)

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I will just make a motion that as a matter of principle in support of the present very practical and effective method of trapping fur bearing animals in the North, that we delete \$2000 for humane trapping and add this to the hunters' and trappers' association allotment.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Could we have a copy of that motion, please?

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, maybe I should have added that we recommended that the Executive Committee -- maybe it is just a foregone conclusion that is the approach that we take in these matters; and if that requires that, I will add it. Mr. Chairman, I think we in the North, particularly those that are representing hunters and trappers, should be very sensitive about the subject; that anything that smacks or deals with humane concerns -- it is the humane societies in the South that are responsible for the decline of the seal industry. I do not think our government should in any way help any humane group that is active, because it means that we could be supporting them. So this little \$2000 -- though it is not very much -- we might be adding to a group of people which will eventually have a big propaganda campaign in the South to outlaw leghold traps. I think we should state at this very early stage that we do not agree with any such undertaking; that the present leghold traps really work very well in the North and that people in the North are not too concerned about the feelings of the little animals that they catch. It is just a matter of living and necessity. So that is what my motion would be doing.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Let us take a 15 minute coffee break. I would like to examine that motion a little further than that before I make my ruling. Thank you.

---SHORT RECESS



CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Honourable Member for Mackenzie Liard.

Motion To Delete \$2000 For Humane Trapping And Add To HTA Allotment, Bill 1-83(1), Reworded

MR. SIBBESTON: It may be that the good motion I made is technically imperfect, so I will try to make corrections. I will change that first imperfect one and move that this committee delete the vote of \$2000 presently allocated under detail of grants and contributions to humane trapping and further, that we recommend to the Executive Committee that it allocate this deleted sum of \$2000 to the item "hunters' and trappers' associations", on the same page in the estimates.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Your motion is in order. To the motion.

MR. SIBBESTON: Let us vote on it. It is a good motion.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): To the motion. Are you ready for the question? Mr. Nerysoo.

More Problems Caused By Doing Nothing

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: I just want to make a couple of points. Number one, the whole allocation is not for the purposes of supporting any specific group or groups with regard to humane trapping; it is for our own purposes of trying to look at what is available. I would just like to further indicate that I think the government not doing anything at all in this particular area, could cause more problems with humane societies than doing something -- at least initially. It is not a matter of promoting what is there. Most of the traps that we are testing are traps that have been invented by trappers down south and it is a matter of trying to see whether or not they are appropriate in the conditions in the Northwest Territories. I just wanted to make the honourable Member aware of that situation.

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

MR. MACQUARRIE: I have no problems with the motion; it is a very insignificant amount. We have seen the seal pelt market eroded by people that we do not particularly respect, yet they were able to mount a significant campaign and undermine the market at a cost of, I suppose, millions of dollars, at least hundreds of thousands to the Northwest Territories economy -- millions. The same thing could begin to happen with fur markets. It is not enough just to say that we do not respect what these people are doing or we do not respect them; that because we do not agree, we should do nothing at all, because we could begin to find that the same thing begins to happen with the fur market. As I say, this is not a significant amount anyway and I do not think that it would contribute much to the kind of program that I have in mind. In respect of that, can I ask the Minister whether there are other funds in the budget to begin preparing -- I do not know whether you would call it a strategy or a campaign or something to ensure that we are able, with facts and with evidence of good judgment, to meet criticisms and the possibility of such a campaign being mounted?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Mr. Minister.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: I would just like to indicate that one might say the dollar value to this is insignificant, but the effects of not doing anything at all could be worse than at least attempting to do something. I would like to say further that we are, as I indicated in my opening statement, trying to work with other jurisdictions to try to look at options of developing new traps or to research, at least, what is available to us.

The other thing is that the whole campaign of banning the leghold trap is already in effect. It started a number of years ago. It is a major campaign in southern Canada. It was major enough in British Columbia to force the provincial government to bring forward legislation to ban the leghold trap in British Columbia. So the campaign is there, and like I said, not doing anything at all could cause a lot more problems than trying at least to attempt to do something. In fact, what I am suggesting is more money, if you could get it.

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

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: First, let me say how pleased I am that Mr. Sibbeston has realized that the proper way to present motions for deleting grants and contributions is to zero in on a specific activity and not have an umbrella approach.

---Laughter

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): To the motion, please.

NWT Government Should Be Involved In Conservation Movement

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: I would like to speak to the motion, Mr. Chairman. I share Mr. Sibbeston's sentiments entirely about the fact that humane traps are foreign to the experience of the people of the Northwest Territories. However, I would just like to explain where I am coming from. I believe there is a world conservation movement that is threatening the fur industry in Canada and in the Northwest Territories. Seals were just the tip of the iceberg and I believe that deleting this amount of money in research to humane trapping will actually give the impression that this Legislative Assembly does not even want to consider alternate means of killing animals. I think that it is just this kind of thing that can be distorted by the media and the press to show that we are not even willing to consider humane options. I think that we cannot ignore this conservation lobby and the Greenpeace movement. I think we have to participate -- show, as I suspect, that humane trapping methods are impractical in the Northwest Territories and will not work.

I understand that this money would be used to pay trappers to field test these methods of trapping. If they are, in fact, not effective and not proper, then we will have some evidence but I think if we just ignore the issue and pretend it is going to go away we have got our heads in the sand. I think we should be involved in these conservation movements, we should be represented, our voice should be heard. We should show that we are willing to investigate these issues and not give the appearance that we are blind to these alternatives. So not because I am not in sympathy with what Mr. Sibbeston says, but because I disagree entirely with his strategy, I am going to have to vote against this motion. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. To the motion. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, at coffee break the honourable Member for Mackenzie Liard...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Deh Cho.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: ...for Mackenzie Liard asked me if I would repeat in the House the discussion that I was having with him at the time. I think it was some two or three days ago, when the Renewable Resources budget was first introduced, the Minister was asked by a number of Members to strengthen the counterattack and the counterargument that this government is mounting toward the growing anti-trapping groups that are appearing on a world basis, and develop strategies to point out that the emotionalism that is being used by them, is just that -- emotionalism -- and is not based on fact. Certainly the emotionalism that has spilled over with regard to the seal hunt has very severely damaged the economic activity in the Eastern Arctic.

Motion Strengthens Position Of Anti-Trapping Groups

I think in the case of the leghold trap none of us will argue that the leghold trap is a humane method to capture animals. We have recognized for a long time and this government has contributed to other methods to trap animals and to kill animals in a quick and humane method. This is a continuation of that program. If I were a member of these groups that are seeking to remove trapping as an economic activity in Canada and North America -- and that is exactly what they are seeking to do -- then I would be delighted with Mr. Sibbeston's motion. In fact, I would give him an honorary membership to the organization, I would take his motion and I would say the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories in its wisdom has decided to remove all funds in search of humane trapping methods. These are the methods now being practised in the Northwest Territories and these are the methods which the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories endorses. Then I would run a number of pictures of animals dying in traps, or legs chewed off by animals caught in traps. One of the major arguments in favour of these groups has been coloured television, because blood is red and the colour red moves people. You do not see them in the slaughter houses, you do not see them killing little lambs, because there is no lobby for little lambs. Only Joey Smallwood is for woolly little lambs.

---Laughter

I say why play into the hands of these people? If this motion is adopted, we will be doing exactly that. We will be handing them on a silver platter an argument which we will not be able to develop any strategy to respond to.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. To the motion, Mr. Curley.

Most Economical Way Of Trapping

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I disagree with the rationale for opposing this motion because this Assembly and this government have not made a decision that the present leghold trap is inhumane, so why are we getting all excited about it? You know, the people who are actually espousing -- the people from Greenpeace and the animal lovers and all that -- are really people like Tom, for what he said. Unless you can either say, "Look, we have an...

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Put on your glasses.

MR. CURLEY: ...economic base that works. Let us make the best of it. Let us protect it." If you continue to say, "We disagree with the present method of catching and trapping in the North," then you are really opening a can of worms rather than trying to defend the position of many of the hunters and trappers in the NWT. Because who says that traps are inhumane?

It is for that reason that I do not see any rationale for having to oppose this. I think we have to do better than that. We have to develop strong public relations to try to defend the hunters and trappers of the NWT, with the message that it is the most economical means of trapping. That is what I would want to see. What have we done to try and promote the hunters and trappers through this government? We are saying "The humane societies down south are doing it, so we are going to join them, join the bandwagon," before even attempting to establish a program that actually protects the present hunters and trappers. Have we shown the national press that the most economical means of pursuing their livelihood must not be jeopardized? These are the questions I would think would have to be answered as well. Thank you.

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

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Yes. I guess my problem is that, as a Minister trying to promote the best interests of the trappers of the Northwest Territories, we have to try to look at options if those options are available to us.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: If not, then we can at least, through our own research with our own staff, at least protect the situation as it is right now. I do not want to get into a debate, but if the economical means was at the forefront in looking at the seal industry, then the situation as it is now and has been in the past would continue and the humane societies would look at it as an ideal option, but that is not the case. What they are suggesting in many cases is to look at what are the options of being humane in the killing of seals and looking at those methods. I do not disagree with your sentiments and the direction you wish to go, and it is certainly the direction I wish to go in, but we have to look at arguments on both sides and certainly protect the arguments that we have with regard to the leghold trap.

Further, I have already indicated to other jurisdictions, in particular Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, as well as British Columbia, that I am not going to introduce at any time, legislation that ends leghold traps in the Northwest Territories. Unfortunately, I thought -- and I thought the other jurisdictions thought -- that British Columbia was on-side and was going to look at options, but they did not; they passed their legislation without discussion with us and with Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan. We thought we had that commitment from them but that pressure, I guess, was there.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. To the motion. Are you ready for the question? Honourable Member from Deh Cho.

MR. SIBBESTON: Just a last few points, which I am sure will convince everybody to vote for it. I think this government should take a very aggressive approach to anyone who suggests anything about "humane", particularly in this case, humane trapping, because as far as trapping and using the present leghold traps goes, it is effective and you cannot improve on it and so I do not want to see this government show any interest at all in any other system than the leghold trap. I think you should growl at them if anybody suggests that you try anything other than the leghold.

#### Good Market For Long-Haired Fur

As for the leghold traps, as I understand it these traps are mostly used down the Mackenzie Valley and up in the Arctic coast to catch what are called long-haired fur and I understand that this type of fur is not so vulnerable as the sealskin was. As I understand it anyway, there is a reasonably good market and it should continue in the future for long-haired fur, because there always will be a few rich people in the world and rich people like to clothe themselves in nice fur coats. In Canada alone I suspect that there is a reasonably good market. There will always be a need for this type of fur.

The other point I wanted to make is that in the South there are some jurisdictions, I understand, that have banned the leghold trap. I guess maybe one can understand that because in the South people are primarily located in the urban centres, so there is a lot of pressure from people not associated with the hunting and trapping type of life, but in the North here hopefully we will never get to a situation where trapping and hunting will become such a fringe way of making a living. Hopefully this government will never be in a position to ban leghold traps, because the matter of deciding whether leghold traps are legal or not is a territorial or a provincial jurisdiction and so we do not have any threat from the federal government; it is really this government that decides that. So as long as the North is reasonably non-urbanized, as long as the North is rural, then hopefully people will support the present way of hunting and trapping and living off the land.

I say there is no likelihood of the leghold trap ever being banned in the North. Of course it would be useless to have these traps if nobody buys the furs but as I said, I feel the long-haired fur is in a much better position than the sealskin has been, and hopefully there will always be a few rich people who will want to buy fur and, heaven forbid, even myself someday, when I become wealthy, will buy my wife a nice fur -- a lynx or a wolf coat, caught by a leghold trap.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): To the motion. Are you ready for the question? Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I could just imagine Mr. Sibbeston's equivalent sitting in the Newfoundland legislature about 15 years ago, saying that they should growl at anybody who suggested that hitting a baby seal over the head with a club was an inhumane method of killing them and that he was not going to make any compromises or take any notice. Yet look what has happened. I think that we could face the same kind of result with respect to fur bearing animals. The market could be undermined. Mr. Sibbeston said that he hoped that it would not and I hope that it will not, too, because I really do support that type of thing. I believe that the world is for man and man can use it as he sees fit but we always hope that he sees fit in a reasonable and responsible kind of way.

The honourable Member for Keewatin South said that he does not agree with those who think that the leghold trap is inhumane and it is, sincerely, a matter for judgment. Some may judge it to be and some may judge it not to be but anyone who judges it to be humane does not, by judging it that way, persuade somebody else who thinks it is inhumane, and there are people who do. I do believe that we have to recognize that and begin planning something to meet that eventuality.

#### Support Program To Find Alternative Trap

I would say that I support the present method of trapping -- the leghold trap -- until there is something better because I believe that trapping fur bearing animals is a legitimate human activity, a legitimate economic activity. I would think that Mr. Sibbeston would agree that if there could be a trap invented that was just as economical to use, just as efficient, just as easy to use and just as effective and yet accomplished its objective in a way that was more satisfactory to people who buy furs, what would be wrong with implementing that kind of system? So I just think that this government should be co-operating in some ways to try to determine whether, in fact, there is such a trap and if not yet, then maybe helping to develop it, and meanwhile supporting the right of trappers to trap in the traditional way until there is something effective in place.

My earliest comment about it was simply that it is a very insignificant amount and I do not think, in answer to Mr. Butters, that \$2000 for a program like that is going to persuade anybody that we are making serious efforts to try to accomplish what I have just suggested. There would not be any serious blow to our program or to our reputation if that amount was reallocated in the budget. I just feel that in future years, beginning now, that the department should seriously look at allocating more money for a program like that so that we can show that we are making serious efforts toward it.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. I think there was a request to read that motion again. It was not translated. Could you read that, Mr. Clerk?

CLERK ASSISTANT (Mrs. Baldwin): I move that this committee delete the vote of \$2000 presently allocated under detail of grants and contributions to humane trapping and further that the Executive Committee consider allocating this deleted sum to the item "hunters' and trappers' associations" on the same page in the estimates.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): To the motion. Mr. McLaughlin.

Significant Investment In Present Traps

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am very interested in this for more than one reason. Firstly, Members may not be aware of it, but there are some people in my constituency who live solely by hunting and trapping who have moved there from other communities and their spouse now works at the mine -- the father in the family hunts and traps in the area.

Also while I worked for the mine staking claims and working in the bush, I have seen animals -- and this is a case where maybe one trapper with poor habits paints a bad picture for the rest -- I have come across animals that have obviously been left in a leghold trap still alive for a couple of weeks. It is not a very pleasant thing to come across and it is an irresponsible trapper who does that. Most of the trappers are not irresponsible and are not like that, but I think there are two serious things here. I do not think that we should make an effort as a government to go in this direction, because I know that these people who hunt and trap in my constituency have 500-odd traps which are worth anywhere from five or 10-odd dollars apiece. They have a significant investment in the existing traps and I do not think our government should be a leader in the field in this type of thing and I do not think \$2000 is being a leader in the field. I do, also, think that by passing this motion we would be, in fact, encouraging these people to confront us.

I would actually ask Mr. Sibbeston to withdraw this motion and consider another motion to use that money in a better manner. Let us pay the way to get some of these Greenpeacers and tree-huggers up here and get them in this committee of the whole as witnesses and have a talk with some of these guys because I think some of our Members here who hunt and trap and live off the land can tell these people what life is really about up here. I am going to vote against the motion on the principle that I do not think it is an effective way to do it. In fact, we may be falling into their hands. I would rather spend the money to get those guys up here in the ropes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. CURLEY: Question.

Motion To Delete \$2000 For Humane Trapping And Add To HTA Allotment, Bill 1-83(1), Defeated

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Question has been called. All those in favour, please raise your hand. Down. Opposed? The motion is defeated.

---Defeated

Detail of grants and contributions, \$1,483,000. Mr. Curley.

Motion To Establish Hunters' And Trappers' Assistance Fund By Reallocating Funding From Capital Budget, Bill 1-83(1)

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have a motion regarding the capital items. I move that this committee recommend to the Executive Committee and the Minister of Renewable Resources that they establish a hunters and trappers capital assistance subsidy fund, to hunters and trappers who earn less than \$10,000 annual income; and further, it is recommended that the Executive Committee consider funding the said fund from reallocation of the 1983-84 capital budget of the department.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): The copies have been distributed and the motion is in order. To the motion. Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, when I look through the capital items here including all the pages here, there are an awful lot of items which Renewable Resources would hope to purchase and I think the money could possibly be better used by people who have no way of really affording any equipment to enable a hunter or trapper to pursue his livelihood. So on that basis I think it is possible to establish a fund by reallocating some of the capital expenditures because in many cases I do not think Renewable Resources require to purchase annually a new snowmobile in the items under the capital items. They just count "mobile equipment" and if you look at it, it is a significant amount if you add all the mobile equipment that they hope to purchase as well as the others. I think in many cases particularly in the Eastern Arctic, Renewable Resources can better utilize the existing equipment of hunters and trappers by hiring them for a few days for field trips and so on.

I think this proposal calls for re-establishing a capital assistance subsidy because these days it is beginning to be pretty expensive for the hunter or trapper to pursue his livelihood without any kind of assistance. I am urging that the government can consider that because many communities do not have financial institutions and it is impossible for people to ask for a loan when they do not have any type of collateral to obtain that loan to enable them to purchase any equipment. I am not including the equipment for fisheries and so on because I think they should be considered altogether differently from federal projects, I would think.

I am urging everyone on the other side of this chamber to support this motion because I think there is room for that and I think that these people deserve some assistance from this government if they are to succeed in their hunting and trapping economy. Thank you.

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

Motion To Establish Hunters' And Trappers' Assistance Fund By Reallocating Funding From Capital Budget, Bill 1-83(1), Carried

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): The question has been called. All those in favour, please raise your hands. Down. Opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Page 11.07, detail of grants and contributions, \$1,483,000. Mr. Evaluarjuk.

MR. EVALUARJUK: (Translation) Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask another question concerning fur bearing animals. I believe that if it has been raised to \$600 for the subsidy that they get -- when the Baffin Regional Council was at a meeting people in the Baffin region asked if this can be reduced. Has the Minister seen a motion that was passed during the BRC meeting regarding the raise from \$500 to \$600, that this be reduced? Is this still the same, or have you heard anything in regard to this?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Mr. Minister.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Yes. Just to indicate that I have not seen the motion, but certainly the suggestion I think being made to decrease the amount from \$600 to \$500 could be looked at by the department and the program. Is that what...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Mr. Evaluarjuk.

Motion To Recommend Fur Incentive Program Be Reduced From \$600 To \$500 Per Person, Bill 1-83(1)

MR. EVALUARJUK: (Translation) This is my question. Maybe if I make a short motion on this, so that it may be worked on. I move that the fur incentive program be reduced from \$600 to \$500, and that the Executive Committee work on this right away.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Let us take four or five minutes so that the interpreters can come over with the motion and the Clerk can work with them for a few minutes.

---SHORT RECESS

Order, please. I am going to ask the Clerk to read the motion.

CLERK ASSISTANT (Mrs. Baldwin): I recommend that the fur incentive program be reduced from \$600 to \$500 per person, and that the Executive Committee consider this motion immediately.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): To the motion. To the motion, Mr. Evaluarjuk.

MR. EVALUARJUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like very much for all of you to understand. If you all spoke Inuktitut, you would probably understand very well. I am sorry that you do not. The reason for this motion is if a person had made \$600, it is the only time that he can be subsidized. What I am trying to do is cut it back to \$500 so that they can get a subsidy, due to the fact that we are in a period of economic restraint and prices are going up very high, and the prices paid for furs that hunters sell are going down rapidly. Does everyone understand what I am trying to say?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

Motion To Recommend Fur Incentive Program Be Reduced From \$600 To \$500 Per Person, Bill 1-83(1), Carried

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Question has been called. All those in favour, please raise your hands. Down. Opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Detail Of Grants And Contributions, Agreed

Page 11.07, detail of grants and contributions, \$1,483,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Detail Of Capital, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Page 11.08, detail of capital, one million dollars. Agreed? Mr. Wray.

MR. WRAY: Not so fast, boys.

---Laughter

Just one question for the Minister. I notice in the acquisition of equipment list, the Keewatin is down for \$6000 for tools and equipment as opposed to fairly substantial amounts for other regions. Is there a particular reason why the Keewatin has such a very low budget for tools and equipment?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Mr. Minister.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Shall I really tell you?

---Laughter

No. Can I have my departmental officials respond to that?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Mr. Bourque.

MR. BOURQUE: In response to the honourable Member's question, the reason is because the Keewatin is a small region and it is fairly well-equipped.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Detail of capital, one million dollars. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

O And M, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Page 11.01, O and M, \$9,631,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Capital, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Capital, one million dollars. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. I would like to thank the witnesses at this time, and also the Minister of Renewable Resources. Is the committee ready to deal with Economic Development and Tourism?

AN HON. MEMBER: Report progress.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Report progress?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Okay. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Pudluk.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILL 1-83(1), APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1983-84

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been considering Bill 1-83(1), Appropriation Ordinance, 1983-84, as well as passing three motions, and wishes to report progress.

---Applause

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are there any announcements from the floor? Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Yes. At this time I would like to apologize to the honourable Member for Yellowknife Centre for misinterpretation. Earlier today, when I was chairing the committee, I think the chairman always has the right to make explanations if there is a misunderstanding in this House. That is what I was trying to do. There was a misinterpretation between you and me. I apologize. I hope you accept my apology.

---Applause

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: You are doing okay, Ludy.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are there any further announcements? Mr. Clerk, announcements and orders of the day.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): There will be a meeting of the subcommittee of the special committee on division at 6:00 p.m. tonight in the caucus room.

ITEM NO. 16: ORDERS OF THE DAY

Orders of the day, Friday, February 18th, 9:30 a.m.

1. Prayer
2. Members' Replies
3. Oral Questions
4. Written Questions



5. Returns
6. Ministers' Statements
7. Petitions
8. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
9. Tabling of Documents
10. Notices of Motion
11. Notices of Motion for First Reading of Bills
12. Motions
13. First Reading of Bills
14. Second Reading of Bills
15. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills, Recommendations to the Legislature and Other Matters: Bills 1-83(1), 6-83(1), 7-83(1), 8-83(1), 9-83(1), 10-83(1), 11-83(1), 12-83(1)
16. Orders of the Day

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. This House stands adjourned until February 18th, 9:30 a.m.

---ADJOURNMENT

Available from the  
Publications Clerk, Department of Information,  
Government of the Northwest Territories, Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
\$1.00 per day; \$30.00 for 1st session, \$20.00 for 2nd and 3rd session; or \$50.00 per year  
Published under the Authority of the Commissioner  
of the Northwest Territories