



COUNCIL OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES DEBATES

57th Session

8th Council

Official Report



Monday, September 29, 1975

Speaker David H. Searle, Q.C.

COUNCIL MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

SPEAKER

Mr. David H. Searle, Q.C.
P.O. Box 939
Yellowknife, N.W.T. XOE 1HO
(Yellowknife South)

DEPUTY SPEAKER

Mr. Donald M. Stewart
Hay River, N.W.T. XOE ORO
(Hay River)

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Mr. Thomas H. Butters
P.O. Box 1069
Inuvik, N.W.T. XOE OTO
(Inuvik)

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. Arnold McCallum
Yellowknife, N.W.T. XOE 1HO
(Slave River)
(Executive Committee Member
for Education)

Mr. Peter Ernerk
Site 18, Box 16
Yellowknife, N.W.T. XOE 1HO
(Keewatin)
(Executive Committee Member
for Social Development)

Mr. George Barnaby
Fort Good Hope, N.W.T. XOE OHO
(Mackenzie Great Bear)

Mr. Dave Nickerson
P.O. Box 1778
Yellowknife, N.W.T. XOE 1HO
(Yellowknife North)

Mr. Mark Evaluarjuk
Igloolik, N.W.T. XOA OLO
(Foxe Basin)

Mr. Bryan R. Pearson
c/o Arctic Ventures
Frobisher Bay, N.W.T. XOA OHO
(South Baffin)

Mr. Ipeelee Kilabuk
Pangnirtung, N.W.T. XOA ORO
(Central Baffin)

Mr. Ludy Pudluk
Resolute Bay, N.W.T. XOA OVO
(High Arctic)

Mr. William A. Lafferty
P.O. Box 176
Fort Simpson, N.W.T. XOE ONO
(Mackenzie Liard)

Mr. John Steen
Tuktoyaktuk, N.W.T. XOE 1CO
(Western Arctic)

Mr. William Lyall
Cambridge Bay, N.W.T. XOE OCO
(Central Arctic)

Mr. James Wah-Shee
P.O. Box 1514
Yellowknife, N.W.T. XOE 1HO
(Great Slave Lake)

OFFICERS OF COUNCIL

Clerk of the Council

Mr. W. H. Remnant
Yellowknife, N.W.T. XOE 1HO

Clerk Assistant

Mrs. Lois Kornichuk
Yellowknife, N.W.T. XOE 1HO

Legal Advisor

Mr. J. Slaven
Yellowknife, N.W.T. XOE 1HO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

29 September 1975

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	1
Commissioner's Opening Remarks	1
Questions and Returns	2
Oral Questions	69
Notices of Motions	3
Motions	7, 8, 37
Tabling of Documents	2
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Tabled Document 2-57 Social Development Paper	10
- Tabled Document 1-57 Political Development Paper	37
Report of the Committee of the Whole of:	
- Tabled Document 2-57 Social Development Paper	36
- Tabled Document 1-57 Political Development Paper	67
Prorogation	70

YELLOWKNIFE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1975

The Council of the Northwest Territories was convened in Yellowknife, Northwest Territories at nine o'clock a.m., on Monday, September 29, 1975, for the third session, 1975, this being the fifty-seventh session.

PRAYER

BISHOP H. G. COOK: Let us pray. Almighty God from whom cometh all wisdom and power, we, the Council of the Northwest Territories in session assembled, humbly beseech Thy blessing on our deliberations, to the end that, inspired by Thy divine wisdom, and setting aside all prejudices, private interests and partial affections, we may work to the benefit, welfare and happiness of the people to Thy glory. Amen.

THE SPEAKER (Mr. Searle): Mr. Clerk, would you kindly determine whether the Commissioner is ready to address this house?

ITEM NO. 1: COMMISSIONER'S OPENING REMARKS

THE COMMISSIONER: It is my pleasure to welcome you again to this special fall session of the Council of the Northwest Territories. This past week Council has been meeting in an informal atmosphere discussing ways and means of improving the political, social and economic situations that affect all Canadians living in the Northwest Territories.

It was approximately 11 years ago that a former Council, after full consultation within that Council, made recommendations to the Government of Canada that eventually brought into being much of the progress that we enjoy today. It would seem to me that what you will be discussing and deciding today might very well lead to the most important decisions that will affect all territorial residents no matter where they may live. While there is much uncertainty at the moment within the Northwest Territories, I have always believed that the Council of the Northwest Territories can and will provide a stabilizing influence, and it is through this body that the road to responsible territorial government lies.

With these few remarks I offer you the utmost co-operation and support from the Northwest Territories government, and wish you good luck as I participate in this, the opening of the 57th session of the Council of the Northwest Territories.

MR. SPEAKER: Members of Council, turning to the orders of the day, do I have unanimous consent to move to Item 9, tabling of documents? Is it agreed?

--- Agreed

Item 9, Mr. Stewart.

ITEM NO. 9: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in tabling the following documents; a paper relating to political development in the Northwest Territories and a paper relating to social development in the Northwest Territories.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Any further tabled documents? Mr. McCallum?

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation for 1974.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any replies to the Commissioner's address?

Item 3, questions and returns. Are there any questions? Mr. Evaluarjuk?

ITEM NO. 3: QUESTIONS AND RETURNS.

Question 01-57: Remuneration for Members of Hamlet Councils.

MR. EVALUARJUK: I am afraid I have not had a chance to write down our recommendations or questions, and I will not raise anything at the moment but I do have one question. Right now there are many other meetings going on here with the hamlet councils and they probably will be talking about many things, and I would like to ask on the fact that hamlet council wrote to the Commissioner and afterwards they gave me a copy of the letter, and the letter came from the settlement, from Sadliq and they are asking for more money and I understand there is a law written down, and I do not know what page number it is on or what rule it is in, but I would like to know who would be looking after this. Is the Commissioner going to be doing something about it or will it be done by Council? Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Commissioner?

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Speaker, my apologies. I did not get tuned in fast enough and I did not hear the essence of the question. I wonder if the Honourable Member would ask me again?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Evaluarjuk, would you mind just repeating the question again, please?

MR. EVALUARJUK: What I said was that the Commissioner received a letter of the Sadliq hamlet council asking him for more money for their council and in the rule book it says how much the council members, the hamlet council members, are supposed to be getting and I said I would find out what I could about it, and I am asking if the Commissioner will do anything about it or should he go through the Council? I do not know what the number is in the rules but this is in Coral Harbour.

THE COMMISSIONER: I wonder if I might take the question as notice and I will see if I can get a reply within the next couple of hours.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further questions?

Turning to the orders of the day, Item 4, oral questions.

Item 5, presenting petitions.

Item 6, reports of standing and special committees.

Item 7, notices of motions. Mr. Butters?

ITEM NO. 7: NOTICES OF MOTIONS

Notice of Motion to Move Tabled Documents 1-57 and 2-57 into Committee of the Whole

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice that on this date with the unanimous consent of Members, I would move Tabled Documents 1-57 and 2-57 into committee of the whole.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further notices of motions? Mr. Lafferty?

Notice of Motion 2-57: Meeting with Yukon Council

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Speaker, on this 29th day of September, 1975, I wish to table the following motion:

WHEREAS this Council is now in an almost identical constitutional position with the Yukon;

AND WHEREAS the political problems of evolution in both territories are similar, if not identical;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this Council invite the Yukon Council to meet with us at their convenience at Whitehorse to discuss problems of mutual concern and ways and means to aid each other in our aspirations. The time and date and other arrangements are to be left to Mr. Speaker to work out with the Yukon Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further notices of motions? Mr. Steen?

Notice of Motion 1-57: Alaskan Visit

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move on this day, the 29th of September, 1975 the following motion:

WHEREAS A gas pipeline may be built in the Mackenzie during the term of this Council;

AND WHEREAS it is in the public interest that this Council assure that the necessary legislation and programs are implemented to protect the public and cushion the impact of such construction prior to its commencement;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this Council visit the State of Alaska to observe the conditions there for the purpose of preparing for the development expected in the Northwest Territories and that this recommendation be communicated to the Commissioner with the request that he attempt to make the necessary funding available.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further notices of motions? There is unanimous consent required by the rules concerning those three motions. Firstly, Mr. Butters, to make motions today and dealing with them one by one, is there unanimous consent of this Council for Mr. Butters to move this motion which is that the two tabled documents be referred to committee of the whole for discussion? Is it agreed?

Concerning Motion to Move Tabled Documents 1-57 and 2-57 into
Committee of the Whole

Mr. Butters, would you move your motion? Excuse me, Mr. Barnaby?

MR. BARNABY: Yes, I would like to ask that the document on political development not be brought forward at this time as I would like to take it back to my community and discuss it further, and I suspect other Members might like to do the same.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that a comment you would like to make in committee of the whole, or do you decline unanimous consent for it to be discussed in committee of the whole?

MR. BARNABY: I can not really discuss it until I get the feelings of my people who I represent.

MR. SPEAKER: Then are you declining unanimous consent for that motion of Mr. Butters to be moved today?

MR. BARNABY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wah-Shee?

MR. WAH-SHEE: Mr. Speaker, could you just for my own information briefly explain the procedure as you have here notices of motions and then you have unanimous consent which must be given to go into committee of the whole, and I would just like an explanation.

Unanimous Consent Explained.

MR. SPEAKER: When a person wants to move a motion, he, according to the rules, has to give a minimum of 24 hours notice. In other words, pursuant to our rules he has to stand up and say, "I will tomorrow . . ." and mind you, he may say any day later, but a minimum of one days notice must be given for a motion to be introduced. Now the purpose of that is so you can have a copy before you and have a chance to think about it. In this case, Mr. Butters gave notice that he would like to move that motion today, but because such a motion offends the rules, in effect, he asked for unanimous consent to move it today and Mr. Barnaby, of course as he may do, declined unanimous consent for that motion to be made today. Presumably, therefore, it may be made tomorrow, and in that case unanimous consent is not required. Does that help you, Mr. Wah-Shee? Do all Members understand the rules now? Mr. Ernerk?

MR. ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, concerning the two papers which you have in front of you, I have put a lot of thought into both of them. I rise at this time to ask you whether or not it would be possible for me to give some of my own thoughts later on during this session because when you look at it very carefully, the two papers, political development as well as social development in northern Canada, are two papers which I feel are very important to the residents of the Northwest Territories. Since coming back from the seminar, I have given these two particular important papers very careful thought, very, very careful consideration, and as a result, I am wondering if it is possible, Mr. Speaker, for me to outline a few of my own feelings later on this morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Maybe there is some way out of the dilemma. Mr. Barnaby, I understand your objections to the discussion of the one paper on political development, but have you any objection to going into committee of the whole to discuss the social development paper, as they are two separate ones?

MR. BARNABY: What I am afraid might happen is that this might get passed without us really talking it over and making some wise decision on it, and really, I am not against discussing it. I am against having it passed at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Do your comments apply to both papers?

MR. BARNABY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Both papers?

MR. BARNABY: Not necessarily against the social development paper.

MR. SPEAKER: So we could go into committee of the whole to discuss the social development paper and you have no objection to that?

MR. BARNABY: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Does anyone else object to that? Mr. Wah-Shee?

MR. WAH-SHEE: Mr. Speaker, my feeling on political development is that I feel it is major policy and I would like to see this particular paper discussed in the communities, particularly with my constituents, and I do not want to give consent at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it, Mr. Wah-Shee, your stand is the same as Mr. Barnaby's on the political development paper. How about the social development paper? Mr. Barnaby says he has no objection to our discussing the social development paper. Have you any objection to discussion of that paper?

MR. WAH-SHEE: Before I answer that question, could I ask you one question? In the social development paper will it be possible later on to make additions to the paper? There may be some things there that are not written.

Purpose of Committee of the Whole

MR. SPEAKER: The purpose of the committee of the whole is, of course to discuss each and every point made in the social development paper, to amend it, to delete from it or add to it as this Council sees fit, or disapprove of it presumably in total if you wish. Once the paper -- you see, the paper is just that, it has no force or effect of any kind now. It is only when it comes out of committee of the whole amended, added to or approved or disapproved, that it has force and effect. You can do anything with it you want. You can discuss it or not discuss it, change it or leave it alone; it is up to you. Mr. Butters?

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, it seems that the intent of my colleagues with reference to taking the paper back to their communities, I would suggest, sir, that while this may be admirable, I do not think it is possible because tomorrow I will move the motion again and the political paper will be in for discussion. The material in the two papers is known to all of us and has been known to all of us for five or six days. I would have thought that if there were any points of contention that Members would have possibly attempted to communicate with their constituents and made known to them these points. However, I just point out that the political paper will be in tomorrow for discussion when we sit.

MR. SPEAKER: I just want to make sure that if I can, Mr. Barnaby, you understand what Mr. Butters is saying? He is saying that you can deny unanimous consent today but tomorrow the rules will permit him to move his motion that it be discussed, just as long as you understand that.

Can we go into committee of the whole, gentlemen, and discuss the social development paper? I think we are agreed on that, are we?

MR. ERNERK: I disagree. Mr. Speaker, may I have unanimous consent of this Council to read out my own paper, my own little paper which I stayed up until three o'clock this morning typing out?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ernerk, if you had given unanimous consent to go into committee of the whole to discuss the social development paper, you then could discuss, you could then give your comments, but I am not sure exactly what you are trying to do. I have to be governed by the rules. Under what item would you be attempting to make your comments?

MR. ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, this concerns the two papers which were tabled this morning, one Tabled Document 1-57, political development in the North and the other is Tabled Document 2-57, social development.

MR. SPEAKER: Which document do your comments refer to?

MR. ERNERK: I refer to these two papers which we have in front of us.

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent has been denied to discuss the one, the political development one. I am desperately attempting to determine this Council's feelings with respect to discussing the second one. If you give your unanimous consent, then you may make your comments in committee of the whole with respect to the second one. This Council does not wish, apparently, to give unanimous consent to discuss the first one, so it would be completely improper for me, I think, to make any comments at this time with respect to the political development paper. However, if you will give your unanimous consent, Mr. Ernerk, we will move into committee of the whole to discuss the social development paper. You may, however, withhold it if you wish. That is entirely up to you. Do not let the Chair bully you into giving it.

Is there unanimous consent to permit Mr. Butters to move his motion with respect only to the social development paper?

MR. ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to speak again?

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order, whether or not you are prepared to give unanimous consent.

MR. ERNERK: On a point of privilege, may I be allowed to express -- I am speaking of voting. That is what I was getting at this morning when I was speaking on the two tabled documents.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, Mr. Ernerk, I can not let you do that. We are on the matter here simply of whether or not this Council -- in fact I should think, Mr. Butters, to be entirely proper, if you want to go ahead with the social development aspect, in that unanimous consent was denied for your specific motion which covered both, you should probably ask to return to notices of motions and start over with respect only to the social development paper. Do you follow me? Would you like to do that?

MR. BUTTERS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Returning to notices of motions, Item 7. Mr. Butters?

Notice of Motion to Move Tabled Document 2-57 into Committee of the Whole.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice that on this date, September 29, I wish to move that Tabled Document 2-57, a paper on social development be moved into committee of the whole for discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: Your notice of motion will stand with respect to the other tabled document which you will make tomorrow?

MR. BUTTERS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Going then to motions, Mr. Butters, is there unanimous consent for Mr. Butters to move his motion that the social development paper be discussed today in committee of the whole?

--- Agreed

Mr. Butters?

ITEM NO. 8: MOTIONS

Motion to Move Tabled Document 2-57 into Committee of the Whole.

MR. BUTTERS: I move that Tabled Document 2-57, a paper on social development be moved into committee of the whole for discussion.

Motion Carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Lafferty. Any discussion? Question? All in favour? Contrary?

--- Carried

There are two other motions. Mr. Lafferty, your motion, you have to request unanimous consent to move your motion which, as I recall it, was with regard to a visit with the Yukon Council. Is there unanimous consent for Mr. Lafferty to move his motion today which, as I understood it, dealt with a visit with the Yukon Council?

--- Agreed

Mr. Lafferty.

Motion 2-57: Meeting with Yukon Council

MR. LAFFERTY: You will have to excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I have such a bad cold I can hardly talk.

WHEREAS this Council is now in an almost identical constitutional position with the Yukon;

AND WHEREAS the political problems of evolution in both territories are similar, if not identical;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this Council invite the Yukon Council to meet with us at their convenience at Whitehorse to discuss problems of mutual concern and ways and means to aid each other in our aspirations. The time and date and other arrangements are to be left to Mr. Speaker to work out with the Yukon Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Butters. Discussion? Question?

MR. STEWART: Question.

Motion Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. All in favour? Contrary?

--- Carried

Motion 1-57, Mr. Steen with respect to a proposed visit to Alaska. Mr. Steen will need unanimous consent to move this motion today. Is there unanimous consent for Mr. Steen to move the motion?

--- Agreed

Mr. Steen?

Motion 1-57: Alaskan Visit

MR. STEEN: This is Motion 1-57.

WHEREAS a gas pipeline may be built in the Mackenzie during the term of this Council;

AND WHEREAS it is in the public interest that this Council assure that the necessary legislation and programs are implemented to protect the public and cushion the impact of such construction prior to its commencement;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this Council visit the State of Alaska to observe the conditions there for the purpose of preparing for the development expected in the Northwest Territories, and that this recommendation be communicated to the Commissioner with the request that he attempt to make the necessary funding available.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder for that motion? Mr. Ernerk. Discussion? Mr. Barnaby.

MR. BARNABY: I do not quite agree with the way it is worded there. From what I hear in the North the majority of the people are against the pipeline and that is just one way of getting control of developments that will be coming, so I do not -- it sort of implies that the pipeline is coming through against the wishes of the people.

MR. SPEAKER: Further comments? Mr. Butters?

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, an examination of the tabled documents indicate they refer to social development and political development and that we have not examined economic development. I suggest before any such realistic examination of such development can occur we must physically see what is taking place in our Alaskan neighbour next door. That is all this motion asks, that we visit Alaska. Such a visit does not suggest that we approve a pipeline or are against a pipeline. It gives us, the government of this country, the legislators of this country an opportunity to see what is occurring there. If the pipeline is built, we must be able to take steps to ensure that the people of the territories are protected to every extent possible and that is all this motion is saying. We should take a visit to improve our knowledge and information, enlarge on it.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion? Mr. Steen, you are entitled to close the debate but if Mr. Steen speaks no one speaks afterwards. Do you want to speak, Mr. Steen? Just before you do, though, is there anyone else who does? Mr. Lafferty?

An Educational Visit.

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Speaker, speaking for the motion, I feel that this is a very educational thing for the territorial Council, and as many of you here have heard in our discussions we are here for the purposes of gaining benefit for all northerners and if the concerns of my colleague Mr. Barnaby were to become immediately true, then I think that we as Councillors of the Northwest Territories owe the people better policies and in order to provide these better conditions we must know what is going on in our neighbourhood and in our backyard. In that regard I think that this is a very good move by Mr. Steen that we visit Alaska.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any further comment from any other Member before Mr. Steen takes the floor? Mr. Steen?

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the motion. I feel that we have to show that we care about the people who we are representing here, and we really care about them and we should be preparing ourselves for the development that will take place in the Northwest Territories. It may not be a pipeline, it could be just Delta drilling as is happening already. We have people now we can not hang onto in the Inuvik region because the oil companies are already using the people, the educated people, and there is no one left in the community to run the community because the oil companies are paying higher wages to the people for working and we can not hang onto them.

We should take a close look at the social problems which are developing in Alaska and I have been reading it and following it and I feel that if we are going to run this Northwest Territories then we should show that we care and make this visit. Alaska was unprepared when their pipeline was put through

and the problems that came up after that, they were not ready for them, for the development. I do not feel that Canada or the Northwest Territories should be caught in the same problem, for services, for hotels, hospitals, schools. Right now we have these kind of schools in the Northwest Territories but if we have a big development there will be no more room in the hospitals and no more room in the hotels, no more room in the schools for your own children. They will all be full from the people who will be moving into the territories. This is why I would like to see us visit Alaska before we make further plans for the economic part and social part of the development. That is all Mr. Speaker.

Motion Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Steen's comments have closed the debate. The question being called. The question. All in favour? Contrary?

--- Carried

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think you got mixed up in number regarding the two motions as the last motion was actually number one and the first one is actually number two. So possibly we could straighten that out in the records. Secondly I wonder if we could have these lights turned off as nobody seems to be using the cameras at this point and it is getting rather warm.

MR. SPEAKER: Firstly as to numbering of the motions, the number that they should have is determined by the order in which the Speaker deals with them. They guessed the wrong order when they put them in the book. On the second question, as I understand it we did agree that the lights would be turned off at the request of any Member and I think, Mr. Clerk, if you would see they were turned off now ...

Turning to the orders of the day, that completed Item 8, motions. We had dealt with Item 9, tabling of documents. Item 10, consideration in committee of the whole of various matters.

ITEM NO. 10: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF VARIOUS MATTERS.

We will need a motion to resolve into committee of the whole to consider a paper relating to social development in the Northwest Territories. Moved by Mr. Butters and seconded by Mr. Lyall. The question. All in favour? Contrary?

--- Carried.

Council will resolve into committee of the whole to consider a paper relating to social development in the Northwest Territories which is a tabled document and Mr. Stewart will be in the chair.

--- Council resolved into Committee of the Whole for consideration of a paper relating to social development in the Northwest Territories with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER A PAPER RELATING
TO SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The committee will come to order to study the paper on social development. Probably we will follow our usual format if it is agreed by this committee and at this time I would accept statements of a general nature regarding the paper. Mr. Nickerson?

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, I have a prepared speech on the social development paper which I would like to read out now as it would not take too long. I think that Council reserves a high degree of priority in matters regarding social development in the broadest possible sense for the people of the Northwest Territories. The paper on social development although incomplete in that it does not address itself to such important areas as health or justice is, in my opinion, a worth-while document and I give it my support, for three important points of principle which it asserts and with which I am in complete agreement as follows:

Three Points of Principle

The first is that self-sufficiency should be the goal of all programs. For instance, an educational program would not become complete unless it prepares those who take part in it for a viable existence both in the territories and for those all over the world. Welfare programs should encourage the recipients to look after themselves as much as possible. The second is that services should be rendered on the basis of need and in so far as is possible there should not be separate programs or policies designed specifically for people of different ethnic origin.

The third is that the real power and authority must be delegated to the communities. Just as Ottawa has refused to grant authority to the territorial government, so we have concentrated power in Yellowknife and refuse to allow people, especially in the smaller communities a real say in their own affairs. We can not neglect the danger that many mistakes will be made by inexperienced local authorities, but I believe it is worth the risk. I endorse the policies and recommendations made in this paper.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Ernerk?

MR. ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, if I may be allowed to speak very briefly on the report on social development, I was going to originally stand up, but I shall remain sitting down while I am reading my little brief this morning.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I wonder if you could move your mike up? I think they may be having a problem hearing you.

MR. ERNERK: All right, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I want to briefly refer to my speech to the Committee for an Independent Canada which I made the other day, last weekend which was on the 19th of September, 1975. As this territorial Council's elected Member to the Executive of the Government of the Northwest Territories responsible for social development, I want to express a few brief ideas on something that was tabled this morning.

I had originally said at the time, giving my speech to the Committee for an Independent Canada that as head of this department one of my top priorities will be to train or to see that extensive training of native people be undertaken by my own department. As you know, presently all the responsibilities, all the jobs are presently held by southern professionally trained members of the working force. It is my intention, or I seek the support of the territorial Council so that the training of native people be undertaken in the immediate future so that these native people who are presently only in such positions as welfare workers and social workers in the communities could become the professional work force throughout the communities in the Northwest Territories. I spoke of starting up what I called social development committees which in my opinion, would be involved in the broadest aspects of the department itself, that is to say, that these committees could give some direction to the social workers, and welfare workers in the communities in terms of child care programs, corrections programs, health services, adoption services, etc. At the same time I want to see, and I seek the support of the territorial Council Members, that welfare appeal systems be introduced throughout the communities of the Northwest Territories. We have yet to introduce psychiatric services, family counselling services for the people living in the communities, the small communities throughout the Northwest Territories. We have yet to introduce a number of services which could meet the requirements of the people, mainly those who have become the underprivileged, the disabled, the needy and the delinquent.

Social Development Should be Controlled by Inuit People

First, if social development is to be meaningful for the people, it must be decided by and controlled by the people. Therefore Mr. Chairman, before I can vote on the various recommendations which were made at the seminar, I must consult with my constituents on these particular matters. The Inuit people, in my opinion, must examine their own needs and problems and develop and control the programs and services which they require, or should I say which we require, to meet our needs as a developing people. What I am simply saying, Mr. Chairman, is that before I myself could vote on these recommendations which we have in front of us, I would like to request that these recommendations on social development be translated into Inuit syllabics, and distributed to the communities in the Eastern Arctic. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Any further comments of a general nature?
Mr. Lyall?

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that being an elected Member from the Central Arctic, that if we keep going back to our communities we will not get anything done. I think we were elected by those people and we should consider that very much, but if we keep going back to the communities it will take a heck of a long time to implement what we have been trying to do for the last seven days. I think we should look very deeply into this before we vote on whether we go back to our constituents and ask them what to do. I think that we should be able to decide seeing that we are out of about 3000 votes from the people and I think if we keep going back to the communities it will take a long time to implement what we have been trying to do.

MR. NICKERSON: Hear, hear!

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Butters?

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out as all Members know that the title is rather misleading on the paper on social development. Here we are not only talking about the responsibilities of Mr. Ernerk's department specifically but also the responsibilities which this Council has in the areas of social development which I believe to be education, the Department of Social Development, medical services, which although is not presently under his department may become the responsibility of this government at some time in the future and other responsibilities which relate directly to people.

General Policies Should be Discussed

So that I think that what we might do in discussing this paper is to look at the general principles which will have effect and apply them to all of these departments and responsibilities. These principles which Mr. Ernerk feels should be taken back to the communities are very, very broad and certainly they are not programs at this time. They are general policies. As there will be much time between the time we discuss this paper and when our decisions are implemented, there will be a great opportunity for Members to discuss the various policy statements with their constituents and an opportunity to come back in the finance committee or our various committees over the next year to ensure that the programs that we finally implement, talking about programs now, meet the requirements and the needs of our constituents. But we are not talking about programs today, we are talking about policies and very general policy statements. I would like to discuss the general policy statement as related to the three departments that of self-sufficiency, of encouraging incentives rather than giveaways. These are the areas which I think we might spend time on properly in this discussion.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Comments of a general nature? Mr. Pudluk?

MR. PUDLUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to make a few comments on the social development document. I would also like to support what the other speaker was saying. I feel the same way. We were elected, as Mr. Butters said, to do what the people want for the people in the North and this relates to similar roles. I say for myself I would like to do everything I can for the people in the North. I am not just saying that for Inuit people, other people too. Since this document is going to be really important to the people of the North we might even take -- add something else or take one off. We have got lots of time. The world is not going to end tomorrow. Therefore, I think we should let the people know in general all about it. That is what I have to say. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Lafferty?

Social Workers Needed in Communities to Assist the Unable

MR. LAFFERTY: Speaking to some of the remarks of our honourable colleague Mr. Ernerk, and the other remarks I heard by other honourable colleagues, I agree with Mr. Lyall and others who have pointed out certain things and their position. As Mr. Ernerk said, all departmental workers work toward becoming full scale social workers in their own communities for native people and also that these communities examine their own needs. I really do not get the position of Mr. Ernerk. I am wondering Mr. Chairman, whether

Mr. Ernerk is speaking to us as a government executive or an executive of Council, or is he speaking to us as both? In my own experience social work has a long history of being able to help the unable. In the case of the Northwest Territories we have very many unable people and of course that applies to other places where there are depressing conditions. Of course the sick and the poor and people affected nearly always have been unable to help themselves and for that reason I regard the social workers in the North here, all across the country, as very important people. Whether we agree with some of their approaches or not, that does not bear too much weight as to weighing and measuring the needs to have highly trained social workers.

As you remember, I pressed very, very hard with each and every one of you for a higher standard of education. Social work requires a lot of understanding, a lot of training and a lot of experience. I think that in time we will require, too, trained social workers in our communities. There is a big gap for a period of at least five years. What do we do in the meantime? We must have trained personnel who can assist these people.

Trained Native Counsellors Needed for Future Development.

In other areas of social problems that we are having are you not thinking only about the sick or the person unable to make a living, that he must draw welfare? I look at the social environment as that institution which prepares people for their future development and that means higher political achievements, better economic conditions and in order to do these things we must have better schools, we must have counselling services in employment and every other area of social development. Presently we have none of these people. Presently in the Northwest Territories there are only half a dozen native people who are counsellors in these fields. I would have to support the proposed social development policy not because I agree with it wholeheartedly. As many of you know, I disagree with some parts of it, but this is -- I have to also think not only of my community but the other communities across the country. Indeed, experienced for several years working with people, I know the need of policies whether we agree with them or not. We need training for native people in these many areas. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I have been informed coffee is ready. Do I have unanimous consent of this committee to adjourn for coffee for 15 minutes?

--- Agreed

--- SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The Chair recognizes a quorum and calls the meeting back to order. Mr. McCallum?

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman ...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I am sorry, we have no interpreters. Please stand by for a moment.

Executive Committee Members for Council Need Direction from Council

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, one of the problems I have as an Executive Committee Member for this Council is to what extent do I press for my own views at the Executive Committee or to what extent do I press for Council's views on matters that come to the Executive Committee? One of the basic premises upon which we as Councillors were elected was that we were representatives of the people in our constituencies and it is my belief that the people in the constituencies thought of us as being capable of making decisions. These two papers that we have, I believe, are policy matters not administrative matters, and as such would give this Council's Members on the Executive Committee direction as to what this Council is attempting to do and the direction in which this Council is moving. I would want to get direction from Council. They placed me in a position as an Executive Member to bring forward their views at the Executive Committee meetings. I do not want to be placed in opposition to this Council. I am one of you. You want me to bring your views to Executive Committee meetings. If you do not give them to me I can not. You made me responsible for education specifically and the other departments generally. How am I to bring your views to these meetings if you do not direct me? If this Council gives direction, then I think you hold me accountable for the administration and bringing this direction to Executive Committee. There are individual items within any paper or papers that can be changed at any time. I do not believe as a Councillor and Executive Member for Council on the Executive Committee I am trying to frustrate Council. I believe the way we are moving now that Council is trying to frustrate me.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. The Chair recognizes Dave Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, I admit to having been a little bit confused about whether or not a Member of the Executive Committee is speaking on his own behalf or on behalf of the government when he speaks in this house. I wonder if it would be at all possible if perhaps the Commissioner or the Deputy Commissioner or somebody with administrative authority could explain what the situation really is?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Would you like to field that question, Mr. Commissioner?

Council Adopts Paper from Minister with Proposed Amendments to N.W.T. Act

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, Mr. Chairman, Members of Council, I really did not want to get into this discussion but I guess it is impossible to dodge. The present system of government in the Northwest Territories, as the system that has been in existence for 105 years, was decided by the central government in Ottawa. The powers for its implementation and its function are found in the Northwest Territories Act. Regrettably, neither this Council nor the people of the Northwest Territories, nor I as a servant of the Government of Canada can in any way change those rules.

When the former Council pressed for changes to the Northwest Territories Act, the Minister responded by putting together a paper which contained a series of amendments which he was prepared to put forward to the House of Commons for changes to the Northwest Territories Act. That paper was brought here 18 months ago and at a special session in Yellowknife the Council adopted that paper with one or two suggestions and one of them was that there be three Executive Members from Council rather than two. But in the main, that design, that paper, laid the groundwork for both this Council and the present executive system.

Members on Executive Must Give Up Individual Status

Now the system envisioned in its form comes from the Yukon Council, and in a paper that was tabled at the January session of the last Council and again referred to in June and in May to this Council, is the viewpoint of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and it also contains guidelines as to how this Council should operate and how the Executive should operate. The two Members who you have placed on the Executive, when they are on the Executive, they are your spokesmen and are supposed to reflect your views on the Executive Committee. By the same token, the two Members who sit in this house are here to reflect our views, the views of the Executive. That is the price you pay for accepting membership on the Executive, you give up your individual status; in other words, it is not possible for you to speak any longer as an individual because if you do, then no one can understand whether you are speaking for yourself or speaking for the Executive Committee. So, it is a very, very difficult role to be in and no one knows it better than I, because I have to bottle up hundreds of personal opinions because whatever I say would be and could be, and rightly so, construed as the views of the Government of Canada, because I am a federal civil servant, not a territorial civil servant. My employer is the Government of Canada, my immediate superior is the Minister of Indian Affairs and his superior is the Prime Minister of Canada. So it is very, very difficult to be able to operate with that responsibility because many things that happen you have your own views on but you can not express them. You must express the views that either you have been directed to express, or what you know to be the policy of the employer, the competent authority, the responsible authority, and that is the Government of Canada.

Changes Subject to Federally Held Responsibilities

When I decide that I can no longer accept that direction, or I no longer can live with that and wish to speak out on my own, then I have no other alternative but to hand in my resignation, and there have been times when I have wondered but I felt that I could do more within the system than I could from without. Now the Council of 1964 to 1967 came to the conclusion that it was time for change. I was a Member of that Council and we worked night and day to set up the Carrothers Commission. It did not happen by a miracle and took a heck of a lot of persuading and a lot of work and in making those decisions, they were the type of decisions you have to make in your own conscience. The problem that would be before you here, on the social motion is that within that motion are certain responsibilities that this Council can not control. As a matter of fact, neither can the Administration, nor can the territorial government, because they are federally held responsibilities. It would seem to me that on some of these things you must go on your own recognition, on your own decision, keeping in mind that this is not a Magna Carta that you are putting together, it is not something that you are putting together for all time, it is merely the start of the instrument, the start of the road, and you will, during the life of this Council add to it, you may even amend or change it, but all of us know that anything that will improve the lot of the people in the Northwest Territories and in the communities is a desirable thing.

Executive Committee Members Reflect Views of the Executive

So what I am simply saying is that Mr. Ernerk is not speaking the views of the Executive Committee, he is speaking his own views and I feel that on things of this kind it is a learning process you go through, but as time goes on Mr. Ernerk and Mr. McCallum and you as a Council must understand their position, that they reflect the views of the Executive. It is only through your good graces that you have allowed us to sit here, but I will only speak under the most reluctant of circumstances to be of assistance. However the views of the Executive come from those two Members and when those two Members no longer express the views of the Executive, then it will be my duty to tell you and then you will have to decide what you want to do about it. By the same token, when they no longer reflect your views as a Council to the Executive, then I am also bound to tell you that too.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, the Chair was in a predicament trying to decide whether this was political in nature and in part I guess it was but since it had to do also with social development, the Chair has allowed this to proceed this far. However the point on political and social development, there the line gets pretty thin and we are certainly walking that line. The next speaker?

MR. EVALUARJUK: Mr. Chairman, I think we are on the same subject from the beginning and we were thoroughly confused from the beginning.

Our constituencies in the Eastern Arctic which we represent, there we were elected by the people hoping to help the people of the Northwest Territories and I was agreeing with what was said earlier, but however, right now I think I will say my part on this area.

Decisions of Council Should Have Constituents Consent

What was said earlier was agreeable to me, and if the papers were translated into the language concerned and sent to most of the communities or distributed to communities for our people's approval it would be better. However, I do not wish to tell untrue information and I have written a letter and told the people that if anything should be made, if there is a decision made by this Council, I would try and help the people of my constituency through the Council. It was not too long ago, in fact I think it would be appropriate to make a decision at the January session on these papers. In consulting with our people first, the native people, they should know what we are doing, what we are writing down on paper. This will take or has taken many years to develop, regulations, and if we go ahead making regulations without our people's approval it would not be appropriate. We were elected to represent our people in our constituency and therefore I think it would be inappropriate to approach anything without our people's consent. We would be in a very bad position if we went ahead and made a decision without our people's consent.

Last June we made a decision and were misleading our people because we were not consulting with our people. At the meeting last June, and it is a little bit confusing because a lot of people do not understand as many of the remarks passing through this Council are not translated. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Are there any other comments of a general nature? Mr. Speaker?

Paper on Social Development States Present Thoughts

MR. SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I suppose that I have the good fortune really of being in an entirely different position than the Executive Members. When I sit in this chair I sit here as the Member representing the constituency of Yellowknife South. When I sit in that chair of course I can not afford the luxury of commenting on the merits of a matter, but I can here in committee of the whole. What I would like to say deals with what I see to be the possible courses of action open to this Council. We could accept the paper after sufficient discussion and as already pointed out, that is not an irrevocable act, it is not something that binds us for all time. As we learn, and as we see where the paper should be added to or subtracted from we can from time to time to time, make the necessary alterations in our position. In fact I would rather hope that we would do that because circumstances change, time passes on and there is nothing in this day and age I think that should be treated as a shrine. Although we have worked very hard at coming up with this paper I do not regard it as the final word on the subject of social development, to the contrary, it states only, in the most general terms, our present -- and I underline that -- our present thoughts. So that is one course of action.

The other course of action would be to do as I understand three or four Members are suggesting to do, to simply receive the paper in effect, to discuss it, but not to adopt it as our policy and as our priorities in the area of social development, but instead to just receive it and all go back to our constituencies and presumably each Member would travel around to each of his settlements and discuss this matter with his constituents. I do not know how you would do that. It seems to me you can not do it on an individual basis, but would you discuss it with the settlement councils, or would you hold public meetings? When do you determine that you have thoroughly discussed it and how do you sort out what your constituents want because presumably some will understand it, some will not understand it, some will agree, some will disagree and in the final analysis you will have to come back and make your own decision on what you think they want.

Responsibility to Act in Interests of People as a Whole

Surely though, your responsibility goes further than that. Surely you must decide in the final analysis not only what your constituents may want for one reason or another, but as well what you think is best for them and not just for them, but for the people as a whole. Surely you are not just in effect a rubber stamp of what your constituents may wish. You may have to, from time to time, go entirely contrary to what you know they want but what you think and firmly believe is entirely in their best interests and in the interests of all of the people of the territories as a whole. Once you are elected to this Council, as I understand it, you are a representative of all of the people, though you are elected indeed by one small part of the territories, and your responsibility is to act in the interests of all of the people as you interpret that interest to be. So going back in determining the wishes of your constituents, although an important thing to do, is only one of the factors which you must consider and not necessarily in my view the prime one.

Now of course, if you continually go against the wishes of your constituents, the practical result of that would be that at the end of your four year term you might not be re-elected. However, again are you here to be re-elected? Is that the purpose of the exercise or are you here to act while you are here

in the best interests of the people regardless of the personal consequences? You know, I think all these things have to be thought out carefully. So that seems to be the other course of action that you might wish to follow, to go back to your constituents, but I suggest if you do decide to do that, you should try and put it in proper perspective, that you just do not go back there to come back here as a rubber stamp necessarily of what your constituents want.

Personally, and I think I can give a personal preference while I sit here, I think we should consider each of these points. I think the chairman might wish to call each of them out and call for comment, to debate each of them and if we accept them, to do so. If we change them, to change them and end up with a paper that we at this time approve or do not approve, again appreciating that it is not the last word, but at this time these are our preliminary thoughts. I think this is a very preliminary document. I, speaking for myself and my own constituency, think it is an excellent start, but I do sense some reluctance in this house to make a start and that I must say is a surprise. Some people have seemed to view this as the finish. It is not the finish -- surely it is a start and let us not be so timorous as to not to want to start. Those are my comments, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. The Chair recognizes Mr. James Wah-Shee.

MR. WAH-SHEE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some comments in regard to the comments made by the Member for Yellowknife South. With all due respect to the opinions expressed, I feel that -- I like the term where do we start and how do we start? My personal feeling is that if we are going to start, let us start on the right footing. I think the other thing is that I think that as a representative of the constituency I feel that it is important that one represents the feelings of the constituency that one represents because that basically is the essence of why we are here.

People Must Understand Decisions to be Made

The other thing is that I think that the implications, the long-term implications of what we are going to decide here I think are very, very important that our people understand. I think that we can discuss matters in isolation from our constituencies and make decisions here, but I do not think that that is really the proper way to do it. I think, if we are going to make this Council work and be a meaningful thing, that it is going to be meaningful to the people we represent, I think it is important that our people understand. I support the statement that Mr. Evaluarjuk has made, also Mr. Ernerk and Mr. Pudluk that we should confer with our people and that these particular documents that we are considering are not really of an emergency nature that we have got to make the decision here. As I understand it, this particular session is for one day, at least that is how the notices have come, so if we are going to have a one day session, I understand that the next session is going to be in January and it is going to last for three weeks. I am sure that at that time that we will have three weeks to consider the various documents and policy papers that we have been discussing informally among ourselves.

Also I do not particularly agree that I should have to compromise the wishes of my constituency. If they do not agree, then that is why I have been elected. I also have a right to disagree. I also have the right to agree and also co-operate in the interests of the Council as a whole. I also think that we are working towards self-government in the Northwest Territories and I think that we have got to take the time to make sure that people are with us and behind us.

Welfare Appeal Boards Should Be Instituted

Also on social development I see no mention of welfare appeal boards. As I understand it, when the territorial government reached an agreement with the federal Government of Canada on the Canada Assistance Plan one of the prerequisites of the agreement was that welfare appeal boards were to be set up. I do not see that such an arrangement is in existence under social development, so that is one area that I am concerned about. I would like to see that included in the social development because if it is one of the requirements under the agreement which the Northwest Territories agreed to with the federal Government of Canada, then I think it should have been instituted a long time ago.

The other one is what type of structure should -- how this welfare appeal board should be instituted I think requires further discussion and I would be interested in hearing from other Members on this. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Any further comments of a general nature before we go into section by section? Councillor Kilabuk.

Wishes of Constituents Should be Known

MR. KILABUK: I would like to say a few words which will not be very long but it will be what I think. What you have just talked about I believe in and understand, but I think -- I seem to be thinking a little differently. I have been voted to be a Member of the territorial Council and before I was voted for, before I was elected I told them what I would do. I told them I would try and help them and say the things that they wished for. I can offer what I think. The Inuit people in my constituency can tell me what they want me to say and they believe in this. What you have just talked about I agree with but the people in my constituency are about 600 people and if I say what I do not know something about, it will not be very good here. If we agree to anything that our people do not know about, we, the Members of the Council, are 15 in number for the whole of the territories and we represent a lot of people and we all know it. They will know what we have said in Council, they will hear about it and if we say anything that they do not agree with they can talk about it themselves and I think personally that the people in our constituencies should be told about some certain documents that will come to be.

We all know what we did yesterday, we can not do it again. Now if we are going to talk about this before people from some of the constituencies know about it we will not be able to go back, just like yesterday never comes back. If we had this in syllabics, we do not understand it accurately unless it is in syllabics. We seem to be in too much of a rush during the seven days we have been here and we are trying to fix this for the future but we seem to be in too much of a rush.

Before we even say who is going to be responsible for this I think we should think about who will be responsible for it, in the various settlements, either settlement councils or hamlet councils or other bodies. We have said there should be other councils and committees. We never mentioned it, but I feel it is time to start, if we are going to have these papers for a long time, we have to think about them. We all know that people in the constituencies, especially Inuit, the Commissioner comes to the settlement, and we tell him, people tell him what they would like to see. They do not get answers for a very long time while the government is trying to decide upon it and we are trying to find these papers and I think we should think about it more longer and not get in a rush. When you hear different people speaking different opinions, it is difficult to make a decision, and no one has said really anything, but when you -- they say when you hear different opinions it does not make it any easier to come to a result. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Councillor Butters?

MR. BUTTERS: Just two things, Mr. Chairman. From my experience with the past Councils, and my knowledge of Councils in the past, I see nothing which has been put forward in either paper that is very new. The ideas as far as I can see were talked about by the past Council and it seems that what Members of this Council are doing is re-examining them and restating them.

Direction to Government Should Come from Council

I think we must remember too, that Mr. McCallum, and Mr. Ernerk as Members of the Executive Committee require direction as to what decisions they may be required to make. So do some 2000 territorial civil servants require such direction, and that direction, as I understand it is given by this body. If we refuse to give that direction then the Government of the Northwest Territories grinds to a stop and nobody knows what is happening. Staff morale diminishes. We begin to lose people and as I say the Government of the Northwest Territories grinds to a stop. Now when this happens an organization which has been slowed down and stopped, and a Council which is doing nothing, becomes passé. We disappear and the feds step in, the federal government steps in and they take back from the people of the North the power which they have delegated, not delegated so much as fought for. What this Council and past Councils have fought for is taken back. When we cease to make decisions then what we are saying to the feds is, "It is all yours." I think this is important, because self-government and autonomy means we make the decisions.

Now, I recognize that consultation at the community level is most important and that we as Members of this Council must do that. We must do that, and if we do not do that and say things which our constituents do not support or approve of, then next time around we do not come back.

The second thing I wish to say is that my colleague Councillor Wah-Shee, spoke of a one day session, and I think this has now become a two, three or five day session. I have business which I hope to discuss and I do not intend to go home until this business is raised, and I think all Councillors who attended the closed meetings we had heard me say this then, that if we are going to sit over and go into other things then I have business which affects my constituents which I will bring up and continue to bring up until I am satisfied that that business is completed. So we will have lots of time to discuss many, many things.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Do any other Members wish to speak on the general principle of the paper? Councillor Barnaby?

MR. BARNABY: I would not speak on the paper but I sense an attempt to make us feel guilty for not making a decision right now and that is a very unhealthy situation to be in. I would not want to make a decision right now and the other Members have expressed this same opinion. All we wish is a means to consult with our people, and so far we have accepted the system in this Council, the way it operates and its rules and there are no attempts made to understand us or to understand our approach. That is all I have to say.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. If there are no further questions of a general nature, do you wish to go through this paper now, clause by clause?

--- Agreed

The "whereas" section at the beginning of the document.

MR. BUTTERS: For clarification, Mr. Chairman. Does social development in that sense relate to the department or does it relate to the broad definition that we earlier touched upon?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): It is my understanding that this is a general policy paper and therefore it would be termed as a generality, and that is my opinion and does anyone else have one? Are we agreed on the "whereas" section?

--- Agreed

MR. BUTTERS: Recognizing at the present time that the medical services do not fall under that broad title. PART 1.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): PART I, general principles. PARTS I and II. Is it the wish I read these as everyone has a copy in front of them but I can read them if you like?

"PART I, GENERAL PRINCIPLES: 1. The overriding principle of all social development programs should be to encourage self-sufficiency.

2. Social development programs should be devised and implemented without regard to racial origin."

MR. SEARLE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I am wondering whether the interpreter in the booth has a copy of the paper.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The answer is yes, he does.

MR. SEARLE: That is fine.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): On PART I, is number 1 agreed?

--- Agreed

Number 2?

--- Agreed

"PART II, SOCIAL SERVICES: 1. In the broad sense, government has to learn to say 'no' to people unless a reasonable level of self-sufficiency is achievable. The handing out of money must cease to be a solution to all problems."

Is it agreed?

--- Agreed

"2. i. A system of rewards for achievement should be the social services policy, not as at present, which is one of disincentive for the achiever and reward for the non-achiever."

Is it agreed?

--- Agreed

"ii. The system, as it now stands, tends to keep people 'down' thereby requiring more government aid programs, hence more government, the expenditure of more public funds and a never ending growth in the civil service."

Councillor Butters?

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I think or I get confused in terms here, social services now relates to the Department of Social Development specifically, does it?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Yes.

MR. BUTTERS: I think that number 1 of PART II is a policy which should extend throughout the whole spectrum of social development programming, that we should seek to provide incentive and encouragement to people to attain self-sufficiency. I think that this is something that should apply in the area of social services and education, and other aspects of social development in the broad sense. I would hope that just because it is confined to this portion of the paper, it does not suggest that it is limited to that portion of the paper, but that the concept extends throughout the whole spectrum of our social development responsibilities, that the person who seeks and works and goes out and attempts to help himself is the person who is assisted and the person who has made available to him incentives and other encouragements.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I think the point is well taken but I do not know what you do to cure it because this paper is essentially about social development and it is difficult to incorporate it in this paper.
Councillor Searle.

MR. SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, if you go back to the general principles PART I, number 1, you will see repeated there the emphasis, in other words, it is on self-sufficiency which I would think since it is under general principles applies to everything.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Any further comments? Is paragraph 2, subparagraph ii agreed?

--- Agreed

"iii. However, where aid is really required, for example for nursing care for the aged and psychiatric care, staff and facilities are non-existent within the Northwest Territories, the reason being presumably being because it is not possible to just make out a cheque to an individual."

Are we agreed?

--- Agreed

"3. Community involvement and control must be emphasized, particularly the opportunity for a community to take over and administer services presently performed by the territorial government. Each community must be consulted individually. A prime objective should be for everyone in a particular community to receive services equally."

Is is agreed? Councillor Butters?

MR. BUTTERS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I take it the reference here is specifically to welfare services, services of the Department of Social Development. Is that correct?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): That would be my assumption, yes.

MR. BUTTERS: I would anticipate that those services would include the giving out of welfare moneys and handling of the administering of welfare moneys?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): That I believe is part of the intent, yes.

MR. BUTTERS: It seems to me that there could be a danger where the control of the Administration, and the giving out of such moneys could be contrary to another statement somewhere in this paper to the effect that all people are to be served equally. I recollect that I raised this matter before when we discussed the point, and I wish to raise it again, that there is a real danger here, there are implications here which can have far reaching effect. Certainly this trend is new, this is new from what past Councils have commented on or recommended, and this is certainly one thing the community should understand very, very thoroughly, every member of the community, and get some idea just what could occur when the dispensing of welfare funds becomes the responsibility of a group in that community.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Councillor Nickerson?

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, I think in my opening remarks I referred to the danger which Mr. Butters has just referred to now. It is obvious that there is a very great danger involved, but on the other hand if we do not give the local people control over their own finances, so to speak, we are not in fact giving them any control at all. I think it is a danger, we have to realize it is a danger and we have to be prepared to take the risks involved. We know that mistakes will be made just the same as the federal government knows that we will undoubtedly make mistakes if they transfer a lot of what is presently their responsibilities over to us. However, I think that at least people will be making their own mistakes, and I think it is the general concensus of opinion here that people have to gain experience in handling their own affairs and have to, as I said before, have real and proper control and not just control on paper.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Councillor Butters?

MR. BUTTERS: I define "control" as the legislation and regulations which determine how such funds are to be turned over, how such funds are to be used, and I just wonder whether Councillor Nickerson is suggesting that that responsibility for legislating and developing those regulations should be turned over to the communities too. Is that what "control" means to him? What does he mean by "control"?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Do you care to answer that, Mr. Nickerson?

MR. NICKERSON: Yes, it would seem that this particular clause, it is not possible for us here today to say "Okay, we will transfer this, this and this and retain control of this, this and this." I think it is a matter of laying down the principle that more control, more responsibility should be given to the various communities.

Control by Communities Must be on Individual Basis

It is pretty obvious that each community is not capable or would want to take over the same amounts of control and responsibility. We have made it quite obvious in here that each community must be treated on an individual basis and in a certain community the Administration would probably be quite correct in saying "Under the present circumstances we are not prepared to transfer so much control." In other communities they might be prepared to transfer a very great deal of the control and the people might want that control transferred. I think we are leaving a lot of administrative matters to be cleared up presumably by the Administration. I think what we are trying to do here is to lay down the fundamental principle that wherever possible control and responsibility, responsibility for finances should be transferred to the individual communities.

As regards legislative matters, we will be responsible for the general legislation affecting social services, social welfare, etc. Presumably the way I would expect this to operate would be for the local community, settlement council or a special welfare board or something of that nature which might vary from one community to another, they would probably like to take on the responsibility of drawing up rules for the handing out of welfare cheques for instance, that they might feel are applicable to their particular community. These would probably be very different from Hay River to Inuvik in dealing with an entirely different set of circumstances. I think that if the communities were allowed to draw up their own bylaws or something of that nature, using authority which is delegated to them from us, we at all times would have to take the alternate responsibility. There would obviously have to be legislation set up whereby if we are not satisfied the people were using the control and responsibility in a responsible manner, we could again take back this control, the same as the federal government can do that with us. This is what I understand by control and responsibility. I agree with you that there are great dangers involved in doing this and I think it is a matter of whether or not we are prepared to accept this risk.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Councillor Searle.

MR. SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I think that that PART II which has been described as social services should probably be more broadly described as "social services and local government". For instance, when you get to paragraph 3 on page two I would not restrict that statement of principle solely to the provision of social services. That principle as stated in my humble opinion is applicable not only to social services, but more applicable to local government. I think that that PART II heading should be really "social services and local government." I would like to suggest that we make that clear here particularly because of the statement of principle in paragraph 3. Admittedly paragraphs 1 and 2 apply probably more particularly to social services but paragraph 3 to my mind applies more particularly to local government.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I agree with what Councillor Searle and Councillor Nickerson have said with regard to giving more authority to the communities. I think we all do and past Councils have as well. I think that the suggestion that Councillor Searle has advanced has proven that point and it should be so stated. Councillor Nickerson brought in another word which is very important and which is not contained in this statement, "responsibility." I think that if we recognize that we, in the final analysis, are responsible for what goes on and we, in the final analysis, must determine how the activities are carried out, then that would be satisfactory.

Motion to Amend Title, PART II, Social Development Paper

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. I have a suggestion then. As I understand it, the title of PART II should read "social services and local government." Is this correct, Councillor Searle?

MR. SEARLE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Would you so move that amendment?

MR. SEARLE: Yes, I would.

Motion Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I have an amendment to change PART II to read "social services and local government." Does anybody wish to speak to this amendment? Agreed?

--- Agreed

The amendment is carried. PART II will now read "social services and local government."

MR. SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I think I would like to speak, if I could, just to paragraph 3 to explain what I think that means because I do not think an important principle like that should just be left to the interpretation that anyone might wish to put on it. I would hope other Members might say what they think they mean by that when you agree to something like that.

Basically what I mean by it, and it may be different from what everyone else means by it, but what I mean by that is this. We get certain authority from the federal government and we are trying to get more authority from the federal government in the area of provincial type services and responsibilities. I see our responsibility here not to keep that authority centralized in the Arthur Laing building but rather, as quickly as we get it we should be passing it on to the local level where that is possible and not just the problem areas, not just the water and sewage and garbage contracts, but realistic authority for people to do things in their community that they want. We should make sure that whatever is passed on is funded sufficiently so that the responsibilities can be discharged. I get the feeling, I must say, that that is not presently the policy of Local Government. I get the feeling that Local Government passes on the honeybag problems to the settlement councils and in the problem areas but keeps back the real control, the real responsibility back here centrally located and directed from the Arthur Laing building.

Responsibilities Should be Given to Communities Where Feasible

I do not think that that is a meaningful development at the local level. That sort of thing can only frustrate the people in the communities, so when I say this it is just one of the 15 people who are saying it, when I say each community must be examined individually, that an extensive examination has to be made and a determination as to what that community can handle. You can not just say "Well, we will give this list of responsibilities to every community." They may not just have the resources in a community to handle it, but each community should be examined as to whether it should take over in a realistic way what responsibilities it feels it can handle and this government feels it can handle. This government should, in my opinion, not sit back and be reluctant to do this and it should not be playing the power trip game of holding back those responsibilities when a community has the resources, the manpower to execute them.

That is what I mean by that principle. In other words, as we get things, powers and responsibilities by the federal government we do not just build up our power chest, you might call it, we pass it on to the communities so it does not stay with us. By "us" I mean the territorial government, excepting those areas where you have to set up a framework through legislation. The legislative responsibility may stay with us but the actual performance of things should get down as far as possible to the community level. I do not know if that has helped or hindered or added confusion but that is what I feel about it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Councillor Lafferty?

"Community" Should be Defined

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to reply as to what I have heard up to the moment particularly the last statements by the Honourable Member for Yellowknife South. I think there is a lot to be concerned about in this item paragraph 3. It has not been pointed out yet, something that I am also concerned about. I think that the word "community" must be defined. What do we mean by communities? How many people constitute a community? Is it three or four or is it 200 or 300? I am in agreement with Mr. Searle's comments and Mr. Butters' but I would like to change a word here, the words "the opportunity for a community" to "the opportunity for incorporated settlements" or something of that nature, which would protect the people in these communities.

I think to give control to a community in general terms is too dangerous. We have many people of diverse interests, different cultural backgrounds living in some of the larger settlements and going back to the expressed views of others on local government. To give more control to the people by going back into the constituencies is a very good term for an argument, but I believe that we have been elected from within the constituencies to represent all the people in major policies for all of the Northwest Territories and for all of the people, and the danger in this, the opportunity for a community to take over the administration of services is that somewhere, if this turnover is done so loosely, it may result in further community breakdown. I agree with the whole principle, we must place more control at the community level, but these controls should be by a central administrative body, such as town councils and should not be turned over to regional administrative bodies. It is a hard thing, I can not decide which way to go until we define what we mean by a "community".

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Councillor Steen?

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on what Mr. Lafferty has said. I think what we were trying to do is give the communities control over the services in the communities so they can have a better control. No system at the present time knows the welfare of the individual in the community except the people who are in the community. So I feel that each community should have the right, whether they are incorporated or not, to be able to administer social services.

Abuses of Welfare Felt in Communities.

There are some people abusing the right to receive welfare and this is the feeling in some communities. They see people refusing to work, especially in small communities and the jobs are there and available most of the time, and you can not get the labour you want. I have been told many times that they did not like the system of people abusing the welfare system. So I honestly feel that each community should have the right to receive or to deal with the director of social and administrative services, and also recognize the danger also, and this wording says "each community must be consulted individually," and I would go along with that. We must consult the community to see if they want to take it over and if so, fine, and if they do not want to and are satisfied with the present system that is it, that is all.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Councillor Barnaby?

MR. BARNABY: I would like to agree with what Mr. Steen said. It is written right in the paper that up to this time there has been no incentive, no policy of self-sufficiency and I believe that the people can not do any worse than that. I think that social development is development of the people in all areas and giving them the responsibility of running their lives and being involved in the problems of their neighbour's social development, so I agree with that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Councillor McCallum?

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that we could possibly get around this, or if we have to get around it this could possible be a means. In paragraph 3, because city, town, village, hamlet settlement councils and band councils are recognized as a form of local government, perhaps paragraph 3 should read "community involvement and control must be emphasized, particularly the opportunity for local government in a community to take over and administer ..." etc. I think -- it is my belief that this is not against the territorial government's wishes and certainly it is not against the wishes of this Council, but I think we have to recognize that in various communities there are various types of local government that are recognized. I do not think it takes away from the meaning of anything, but it certainly is more specific and to the point, if I may be so bold as to suggest that.

Motion to Amend Paragraph 3, PART II, Social Development Paper.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Would you like to move that as an amendment?

MR. McCALLUM: Yes, I would.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. So, 3 would read "community involvement and control must be emphasized, particularly the opportunity for local government in a community to take over and administer ...", on the amendment? Is there an agreement to the amendment? Councillor Nickerson?

Local Government Should Not Include Band Councils

MR. NICKERSON: I agree with the amendment but there is one point I would like to bring up in referring to various types of local government such as city councils, town councils, settlement councils, etc. Mr. McCallum brought up band councils too, and my interpretation of this would be to exclude band councils because they are not a creature of the territorial government, they are in fact, as far as I believe a creature of the federal government. I can see cases where there is a band council in a community and no settlement council, for instance, that it would be right and proper of us not to delegate power to a band council but to contract it out, to make a contract with a band council to carry out certain aspects of local government, but I think it should be made quite clear that the interpretation of local government here would not include band councils.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Are there any other comments on paragraph 3?

MR. ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, we take this paragraph 3 as now reads "community involvement and control must be emphasized, particularly the opportunity for local government to take over and administer ..." Is that my understanding, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I do not think it reads exactly that. The way I have it is "community involvement and control must be emphasized, particularly the opportunity for local government in a community to take over and administer services ..."

MR. ERNERK: But I would go back to this particular paper which I think is much the same as that of the goals of the Government of the Northwest Territories under the Department of Local Government, objective to develop political and social awareness and administrative capability at the community level, and I think this ties in together with that, is that correct, is my understanding ...

Motion Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Basically it does tie in closely with that paper but this is a document on its own too, not necessarily referring to that other paper. Are we agreed to the amendment to paragraph 3?

--- Agreed

Now, paragraph 3 to social services and local government, are we agreed?

--- Agreed

PART III "home ownership should be encouraged in those areas of the Northwest Territories where it is feasible." Are we agreed?

--- Agreed

PART IV, EDUCATION 1, "that the education ordinance be introduced to Council in 1976." Is it agreed?

--- Agreed

Paragraph 2, "that Council supports the concept of educating children in their home communities and directs the Administration to continue the decentralization of schools and to extend the grade levels in each community as far as possible." Is it agreed?

--- Agreed

Paragraph 3, "that the education system be flexible enough that where appropriate it provide for the retention in the curriculum of instruction in native languages, cultural and traditional skills and that towards this end, local human resources be employed." Is it agreed?

--- Agreed

Paragraph 4, "that equal emphasis be placed on trades and technical training yet leaving the option open for students to pursue the academic aspects of the curriculum." Is it agreed?

--- Agreed

Paragraph 5, "that a new and more equitable method of school taxation be developed and introduced to Council in 1976." Is it agreed? Councillor Barnaby?

MR. BARNABY: Could I have some explanation on this?

Levying of School Tax

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Well, basically the territorial government at the present time has been, in cities and towns, levying a school tax at the rate of 15 mills on land and improvements and this method has been found to be discriminatory to a certain degree by the cities and towns, and we would like a review of the taxation method.

MR. BARNABY: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Councillor Wah-Shee?

MR. WAH-SHEE: One question, Mr. Chairman. When you come up with a method of school taxation, will that include future, other communities other than towns and cities which you have at the present time? In other words, you have hamlets in communities now and at some point in time do you see a situation where they will be required to contribute?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Well as I understand the present policy of the territorial government, the school taxation is being put into effect in all areas of the territories whether it be hamlets or improved districts, as soon as the assessors can actually assess the values of the land. For example the corridor between Hay River and Enterprise, this area last year was taxed and it is not a hamlet and it is not an improved district so I would assume from that it would apply all across the territories when the assessors get to a point of being able to assess the land and improvements. That is the present policy as I understand it but I may be in error. Deputy Commissioner Parker, could you add anything to that? Is that correct?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, you are correct, that is the policy. As soon as an assessment has been completed then the school tax levy is applied.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Councillor Barnaby?

Need Better Method of Taxing for Education

MR. BARNABY: I am sort of mixed up here, but I can not see people agreeing to something like this, or even people in the towns and cities. Is there no other way? Are people trying to think of other ways of giving money to the government? We talked about self-sufficiency and is there no way to provide our own education at least before high school? Has anyone thought of a new system of providing education without taxing people? I do not know how to say it, but how could one get new ideas into this Council?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Well as I understand it, what we are saying is that the present method and policy is not what we agree with and we want them to find something better, something that would be more equitable to everyone concerned, so what actually we are saying is we do not like the present policy and want it changed. Is there anything further on paragraph 5? Are we agreed on paragraph 5?

--- Agreed

Paragraph 6, "that the development of additional school boards with authority for the operation of schools and the employment of teachers be encouraged, without their being necessarily required to raise a portion of their operating costs through taxation." This in part is part of the answer to paragraph 5 you just brought up, Mr. Barnaby. Councillor Nickerson?

Motion to Amend Paragraphs 6 and 7, PART IV, Paper on Social Development

MR. NICKERSON: I move that in paragraph 6 the words "the development of" be deleted and in paragraph 7 "emphasis on the development of" be deleted and this to my mind would neither add nor subtract anything to the meaning but would just improve the wording.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I do not know but if you remove "the development of" is the formation of that sentence correct? I will bow to your knowledge of the English language.

MR. NICKERSON: I am not an expert on the English language.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I do not think we should delete it without putting something there.

MR. NICKERSON: As I would read it it would appear to be correct to me but perhaps we could have the legal advice of the Clerk on that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Your suggestion is as I understand it, is that the words "that the development of" be deleted.

MR. NICKERSON: The word "that" would stay and the words "the development of" would be deleted.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): That reads a little better. Any comments on 6? I have a motion to delete the words "the development of", is it agreed? So, it would read "that additional school boards with authority for the operation of schools and the employment of teachers be encouraged ..." On the amendment? Opposed to the amendment? Sitting on the fence on the amendment? On the amendment, on the wording, it is agreed?

MR. BARNABY: It is good enough the way it is.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Do you want to leave it the way it is? Are we agreed with the way it is?

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, the reason I would say to leave it as it is is because of the fact that a lot of your communities have not got to the stage where they do have any school boards, so if you leave "... the development of additional school boards," I think that would satisfy most of our needs.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I will try once again. On the amendment -- did you want to speak, Councillor Nickerson?

MR. NICKERSON: No, I did not want to speak, I just wanted to vote.

Amendment to Paragraph 6 Defeated

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I will take it once again and vote on the amendment. "That the development of additional school boards with authority for the operation of schools and the employment of teachers be encouraged..." Those in favour of the amendment, please? Paragraph 6, as it now stands, are we agreed?

--- Agreed

The amendment was defeated. Paragraph 7. I did not write it down.

Motion to Amend Paragraph 7 Withdrawn

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, it will undoubtedly be defeated. Therefore, I withdraw it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): "That we support emphasis on the development of day care centres, adult education programs, guidance programs and apprenticeship programs." Agreed?

--- Agreed

Paragraph 8, "that we support capital expenditure on new schools, additions and equipment where necessary; that we direct that reasonable standards be developed, adopted and adhered to in the design of school facilities and provision of school furnishings and equipment. We feel that much money has been wasted in the past by individualistic school design and the provision of unnecessarily high quality equipment and furnishings." Agreed?

Motion to Delete Last Sentence from Paragraph 8, Social Development Paper

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that we delete the last sentence from paragraph 8. I think that this has been included in the foregoing part of the section. What it looks like we are trying to do here is emphasize this, which is probably not necessarily the case. I would not like people to feel that what we are insisting is that they come up with a standard design which is to be placed in every settlement. I think there is still room for good designs. Maybe we do not want the same design in Pine Point as we do in Resolute Bay. Obviously there have to be certain differences. When you put up a building such as a school, it is something that is going to stay there for a very, very long time and maybe we should try to make them architecturally suitable even if it does mean spending a few thousand dollars extra. Over a period of time I think this would pay for itself. I agree that what has happened in the past is that we spent vast sums of money needlessly, but I think, as I said before, that that thought would be included in the first part of the section and I would not like it to be taken that we are just sniping at people who did this in the past. I think it is a legitimate point but it has already been included and we really do not want to emphasize it here.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Councillor Lyall, to the amendment, please.

MR. LYALL: To the amendment I would just like to support Mr. Nickerson because of the reasons he gave. I would not like to let other people think that I was trying to say they were wasteful. If it was wasteful at that time, then it has been done and let us think about what we are doing now.

Motion Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Any other comments on the amendment? Those in favour of the amendment? Agreed? Opposed? The amendment is carried. We will delete the last sentence starting "we feel that ..." paragraph 8 as amended, are we agreed?

--- Agreed

Paragraph 9, "that the teacher education program be continued and expanded for all territorial residents." Agreed?

--- Agreed

Paragraph 10, "that the methods of discipline in the schools, particularly in the primary grades, be sensitive to the various cultures." Agreed?

--- Agreed

Number 11, "that we support the establishment in the Northwest Territories of an institution of higher learning." Agreed?

--- Agreed

The paper as a whole? Councillor Nickerson? I am sorry, Councillor Butters?

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I did not think we would get think we would get through the paper on education so quickly. I think I will just repeat what I indicated much earlier when we discussed this general subject, that at the present time the educational aspects of our budget amount to something like 18 per cent and that to obtain the programs and objectives that have been agreed to and outlined here would require in my estimation that a greatly increased number of dollars be put into education and that that 18 per cent be increased markedly. I think I pointed out during our previous discussion that in a nation such as Tunisia 50 per cent of the budget goes toward education. I think that in agreeing with the statements here, and in approving these we must recognize that Members serving on the finance committee are going to have to emphasize the need to increase the amount of money that is allocated to the Department of Education for educational programs -- greatly increase it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Any other comments? The paper as a whole? Agreed?

--- Agreed

What is Council's wish at this time? Should we recess for lunch or should I report back progress to the Speaker?

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to request information of the Minister of Education. I do not think this would take very long. It is not at all a controversial issue but I would like to sound out his feeling and it would take about five minutes. I wonder if I could have permission to do this?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): This matter is not really covered by this committee. I am quite prepared to accept it if we have unanimous consent. Agreed?

--- Agreed

MR. NICKERSON: This falls under paragraph 11 under education, under PART IV of the paper. I think we are all agreed with what is written down there but I just wonder if the Minister of Education would like to clarify or expound on what is happening in this area at present.

Research Concerning Institution of Higher Learning

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, Councillor Nickerson, there is a certain amount of research going on now by the department on the feasibility of establishing an institution of higher learning in the Northwest Territories. The form that it would take, that is, the institution itself will not necessarily be a university as such. It may be that it will eventually be a university, but I think that in the beginning what we would like to see would be some combination of a junior community college with a central campus and with various satellite campuses throughout the territories. If I may define a junior community college, it would be in terms of a college that would offer not only trade and technical training or courses, but hopefully would offer some transfer courses to universities in the South and by transfer courses I mean courses that would lead to -- that would allow a student to enter into further education at a university. By community courses I mean not only the trades and technical training, but also those courses that each individual community would like to see take place either in their own community or in a central campus, for example, if I may, courses that would help individual businesses or people in business to better manage that business, courses that would allow people to learn more about the development of government in their community or to look for new ways of developing a form of government. The number of courses that could be offered either in a central campus location or in individual communities could be as wide or as varied as you can think of, but I think that is the basic idea behind the kind of investigation or research that is going on at the present time. I would hope that would be an answer -- or I would hope that would answer the question satisfactorily.

MR. NICKERSON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Are there any other points? Councillor Searle?

No Decrease in Post-Secondary Education Grants at Present

MR. SEARLE: This is something I do not want especially to see included in the paper but it is a current issue. A lot of constituents, Mr. Chairman, have been asking me whether there is any intention on the part of the government to decrease the grants for higher education or to put a limit on the number of people. There has been some concern about that and this is

regarded as a considerable fringe benefit living here in the Northwest Territories if you have children of university age, so I guess my question is simply this. Is there any consideration presently to altering the grant structure for higher education? I guess it is a question for Mr. McCallum. If there is, what would the current thinking be and finally the third part of the question I think, Mr. Chairman, would be we assume that before this is altered that there would be a paper for reference to Council so that we could have some input.

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, Councillor Searle, there is at the present time nothing in the wind about either decreasing the allowances for post-secondary education of students in the territories or decreasing the number of people who are eligible to receive this kind of an allowance. Any future developments in this particular regard would, of course, be done in terms of a paper or a listing of a certain number of recommendations that would be brought back to Council through the government which of course, would come through me and certainly nothing would be done in terms of actually changing anything without Council's approval.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Any further questions? If not, this committee stands recessed until 2:30 p.m.

--- LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The Chair recognizes a quorum and calls this committee to order. We are dealing with social development and are there any further remarks with regard to that? Councillor Nickerson.

Motion to Adopt Tabled Document 2-57

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, there being no further discussion on the social development paper, I would now like to move, sir, that this Council adopt Tabled Document 2-57 as its social development policy.

Motion Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I have a motion on the floor. To the motion? Does anyone wish to speak to the motion? The question is being called. All those in favour? Opposed? The motion is carried.

--- Carried

Can I then report back to the Speaker? Is it agreed?

--- Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Stewart?

Report of the Committee of the Whole of a Paper Relating to Social Development in the Northwest Territories

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, your committee has this morning and this afternoon studied this social development paper and I wish to report that this has been moved as the official policy of your committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Turning to the orders of the day, Mr. Butters?

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, may I have unanimous consent to turn to agenda Item 8?

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent is requested. Is it agreed?

--- Agreed

Returning to Item 8, motions, Mr. Butters?

REVERT TO ITEM NO. 8: MOTIONS

MR. BUTTERS: May I have unanimous consent to move the motion I gave notice of earlier on this date?

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent requested to move motion -- the motion with respect to committee of the whole discussion of the tabled document concerned with political development. Unanimous consent is requested. Is it agreed?

--- Agreed

Would you move your motion, Mr. Butters?

Motion that Tabled Document 1-57 be Considered in Committee of the Whole

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move that Tabled Document 1-57 a paper on political development be moved into committee of the whole, or rather be considered in committee of the whole.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder?

MR. PUDLUK: We are having a little problem with the interpretation.

Motion Carried

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved by Mr. Butters that we move into committee of the whole to discuss Tabled Document 1-57. Is there a seconder? Mr. Steen. Is there any discussion? The question. The question being called. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

--- Carried

REVERT TO ITEM NO. 10: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF VARIOUS MATTERS

Returning therefore to Item 10, Council will resolve into committee of the whole to consider Tabled Document 1-57 with respect to the political development of the Northwest Territories with Mr. Stewart in the chair. However, before we leave the chair I wonder Mr. Clerk if you could determine whether or not the five pictures have been taken. One more? Four more? For pity's sake.

Introduction of Mrs. Kornichuk, Clerk Assistant

Maybe I could take this opportunity to introduce to Members Mrs. Lois Kornichuk and would you just stand up? Mrs. Kornichuk joins the staff of the Clerk of the Council's office, replacing Mr. Doug Blain who you may recall was the Clerk Assistant previously. I thought you should meet her because if the arrangements are the same, it is to her you go to find your cheques, that sort of thing. Apparently these pictures are necessary for the annual report. Possibly gentlemen, I could take this opportunity as well to recognize a distinguished colleague in the gallery, an ex-Member of this Council who served the last four terms, Mrs. Lena Pedersen. Mr. Stewart?

--- Council resolved into Committee of the Whole for consideration of a paper relating to political development in the Northwest Territories with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER A PAPER RELATING TO POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Committee will come to order to study the political development paper, Tabled Document 1-57. The Chair will now accept comments of a general nature. Councillor Nickerson?

Council Desires Additional Responsibilities

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, I take justifiable pride in the work of Council in assembling the document we have before us. In it, the Council as the sole representative of all of the people of the territories at the territorial level manifests its desires and expectation of assuming additional responsibilities leading to eventual provincial status for the territories. The Council is justly jealous of its political prestige and powers. The tendency of Ottawa to set up rival governmental bodies in the territories and to reserve unto itself the revenue producing areas of jurisdiction must be averted. To this end I see the recommendation that the administration of land and subsurface rights be transferred to the Commissioner from the departmental Deputy Minister as a most important one. In setting up the Council negotiating committee we have devised a way which I am sure will be a preferred and acceptable one as far as the cabinet is concerned in which concrete steps in the political development of the territories can be arrived at and put into effect in the optimum manner.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to make known my complete approval and support for the document.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Any other comments of a general nature? Is it your pleasure we go through the document in the regular manner? Is it agreed?

--- Agreed

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Political development, the preamble:

"WHEREAS the Council of the Northwest Territories is the government of all of the people of the Northwest Territories including the Dene, the Inuit, and others;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the Northwest Territories is the sole legitimate political entity at the territorial level of government;

AND WHEREAS the Members of this Council are elected by all of our people based on one vote for one person, the racial mix and composition of this particular Council being evidence of this fact;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that the following become the policies and priorities which this Council deems applicable to the political development of the Northwest Territories." The preamble. Is there any discussion? Are we agreed?

--- Agreed

Paragraph 1, "Turning to the philosophy of the federal government as stated by the then minister in his white paper of 10 November, 1969, we quote it as follows:

- (i) 'In the first place, I firmly believe that at this time and for the foreseeable future, the granting of provincial status to either territory is not a realistic alternative.
- (ii) I further believe that the federal government should continue to manage and develop the natural resources of the North for the benefit of both northern residents and all Canadians.'

Regrettably, the foregoing is phrased in the negative, leaving this Council frustrated and uncertain as to what next, if anything, shall occur. Evolution requires a positive approach to political development. Consequently, we believe that the position of the federal government, stated positively should be as follows." To the preamble, because that was something I stated, to the preamble on this section. Is it agreed?

--- Agreed

"(i) The Government of Canada is committed in principle to provincial status for each territory, after timing and sound financial arrangements have been negotiated." Are we agreed?

--- Agreed

"(ii) In the meantime, however, the federal government will continue to manage and develop the natural resources of the North as trustees for northern residents."

Councillor Barnaby?

Provincial System of Government

MR. BARNABY: I am really confused here, I do not know what is going on at all. Does this imply there is no alternative except the provincial system of government, that we have no chance or no part in setting up the political system that will be in the North for Inuit and Dene people?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Provincial status is basically the statement here but provincial status does not necessarily prohibit other forms within provincial status in my opinion. Now that is just my opinion. Would anyone like to add to that? Councillor Searle.

MR. SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I think that Mr. Barnaby's question is an excellent one and I think he will find the answer to that in two places in this paper. Firstly if you look to paragraph 4 which says: "We support a fair and speedy settlement of native land claims and recognize that their settlement is a first priority for full provincial status." I think you realize once you read that that if we had our way that whatever special form of settlement which could presumably contain political jurisdiction over certain large tracts of land, then whatever we had after that would be subject to that settlement. That is number one. Number two, the negotiating committee contemplated under paragraph 6 would obviously have to liaise very closely, I should think, with what the native organizations are doing, because our negotiating committee can not really get going very effectively without knowing what the position of the native people is, and in the final analysis, of course no firm commitments could be made by our negotiating committee until the land claims had been settled. Obviously you are only dealing with what land and what areas are left after a land settlement when you talk about future political development because it obviously refers to a jurisdiction over specific areas, a specific tract of land. Presumably that is what is left after there had been a fair and proper settlement with our native people.

"Provincial Status" is Concept of Sovereignty

So, I think you find or I think the answer to your question is yes, this envisages or this considers the sort of flexibility that you are thinking of, but you have to call it something and presently you would call that provincial status. I do not know what else you could call it with any degree of precision. It may be an entirely different form of provincial status than is recognized and known in the rest of Canada, but I think the term "provincial status" recognizes sovereignty in this government over certain subjects and over certain areas of land, and it is really the concept of sovereignty in the provincial sense we are talking about. Whether this negotiating committee of Council comes up with something identical in form to what the other provinces have I would doubt very much. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, if that assists in any way but that is my own personal interpretation of what this says.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Are there any other comments? Does that satisfy you Councillor Barnaby?

MR. BARNABY: Yes, but what I am trying to get across is that as I said before, just because we take part does not mean we freely accept it but there is nothing left to do and we must either join or have no representation.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Subparagraph (ii), are we agreed?

--- Agreed

Paragraph 2, "The salaries of the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner should be a first charge on the consolidated revenue fund of the Northwest Territories and should appear in the territorial estimates." Are there any comments? Are we agreed?

--- Agreed

Paragraph 3, "Regarding territorial finances, the present form of financial negotiation is cumbersome and should be discontinued in favour of formula financing, which system would guarantee the territories a substantial share of resource revenue without strings attached as to how it should be spent." Are there any comments? Are we agreed?

--- Agreed

Paragraph 4, "We support a fair and speedy settlement of native land claims and recognize that their settlement is a first priority before full provincial status." Comments? Councillor Wah-Shee?

MR. WAH-SHEE: Mr. Chairman, as far as I feel I have already expressed this to my colleagues, that I think when we are discussing political development in the Northwest Territories I think we should take our time. The way I see it we are not doing that. I think rather some Members here feel that there is some urgency, that we have to make a decision on this today. I feel that this is a major item that this Council has dealt with or will be dealing with and I think it is a very major issue. I also think that, the way I feel about it, I think there is some lack of understanding here in regard to the feelings and aspirations of native organizations and native people generally when they are dealing with the question of claims, as expressed by some of the Members here, this particular territorial government be entrusted with looking after the interests of the native people in the area of education, local government, resource development and also game management, social involvement.

Areas of Negotiation Questioned

I would just like to know for my own interests what do the non-native people who sit on this Council view as the question, what do they feel or what is their view in terms of what are the native organizations and the native people going to finally end up negotiating with the federal government with regard to outstanding native claims? If all these areas are turned over completely and there is no room for alternatives, no room to use the imagination, no room to come up with ideas from native people as to what type of political institutions they want in the North, then what is there that is finally left once all of these responsibilities are completely taken over by the territorial government? What is there finally to negotiate with the federal government other than land and possibly royalties? I would like to know very seriously what is there that the native people are finally left with to negotiate? If we are going to talk about the provincial type of responsibility, is it the feeling of this Council that once you come up with provincial status that this particular provincial government of the territories will have complete responsibility for the Dene and the Inuit people? The way I see it this particular Council is getting involved in an area that is going to be negotiated, hopefully in good faith, and with a lot of co-operation and understanding between the native people and our non-native brothers and sisters in the Northwest Territories.

Constitutional Responsibilities of Federal Government.

As I understand it, when we are talking about claims to be negotiated between the Inuit people and the Dene people with the federal government on constitutional responsibility because we do have special status, special rights under the BNA Act and under federal legislation. As I understand it in the provinces you have provincial governments that are in existence and they do have provincial responsibilities in a number of areas, but when it comes down to Inuit people the federal government has the constitutional responsibility which is negotiated between the federal government, the provincial governments and the Indian people in the provinces. The federal government retains constitutional responsibility for these people in the areas of education, local government, resource development, social development, game management and so forth, but here the way I understand it this particular Council is saying the territorial government should have complete responsibility and should negotiate toward that end.

Proposed Provincial Government May Undercut Native Negotiating Position.

It is my understanding that this particular future provincial government is going to negotiate constitutional responsibility and thereby perhaps undercutting the negotiating positions in regard to special rights that the Indian people and the Inuit people enjoy. The way I see it is that I think the outstanding land settlements in regard to the Dene people and the Inuit people I agree wholeheartedly that it has to be dealt with first. That is the number one priority before we can discuss provincial types of responsibility or even negotiating for it because I feel that these particular rights have to be entrenched and the native people should have the right to negotiate with the federal government if they wish to have their own institutions separate from the provincial government, if they want to take over such areas as resource development over their land, not only royalties. I know in the area of game management today the people have definite interests because I have already expressed to you before the native people do not hunt for sport, they hunt for a living, to provide food and clothing for their families. The way I feel about it is that this particular document in the area of provincial political development in the Northwest Territories has a great deal of implications. The kinds of positions from which native people are going to negotiate with the federal government, the way I see it it is going to undercut the strong negotiating position that the Inuit people have at this time and also the very strong negotiating position that the Dene people have.

I feel that the native people should be given the opportunity to come up with their own ideas as to what type of government they want in the Northwest Territories and I do not feel as a Member that I can say that this is what they want, which we have right here in territorial Council.

I firmly believe that we can do something in the North which is quite different and I firmly believe that it is possible to do something. This is not to be taken as a separatist view because we are going to negotiate with the federal government and ultimately the native people are going to have to relate to whatever provincial type of government you have in the North, but I think it is important, extremely important that we get participation from everybody in the Northwest Territories.

Decision Should Not Be Hurried

I do not believe that sitting down for the last four or five days in isolation with no preparation whatsoever before you get into there and coming up with a policy which will have a great deal of significant impact on the direction we are going -- I realize some of us are a little more articulate and able to analyze the implications of what we are doing, but some of us do not really understand. Some of us feel that we should take our time. What is the hurry anyway? We have a January session which will last for three weeks. We take a little bit of time to discuss this with the people in the communities to make your decision. That is my point.

In the area of speedy -- we support a fair and speedy settlement -- that is another way of ramming something down the throats of native people. The way I see it, land claims to me mean a heck of a lot more than land and resources, a great deal more than royalties. I feel that I should have my input into the kinds of political structure that we would have in the future, which would have a great deal of meaning for the people because if native people have adequate input, they would have that much more respect for the type of institution you come up with.

Native People Should Have Equality

They will have a great deal of understanding and then you can talk about equality, then you can talk about policies and programs which would have equality for everyone, but from where I stand and the way I view it, we do not have equality. I think it is about time that this Council came to grips with the feelings and the aspirations of the native people. To try to justify your actions, your own ideas and make decisions and use native people who sit on this Council to legitimize what you are doing, to me is a great mistake.

I believe we have not been frank enough in the past to say this. We talk about Honourable Members, we talk about gentlemen's agreements, we talk about equality, participation, we talk about all sorts of social problems that we have, we talk about areas of education, areas to ensure that everybody respects the culture of everybody else. We talk about ensuring that everybody gets involved at the local level, you come up with institutions which will ensure that everybody participates.

Well gentlemen, I feel that for the sake of mutual co-operation, to ensure that everybody gets a chance to review what we are dealing with, to ensure that we ensure that everybody participates there is nothing wrong with taking a little bit of time. I do not feel there is a great deal of urgency today to bring forth this document. We can discuss it, there is no disagreement here, but to make a decision which will have a great deal of impact some of us do not even realize, but I do. Sometimes I disagree with you people, not because you are white or have some other shade. I disagree with you because I believe in what I have just said and I hope that you will take that in the proper context. Thank you very much.

--- Applause

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): We are on paragraph 4, and are there any further comments? Could I have the committee's direction on 4? Are we agreed? I have two agrees and that is all. On paragraph 4, are we agreed?

--- Agreed

Paragraph 5, "We note that the federal government is directly involved outside and independent of the territorial government in the provision of provincial type services and responsibilities, namely: highway construction and maintenance, forestry, fisheries in inland waters, health services, provision of electric power through Northern Canada Power Commission, the administration of surface rights to land and inland waters, the administration of subsurface rights to land and inland waters and the attorney general. These responsibilities together with the funding and positions should be promptly transferred, as a first step, to the territorial government. For these responsibilities to be performed for the Minister through the Commissioner (his resident Deputy Minister) rather than through the departmental Deputy Minister in Ottawa is no more or less remote, nor no more or less responsible. The Minister's control remains the same but hopefully the public servants involved, if responsible to the Minister through our Commissioner, will be more responsive to this Council. This responsiveness, though it would not amount to real control by this Council, is a step in the process of evolution."

Paragraph 5, are there any comments? Councillor Barnaby?

MR. BARNABY: I think this is an area that Mr. Wah-Shee was talking about and it has all these responsibilities, and says they should be turned over to the territorial government as soon as possible. From the remarks I heard before, are these things supposed to be done after the land settlement claim?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): There is quite a difference actually in provincial status and turning over all of these particular functions. This is a very slight increase in power towards provincial status but it certainly is not provincial status. Councillor Searle?

MR. SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, whether these responsibilities are being performed through public servants who in turn are responsible to the Deputy Minister of the department in Ottawa or whether they be responsible through our Commissioner, who is a federal public servant as you heard him say today, of deputy minister rank and who is responsible to the same Minister, there is no legal difference to my mind in essence. What there is however is hopefully, a group of people in this area who would be a little more susceptible to the feelings of this Council, and of course that is all this Council would have, is a degree of influence until you got to provincial status or whatever it was going to be, by which time whatever deal was going to be made with the native people would have been made and these things that would be part of that deal would be exempted out. You know, that is the point that does not seem to be getting across here, and I am afraid I just do not accept some of the things I have heard here today.

Non-Native Members Concerned that Arrangement with Natives be Fair

We non-native Members are sincerely and honestly concerned that whatever arrangement is to be made between the native people and the federal government, that that arrangement be a fair one, it be a just one and that obviously is subject to what is done there, and only after that can we start talking about a provincial government and what authority it has. I know that I for one appreciate that the settlement may not be the traditional sort of settlement, it may not be a giving up of all rights for money, it may indeed be a settlement that preserves those rights, and it may be that to ensure their preservation, a form of political autonomy by native people in certain areas is necessary. I do not know. It is not any of my business, except to hope and pray that the native people and the federal government make their deal to their mutual satisfaction.

Understanding that Native People Would Have Support of Council

But whatever that deal is, after it is made, and subject to that deal, then we can start talking about a meaningful form of provincial type government but whether it is the traditional form I do not know. There may not be enough left of it to take any traditional form. I do not know. But that is all this paper is saying, there is nothing mysterious about it, there is no skulduggery being engaged in, the plain meaning of these words says that. Now if you want to redraft it to say the same thing then someone else can have a hand at it, but that is my understanding of what this whole paper says and that the native people have the support of the whites and would have the support of this Council's negotiating committee.

This negotiating committee would be of and from this Council, it would report back to this Council, it would take its instructions from this Council and I can not imagine any negotiating committee going in a direction that was either opposite to or headlong into the negotiating committees of the Inuit and Dene, as you would not let them, surely. Look at the mixture of this Council. Surely the negotiating committee of this Council will be made up of the Dene and Inuit people sitting around here as well as the others. I should not think that the negotiating committee of this Council would look very much different from the negotiating committee on behalf of the Inuit and Dene and if they were going in opposite directions to the other negotiating committees, speaking personally as a Member, I would be very concerned. So I do not know what we have to do, possibly get a stack of Bibles and we could all stand on top of it and take certain oaths. If that is required, let us do that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Are you finished, Councillor Searle?

MR. SEARLE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Councillor Butters?

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I am speaking for paragraph 5 or paragraph 6 but possibly you could separate my comments. The matter which we are now discussing we discussed earlier on, the points we are now raising they were raised earlier on. I remember at that time I pointed out that the situation in the territories that now prevails is contained in the whereas clauses, that this Council is the government of the people of the Northwest Territories and if we are a responsible government, or if we wish to become an increasingly responsible government we must act on what appears to be to us the wishes, direction and priorities of the people whom we represent.

Time of Native Negotiating Position Readiness Questioned

If we do not act, then there is absolutely no use of us sitting. If we do not work out and develop policies then there is absolutely no use of us meeting here. My colleague asked a question which I do not believe was rhetorical -- he asked what the non-native Members of this Council believe will be, I think, the future after the claims are negotiated. I have just forgotten the question, but as a non-native Member of this Council I can comment on what I think might happen, but as I mentioned at the seminar, where and at what time will the negotiating position of the Indian Brotherhood of the Northwest Territories be ready? When that position is ready then I would have an idea of the alternates that we may choose from. I would then have an idea of what this unique opportunity which has been described to us by Mr. Wah-Shee might bring about, but at the present time I have not seen any of the options nor any of the alternatives which are open to us as a people, a people of different ethnic backgrounds, but which are open to us as a people.

The only one I have heard of is that the Northwest Territories Indian Brotherhood has determined that it has title to 450,000 square miles of territory which I understand is the approximate land area covered by Treaty 11. If that is the position of the Northwest Territories Brotherhood, if that is the negotiating position of the Northwest Territories Brotherhood, my position would be that it is an impossible position, that it will not be accepted by the federal government. However until one position is put up and another is put up, I do not know what will occur. So I realize that when we say "speedy settlement" we are being presumptuous. I do not think it can be speedy, and I do not think it will be speedy, it could take ten years.

Council Must Instruct Ministers of Constituents Desires

However, I can not answer the question until I have more information, except that on the information I do have to date, I can not see title to 450,000 square miles as being an acceptable situation and I think that we, as Councillors here, must attempt to serve our constituents, develop policies, instruct our ministers in the area of social development and education and local government as to what we believe the people we represent require and desire. If we can not do that, if we are prevented from doing that, then I think that the need for this Council is zilch, we can go home.

I would like to save my other comments relative to the Executive, or the negotiating committee, until we get to that point because I would like to discuss at that point Mr. Chrétien's "A Decade of Development" statement because I do not think that it is relevant under this one.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): We are on paragraph 5 and is there any further comment?

MR. NICKERSON: I would like to compliment my colleague Mr. Searle on putting forth his position which also corresponds to my position in this particular matter. I do not think there is any attempt whatsoever to compromise the bargaining position of the Inuit or Dene at all. I find it rather difficult to follow Mr. Wah-Shee's line of reasoning and it certainly is not my intention that their position be in any respect compromised.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Are there any further comments? Councillor Lafferty?

Terms Native and Metis Defined

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman and Honourable Members, there is another side to this story which I do not think has ever been mentioned. I speak on behalf of the total people combined as native. As I previously said in earlier Council sessions, I underlined the word "native" as to mean that it is applied to anyone born in this country. There are many native people who are born here and there are many native people who are Metis. Many of these people are not entitled or represented either than perhaps being a member of certain associations in the Northwest Territories and of course there are many who are not members of native associations. We must take direct action responsible to all of the people in the Northwest Territories I believe. Native land claims as I understand it is a matter for the federal government and native land claims is something which is of priority on my mind and I support it 100 per cent, whether this land claim be Indian or Eskimo. But then there is another matter that bothers me a great deal and that is that included in the term, maybe for administrative purposes only, are a lot of Metis people, many of whom are regarded to be white and many of these people have the status of white and many of these people are in opposition to what is taking place in the North. These people are not heard and this is a fact that we must weigh. When I look at this simple little factor and our social conditions in the North, I must say that those people who are in opposition to the claims placed upon the federal government and the territorial government, combined ethnic groups constitute the majority of the Northwest Territories.

Council Must Weigh Viewpoint of Majority

In policy matters I support the concept of a territorial wide government representing all people and this is what we are dealing with possibly. If I am wrong, I hope our Legal Advisor here will correct me. In other matters, constituency matters are private Members' bills and this is another matter. Personally I have no private business today, but I ask each and every one of you to weigh your own problems in your own constituencies that there are native people in opposition, not only native people but there are white people here, white people pro-development and there are white people pro-native claims and there are white people who are anti-development and anti-native claims, but these are none of our concerns I believe. We have to weigh the majority of the people's viewpoints in the Northwest Territories and that is what we are doing here. In that view I sympathize with some of my colleagues and my fellow native people, but for the benefit of all people in the future, of our descendants, we have to take a step and I believe that we are doing that very thing, taking a step. Whether it is on the right foot or the left foot is irrelevant. We can correct some of the mistakes if there are any, but I think under the constitution of the federal government we are protected and there is really no danger I think.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Councillor McCallum?

Negotiating Committee Duties for This Council Only

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, my interpretation of this document is also similar to Councillor Butters' in that it is a political statement reaffirming what I believe this Council to be, representative of the people of the North. That is what it says. I do not believe that we are attempting to be unco-operative in trying to develop new avenues of government. I believe that there may well be many options open to this Council. What they are, what they will be I do not know, but as has been said, we are the Council of the territories and I believe the document simply is a statement as such. When the Council's negotiating committee carries out their duties it will be for this Council only. Others will carry out their negotiations as they have been doing. If what we know as provincial status does not fit the needs of this large area for all northerners, then let us look and try to develop something that is different. There may not be any great need for haste, but I am here as a Councillor in an attempt to develop something new and I am game to try.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Paragraph 5, any further comments? Are we agreed with 5?

--- Agreed

Paragraph 6, "The Carrothers Commission recommended a ten year review of its recommendations which would presumably occur after August 1976. Though we feel a review is now timely, we do not support the appointment of a commission. Instead, we feel that it is time for federal politicians to meet and negotiate with their territorial counterparts because of the policy considerations involved. To that end we propose to establish a negotiating committee of the Northwest Territories Council which would meet with a federal negotiating committee of cabinet. This group would identify the constitutional, administrative and resource transfers required to attain provincial status and set a time schedule for their implementation. This would include the appointment of additional Members from this house to the territorial Executive. The Council negotiating committee would report to and take instructions from the Council." Paragraph 6, comments? Councillor Wah-Shee?

MR. WAH-SHEE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know when will this negotiating committee be set up and when will this territorial council negotiating committee begin negotiations with the federal government if it is passed?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The timing would be up to the Council but I would assume this committee would be set up in January and given instructions at that time. What the instructions would be I would have no way of knowing as being an individual Councillor. I have no way of knowing. Councillor Searle?

MR. SEARLE: Possibly the Commissioner could give us some guidance here, but I should think that concurrent with our setting up a negotiating committee we would have to be satisfied that we have someone on the other side to negotiate with. So I should think step number one would be to make this document, assuming it were approved by the Council, of course, make it known to the Minister of Indian Affairs and the Prime Minister. If they accept it, they would appoint a cabinet committee to negotiate and then concurrent with the appointment of that committee we would presumably appoint our committee. If, on the other hand, the suggestion were rejected by the federal government, then it would be difficult to appoint a committee of this Council to negotiate because they would presumably have no one to negotiate with.

Acceptance of Document by Minister Proposed First Step

So, I should think an essential first ingredient would be that the federal government through presumably the Minister of Indian Affairs indicate an acceptance of this as a formula for reaching the desired goal. If they did not accept it, then of course, we would have to attempt to come up with something that would achieve that end. I do not know what else you could do. I think we are reluctant to recommend a royal commission. I think we have probably heard enough of that for a while, so if we do believe that it is time that the politicians at the territorial level started dealing directly not with officialdom, but with the policy makers at the federal level and if we are convinced that this is the meaningful approach, then surely that will appear just as reasonable to the Minister. I would say that the committee would likely be set up once you have an indication from our federal side that they accept this as a formula.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Wah-Shee?

MR. WAH-SHEE: Mr. Chairman, on paragraph 6 it says that "we feel that a review is now timely ..." I am just wondering what is the feeling of the Members of Council if your review is done, if everybody has an opportunity in different groups to participate in the review which will have involvement of a large number of people in the territories which will do basically an assessment and make recommendations which would involve a lot more people than setting up a territorial Council negotiating committee of four. My question basically is do we have any idea of how this review is going to take place or is it the intention that you set up this negotiating committee and they begin negotiating with the federal government and do your review and assessment at a later date?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Because this is a Council matter that has not been decided it would be presumptuous for me to make any point at this time. I do not know how you would arrive at a position where you can enter that question without some sort of formal vote and discussion on the matter. Councillor Searle?

Committee Should Negotiate with Cabinet Ministers

MR. SEARLE: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that these questions which are being raised by the Honourable Member are important but at this point may be slightly premature because what paragraph 6 purports to deal with, I think, is the principle of a negotiating committee and that it should negotiate with federal policy makers, that is, cabinet ministers. Now, as to exactly

how they will go about their work I should think that after the federal government indicate agreement to this formula, then this Council would want to appoint a committee, would want to appoint a chairman. They would want for that committee to meet and to come back with recommendations on these various questions, how do they conduct their review? Does the committee, for instance, go out to regional points or even settlements getting the wishes not only of this Council but of the people. It could presumably do that. Surely Mr. Chairman, these are the sorts of questions which Council and the committee have to come to grips with as the next step if agreement in principle is reached with the federal government.

I do not suggest for one minute that Mr. Wah-Shee should not raise them here but in thinking the thing through those are obviously the next things to decide after the principle has been agreed to both by us and the federal government.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I understand that coffee is ready and we will recess for 15 minutes, is that agreed?

--- Agreed

--- SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The Chair recognizes a quorum and calls this committee back to order. I believe Mr. Butters had indicated prior to the recess that he wished to speak. Councillor Butters?

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to clarify a couple of things in my own mind regarding the Carrothers Commission aspect; first the review. I understand that the review referred to is a review that would be carried on by the federal government, whether we wished it or not. It seems to me that Carrothers recommended such a review be carried out and that recommendation was made to the Government of Canada, and whether we pass a motion calling for this or not it will be up to the Government of Canada to determine whether such a review is necessary. So, I feel that review is really beyond our terms of reference and our ability to influence. Therefore, I wish to discuss the matter of the negotiating committee only.

Direction and Priorities of the Negotiating Committee

The negotiating committee might be too grand a term for what I see this group doing as the term "negotiating committee" has come to mean something which I think is larger and stronger than at least what I have in mind. I see that such a committee would attempt to carry on directions and priorities of past Councils, priorities and directions which dealt with an attempt to gather in more responsibility to this Council, responsibility which we could then delegate to the communities and to the third level of government which has been set up in the communities. This negotiating committee, therefore, I can not see would be pursuing ends that would be new or different to what has been the general direction of the past. I have been concerned that over the past five years we have seen the Carrothers recommendations take place, the recommendations of the Carrothers Commission of 1965 being implemented with the one major exception being that of a development board. However it has appeared that in the last three, four or five years that this forward motion towards more responsible government has slowed down and almost shuddered to a halt. At the present time we administer, this Council administers and has authority to administer game matters excepting in those areas where native people by treaty agreement have made arrangements with the Government of Canada. That is all we now have, what is left over in game matters which, I think has been the situation for the last ten years.

Minister's Statement "Decade of Development"

The Carrothers Commission, one hoped would now give this Council more responsibility in the area of provincial type matters, but in the interim, the Minister published a statement which is loosely termed the Decade of Development statement, and it was this statement that really got the seminar into action. The Commissioner last June, on page 337 of our debates pointed out that it is the Minister's statement that the Treasury Board currently uses to determine what funds will be approved for expenditure in the Northwest Territories. I believe that it is this statement too which any negotiating committee, for want of a better word, is going to have to examine, interpret and attempt to have almost rewritten to ensure that the Council of the Northwest Territories becomes more responsible than it has been.

I believe that the reason, and we have complained about this on many occasions, but the reason we are seeing an increased number of federal civil

servants in the Northwest Territories can be found right in this document, right here, and the reason that we have appeared to have gone back in the last three years can be found in this document in the Minister's statement. I hope that whomever may sit in that group which meets with the federal government will use as one of the matters of discussion this document which really does not clarify the problem but creates it.

Areas of Federal Responsibility

It is unfortunate that we possibly did not have the time to discuss this statement over the last four or five days but I think it is most important and has caused in effect the predicament in which we find ourselves today, especially with regard to funding and funding programs because the Minister has indicated in the statement, and I would just read a few references. He said that the federal government would be moving back into the area of the environment and I think that environment is one of the things that really is guaranteed to provincial jurisdictions under the BNA Act. It would be moving back into areas of social concerns and in fact into many areas which really this government would hope to consider as its own. Jobs and economic opportunities, development projects dealing with non-renewable resources, and renewable resources, these are areas which I think the Council of the Northwest Territories was anticipating moving into and which would appear that the federal government has earmarked as its own, and areas which I feel that any negotiations should re-examine when we meet should this policy paper be approved, when we meet with federal representatives.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Any other comments? Councillor Barnaby?

Consultation with Native Organizations Suggested

MR. BARNABY: I am not speaking to the part we are on now, but just on the whole thing. I was just thinking back to some statements that were made, that there is no wish on the part of anybody to jeopardize the land claims of the native people and this is the feeling that the native people on this Council are having, that it will harm the negotiating position that the Inuit and the Dene people have. Since none of us, I guess, can really say if it will do harm to the land claims, I would like to suggest, or ask that no decision be made at this time but rather there be consultation with the native organizations. They would know if it would harm their negotiating positions, such as the Brotherhood, the Metis Association, the Inuit Tapirisat. Since we are trying to do the best for everybody, I think we have to look very closely at this and go slowly. I do not want to see it passed at this time and would strongly oppose that. I am not against discussion but am against it being passed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Paragraph 6, and the Chair is slightly confused whether I have had this agreed or not so I will ask it again. On paragraph 6, are we agreed?

--- Agreed

Paragraph 7, "All organizations funded by the federal government in the Northwest Territories should be funded through the territorial budget, except for those areas which are the constitutional responsibility of the federal government such as research necessary to settle native land claims."

This is paragraph 7. Are there any comments? Councillor Barnaby?

MR. BARNABY: Yes. I know the Brotherhood runs a program something like community development, but do you mean that would come under the territorial government?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): As I read this, I think the key words are "constitutional responsibility" and I believe this is the constitutional responsibility of the federal government as far as natives are concerned and I do not see how it would affect it. That is my personal opinion. Councillor Wah-Shee?

Constitutional Responsibility for Indians.

MR. WAH-SHEE: I do not support paragraph 7 and I also wish to have it recorded that I have not supported the previous paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 as well, and also 6. The reasons being those I have already expressed to you, my deep concern. This section, paragraph 7 is another section that I do not agree with and I would like that to be recorded. As far as the funding of the Indian Brotherhood and the federal government is concerned, pretty well all areas that the present territorial government is administering for the treaty Indians is basically a constitutional responsibility anyway. So, I just want that to be clear and I think that if at some point in time, if and when the Indian people decide they want to no longer have federal responsibility, particularly constitutional responsibility, then I think it is entirely up to them to decide. But at this point in time I know that their position is that the federal government should retain federal responsibility for the Indian people, particularly the constitutional responsibility. As far as this particular section is concerned I see no need for it anyway, I see no need whatsoever for it, that particular section.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Councillor Butters?

Motion to Delete Paragraph 7 of Paper Relating to Political Development.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I agree that the section seems to be contradictory, and meaningless the way it is presently phrased, and I suggest that the document would be strengthened if we deleted paragraph 7.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Do you so move?

MR. BUTTERS: I so move for deletion.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): On the move to delete paragraph 7. Councillor Steen?

MR. STEEN: On paragraph 7, one of the reasons that we put that in there should be remembered, in that we agreed to leave the federal and Indian land claims to the federal government and it says that in this paragraph and in the past we have noticed that some organizations were receiving funds from the federal government to do some of the responsible things we were supposed to be doing. If we want to get a strong territorial government then we have to have some control.

I believe that some of the things, I honestly believe that some things said here today such as the use of native people to get your thing done by the white people, I do not believe this is so. I am speaking as a native of the Northwest Territories and I do not believe that democratic government has been shoved down our throats either. I can only see what the viewpoint of some of the Members is, especially Mr. Wah-Shee, that what is going to happen is that you are going to have a government for the Dene, a government for the Inuit, a government for the Metis, and a government also for others. So, what do you do? Services would have to be separated, and they are talking about separatists. Everything would be separate and I can only see conflict, and I can not see any way, the way it has been introduced a while ago.

Settlement of Land Claims to Hasten N.W.T. Government Development

On the land claims, I feel that it is none of our business, but if our development is not going to be until land claims or at least territorial government development is not going to take place until land claims are settled then I would say that we tell the federal government to get on with it. So, there are less public funds to keep on coming. They are using public funds to negotiate and I think as taxpayers everyone has a right to tell them to get going and that is all I have to say.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Councillor Wah-Shee?

Financing of Land Claims Negotiations

MR. WAH-SHEE: With all due respect to the Honourable Member from the Western Arctic, I must say that he still does not completely understand the ramifications of this political development. As far as taxpayers' money being used by the Dene people to negotiate, I want to make it quite clear at the present time that the Dene people intend to acquire a loan from the federal government which will be repaid back to the federal government so that we will be spending our own money in the negotiating process. As far as taxpayers' money is concerned, outstanding claims have not been settled. Royalties from the area of land has not been settled and the native people are not receiving these royalties. I think on the other hand too that when we are talking about native land claims ...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Just one moment, please. We are having interpreter trouble. I am not sure at what point the communication problem developed, so you may want to start again, Councillor Wah-Shee.

MR. WAH-SHEE: Is the translation equipment being fixed now?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Let us try it.

MR. WAH-SHEE: What I said basically was that as regards the comments made by the previous speaker I do not think there is enough appreciation for the document that we are dealing with at the present time, political development, the entire ramifications it will have for native people when they are negotiating. For one thing, I think the whole question of land claims has to be settled first before you get into the whole process. I also think that the native people will have to be given an opportunity to state fully what type of political institution or what type of government we eventually end up with and that is not to say that you are going to have three different types of government. You are eventually going to end up with one.

As far as claims are concerned, as I understand it, the Members here agree that native land claims should be settled first. If that is the case, then I think that there should be some guarantee given that that is the case before we start implementing this political development, if they are sincere. I do not agree with this interpretation of native organizations negotiating that they are going to end up with three different separate types of government. I believe that the negotiation process of the claims is very significant, a very significant issue.

Consultation with Communities

I believe that when we are talking about political development in the North there is absolutely nothing wrong as far as I am concerned with consultation of the communities, unless we are afraid that we are going to have negative impact or negative reaction, and that is all I can see here, is that people are afraid that once they consult the communities they may find that the communities do not agree with the political development document. I think in the past native organizations have been accused of not consulting with the communities and I see no difference over here in this particular Council. The document was discussed in isolation. There was no community input the way I see it. We have not given them the opportunity. If we are talking about real development, human development, people development, then get communities involved. What are we afraid of?

I think that the way that this political development document has been discussed it has absolutely no guarantees to the native people even when they are sitting down negotiating. They say land claims should be settled first, but I just do not see anything in here that gives that kind of guarantee and I am not talking about Bibles either. So, if we are talking about some type of government that we are working towards, self-government, then there is absolutely nothing wrong with involving everybody and I think it should be one of our rules as elected Members.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. We are having difficulty here. We are speaking actually to paragraph 7 and the motion on the floor is to take 7 out. I would like the speakers from here on in to stay on that subject to decide that particular motion. From here on in would you please direct your remarks to the withdrawal of paragraph 7? Any further speakers? Are you ready for the question on the withdrawal of 7?

MR. SEARLE: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Question being called.

Organizations Funded by Federal Government

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, the reason for the motion is that it strikes me as having no significance. I believe the Member from the Western Arctic said that there were some organizations that might be referred to, not native organizations but other organizations. What organizations are being funded by the federal government at present? Do you recollect what they might be?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): One I have heard mentioned is the LIP grant but I do not think we could take the position that is a constitutional responsibility.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, on that basis I do not think there are any organizations being funded in the territories now by the federal government which are being so funded except on the basis of the constitutional responsibility of the federal government, so I would think that the statement really has very little value.

Motion to Withdraw Paragraph 7 Defeated

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Are you ready for the question? Question. The question is shall we withdraw paragraph 7? Those in favour of withdrawing 7? Three. Opposed to withdrawing paragraph 7, a show of hands, please. Six. The Chair recognizes that there was a conversation going on when the vote was taken so I would like to clarify it so that there is no error in the wishes of this committee. The motion on the floor is to withdraw paragraph 7 from the paper. I will call the question once more. Those in favour of withdrawal, a show of hands, please? Four. Those opposed? Four. The motion is defeated. Is paragraph 7 agreed?

--- Agreed

Powers Delegated to the Commissioner

Paragraph 8, "A review of all ordinances should be undertaken to identify all powers delegated to the Commissioner by this Council for the purpose of re-examining them." Discussion? Councillor Butters?

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, just to clarify a point, it is not to my knowledge that we delegate any powers to the Commissioner. It seems to me the Commissioner obtains his powers from section 4 of the N.W.T. Act which says that "The Commissioner shall administer the government of the territories under the instructions from time to time given by the Governor in Council or the Minister." There is nothing in there that refers to the Council whatsoever.

Commissioner's Powers to be Inventoried and Examined

MR. SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to my colleague, Mr. Butters, I think that that refers to those many, many places in every ordinance that say, "Subject to the approval of the Commissioner...", you know. You will find, I think if you did an inventory of approvals, consents, regulations, what is delegated to the Commissioner by regulation you would probably find a list that would be in the thousands of the powers delegated to him. This recommendation does not suggest that they necessarily be removed. It does suggest that they be inventoried and examined. Essentially this Council is in the position of having powers some of which they keep to themselves but others of which they delegate to the Executive. That is on the one hand.

On the other hand, of course, there is a large area that we have covered here in paragraph 5 over which we have no jurisdiction, so as I see the thrust in the paper, the Council is to try and get jurisdiction over areas that are legitimate provincial type areas that it does not have on the one hand and then on the other hand to review the powers that it does have but which it has substantially delegated to the Commissioner, so this is just a second part of that two-pronged approach.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Any further discussion on paragraph 8? Are we agreed?

--- Agreed

The paper as a whole? Mr. Barnaby?

MR. BARNABY: I would like to get back to my suggestion again that there be consultation with the native groups to see if there is any effect of this on the land claims.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you.

MR. BARNABY: Could I get some support for that?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Discussion? Councillor Butters?

MR. BUTTERS: I wonder, sir, if Mr. Barnaby might have some idea how long such consultation would take? Would it be completed by our January session?

MR. BARNABY: I suppose so. We would talk to our people and somehow get in contact with the native organizations.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Further discussion? Councillor Nickerson?

Motion to Adopt Tabled Document 1-57.

MR. NICKERSON: If you have arrived at the conclusion that there is no further debate, no further debate on the paper we have before us, I would now move that this Council adopt Tabled Document 1-57 as its political development policy.

MR. BUTTERS: In the interests of unanimity and our total agreement I wonder if we might not, in view of the reservations that have been raised by a number of our Members, look at the possibility of using the word "accept" instead of "adopt" at this time with the understanding that the motion to adopt could come in our January session after the type of consultation and discussion that Councillor Barnaby has suggested and recommended takes place. There is no rush to do this and the word "accept" might be acceptable to all of us at this time.

MR. ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, I have been saving my breath this afternoon. I wanted to say a number of things concerning this whole matter. I wonder if I would have the permission of my colleagues to speak briefly in terms of my own beliefs? What I am merely saying, Mr. Chairman, is that first of all, I must, as an individual, as myself, stand as a Northwest Territories resident firstly.

Secondly, I have been, as you know, as all of us here, have been elected by the people of the Keewatin district to represent their views, their needs, their wishes, and for me to speak on behalf of them on the territorial Council. This morning I tried to speak very briefly on a number of things along with my colleagues to my right and to my left concerning the Department of Social Development programs and services, and particularly the direction which was given to the department itself, to try and seek support from the rest of the territorial Councillors to think in such a way of how we dealt with it, that we wanted to bring it back to the people living in the communities.

Basic Political Rights of Native People Ignored

It seems to me that the whole political development, Tabled Document 1-57, I must say first of all, that I accept your views, I accept the Councillors' views, all the Members of this Council and respect your views, but there are also people living in the communities who are going to be affected by this particular paper very, very much. I have been reading it over and in some cases I have come to the conclusion that it ignores some of the basic political rights of the native people, and I am speaking now of Inuit people, to determine the structure of government, not necessarily provincial status. I want to state very briefly about what I feel has to be done in my own riding, in the Keewatin district. Perhaps I was not listening in some cases but I did not hear a word from any Member of this Council about the word "independence".

Having been elected I am now speaking, of course, as a territorial Councillor for the Keewatin district, elected by the people of the Keewatin, and I want to share with you some of my personal views of what I feel must be done in the future for these people living in the smaller communities. I, of course, speak about the children, about the future of the children, and I come to the conclusion in some cases that, as you know, the words, "land claims" are discussed a lot here this afternoon-- the Inuit people in the Keewatin district are now very much afraid that in many, many ways they have no control. They have no say in what is happening to their communities as well as to their environment. I seek, and I want to find independence for those communities in the future. Many people in the small communities are now struggling to survive, and I speak as an individual who has lived in a small community, Repulse Bay for one, or Coral Harbour, as well as Baker Lake last year.

Land Claims Responsibility of Native Organization as Well as Federal Government

We have been discussing this whole paper this afternoon, but I think we, as the territorial Council, must keep in mind that the native land claims are also, or should be, considered to be those responsibilities of the native organizations as well as the federal government. I asked myself what future do we hold for the small communities such as those I have just mentioned a few minutes ago, in terms of their future? What independence do we want for these Inuit communities? What is in store for them, what is in store, what do we have in the confines of this room or something for these small communities and must we underline the word again or repeat the words again, who are struggling to survive in today's so-called society? Do we as a territorial Council support these small communities in the Arctic when we want them to be independent in terms of looking after their own, administering their own education, social and economic development, as well as local government?

For my part I think I could safely say that this is one of my major convictions. I do not wish to take too much of your time, but I simply want to state that I have a dream which I hope will also be considered very seriously by the Council that our little children, and my neighbour's children will not have to struggle like we are doing today because we, the Council of the Northwest Territories, in fact want them to be free, want them to be independent and live in such a society where they can move around in such a spirit of their own choice at their own time. I hope that we as a territorial Council will also consider these points. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I was wondering, Mr. Butters, as this matter is fairly important to all of us, I would like the opportunity of saying a few words, and would you mind taking the chair?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Mr. Stewart?

Paper Would Bring Independence for People of the North.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the various points made with regard to political development, and I think basically there is really no division as far as the freedoms and the things we expect for our people of the Northwest Territories. Our last speaker, Councillor Ernerk, indicated independence for the people of the North and I suggest to you, as we go through this paper that that is exactly what we are trying to do. We are trying to take it out of the hands of the bureaucrats in Ottawa where we have no say in what they do and bring them to the floor of this house where all ethnic groups are represented. Now, surely if you really want what you say then you must support the paper to bring it here. Surely you can not have it both ways, leave it in Ottawa where we have no input whatsoever into the matter of political development and bring it here into the territories so this Council can deal with it.

Support for Paper as a Whole.

Now, as I go over the whole paper, number 1, certainly there can be nothing in that that any native organization in the territories could complain about.

You go to paragraph 2, the salaries for the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner and what has this to do with native groups, this is a matter of policy.

Paragraph 3, territorial finances, that we should improve the method or the way we get our money to spend in our areas and in your settlements. What in the world could be the matter with that?

Paragraph 4, we recognize that land settlement must be made before any provincial status or any further advancement in government in the North takes place. What can be the matter with that from the standpoint of the native people or the native organizations? The second point is just to bring the type of services under the control of the Council that you need in your communities. Would you rather they remain where they are under the bureaucrats in Ottawa where you have nothing to say about what they do or would you rather have it here where you can stand on the floor and have an input into how it will be spent? Under the present system you do not have that. So, there is nothing wrong with 5.

Paragraph 6, all we are saying in section 6 is that we do not want another royal commission on the Carrothers report and we should have input from this Council which represents the people and native groups of the territories, and have a committee formed to work with the cabinet. How could anybody tell me that that is in opposition to native groups? There is nothing in there against the native groups.

Paragraph 7, you could take that one way or the other and it went to a vote and it was approved so I will accept that as being approved by the Members here and 8 is a review.

Now, surely gentlemen, there is nothing in this paper anywhere that would detract in any way from the rights of any native groups or in fact on the rights of any other group in the Northwest Territories. This is to bring under one roof the responsibilities, give this Council something to do. If you as Councillors are prepared to sit here and work with a game act which does not include the people of the Northwest Territories which is more than 50 per cent of the population, if you are prepared and content to sit here and play games with that I am not. I am here to do a job for the people of the territories the best I know how. Procrastination, gentlemen, is the biggest link to defeat that you are ever going to get and if we continue along the line of procrastination then I suggest there is only one other recourse and that is for this Council to resign and go home.

--- Applause

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Mr. Barnaby, please?

Request for More Time for Consideration

MR. BARNABY: I would like to be assured by what has been said, but I can not help but think about the people I represent. All we are asking is that it wait three months, at least to consult our people, to consult with other groups and I do not see anything wrong with that. Life is too short to jump into all kinds of things I think.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Councillor Wah-Shee?

MR. WAH-SHEE: I do not like to see anyone on this Council give an improper interpretation of the intent and concern that I have. I have not labelled anyone in this Council chamber for the reasons through this paper today, but I do not care for the kind of remarks that have been made by the Honourable Member from Hay River. I think that if he believes in co-operation and mutual respect, then I think that he should respect the views and opinions of his fellow Members of Council.

Support for Consultation with Communities

I also feel that if the Honourable Member from Hay River in his remarks, if that is the intent and if that is the explanation given then let us find out if that is the feeling of the people of the North, and the only way you can do it is to consult the communities, the people you represent and I think that the basis for a democracy as I understand it, is that you consult your representatives, people you represent and I feel no urgency to make a decision right here. I feel the same way as Mr. Barnaby that we should wait and discuss this matter because the way it has been done so far has not been done in consultation with the communities, it has been discussed in isolation and that is the way it will be viewed by the people in the communities.

If you go ahead and make a decision then you will find out the reaction after you have made the decision and some of us represent native people, both Inuit and Dene people, and I do not think that they will agree. I think the only way you will find out is to consult with them. The way I see it

right now is that we are running away with all sorts of excuses as to why you should pass it this very day. If you believe in what you say then let us find out if the majority of the people agree with it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Councillor Lafferty?

MR. LAFFERTY: I do not know, Mr. Chairman and fellow Members, my honourable colleagues, what all the mistrust is about. I have heard so many remarks today directed at the native people and I have continually said in this Council or asked for your interpretation as to the meaning of native. I think really we are not talking about people as a whole and going back to the communities, I have no fear whatsoever about going back to my community but I happen to represent a community which is diverse in its interests and each group is powerful within my community.

Speaking to Mr. Wah-Shee's remarks as to consulting with the Dene people, I do not think that we as native people who are declared Dene have been consulted with in my community or my constituency. I think that the time has come that we must see facts and, if we are truly concerned about our brothers and sisters who are Indian people and they are impoverished to a point where they can not help themselves and worse yet are the Metis people in Fort Simpson, Hay River and many other places along the Mackenzie River and these, many of them, do not regard themselves as Indian.

For that matter I am Metis and I am getting sick and tired of being referred to as Dene. If I want to choose to call myself so, I will. If someone is going to say this is a free democratic country where I have a say, I am saying it now and for your information, Members of the Council, my honourable colleagues, and people in the chamber, let it be known in history that I will die a Metis before I will die a Dene. I am not here representing Indian people or Metis people or white people. I am here Slavey representing people as a whole and I speak Indian just as well as most others in this country. In my interpretation the word "Dene" means people, not Indian or halfbreed or so-called mixed identities imposed on us by white people from outside and the Indians.

Many Native People Dependent on Government Funded Projects

If such a little thing as a cultural past is going to hold us up here, I think we should take the suggestion of Mr. Stewart from Hay River, our honourable colleague's suggestion and all go home and then you will have a problem beyond anything that you probably have foreseen, because many of these people in Fort Simpson and that area and throughout the Mackenzie, including some people from the far North, are dependent on government funded projects and many of them have no foreseeable future. They are on welfare or the Hire North projects and I understand for your information these programs are being cut back now to a minimum of 30 or 40 people and these are primarily native people who are employed there. If we are truly concerned about the social conditions, the economic conditions, then let us talk about people and let us not get held up on something that is not going to affect our future but enhance native education, native development and that includes everybody who lives here, the Eskimo, the Indian and the Metis and the white guys who are born here.

Political Development Policy Must be Formed

My own uncle who is a Metis and he is declared a Dene lives in a shack on

which he pays \$400 a year tax and much of that tax money goes toward the village in which some other people are paying \$2 a month rent and are still in arrears for nine months and that is nobody's fault but their own. I think the responsibility has to be given to the native people thereby learning to help themselves. If we are to achieve that, then we must go ahead and develop a political development policy. The sooner we vote on it, the better I would like it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): I would like direction from the committee. The object I recollect I took the chair for was to permit the Honourable Member from Hay River to make his contribution to this debate and he has done so. Prior to that time we were discussing the motion that Mr. Nickerson had brought in regarding the paper. Would Members instruct me as to what they wish to do now?

MR. SEARLE: Question.

MR. STEWART: Question.

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

Suggestion that Discussion be Deferred

MR. BARNABY: I have to disagree with what Mr. Lafferty had to say. I just can not agree. There are a lot of people who are not agreeing to it and I think that has to be cleared up. There is fear and distrust here and that has got to be cleared up. The more we talk I think it is still there, so rather than walk out of here quitting, I think it would be more of a positive move to defer this topic, not to vote on it at this time. I do not see anything wrong with that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): I have asked the Clerk to provide me with the text of the motion. The motion as made by Mr. Nickerson reads as follows: "I move that this Council adopt Tabled Document 1-57 as its political development policy." If there is no further discussion, Mr. Barnaby...

MR. BARNABY: May I make one comment?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Just let me finish my comment. I know you have suggested deferral for a period of time. I understand that that could be done by putting an amendment to this motion, rather than just making a suggestion.

Motion to Defer Adopting Tabled Document 1-57

MR. BARNABY: In that case I would like to amend the motion so that it be deferred at this time. Is that amending it or is that another motion?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Let me talk to my Legal Advisor here. If you will pardon us for a few moments.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Mr. Remnant--I notice the Commissioner looking on. Mr. Barnaby, Mr. Remnant is approaching you and may have a possible solution to the matter you have raised. In view of the very important matter that is before the Council, I wonder if we might take a ten minute recess to get proper wording which will meet Mr. Barnaby's requirements?

I think that rather than rush into this it will be better to take a little bit of time. Let us get wording he is satisfied with. Are other Members of Council in agreement to that?

--- Agreed

May we take ten minutes while we work this out?

--- SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Order, please. Would all Members in the vicinity please take their seats? There are two Members missing. I would like to wait for all Members to be present before I advise committee Members of -- Mr. McCallum, I hope it is very important.

Concept of Elected Representatives.

MR. McCALLUM: I do not think, Mr. Chairman, I would have raised my hand had I not believed it will be important. Quite possibly, Mr. Chairman, we have come through this discussion that we have been undergoing down to one basic thing and that would be recognize that there is a difference in the concept of elected representatives under my experience, that is, my background. An elected representative is elected to make decisions, but it is quite possible that under other cultures the elected representative is a spokesman for a group and as such that may be where the difficulty and the reluctance would be to deal with this particular motion. I would hope that is what it is and not a mistrust of what my motives are as an individual on this Council because I assure you and others that I have no ulterior motives other than to be part of a Council that works for the betterment of all the North.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Thank you, Mr. McCallum. It would appear that I incorrectly advised Mr. Barnaby that an amendment would operate here and permit him to get across the ideas which he wishes to put before us. The situation as I see it is that this motion which has been presented by Mr. Nickerson, and from him I learned it is on behalf of the total Council and is not his motion specifically, suggests to some Members that if it is put and approved, that it ties in, locks in all Members of this Council to this political development paper and position.

The position that has been raised by Mr. Barnaby is that he would prefer and feels it necessary that the ideas that are contained in this paper be taken back to the communities he represents so that they can have an understanding of the concepts that are raised in this political paper, consultation with people. The understanding I receive as chairman is that there is a way to attempt to delay or it is a matter of deferring it for a period of time. I think the time suggested was three months until the January session, at which time the document could be more formally recognized and approved, but at this time some Members feel possibly that approval is a pretty strong word and they could not so do.

Having said that, it would appear that the only solution open to me as chairman is to ask the mover of the motion that is presently before us, which was moved on behalf of all Councillors, if he might withdraw that and permit Mr. Barnaby to put his motion. I think this is the direction I have been given by the Legal Advisor and the Clerk. If that is satisfactory, may I proceed in that manner? Is there any comment?

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, that motion was put on behalf of the whole Council and it is not really my motion, as you pointed out. Therefore, I think you should ask agreement from the whole Council before I undertake to withdraw it.

Motion to Adopt Tabled Document 1-57 Withdrawn

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): I accept that suggestion. As Mr. Nickerson pointed out, he was making the motion on behalf of the total Council. Do I have unanimous approval of all Members to withdraw it? It appears I have unanimous approval and the motion has been withdrawn. Mr. Barnaby, do you wish to put a motion? Has it been worded now?

Motion to Defer Repeated

MR. BARNABY: No, it has not, but what I would like to move as a motion is that the paper on political development of the North be deferred at this time so that we would have a chance to consult with the people we represent.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): This expectation that it could come back on the next occasion when we meet?

MR. BARNABY: In January, I guess. The January session. I did not have a chance to write it out.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): I thought you had it written out. Does every Member understand the motion that has been orally provided by Mr. Barnaby? I did not write it down. Mr. Ernerk?

MR. ERNERK: I think I understand. When the going gets rough it...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Do we have interpretation service? Are people getting the translation?

MR. ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, it seems that we do not get the message on this particular side of the table. I will interpret this particular one in both languages, English and Eskimo or Eskimo and English. I will say it in Eskimo first and then I will say it in English.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): You may certainly speak in both languages but I think that the interpreter's responsibility is to translate, so there will be dialogue on the phones.

MR. ERNERK: When I was speaking in Eskimo was that translated?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): I do not believe it was but it is now. If you wish to start again, please go ahead.

MR. ERNERK: This motion by Mr. George Barnaby is -- what I think was this way; it was discussed today whether it should be temporarily stopped or cancelled or whether it should be brought to the January session and I agree to this.

Motion Restated

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): The motion that has been handed to me, Mr. Barnaby, as carrying out the wishes is this: I move that the paper on political development of the North be deferred at this time in order to

permit consultation with the people in the communities with the expectation that it be brought back at the January session. Do you accept that?

MR. BARNABY: Yes, that is fine.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): You have heard me read the motion once and is there any discussion on the motion as presented by Mr. Barnaby? I am just calling for discussion on the motion, the motion has been put and if there is any discussion on the motion I will receive it now, otherwise I will read it once again and call for the question.

Council Should Decide on Format

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, the point has been made by the Honourable Member from Fort Smith that there may be a difference in political philosophy with regard to the position of territorial Councillors, and I can appreciate this. I find myself in a quandry, however. Does that mean that every time we sit as a Council that people will have to take back to their various settlements what we are discussing for a decision at that level to be brought back at the next sitting? Now, if this is so we are going to have an awful time getting any business done in this house. However, if that is not so, and it is because of the political development issue on this particular paper then possibly it would be acceptable. But, I have got to know, because my philosophy is I do not want the way -- on this particular paper, I believe in it and believe it should go forth and I am prepared to vote on the matter now but I must have some assurance that this is not going to happen every time something comes up because I do not know how we could operate our business as a Council. Now, Mr. McCallum has indicated that this might be a difference in philosophy with regard to the political position of Councillors but if this is the case, then we must change our format and have a weeks Council session and two weeks holiday to go back and get the answers and come back but certainly we must have some method of getting our business done. I agree that it is not relatively important if it is done now or three weeks from now, I do not think it makes any difference, but it is a matter that we must come to grips with on how we are going to operate.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Mr. Stewart, if you were not my boss as chairman of this committee I would have ruled you out of order, because the subject we are discussing is Mr. Barnaby's motion and you asked a rhetorical question about Mr. McCallum's position and while I feel that while it is interesting as an individual statement again it does not really apply to what we are discussing at this moment which is the motion made by Mr. Barnaby. With all respect I think that I wish to hear from Members on the motion. Mr. Wah-Shee?

MR. WAH-SHEE: I just wish to make a comment and try and relate it to the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Good.

MR. WAH-SHEE: It is extremely difficult because you did not rule out the previous speaker. Now, just to create a better understanding, and I do not think it is the wish of all the Members that every time you deal with an issue, I do not think it requires you to go back to your community. I just want to give that assurance. But for this particular document, because it is a very and extremely important document we feel that this is a special case, and I support the motion.

Motion to Defer Discussion Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Thank you very much. Are there any further comments on the motion? The question is being called, and I will read the motion again. "I move that the paper on the political development of the North be deferred at this time in order to permit consultation with the people in the communities with the expectation it will be brought back at the January session." All those Members in favour of the motion please raise your hand. Against? Holy smoke, you have left me with a tough job, it is five to five. My vote is that the paper be deferred until the January session. Did you vote, sir?

MR. McCALLUM: I am sorry, but I misunderstood the vote, the question in the first place and I do not want to foul things up here any more, but was the vote a six-six tie?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): It was a five-five count.

MR. McCALLUM: Could you get a recount? There are 13 people here.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): It is fine with me. Would the Members wish to have a recount on that vote?

--- Agreed

The motion -- I will read it again. "I move that the paper on the political development of the North be deferred at this time in order to permit consultation with the people in the communities with the expectation that it be brought back at the January session." All those in favour of that motion please raise their hands. I have it as seven. Against or contrary? The motion is won.

--- Carried

If there is no further business, I will report to the Speaker and report progress.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, I did not vote this last time because there is something bothering me in this thing here, the paragraph 7 of the political development paper. I do not like to bring you back to it but on this thing I spoke against having it removed, I thought of a different organization afterwards that is funded by the federal government and I do not know where they would fit into the picture.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): In view of the fact that there is a time period here for questions, over the next three months perhaps this could be clarified. Do you think you could get clarification on this matter during that period and could raise it again in January?

MR. STEEN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Would that be satisfactory?

MR. STEEN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): I can not answer the question myself and I do not know if anybody else here can.

MR. STEEN: In view of that I think it is good the way the motion went.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): May I then report progress? Is it agreed?

--- Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters?

Report of the Committee of the Whole of Tabled Document 1-57, A
Paper Relating to Political Development in the Northwest Territories_

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, your committee has met to consider Tabled Document 1-57, a paper relating to the political development of the Northwest Territories and the following motion of your committee applies. "I move that the paper on the political development of the North be deferred at this time in order to permit consultation with the people in the communities with the expectation that it be brought back at the January session."

MR. SPEAKER: Turning to the order paper, are there any reports of committees of the whole? I guess we have just had them. Is that agreed?

--- Agreed

Mr. Pudluk, you wanted to return, I believe, to Item 4, oral questions?

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker, I said that I could ask him personally and would have an answer in a few days.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there unanimous consent to return to Item 4, oral questions?

--- Agreed

Proceed.

MR. STEWART: A point of order, Mr. Pudluk said he would look after that himself.

MR. SPEAKER: I misunderstood. I am sorry. Fine. I believe the Commissioner would like to make a communication or special message, as he calls it, to the Council with respect to his proposals for the appointments, filling two vacancies on the board of directors of the Housing Corporation. Is that correct, Mr. Commissioner?

Appointments to N.W.T. Housing Corporation.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure if I am supposed to glide in here or come out of the floor, but my message to you is this, that there are two vacancies now on the Housing Corporation with the resignation of Mr. Fred Carmichael and Mr. Sid Hancock and I would like to place before you the names of Mr. Richard Whitford who is the nominee of the Northwest Territories Metis Association and Mr. John Parker who is the nominee of the Executive Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: May we have a motion from a Member recommending the appointment of these two people? That is to the board of the Housing Corporation, Mr. Butters?

Motion to Approve Appointments to N.W.T. Housing Corporation

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I so move.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Lyall. Is there any discussion? Mr. Stewart?

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I have no opposition to the two nominations, however, I am concerned that at the present time no one responsible to this Council is a member. I would prefer to see someone appointed by the Council as a Council Member who would be responsible for reporting directly to this body.

THE COMMISSIONER: That is not exactly correct, Mr. Pearson, although he is not here, is a member of the Housing Corporation.

MR. STEWART: I withdraw my complaint.

Motion Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Any further discussion? The question. The question is being called. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

--- Carried

I would like to take this opportunity to recognize another distinguished ex-colleague in the gallery, Mr. Willy Adams who used to represent the Keewatin.

--- Applause

Members of Council, just as soon as the Clerk finds me my prompting card on the prorogation procedure, it would appear that that is probably the next thing to do. Mr. Commissioner?

REVERT TO ITEM NO. 3: QUESTIONS AND RETURNS.

Return to Question 01-57: Remuneration for Members of Hamlet Councils

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Speaker, I promised the Member from Foxe Basin an answer to his question with regard to higher honourariums for the hamlet councillors and he was referring specifically to Coral Harbour. At the present moment the honourariums for hamlet officers are \$500 a year for a chairman and \$250 for members, and I have given him a reply in syllabics, but for the information of the Council here the proper way for this to be done is for an amendment to the Municipal Ordinance through recommendations from this Council or the Administration could introduce it as a paper. Failing no action today, it would be the intention of the Administration to introduce an amendment to the ordinance in January for an upward revision.

MR. SPEAKER: I presume there is no further business then? Mr. Wah-Shee?

ITEM NO. 4: ORAL QUESTIONS

Question 02-57: Canada Assistance Plan

MR. WAH-SHEE: Mr. Speaker, I just have one question. I would like to ask if the Minister of Social Development would comply with the Canada Assistance Plan, the agreement between the territorial government and the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER: I assume you want to go back to questions then?

MR. WAH-SHEE: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any objection to going back to oral questions, Item 4? Is it agreed?

--- Agreed

Could we regard the question as having been asked because it is fairly clear? Is there any response the Executive wishes to make at this time? Mr. Ernerk?

MR. ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, I did not quite hear the question. Could I ask Mr. Wah-Shee to repeat the question again please?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wah-Shee, would you repeat the question?

MR. WAH-SHEE: The reason why I am doing this is not to put you on the spot, but what I just wanted to know is this: The territorial government would live up to the terms in the agreement of the Canada Assistance Plan between the territorial government and the federal government of the Canada Assistance Plan, which includes, as I understand it, welfare appeal boards, which is one of the conditions?

MR. ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, I would have to seek a very fast consultation with my officers. Would the committee allow me to do so?

MR. SPEAKER: Would it meet with the approval of Council to have Mr. Ernerk communicate that response to Mr. Wah-Shee privately or file it with the next session in January as well? Agreed?

--- Agreed

Is there anything further, any other item anyone else wishes to return to? Mr. Clerk, would you escorted by the Sergeant-at-Arms find the Commissioner and ask him if he would be good enough to prorogue this house?

THE COMMISSIONER: Please be seated. Mr. Speaker, Members of Council, I want to congratulate you on a hard days work. It is strange to sit in Council as you have allowed the Deputy Commissioner and myself to do and to hear discussed an item of business as important as what you have discussed and not be able to participate in it. I recall very well a similar discussion some many years ago which eventually led to the bringing to the Northwest

Territories not only the capital, which at that time was located in Ottawa, but also the government itself and the turning over of many responsibilities to the new, as it was then, territorial administration. I say to you that after you have finally reached your conclusion that the success of it will depend on the support that you can get from the Council, because it is like anything else, the more weighted it is toward unanimity, the more attention you will receive from the Government of Canada and those whom you are most interested to impress.

Inspector Barker, Honorary Aide-de-Camp

This morning I had the opportunity of bringing in or having accompany me in Inspector Barker of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. He was newly appointed this morning as Honorary Aide-de-Camp to the Commissioner. I neglected to introduce him to you at this mornings session. Unfortunately I was not able to get him over here quickly enough this afternoon.

I would like to announce prior to the prorogation the appointment, as a result of your decision a few moments ago, of the two new members to the Housing Corporation of Deputy Commissioner John Parker to succeed Assistant Commissioner Hancock as chairman of the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation.

ITEM NO. 12: PROROGATION

I believe that the next session of Council has already been set for the last week of January and as there is no further business to come before this Council, I now prorogue this, the 57th session of the Council of the Northwest Territories.

Available from the Clerk of the Council of the
Northwest Territories, Yellowknife, N.W.T. at \$5.00 per session
Published under the Authority of the Commissioner
of the Northwest Territories