



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES
DEBATES

61st Session

8th Assembly



MARCH 28, 1977

Speaker The Honourable David H. Searle, Q.C.

DONATION

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

The Honourable David H. Searle, Q.C., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 939
Yellowknife, N.W.T. X0E 1H0
(Yellowknife South)
(Speaker)

The Honourable Arnold McCallum, M.L.A.
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0
(Slave River)
(Minister of Education)

Mr. Donald M. Stewart, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 310
Hay River, N.W.T.
X0E 0R0
(Hay River)
(Deputy Speaker)

Mr. Peter Fraser, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 23
Norman Wells, N.W.T.
(Mackenzie Great Bear)

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

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

Mr. William A. Lafferty, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 176
Fort Simpson, N.W.T.
X0E 0N0
(Mackenzie Liard)

Mr. William Lyall, M.L.A.
Cambridge Bay, N.W.T.
X0E 0C0
(Central Arctic)

The Honourable Peter Ernerk, M.L.A.
Site 18, Box 16,
Yellowknife, N.W.T. X0E 1H0
(Keewatin)
(Minister of Economic Development)

The Honourable Dave Nickerson, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1778
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0
(Yellowknife North)
(Minister of Social Development)

Mr. Thomas H. Butters, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1069
Inuvik, N.W.T.
X0E 0T0
(Inuvik)
(Deputy Chairman of Committees)

Mr. Bryan R. Pearson, M.L.A.
c/o Arctic Ventures
Frobisher Bay, N.W.T.
X0A 0H0
(South Baffin)

Mr. Ludy Pudluk, M.L.A.
Resolute Bay, N.W.T.
X0A 0V0
(High Arctic)

Mr. John Steen, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 60
Tuktoyaktuk, N.W.T.
X0E 1C0
(Western Arctic)

Mr. Richard Whitford, M.L.A.
Rae, N.W.T.
(Great Slave Lake)

OFFICERS

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

Sergeant-at-Arms
Mr. F. A. MacKay
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0

Clerk Assistant
Mr. Pieter De Vos
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0

Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms
Mr. J. H. MacKendrick
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0

LEGAL ADVISOR
Ms. P. Flieger
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

28 March 1977

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	943
Questions and Returns	943,952
Oral Questions	945
Notices of Motions	948,953
Motions	948,955
Tabling of Documents	949
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Motion 12-61 Meeting of Members with Minister March 11	957
- Motion 24-60 Formation of a Special Committee for the Development of Territorial Legislation before the Construction of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline	966
- Sessional Paper 1-61 Devolution	978
Report of the Committee of the Whole of:	
- Motion 12-61 Meeting of Members with Minister March 11	966
- Motion 24-60 Formation of a Special Committee for the Development of Territorial Legislation before the Construction of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline	976
- Sessional Paper 1-61 Devolution	980
Third Reading of Bills	980
Assent to Bills	983
Time and Place of Next Session	983
Prorogation	983

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES.

MONDAY, MARCH 28, 1977.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Steen, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Lafferty, Mr. Lyall, Mr. Butters, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Whitford, Hon. Arnold McCallum, Mr. Evaluarjuk, Hon. Peter Ernerk, Mr. Pudluk, Hon. David Searle, Hon. Dave Nickerson, Mr. Kilabuk

ITEM NO. 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

SPEAKER (Hon. David Searle): Turning to the order paper, Item 2, questions and returns. Mr. Butters.

ITEM NO. 2: QUESTIONS AND RETURNS.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I have two questions.

Question W47-61: Student Knowledge Tests

Has the Education Department yet embarked on a program of testing junior and elementary school students on their grasp and knowledge of basic subjects as promised in January?

Question W48-61: Mackenzie Delta Regional Plan

My second question, Sir, is -- and I expect both of these to be taken as notice -- can the Commissioner inform this House when he will be providing the Inuvik Mayor Jim Robertson and members of his council with copies of the Mackenzie Delta Regional Plan which he has indicated was in his possession when he met with the Inuvik town council earlier this month?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Arnold McCallum, what is your wish with respect to the first question?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I will take that, Mr. Speaker, as notice and try and answer.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the second question, Mr. Commissioner.

Return To Question W48-61: Mackenzie Delta Regional Plan

COMMISSIONER (Mr. Hodgson): Mr. Speaker, with reference to the Mackenzie Delta Regional Plan, it is true that I have seen a first draft. The final draft is still being worked on and will not be ready for about 30 days. We are in the process of contacting the department who funded this program to see if there is any objection to us releasing it. In any event, we have promised the first people we would make it available to is this Assembly and as soon as we get approval to release it and it is finished we will release it to this Assembly first, followed by general distribution.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: As a supplementary, if this Assembly is not in session when permission is given to release it, will it be held until our May session before it is provided to the communities in the Delta who are perhaps more directly affected and interested than Members of this body are?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: If the Assembly Members wish we could send it to the Members at their homes and hold up releasing it until the Assembly comes back in session and then, based on the advice of the Assembly we can release it if they so wish.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further questions? Mr. Whitford.

Question W49-61: Game Management, Fort Resolution

MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Speaker, the people of Fort Resolution have been promised some change in the game management in Fort Resolution. I am wondering what the administration has done to solve this problem in regard to having someone new there, or what they are going to do?

MR. SPEAKER: Deputy Commissioner Parker.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, not being fully aware of the events to which the Member refers, we must take the question as notice and provide a reply. I will also seek an opportunity to speak with the Member in order to determine more accurately the problem.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further written questions? Mr. Whitford.

Question W50-61: Introduction Of Bill 10-61

MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fraser can not talk this morning so I will deliver this for him. I note that Bill 10-61, the Constitutional Development Advisory Committee Ordinance is listed on today's orders of the day for first and second reading and for consideration in committee of the whole. May I therefore ask if the administration intends to proceed with the production of this bill today?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Commissioner.

Return To Question W50-61: Introduction Of Bill 10-61

THE COMMISSIONER: My apologies, Mr. Speaker. I had forgotten for a moment what it was referring to and the answer is no.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further written questions? Mr. Whitford.

MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Speaker, just one last question. I asked the last time, or complained the last time about the telephone service that was in Rae and we have received a letter from Canadian National Telecommunications, a letter stating that everything was well in that particular community. However, Mr. Speaker, it is not and we have asked for an additional line service into the community and I am wondering if perhaps at the next Assembly session in May the administration could seek the proper people from CNT to meet with the Assembly in committee of the whole to discuss further communications, not only in that particular area but in other areas of the North.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Whitford, you have put the Executive in a difficult position in answering that and presumably their answer would be if the House wishes. The best way of handling that would be, I should think; to make a motion that this House ask the administration to procure the attendance before it of CNT officials, and if everybody wanted that sort of discussion to take place then presumably the motion would pass and they would then have the direction of everybody. Do you see what I mean? You are putting the administration in a problem by asking that as a question, because the administration must really come back and say "Well, I suppose if everybody wants..." and I think you would be better to do that in the form of a motion if I could suggest so and then you could get the feeling of the whole House.

MR. WHITFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Whitford.

MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Speaker, could I ask that same question in terms of a motion at the end of the day, sir?

MR. SPEAKER: When we get to Item 6, notices of motions, and Item 8, motions, and those would be the appropriate places to move the motion and because we may be in session only today you may wish when you get to Item 8 to ask for unanimous consent to move it today. What you should probably do is get some assistance from Mr. Remnant to help you with that motion so that it is ready when we get to those items.

MR. WHITFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there further written questions? Deputy Commissioner Parker, I neglected to ask for returns, were there any returns outstanding?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, we do not have any returns ready. I believe there may have been one outstanding but there are no other returns ready.

ITEM NO. 3: ORAL QUESTIONS.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 3, oral questions. Mr. Butters.

Question 051-61: Report On Meeting With Minister Of Indian And Northern Affairs.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, will a Member of the Executive or even possibly yourself, sir, be making a complete and full report on the March 11th meeting between Members of this Assembly and the Hon. Warren Allmand and his senior departmental officers now at this first opportunity to do so following that historic and unique meeting? I believe the Minister informed you, sir, that nothing he told us on that occasion was off the record and from my recollection much of what he told us was very encouraging and very forward-looking. I was hoping that possibly there would be an oral report made at this time of that meeting.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a response from the Executive? The question was directed to either the Members of the Executive or the Speaker and speaking for the Speaker, I do not think that I can under the Rules and the items of business here make such a report from the chair. I am really sitting here as a non-participant. You could I suppose move that the matter be discussed in committee of the whole and we could do it that way but certainly from here I do not think there is any precedence to allow me to stand up and read out such a report, because I would really be engaging in debate and I think I am prohibited from doing that from here. However, you may want some kind of a response from the Executive. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: With all due respect that is hardly a proper question to be addressed to the government. The meeting that occurred with Hon. Warren Allmand was of course between the Legislative Assembly and himself and departmental officials and I think the question should more properly be addressed to the chairman of the caucus possibly at a caucus meeting.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further oral questions?

Return To Question 051-61: Report On Meeting With Minister Of Indian And Northern Affairs

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, if I may, as caucus chairman I do not know if at this present time -- I had not thought about making any sort of oral report and if I thought we were I would prefer we did it at a caucus meeting or in committee of the whole but I do not have anything here at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further oral questions? Mr. Pudluk.

Question 052-61: Workshop Planned For Baker Lake

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the administration about the workshop in Baker Lake, which was to happen during this session. We were going to hold a workshop in Baker Lake and this was among members of the communities and I would like to know what happened?

MR. SPEAKER: A workshop planned for Baker Lake, is that the question, Mr. Pudluk?

MR. PUDLUK: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Commissioner.

Return To Question 052-61: Workshop Planned For Baker Lake

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Speaker, with reference to the Honourable Member's question, some months ago it was decided to hold a series of workshops in the communities and invite a number of the people from the various communities to come together to participate in such a workshop. Five of these workshops have been held, the sixth was to take place in Baker Lake this morning but there is a difference of opinion which has developed within the government with reference to one of the courses that was to be taught. The title of it is "Tactics for Radicals" and until we are sure just what is meant by this, or what the course is all about I decided to postpone the conference until I had time to discuss it with a full session of the Executive.

On Saturday one or two of the people who would be attending phoned me and asked that I reconsider and that the course go ahead as people were assembling. I called an emergency meeting of the Executive yesterday and we discussed it and after a thorough discussion we decided to accept the recommendation of the people who had contacted us and to go ahead with the course. Apparently there were some second thoughts on the part of the people who we had been communicating with on Saturday and they asked that it not go ahead at this time.

So, we will accept that suggestion also and we have agreed to postpone it until some future date. In the meantime, we will look into the situation and see just what the program is and get a detailed rundown of the courses which are being taught. To the best of my knowledge there is no disagreement with the five courses that have been taught up until now and I am sure one way or another we will be able to work this out.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further oral questions? Mr. Butters.

Question 053-61: Material On Radicals Be Made Available To The Assembly

MR. BUTTERS: As a supplementary I know that the North has an ideal environment for radicals and I would be interested in the material described by the Commissioner, if it could be made available to this Assembly in tabled form and made public. I do not think this material is something that should remain within the walls of the Executive. It should not only be tabled here but made public to the people of the Northwest Territories.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Commissioner.

Return to Question 053-61: Material On Radicals Be Made Available To The Assembly

THE COMMISSIONER: I will undertake to do that. This administration has no intention of teaching any courses to anybody that would not have the support and approval of this Council. We understand and well realize that the Council, when they pass the appropriations in which these various programs are contained, that they do so on the word of the senior members of the government, and that includes the appointed and elected Members. We respect that appreciation of the Council Members and so, not willingly or knowingly would we undertake to do things that this Council would not approve of. So, I am quite happy to put together the details of what is being taught and put it to Council before we proceed with another course, before we reschedule it.

MR. SPEAKER: I am tempted to suggest, Mr. Commissioner, that such tactics might be useful to Members.

---Laughter

Are there any further oral questions? Mr. Butters.

Question 054-61: Shell Oil And Cominco Pulling Out Of N.W.T.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, can the Commissioner or the Deputy Commissioner confirm that Shell Oil and Cominco have recently announced their intention to pull out of the Northwest Territories owing I believe to, one, resistance being received from certain northern groups, and, two, the lack of decision of the current government regarding its attitude towards supporting northern exploration and northern exploration activity?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Commissioner.

Return To Question 054-61: Shell Oil And Cominco Pulling Out Of N.W.T.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Speaker, I can not comment for Cominco as I have not been approached by any of the Cominco officials. I know that we have been liaising with the federal government and Cominco with reference to the project at Arvik on Little Cornwallis Island, and we have been keeping the people in Resolute Bay informed as to what has been happening. We have not heard anything for I think at least five or six months, so I have nothing to report as to what their plans are.

With regard to Shell Canada, one of their officials did come and see me the other day and he told me that he was going to Inuvik and he was going to announce that Shell Oil was suspending their drill program at the end of the current session, and that they were pulling back, and I guess would reassess their position based on what type of a decision was made by the Government of Canada as to whether they would restart next year, by themselves or with a partner, or pull out all together. So, other than what was made public by this official in Inuvik that is about all that I can report.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker, I might be able to help out a little with this question, especially with regard to what Cominco and other mining companies are expecting to be doing in the territories this year. I do not think the intention is to pull out, but it is certainly their intention to slow down in the Northwest Territories. They will be putting a good deal of money into British Columbia and other places and the reason for this is very apparent, it is because of the very poor investment climate in the Northwest Territories at the present time and the political situation which is not at all good. I think that a lot of it falls upon us to make sure that this set of circumstances continues for as short a period of time as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 3, oral questions?

Item 4, petitions.

Item 5, reports of standing and special committees.

Item 6, notices of motions. Mr. Whitford.

MR. WHITFORD: I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make a motion:

ITEM NO. 6: NOTICES OF MOTIONS_

Notice of Motion 11-61: CNT Representatives Attending May Session

WHEREAS the standard of telephone service now provided to a number of northern communities including Rae, is inadequate;

AND WHEREAS the anticipated population expansion will place an increased demand on the existing equipment which is already overloaded;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this Assembly invite representatives of Canadian National Telecommunications to appear before this House during the May session so that Members may discuss with them the communications needs of northern settlements.

MR. SPEAKER: That is notice of motion and your intention would be to move that later today I presume. Do you agree, Mr. Whitford?

MR. WHITFORD: Yes, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further notices of motions?

Item 7, motions for the production of papers.

Item 8, motions.

ITEM NO. 8: MOTIONS

Mr. Whitford, presumably you wish to request unanimous consent to move the motion now that you have just given notice of, do you?

MR. WHITFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent being requested to move the motion now with respect to Canadian National Telecommunications which Mr. Whitford just gave notice of?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Proceed, Mr. Whitford. Would you just read the motion again and then it will be moved and I will call for a seconder.

Motion 11-61: CNT Representatives Attending May Session_

MR. WHITFORD:

WHEREAS the standard of telephone service now provided to a number of northern communities, including Rae, is inadequate;

AND WHEREAS the anticipated population expansion will place an increased demand on the existing equipment which is already overloaded;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this Assembly invite representatives of Canadian National Telecommunications to appear before this House during the May session so that Members may discuss with them the communications needs of northern settlements.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Whitford. Is there a seconder? Mr. Pudluk. Any discussion? Mr. Whitford.

MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Speaker, I believe, and I strongly believe, that there are Canadians in the western part of the North who are looked after by CNT, and I believe also that the equipment that is being used in the communities is now at a point where it can no longer be adequately serviceable. Such is the case at Rae, and I use that only because I know that community well. We have got one telephone line in and out of that community and one out of Edzo. If the telex is on no one can phone out of that community. So, I would ask this House if we could please invite the people from CNT to come into our Honourable House here to explain why these communications are lacking and what they are going to do to better develop the communications network for all of the North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any further discussion? The question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

Motion Carried

MR. SPEAKER: The question being called. All in favour? Contrary? The motion appears to have been carried unanimously.

---Carried

I presume there are no further motions, Mr. Remnant, are there in the book? Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: My economy motion, it is not in there and I would ask that it be deferred. I do not see it in the book, but I expect we will be sitting tomorrow so with your leave, sir, I will bring it up tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Fine. Before I leave that item if you do intend to bring it up you might be wise to do it now. I am not so sure we will necessarily be sitting tomorrow. That is a lot of "if's". I guess I am just cautioning you against assuming that.

MR. BUTTERS: I appreciate that, sir. It is not in the book and I do not have it with me. I did not expect we will be shutting it down today and I did not bring my material in with me so possibly later in the afternoon we could return to this agenda item and I could raise it then.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 9, tabling of documents.

ITEM NO. 9: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table Tabled Document 14-61, Preliminary Report to the Legislative Assembly Regarding the Effectiveness of the Subsidized Term Employment Program (STEP).

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Are there any further documents to be tabled? Gentlemen, with respect to Items 10 and 11, in view of the provisions of the Northwest Territories Act which requires money bills to be put forward by the government and in view of the answer that the Commissioner has given to the question put this morning that the Executive were not prepared to advance Bill 10-61, obviously there is no point in the calling for first or second reading of that bill. So, we will proceed to Item 12.

Item 12, consideration in committee of the whole of bills and other matters. Similarly, Bill 10-61 because it has not received first and second reading, we will not be proceeding with it in committee of the whole.

Motion 24-60, Formation of a Special Committee for the Development of Territorial Legislation before the Construction of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline. That motion was moved for discussion in committee of the whole. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Yes, sir, in arriving late, and not having seen this agenda I have sort of got my materials back to front. I did not expect that this would come up until we had had a chance to deal with some of the more important, or most important thing, probably, which is the direction we are going to go in view of the information provided us by the Minister and so I did not bring my information with me. I think this is a very important subject which we have to discuss here and I have a number of points which I wish to raise and bring to the attention of the committee.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it you do not want to proceed now then with Motion 24-60?

MR. BUTTERS: Sir, if it is the wish of the Assembly then I can go back to the hotel and get the information I have and perhaps you could take the others but no, I would prefer to proceed a little further on, later in the day.

MR. SPEAKER: Sessional Paper 1-61, Devolution, a discussion paper. Are we prepared to resolve into committee of the whole in consideration of that item? Mr. Stewart.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I would request that we recognize the clock as 1:00 o'clock p.m. at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: This House will recess for five minutes.

---SHORT RECESS

MR. SPEAKER: The House will come to order. Mr. Stewart, that was a very interesting term. However, I can not accept a request to recognize the clock. We have given the Rules as much of a "scrute" as can be "scruted" and there is nothing in there which would permit me to recognize the clock in that way. What you really want to do is recess the House until a later time. It seems to me that there are several ways you could do that, either by way of a proper notice earlier on or returning to that item and making a notice of motion, seeking unanimous consent to return to that item. I am wondering, looking at the orders of the day if we can not or if I can not maybe assist in determining what the feeling is. Deputy Commissioner Parker, the other item we have on here deals with the report of the Auditor General. I understand that those people will not be available, is that correct?

Delay Of The Auditor General's Report

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, I advise with regret that they will not be available either today or tomorrow. We were not advised that the Auditor General's representative was not travelling to Yellowknife today until this morning and therefore we had no opportunity to take any other action. Therefore, I am sorry but we would have to delay the report of the Auditor General, that is the hearing of the Auditor General's representatives until the next session.

MR. SPEAKER: The territorial government policy as to pricing liquor, I understand that is a matter you have set down for next session as well?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, it appears therefore that if you look at all of those matters under Item 12, the first one Bill 10-61 is off. We are left with Motion 24-60 which Mr. Butters would like us to deal with a little later and Sessional Paper 1-61, and that is it, apart of course from third reading of bills which would take a very brief period of time and also assent to bills. So, it would appear to me that we could, if it were the wish of this Assembly, adjourn or rather recess until say our normal returning time after lunch to enable a caucus meeting to be held which is what I rather suspect is what people would like to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any serious objection to me recessing now say until 2:30 o'clock p.m.? If not, that would enable a caucus meeting to be held immediately. Is there any objection? None? Hon. Arnold McCallum, before I recess, have you got a place? Mr. Clerk, room 215?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Room 215 in this building which is where, Mr. Clerk? Is it just up here?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Just upstairs, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A caucus in room 215. This House recessed until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

---SHORT RECESS

MR. SPEAKER: There being a quorum of Members present, Deputy Commissioner Parker.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: I have some replies to questions raised this morning and I would seek unanimous consent to return to Item 2 in order to provide these returns.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

---Agreed

REVERT TO ITEM NO. 2: QUESTIONS AND RETURNS

Return to Question W49-61: Game Management, Fort Resolution

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Thank you. Mr. Whitford asked what was going to be done regarding fish and wildlife positions in Fort Resolution.

The Fort Smith regional director and the Fort Resolution Hunters' and Trappers' Association have met and discussed several possible changes that may be feasible in relation to the administration of fish and wildlife programs in the Fort Resolution, Pine Point areas. No final decisions have been made, however, we anticipate a greater involvement by the hunters' and trappers' association and we will be pleased to advise Mr. Whitford of the action taken.

Return to Question W47-61: Student Knowledge Tests

On Monday, March 28, 1977, Mr. Butters asked Question W47-61. Mr. Speaker, this one concerns an education matter but I will take the liberty of reading the reply.

The department has not embarked on a program of testing junior high and elementary school students. However, the department was reorganized on February 1st to better meet the objectives set for it. Executive approval for the conversion of a subject specialist position to a measurement and evaluation specialist was given on February 15th. This position is currently being advertised and, on being filled, the department will be in a position to begin an evaluation program in specific areas of the curriculum.

Return to Question W11-61: Radio and Television Service In Spence Bay

Mr. Speaker, Question W11-61 was asked by Mr. Lyall on January 27 concerning the provision of Anik radio and television service to Spence Bay.

At that time we responded that we knew of no plans in the immediate future. However, we have since received a telex, in fact it was received late last week, from Mr. Douglas Ward, the director of the CBC northern service and I would like to read the appropriate portion of his reply: "Spence Bay council chairman was informed by letters dated August 5th and November 4th, 1976, from myself that Spence Bay community would receive both services probably by late 1977. At this point in time, the Telesat program feeds for radio and television has been ordered and the CBC's engineering details are now being submitted to the federal government Department of Communications and Canadian Radio and Telecommunications Commission for approval. Services should be on air by late 1977 or early 1978. However, the actual completion of this installation will be subject to equipment and feeds system delivery." So, that constitutes a much more favorable reply, Mr. Speaker.

Office/Firehall And Road Grader For Coral Harbour

If you could have your indulgence, during the budget debate Mr. Evaluarjuk asked some questions regarding an office/firehall and a road grader for Coral Harbour.

With regard to the office/firehall, the regional office has identified a requirement for an adequate municipal office complete with council chamber and

firehall to be provided at the hamlet of Coral Harbour. However, at the present time we do not anticipate supplying such a facility to Coral Harbour until the 1979-80 fiscal year. Although this projection of our timetable to provide the requested facility is somewhat flexible, and subject to capital planning approval, we are not in a position to consider any revision to our 1977-78, that is the current year, schedule, owing to prior commitments. A new road grader was delivered this past sealift to Coral Harbour to assist the council with their road maintenance. The equipment supplied to Coral Harbour is not required for airstrip maintenance and we have confirmed with the hamlet that the grader is operating normally.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters.

Question W56-61: Advice On The Government's Review Of The Dene Proposal

MR. BUTTERS: I will respond to that section. On January 31st I asked Question W16-61 concerning representation of the Northwest Territories Legislative Assembly at meetings scheduled in February between the Northwest Territories Indian Brotherhood and the Government of Canada re land claims. The answer that the Deputy Commissioner gave me to that question said in part "The practice which was evolved in the Yukon concerning involvement of members of the Legislative Assembly in land claim discussions has been to name the territorial Commissioner as chief representative of the territories and allow him to designate other territorial representatives as he sees fit." In this instance, the Executive Committee member for Local Government who is an elected Executive member has represented the legislature. Now, by letter dated March 14 from the Honourable Minister, Warren Allmand, we are informed and I think we have all received this letter--he says in part "I will be seeking the advice and assistance of territorial representatives during the government's review of the proposal." He is referring here to the Dene claim, and this is a very great step ahead in terms of participation than hithertofore indicated to us by the Deputy Commissioner. So, I would ask therefore if we could have or if this chamber could have as soon as possible from the Minister full details of an explanation as to how he "will be seeking the advice and assistance of territorial representatives during the government's review of the Dene proposal."

MR. SPEAKER: Deputy Commissioner Parker.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, we will attempt to obtain from the Minister at the earliest possible time his more specific views on what he means by "territorial representation" and provide it to Members. I believe that the Commissioner will be attending the first round of meetings with the Dene Association which will be held shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Peter Ernerk.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have the unanimous consent of this Assembly to return to Item 6, notices of motions?

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent requested to return to Item 6, is it agreed?

---Agreed

REVERT TO ITEM NO. 6: NOTICES OF MOTIONS

Proceed, Hon. Peter Ernerk.

Notice of Motion 12-61: Meeting Of Members With Minister, March 11

HON. PETER ERNERK: I wish to give notice that today, March 28, 1977 I will move the following motion:

WHEREAS Members of this Assembly met in Ottawa with the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs on March 11th;

AND WHEREAS it is desirable to consider publicly matters discussed at that meeting;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this House resolve into committee of the whole today to discuss matters relating to the meeting of Members of this Assembly with the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Stewart.

Notice of Motion 14-61: Appreciation of Commissioner's Service

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give notice of the following motion:

WHEREAS Stuart M. Hodgson, O.C., K.St.J., was appointed to the Council of the Northwest Territories on May 21, 1964, to the post of Deputy Commissioner on August 1, 1965, and to the office of Commissioner of the Northwest Territories on March 2, 1967, which position he still holds;

AND WHEREAS his outstanding contribution was recognized by the presentation to him on February 9, 1977, of the Outstanding Achievement Award of the Public Service of Canada for 1976;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this Legislative Assembly express to the said Stuart M. Hodgson, O.C., K.St.J., its most sincere appreciation for his many years of extremely dedicated service to all northern peoples and for the exemplary leadership and guidance which he has provided, especially to this Legislature initially as a Member of this House, and since 1967 as Commissioner of the Northwest Territories.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Dave Nickerson.

Notice of Motion 13-61: Establishment Of A Special Committee To Recommend Policies To Minister

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I give notice that today, subject of course to unanimous consent by the House I will move the following motion:

NOW THEREFORE, I move that:

- I: A special committee of this House be hereby established to recommend to this House the policies to be contained in the "Major Policy Statement" to be made by the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs concerning constitutional matters, economic matters and native land claims;
- II: That the committee be comprised of the following members: Hon. Arnold McCallum, chairman; Hon. David Searle, Hon. Peter Ernerk, Mr. R. Whitford, Mr. T. Butters, Mr. W. Lyall and Mr. Stewart;
- III: That the committee have the authority to retain such professional and clerical assistance as it might require and sit at such times and places as it might deem necessary whether or not the Legislature be in session.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further notices of motions? I assume that all three Members are requesting unanimous consent to move to Item 8, motions. Hon. Peter Ernerk.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker ...

MR. SPEAKER: Is there unanimous consent?

---Agreed

REVERT TO ITEM NO. 8: MOTIONS

Hon. Peter Ernerk.

Motion 12-61: Meeting Of Members With Minister, March 11

HON. PETER ERNERK: Thank you. Mr. Speaker,

WHEREAS Members of this Assembly met in Ottawa with the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs on March 11th;

AND WHEREAS it is desirable to consider publicly matters discussed at that meeting;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this House resolve into committee of the whole today to discuss matters relating to the meeting of Members of this Assembly with the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Butters. The question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

Motion Carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The question being called. All in favour? Contrary? The motion is carried unanimously.

---Carried

HON. DAVE NICKERSON:

Motion 13-61: Establishment Of A Special Committee To Recommend Policies To Minister

HON. DAVE NICKERSON:

NOW THEREFORE, I move that:

- I: A special committee of this House be hereby established to recommend to this House the policies to be contained in the "Major Policy Statement" to be made by the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs concerning constitutional matters, economic matters and native land claims;
- II: That the committee be comprised of the following members: Hon. Arnold McCallum, chairman, Hon. David Searle, Hon. Peter Ernerk, Mr. R. Whitford, Mr. T. Butters, Mr. W. Lyall and Mr. Stewart;
- III: That the committee have the authority to retain such professional and clerical assistance as it might require and sit at such times and places as it might deem necessary whether or not the Legislature be in session.

MR. SPEAKER: In that Hon. Dave Nickerson is a Member of the Executive and notwithstanding the fact therefore, that the motion deals with the retaining of experts and hence the spending of money, the motion is in order. Is there a seconder? Hon. Peter Ernerk. The question. Is there any discussion? Mr. Whitford.

Amendment To The Motion

MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an amendment to that motion and add on to it Mr. Bill Lafferty, if he would.

MR. SPEAKER: Your amendment is restricted to simply the addition of Mr. Lafferty as a Member of the committee, is it?

MR. WHITFORD: Yes, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder to the amendment? Mr. Butters. Now, let me see, do we vote on the amendment first? I think so. Yes. That always gives me trouble. Is there any discussion on the amendment?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

MR. SPEAKER: The question. The question being called on the amendment which is simply to add Mr. Lafferty as a Member of the committee. Do we all understand that? The question being called. All in favour? Contrary? The motion or rather the amendment is carried.

---Carried

Now, on the motion as amended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

Motion Carried As Amended

MR. SPEAKER: The question. The question being called. All in favour? Contrary? The motion is carried unanimously.

---Carried

Motion 14-61: Appreciation Of Commissioner's Service

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move:

WHEREAS Stuart M. Hodgson, O.C., K.St.J., was appointed to the Council of the Northwest Territories on May 21, 1964, to the post of Deputy Commissioner on August 1, 1965 and to the office of Commissioner of the Northwest Territories on March 2, 1967, which position he still holds;

AND WHEREAS his outstanding contribution was recognized by the presentation to him on February 9, 1977, of the Outstanding Achievement Award of the Public Service of Canada for 1976;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this Legislative Assembly express to the said Stuart M. Hodgson, O.C., K.St.J., its most sincere appreciation for his many years of extremely dedicated service to all northern peoples and for the exemplary leadership and guidance which he has provided, especially to this Legislature, initially as a Member of this House and since 1967 as Commissioner of the Northwest Territories.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder?

---Applause

For the record, Mr. Whitford, as seconder. Any discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters, any discussion?

MR. BUTTERS: Sir, I wholeheartedly support the motion but I would just want to make it clear that in so doing I do not see the Commissioner departing into the sunset, it is like buying a new set of tires when your old ones are still good with a lot of miles on the tread yet and while he has completed his first ten years in the North I think he has another ten to go and he would receive the support of this House during the next ten also, sir.

Motion Carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any further discussion? The question being called. All in favour? The motion is carried unanimously.

---Carried.

Mr. Stewart, could you ask the Commissioner to come up here, please? Would you escort him? I am sure it comes as no surprise that we have the motion that was just read put here in the appropriate form. There is only one signature we have not got, sir, and we plan to get that by hook or by crook, and when we next see Mr. Pearson we will have that done, but may I present this to you symbolically and we can take it back later and get the signature put in.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Would you like me to say a word? Just one word, I would like to say that from one old tire to a lot of new ones I appreciate this very much, it is very kind of you. I do not know how many months I have left with the Assembly but I have enjoyed the years I have been here and I want to say, in all honesty, that I could never have done it had it not been for the help of Deputy Commissioner John Parker. He is the unsung hero as far as I am concerned in this Assembly and in the territorial government and if he is to be the new Commissioner and I certainly hope he is, and I will do everything to see that that comes about because you could not be better served.

Finally, this is one way of getting me to say you are no longer the Council of the Northwest Territories but the Legislative Assembly. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: I do not recall ever before publicly congratulating a Commissioner and normally we get all kinds of suggestions as to what he might do.

---Laughter

Gentlemen, it seems now that it would be appropriate to move on to Item 12, consideration in committee of the whole of bills and other matters.

ITEM NO. 12: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS AND OTHER MATTERS.

I would assume in view of the passage of the motion moved by Hon. Peter Ernerk that this House resolve into committee of the whole today to discuss Motion 12-61, Meeting of Members with Minister, March 11, and it would therefore be your wish that that is the item we resolve into committee of the whole on at this time. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

That being so, this House will resolve into committee of the whole for consideration of the motion made by Hon. Peter Ernerk, and I will not repeat it, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into Committee of the Whole for consideration of Motion 12-61, Meeting of Members with Minister, March 11, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER MOTION 12-61, MEETING OF MEMBERS WITH MINISTER, MARCH 11

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The committee will come to order. The motion reads:

Motion 12-61: Meeting Of Members With Minister, March 11

"Now therefore, I move that this House resolve into committee of the whole today to discuss matters relating to the meeting of Members of this Assembly with the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs." Are there any comments from the floor? Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Just in order to get things going, Mr. Chairman, I will briefly state to the committee what I consider to be the three main points to have come out of the meeting.

It was one of those meetings where people talked at great length about rather abstract concepts, and it is sometimes difficult to pin down what was actually said, but as I recollect, probably the three most important points were these: First of all, the Honourable Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development made it absolutely clear that the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories was to be considered the supreme body when it came to matters political at the territorial level. This recognition is important because over a period of time I think that some of us, and some of the people we represent have had the feeling that somehow we were slipping and that this recognition was not there. I for one was very pleased to see the Minister, that he came out very strongly in favour of this point of view.

Incorporating Views Into The Initial Policy Statement

The second most important point, one that initially comes to mind, is that in this major policy statement that is to be made by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, some time, we are told in May, we are to have a good deal of say in what goes into that statement, initially. That means that with the committee we have established this afternoon we will be able to draw upon the viewpoints of our Members here, we will be able to solicit the views of our constituents, and we will be able to have these incorporated into the initial policy statement. We are given to understand that after this statement has been released by the Minister, and this of course will be a document approved by cabinet, it will not just reflect the views of the Minister of Indian Affairs, in fact it will be a government document, the Minister will appoint a special representative to tour the territories to find out what the public have to say about this statement. We were given the undertaking that the Minister's special representative would not be appointed unless he was acceptable to ourselves. So, that means we have a good deal of control in that particular matter.

At the same time as the Minister's special representative is undertaking his task we will be able to probably have one of our representatives travel with him to find out what he is up to, I guess, keep tabs on him, to listen to the views of the people at the same time, to make sure that what the Minister is told is as close as possible to reality. We will have a good deal of say in these discussions that take place at that time and in whatever comes out of it at the end.

A Just Settlement Of Land Claims

Thirdly, the third important point was that the Minister made it very clear that the whole issue of the various claims being put forward on behalf of the native people of the territories, they were to be dealt with in two separate manners:

First of all there is the legitimate land claims, the land and money, that type of thing which of course is a matter very much between the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs and the various native groups and their elected representatives, apart from ourselves. That is of course all well and good and what we have been saying, and we have said it time and time again, that we are in favour of a just settlement of land claims and that the federal government should get on with the job. So, that is good, we are getting our way there and it seems likely that the land claims will be settled, or perhaps not possibly settled, but at least some kind of definite step in the right direction will be made within the foreseeable future.

The other various land claims, not land claims but claims from -- political claims, all this type of thing, we are told are to be removed from the land claim issues in themselves and, of course, everybody is involved in these political type negotiations and indeed even the people in southern Canada are because they have some kind of an interest in the Northwest Territories. So, these other aspects are to be separated from the land claims as such and everyone concerned will be able to have their proper input into dealing with this separate problem.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Hon. Dave Nickerson. Hon. David Searle.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to touch on the areas which I found important in that meeting, and give a general summary of it as the Hon. Dave Nickerson has done.

The Time Frame.

The meeting of course took place on March 11th and my notes say it started at 1:10 o'clock p.m., and I think it ended at approximately 4:00 o'clock p.m. The purpose of course was to discuss our proposal of a public inquiry concerned with the constitution of the Northwest Territories. The Minister of course indicated that he could not agree with that proceeding at this time. I got the feeling that he did not disagree so much in principle with what we were wanting to do, but rather with the time frame, essentially, and as well he thought that that kind of an inquiry, if it was undertaken, probably should be undertaken by him.

As to the time frame, he made it clear that he felt that he had the responsibility of preparing within the next three months a major policy statement on the Northwest Territories which he felt would have to cover essentially three areas. He felt that all these three areas were interwoven, one with the other; the question of economic development, which really means a pipeline proposal, two, the matter of land claims and, three, the matter of constitutional development.

The three month deadline, and I do not know what is wrong but I seem to be getting some echo from this side, but I suppose it might have something to do with the location of the speakers. I think that is better. His time frame of three months seems to be because he felt that he should have some response ready when the Berger Inquiry comes up, and I think that is my recollection of why he felt that this three month time limit was essential. He felt that once the report is made that he would have time, a month or so, to consider it, but essentially he would have to make some meaningful response and he wanted to be prepared to make that response.

Principal Political Institution In The N.W.T.

Now, as to that major policy statement it was clear that he was looking to this Legislature, and as the Hon. Dave Nickerson said, he said clearly that he regarded us as the principal political institution in the Northwest Territories and it was to us who he wished to look for political advice. He invited us to immediately get to work in putting together our thoughts, thoughts that could bear on the three areas of economic development, land claims and constitutional development and get those in to him. This work, of course, would be done through a committee of this House, the committee in question being the committee contemplated by the motion which Hon. Dave Nickerson moved, and which was just passed. That committee of course is just an enlarged committee of the committee which Mr. Butters chaired and contains the same membership plus a couple of others.

The idea therefore, is that we would directly recommend to him what we think should be contained in his policy statement. He then would consult in that way with us and with other persons involved in the Northwest Territories. I am certain with the Indian Brotherhood, the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, Committee for Original Peoples Entitlement and others, with particular emphasis of course on the matter of land claims, and then after considering what everybody had to say he would then publish, in a public way, at some opportune time this major policy statement.

Public Debate On The Policy Statements.

Then, the second phase would go into effect, and that is the wide public discussion, wide public debate on those policy statements, and my feeling was that it would be then, and as part of that statement, that he would name his special representative concerned with matters constitutional, and then presumably after this wide public discussion you would foresee certain changes or amendments being made.

He felt that after this statement you would have on the one hand the special representative with respect to matters constitutional travelling widely in the North and on a much more informal way than an inquiry would do, talking to persons and, in that way, matters of constitutional concern would become more definitive. At the same time, he felt that the land negotiations would go on and that all of this would progress hand in hand.

No Time Limit

Finally, and there is no time limit on this, ultimately legislation would be advanced both at the territorial level and at the federal level implementing the land claims settlement and the constitutional amendments. Now, that last step could be his way. Personally, I felt he was being pretty optimistic to think that you could do the two things and end up with the land claims settled and the constitutional matters negotiated at the same time and then putting it all in a package. However, that may not work that way.

So, that was, according to my notes, essentially what he said to us and that was on Friday afternoon, as I said, on March 11, and it then became necessary for us to make some kind of a response, making up our minds as to what sort of action we would take. Obviously, at 4:00 o'clock p.m. Friday afternoon with him rushing off to Montreal we could not then and there give an appropriate response. So, as Members will recall we retired to our hotel and on the following morning we thought about it a bit and agreed that we would meet further. So, we met Saturday morning and then met on the Sunday afternoon. It was on the Sunday afternoon that we did two things: One, we put together a press release and; two, we put together a letter to the Minister which, because of communications between he and the House, because it had been done under my signature, solely as a servant of this House, it was I who signed the letter to him confirming our discussions of Saturday, giving him our response to the points he had raised.

That letter reached the Minister I think the Tuesday next and I have been attempting today as Members know to get in touch with him to get his permission to in fact table that letter. I am reluctant to table a letter I have sent to someone unless I can first determine whether that person minds whether I do that or not. So, with the indulgence of Members I would propose not to actually table the letter today, but I would propose to continue to try and get to him and if he would agree then we would table that letter in May.

Responses Made To The Minister

In the meantime, I would suggest that the House again indulge me by letting me touch on the important points in the response we made to the Minister without in fact reading the letter. Now, I know that is a fine line but if I might I would proceed on that basis, Mr. Chairman.

We indicated to the Minister in the letter that we understood his requirement for a policy statement dealing generally with the three areas of economic development, land claims, and constitutional development. We indicated that we understood the time frame within which he wished to work and we indicated that we would be most pleased to provide him our thoughts, that we were pleased that he would ask for our thoughts, particularly in the three areas.

Our public inquiry after all was only concerned with one and here he responded in effect with a request that we provide him advice on all three. We indicated, or I indicated to him in that letter that we would be setting up a committee and would be proceeding immediately to work. We felt that as we progressed we would probably have further meetings with him, we felt that his idea of pre-consultation, before he actually put forward the policy statement was a good one because that was really the opportunity which we would need to get our oar in first. We also agreed that post-consultation on a wide, general, public basis was essential. We offered the

full resources of this House, the co-operation of each and every Member to assist in the post-consultative process, feeling that after all what better force is there in the North than the Members of this House, coming from all parts of the North. We indicated that in that post-consultative process we would have to of course travel extensively, we would have to therefore set about putting together a budget so that our Members could do that and, of course, that is one of the things that the committee will be directing its mind to. The Minister certainly at the meeting indicated certain numbers to us which he felt would be appropriate and, of course, I confirm those numbers, not of course wanting him to forget them.

I think the one point that I emphasized in the letter which, of course, we had all reached consent on was that we were very pleased with his expressed view of where this House stands, that is, that we are the principal elected political body in the Northwest Territories and that it is to us who he should turn for political advice and suggestion. We felt I think that in itself was almost worthy of the trip.

Native Land Claims

On the question of native land claims, of course, we support the position that constitutional matters should be settled out from those claims and should be dealt with independently. Respecting the special representative, we felt that that person should not be someone unacceptable to us and hence, we should be consulted with respect to the actual person, who it might be. We offered as well to put together the staff side of it, in other words, we felt that we could probably find people to assist that special representative and we offered the co-operation of the House in travelling with and getting people out to talk to that special representative.

As to the public inquiry that we were proposing, we indicated that he should not think that we were abandoning that idea but that we had instead, for the next three months at least, agreed to go down the road in effect with him, with his priorities, and see how far that took us. If after three or four months that exercise did not turn out to be productive then presumably we could come back to our original idea. After all, there are two years left, there are at least two more budgets to go and so there is one every year in fact. So, that is the essence of our response. It seems therefore, that this House is in the position of having to consider whether or not third reading should be given to the outstanding financial bills and other bills in view of the meeting with the Minister and the response we have made to him. It seems to me obvious that we should proceed with third reading after we have completed our discussion here.

Mr. Chairman, I think those are the only comments that I wish to make and having been asked to kind of summarize what has happened, I think that would suffice except I should say that the Hon. Arnold McCallum has become the chairman on a full time basis of the new committee and possibly it would be appropriate to have him fill in the blanks, to fill in those places I have missed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Hon. David Searle. Are there any further remarks from the floor?

The Committee's Work

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I would just want to possibly add to what has been noted by the previous speakers and give the Members an indication of just where we stand as regards the committee's work.

I would like to suggest that there were some other pertinent points that the Minister agreed to at that meeting, specifically the first of these points, which would be that the Minister, Hon. Warren Allmand, has changed his mind as regards the development by the federal government of a policy paper for the entire North; that is, the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. I think Members will recall that the Minister did actually say that he has now changed his view and what he indicated to the Yukon people, the Legislative Assembly of the Yukon, would apply only to the Yukon and would not apply to the Northwest Territories.

Following that he indicated that he was prepared to consider entering into discussions with us that would provide more elected Members to this Assembly, more elected Executive Committee Members, and the turning over to the Government of the Northwest Territories surface resources. I think those are points that we should as well remember, having been made as I think they are of paramount importance. In addition to the separation of the political issues as opposed to the land claims and the pipeline issues, the Minister indicated, as well at that meeting, that in the Berger report that would be forthcoming he was prepared to take that political aspect out of it.

Input Into The Cabinet Paper.

We had, as has been noted, the opportunity to have input prior to the Minister's policy paper being submitted to the cabinet and, in fact, the Minister said that where he does not agree with us on conceptual statements that will make up his policy paper he told us that we can add one to four pages in that cabinet paper and we would have input even after the cabinet has discussed it, and again he indicated that he wanted our comments on land claims but he specifically wanted our political opinions because, to reiterate again, he regarded this House as the principal political body in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. Chairman, we have had one meeting of the committee wherein we agreed to a plan of action, as it were, or a course of action that we would come back to caucus for ratification on. We will be meeting again tomorrow, the committee, to discuss further the various statements that we want the Minister to include in his political paper. The committee has as well struck a short-term budget and is prepared then to give direction to our research staff in an attempt to ensure that the statements we wish to have included in the policy paper, have been well researched out, for our benefit as well as for the Minister. I would expect that the committee as well will discuss actual names, in the Minister's words, of elder statesmen, possible an ex-cabinet minister who would be his special representative and, I think the committee will be dealing I think as well with a recommendation as to the senior staff official who would be working with the Minister's special representative.

Other than that, Mr. Chairman, unless there are particular questions of Members of me as regards this committee I do not have anything further to add other than again I would like to reiterate that although Hon. Dave Nickerson and Hon. David Searle have both talked about particular points that were raised and which we should note, I would simply say that my purpose in the beginning was simply to suggest that there were others that we should consider to be of paramount importance, especially in terms of the Minister's reply to the Yukon Legislative Assembly.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Hon. Arnold McCallum. Are there any further speakers? Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Sir, I do not have my thoughts as well organized as the Members who have spoken before me. I think they have very ably presented what occurred during those three hours with the Minister, but that being the case, still I would like to just say a few words on my recollections of what occurred.

A Strong Bond

I may say I was rather stunned at the manner in which he opened his statement saying "I just can not wait for your study. I need to have the material to answer Berger" and that is in summation what he said. Of course the other key date he put on his requirement was September first when the decisions would be made relative to the pipeline. I was very happy with the results of the meeting. I felt that there was a real meeting of minds between the Minister, and I am talking about the Minister as an elected person, and ourselves who were there with him who are also elected people. I must say I did not get the same feeling of co-operation possibly with the senior staff but I felt a strong bond growing between the Minister and this body and the Members who make up this body.

He said on many occasions, as I recall, "I want your input" and he talked in terms of hundreds of thousands of dollars. The Member from Yellowknife South referred to the figure but it was in hundreds of thousands of dollars which he would make available to us to get that input and, as Hon. David Searle pointed out, he even went beyond our original subject of constitutional evolution and included land claims and a pipeline decision because he said that these matters were inseparable, noting you can not make a decision on one without the others, or without considering the others. I recollect also one statement he made about the resolution of land claims. He said "Maybe land claims may take five, seven or eight years, but we must think about the consequences in other areas" and here he was referring to the coming pipeline decision and constitutional evolution.

Running Out Of Time

I am however, rather disturbed. He mentioned that he wanted our input -- he wanted our input into areas of the government paper which he and his senior bureaucrats described as a framework and we were advised that a letter would be coming and that that letter would list the subjects that he would wish to deal with, which would make up that framework. How, here it is March 28th, over two weeks since we met in Ottawa and to my knowledge nothing has yet arrived from the Minister listing these details which would go into his framework. Now, you may say "Well, we have got lots of time" but as the Speaker pointed out we do not have a lot of time. The time frame was 60 days in which to spend the hundreds of thousands of dollars to just about make up our position. We met him on March 11th and on March 15th the Berger report would be public, he mentioned -- I said March 15th, that should have been May 15th -- he mentioned that he would be required to respond to Berger, that the Cabinet would be required to respond to Berger, that the country would seek a response to the Berger report coming out in mid-May and the cabinet would have to do that by, I understood him to say, June 15th.

So, if we are to accede to his request of providing him with our input we must really get moving and I am very, very concerned that over two weeks has gone by and the Minister's aides have not yet told us what they see will form the detail, I mean will form the framework of this government policy paper in which we are participating or co-operating. My understanding was that the Minister said that he would hope to discuss with us personally that framework and the 14 or 16 points that made up that framework. I have him here quoted as saying "I hope to do that" and I got the feeling that that would occur when he came up to the territories in mid-April.

As other Members have mentioned, there were highlights of the meeting, as when he said in response to one Member "I recognize you as the principal spokesmen, the elected Council of all of the people of the Northwest Territories" and that is what I wrote down. I do not think I am revealing any confidences here, I think the Minister said "What I told you is not off the record and is in the public domain". I think that that reply was made when one of the Members of this Assembly, a native Member said to him, "I feel I represent every person in my constituency". I also have written down here what he said about separating land claims "We are going to try and separate out the constitutional questions. It is going to be tough but I am going to try and keep them separate" and as far as I am concerned that is a direct quote of what he said relative to that point. He also said "I intend to follow the policy of more responsible government for the Northwest Territories" and "I will prepare this paper after a lot of pre-consultation with you".

Discussion Of The Policy Framework

Now, I believe the Minister means just that, and I believe that the Minister means that, when he says "I will prepare this paper after a lot of pre-consultation with you" I do not see that consultation being done by his aides. I see that consultation occurring between political representatives of two levels of government, the federal level and the territorial level, and I think that is what the Minister meant. I think that is what we all expected that the Minister meant and I think we all expect that we will be sitting down with him within three weeks to discuss the policy framework which his bureaucrats assuredly are now putting together.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Mr. Butters. Are there any further comments? If there are no further comments shall I report that this matter has been dealt with? Could I have the committee's direction, please? Shall I report the matter dealt with? Is that agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: The House will come to order. Mr. Stewart.

Report of the Committee of the Whole of Motion 12-61, Meeting of Members with Minister, March 11

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been dealing with Motion 12-61, Meeting of Members with Minister, March 11, and we wish to report that this matter has been fully dealt with.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters, what about your Motion 24-60?

MR. BUTTERS: In committee of the whole?

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready to deal with that?

MR. BUTTERS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: This House will resolve into committee of the whole for consideration of Motion 24-60, Formation of a Special Committee for Development of Territorial Legislation before the Construction of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline. Mr. Fraser is not here, do you wish to discuss this, Mr. Stewart. I see an anguished look on your face. Do you want to take the chair or would you rather someone else do it?

MR. STEWART: I would prefer someone else if possible, but I will however, if no one else will.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure we can get a volunteer somewhere for the chair. Hon. Peter Ernerk, would you take the chair?

HON. PETER ERNERK: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: With Hon. Peter Ernerk in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into Committee of the Whole for consideration of Motion 24-60, Formation of a Special Committee for Development of Territorial Legislation before the Construction of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline, with Hon. Peter Ernerk in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER MOTION 24-60, FORMATION OF A SPECIAL COMMITTEE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF TERRITORIAL LEGISLATION BEFORE THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): The committee will come to order. Motion 24-60, Formation of a Special Committee for Development of Territorial Legislation before the Construction of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline. I will read the motion just to sort of refresh your minds.

Motion 24-60: Formation Of A Special Committee For Development Of Territorial Legislation Before The Construction Of The Mackenzie Valley Pipeline

WHEREAS the decision on the proposal to construct the Mackenzie Valley natural gas pipeline will be made before the end of the year;

AND WHEREAS the project, if approved, could require new legislative terms and conditions in the fields of labour relations, job training, labour standards, northern employment and business preference, environmental and wildlife safeguards, revenue sources and location formulas, and compensation provisions and procedures;

AND WHEREAS the responsibilities for the development and provision of legislation in the event a pipeline is constructed is, in co-operation with the parliament of Canada, the responsibilities of the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that a special committee of the Legislative Assembly be struck to develop the territorial legislation that will be requested to be in place before or shortly after approval is granted to construct the Mackenzie Valley natural gas pipeline.

Is there any discussion on the motion? Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The motion was made originally on January 20 at the previous session and brought forward to this session for discussion. I feel that it is probably more pertinent to discuss this motion at this time than when I introduced it, the reason being I think that the Berger report is imminent. In fact, some say May 4 and some say May 11. The terms of reference of Mr. Justice Berger was to develop the conditions under which a Mackenzie Valley pipeline could be constructed.

Quotes From A Statement Made By Hon. Jean Chrétien

I think it is worthwhile going back in time to January 18, 1974, with your indulgence, and I will watch my watch so I will use only my ten minutes, but I would quote from a statement that the Hon. Jean Chrétien made to Members of the previous Council: "This government after weighing all of the factors involved carefully has come to the conclusion that a gas pipeline down the Mackenzie Valley is in the national interest."

"In reaching this conclusion, this government has been influenced by the possibility that failure to act in a possible manner toward this project could lead to acceptance by the United States government of the El Paso alternative for Prudhoe Bay gas and of its liquefaction and transport by tanker from Valdez. This in turn could mean that Canadians would not have access to Mackenzie Delta gas when they need it. The key to meeting Canada's gas needs in the next decade involves a joint gas pipeline along the Mackenzie Valley." Now, he continues: "We are prepared to receive an application for a right of way for the pipeline immediately should one be forthcoming and have decided that there shall be special hearings on this issue. I am currently taking steps to set up a formal commission of inquiry to examine the regional, social, environmental and economic aspects of such an application."

A Successor To The Carrothers Commission

There was the first reference to the Berger Inquiry. It is interesting that in this same speech the Minister also made reference to Carrothers and said, and here he is referring to Carrothers after mentioning that many of the recommendations had already been implemented and he said "Whether or not another commission is needed we are not sure at this time, however, there would be great social and economic changes in the North and I believe there is a need for much further needed study and discussion about the future development of government in both territories."

Now, six pages along he mentions this other inquiry which in effect has become the second Carrothers because in effect Mr. Justice Berger would appear to have far exceeded his initial terms and conditions. Now, I may be presumptuous in saying that but he certainly listened to material that was very, very far outside his terms and conditions and if one were to believe the rumours, if one were to believe even the story which I mentioned, or the CBC mentioned: Mr. Whit Fraser, he said "the report would redirect the North", a report that would redirect the North. Now, what is that but a successor to the Carrothers Commission?

I think that in this situation with the Berger Inquiry growing from a one line sentence made on January 18, 1974 to pick up the mass of momentum that it has today, it would behoove us to recognize that we have responsibilities for developing terms and conditions because after all what is legislation but terms and conditions by which man in a democratic society agrees mutually to govern himself. These are terms and conditions. I think that we would be very remiss if we did not begin to establish a committee along the lines I have suggested to examine the legislation developed in Alaska, to obtain the aims and objectives which I have included in some of the "whereas" clauses so that if just possibly on September

first, the American government in conjunction with the Canadian government decide that the Mackenzie Valley pipeline is in the national interest of both countries, we will be ready. I think we have a responsibility to have a position and to have input into this area as well as into constitutional matters and land claims. And what that input should be I suggest, sir, is a body of legislation, a package of legislation which would control as much as this House has possible, to control the manner in which our northern lifestyles will be altered and affected. That is all I will say in introducing the motion as I have other comments which I will wish to raise later on.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): Thank you, Mr. Butters. Are there any further speakers to Motion 24-60? Hon. Dave Nickerson.

A Horrendous Amount Of Work And Money

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: There is one thing that bothers me about this motion, Mr. Chairman, and it is not really what it says, but how we would do this particular task. Now, it is a fairly easy job to make a list of philosophical points that we would like covered, and that is not particularly difficult. I think we could review the debates of this House and come out with that type of thing fairly easily, but then, when you actually come to, as it says here, develop the legislative terms and conditions in a very large number of fields, that presumably would mean coming up with draft ordinances, maybe even draft acts of parliament because some of this is outside our jurisdiction. Also I would imagine that if the Honourable Member for Inuvik envisages certain types of agreements that would be negotiated for instance between ourselves, the federal government, the pipeline contractors or pipeline owners, and that type of thing, that is a horrendous amount of work. I think that could keep ten legal draftsmen busy for maybe a period of a couple of years coming out with all this type of stuff. I am just wondering if the Honourable Member has given any thought to the amount of work that would have to go into this, the legal expertise, if we really wanted to do this draft.

Probably another point which is very important is where this money would be coming from because it would obviously be a very expensive venture. Unless there was some undertaking on the part of the federal government who makes up our deficit to pay us to do this job, which I suspect they might be thinking is something that they should keep under their thumbs by way of a Mackenzie Valley pipeline authority. Does the Honourable Member have any understanding or undertaking that these funds which would obviously have to be in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, might be forthcoming?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): Mr. Butters, would you like to reply?

Development Of Rational And Reasonable Positions

MR. BUTTERS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have not projected what I anticipate the cost of such a study would be, but the Berger Inquiry cost \$5 million, to develop the terms and conditions he would be bringing down. I can not see that half a million to develop legislative terms and conditions would be remiss here. I do not think it would really be that much. Of the two timetables that face us if we included this and can see this as being a responsibility of ours, that is developing legislation, the one that gives me the most concern is the one the Minister laid on us on March 11. I think we are going to have a lot greater problem developing rational and reasonable positions in the time frame that was imposed upon the Minister than in the time frame that would be required to put into place this legislation. I say we are looking at probably two years as far as legislation goes but we might be looking at two months as far as the other matters are concerned.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): Hon. David Searle.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I like the idea behind the motion and of course there are many, many ways to do the same thing I suppose. My feeling for it is to have another special committee but at this time I am not sure whether we have Members who have the time to do it. It is obviously a legislative matter and we do have a standing committee on legislation. It would seem to me that a recommendation from the House to the standing committee on legislation, to start looking at this area would be the appropriate course of action and would avoid setting up a new committee and a committee that would be getting into the area of the standing committee on legislation.

For instance, I would foresee if I were on the standing committee on legislation, I think my first step would be to ask the Executive to do a department by department examination of what legislative changes to their respective acts would be required if there were a pipeline; in other words, put the question to them "What would you foresee?", not in terms of financial requirements because I am sure all the departments have gone through that exercise already, but legislative requirements and once you got that back on a department by department basis then you would have a starting point.

Avoiding The Establishment Of Another Committee

So, my suggestion would be therefore that the idea behind this motion be examined by the standing committee on legislation and that they request the necessary paper from the Executive on a department by department basis and then leave it to the standing committee on legislation to co-ordinate with the over-all legislative program of the government. I am just wondering what the mover of the motion might think about that as a way of doing what he wants done, but avoiding the establishment of further special committees.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): Mr. Butters, do you wish to speak?

MR. BUTTERS: Just to say that I thank the Honourable Member for his support of the idea. The method by which it is achieved does not concern me so greatly at this time. I think possibly the only mechanism we have in existence now is our legislation committee and if the motion is approved by the House and referred to the legislation committee, and they could examine it and see what could be done, that would be satisfactory. But the idea is that something would be done. I certainly agree with Hon. David Searle that it is something that can not be done hopefully in the next 60 or 90 days. We have to put forward this other thing, but I think we should be able to tell the Minister that this type of special study is going ahead, that our legislation committee has looked at it and has made recommendations -- whether it is a special committee, that certain work be done, but that we will be able to provide him with draft legislation or suggested legislation in this whole area should September first arrive and a news release be made that the Mackenzie Valley pipeline will become a reality. So, I would agree with the Honourable Member.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): Hon. Dave Nickerson

A Major Undertaking

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I hope for a minute that the committee did not get the idea that I was opposed to this, in fact I am not. I think the idea behind this motion is a very good one. I also think that the Government of the Northwest Territories have not been derelict in this field of endeavour, even at the present time, as I know that the government has been very active in, for instance, trying to develop a series of proposals which would govern the construction of gas plants in the Delta which would be a major undertaking, somewhat comparable to a pipeline. I do not think these have been finalized yet but I have seen an initial draft of these guidelines and what it does there is not necessarily spell everything out in legislation, which is of course a very difficult and expensive job to do, but what it does is say that this particular term and condition should be attached to any agreement by which a company is to build a gas plant.

Now, that type of thing can be done fairly easily and these types of recommendations would be useful, either to ourselves were we the people who would end up as being responsible for drawing up this legislation, or, alternatively, this type of approach would be useful for instance to a Mackenzie Valley pipeline authority. We would have done our homework and we would then be in a position to give to these people our particular recommendations. So, that is the route I would see being taken and I think that Hon. David Searle's recommendation that this matter be referred to the standing committee on legislation is a good one and, I would hope that once these guidelines on gas plant construction have been finalized, that maybe the standing committee on legislation could look at these and find out which of those might also be applicable to a pipeline and which ones they may not agree with and which other ones they could think of should be included.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): Could I have an indication as to how many more speakers we will have? I know the Deputy Commissioner would like to speak next and could we break for coffee and come back to it? It is now 4:00 o'clock p.m. We will recess for 15 minutes.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): The Chair recognizes a quorum. We have a quorum but no interpreters. There is one interpreter, the console operator is here. Mr. Stewart, you are next on the list.

Enacting Legislation Applicable To Certain Areas

MR. STEWART: I was afraid you were going to say that. Basically on this point of getting organized for pipeline work, I would hope that we as a territorial government do not make the same mistake that we are forever accusing the federal government of, and that is taking over the full responsibility and enacting legislation for the whole of the Northwest Territories which may not be applicable to certain areas. I would hope that we would through the Municipal Act of the Northwest Territories.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): Could you please get your microphone a little bit lower as the interpreter seems to be having a bit of a difficult time hearing you?

MR. STEWART: Thank you. I would hope that we would through enabling legislation allow municipalities the authority to look after their own affairs in many respects with regard to the impact that a pipeline -- what may be practical for Hay River may not necessarily be practical for Fort Simpson or Inuvik or for any other place. So, I would hope that when we are looking at the legislation that is required that it be done on a delegated basis so the municipality involved would be actually the people to set up their own regulations. I am now speaking of the social implications basically of a pipeline and I would hope that this matter could be handled in this way rather than by a blanket type of thing. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): Thank you. Deputy Commissioner Parker.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, the persons who have spoken to this motion I think have displayed a very good understanding of what should happen in the way of the preparation of necessary legislation for the possible construction of a Mackenzie Valley pipeline. The territorial government has already been engaged in an exercise which saw the review of existing legislation and a compilation of legislation made as to which pieces of legislation would be involved, were a pipeline constructed. So, we already have a very good idea of where the matter stands.

Labour Legislation Necessary

I would say, surprisingly enough, there is not a large body of legislation necessary, were a pipeline to go ahead, from the territorial standpoint. Perhaps the major piece of legislation might well be labour legislation and, in that area, we are still awaiting approval from the federal government, or I should say rather an amendment to the Canada Labour Code which would permit this Legislature to legislate in that area. However, we have conducted a review, we know what legislation would be called into force and I think very rapidly we could put together a list of new pieces that should be considered. I think the suggestion that has been made that the existing standing committee take on this task with the help of the administration is a very good suggestion and, the administration stands ready to put forward the work that it has done in the past to the committee if that committee is so designated and to do the necessary leg work for the future.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Commissioner. Mr. Butters, you wanted to speak next.

MR. BUTTERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When I opened this discussion I purposely read from the statement of Hon. Jean Chrétien, in 1974, when he indicated at that time the seeming expectation and desire of the federal government for a Mackenzie Valley pipeline, that it should be built and that he was establishing a Commission of Inquiry to examine the terms of reference of such a construction project one that would address itself and apply itself to the pipeline guidelines which were issued by his department previous to his remarks.

Terms And Conditions Of The Berger Inquiry

As I say, since that time the Berger Inquiry has grown like Topsy. I would remind Members of some of the terms and conditions which were suggested by Commission counsel to the Berger Inquiry: One recommendation on location and routing was "based on a limited review by this Inquiry of alternate pipeline corridors for a pipeline across the Yukon Territory as put forward by Arctic Gas. The Fairbanks corridor along the Alaska highway offers environmental advantages of the routes across the northern Yukon". So the Commission counsel for the Berger Inquiry suggested in the pre-judgment report that the Mackenzie Valley pipeline be given the lower priority than the Alcan route.

The counsel of the Commission also recommended on page 43 of the material dealing with native land claims which I believe was written by Mr. Michael Jackson "In our submission the clear implication or analysis given the principles underlying the land claims is that not only must the claims be settled first, but that a substantial period of time in our estimate, ten to 15 years, must be allowed before a major development to permit the implementation of a settlement." I would read those just to remind Members of recommendations of Berger's Commission counsel. I would also at this time read what Hon. Jean Chrétien said in 1974 on May 23 at a news conference in Fort Smith that "There is a very real danger that the pipeline will be lost and if that happens it would be to the detriment of all Canadians."

Summary Of The Berger Report Exposed To Some

I reiterate those points because it seems to me that the Liberal government had hoped that by establishing this Commission of Inquiry it would prevent what you might term a pipeline debate on the floor of the House in Ottawa. I suggest that for all their hopes of such an event not occurring they will be sadly disabused, come May, when the Berger report is out. Again one presumes, but there is a very substantial rumour that the Berger recommendations will be for a delay which will kill the Alcan route, or rather kill the Mackenzie Valley route by five years. There may be some grounds for this rumour because it is said that a summary of the Berger report has been in the hands of native interpreters and translators and that the basic recommendations of Mr. Berger are already known to the Indian Brotherhood of the Northwest Territories, the ITC and more important to the southern support group.

I would like to point out that the organization that has gone into the preparation of briefs and positions that were made before Mr. Justice Berger by the various organizations, by the southern support group, were excellent. I think that in the southern support group we have probably the most effective and most efficient anti-pipeline coalition, anti-development coalition that this country has ever seen and probably ever will see. In fact some peoples feel that it could just be successful enough to stop the Mackenzie Valley pipeline no matter what the Liberals have said in the past. The reason for the success of this southern support group is that it reaches out into all strata of the Canadian community, into the church establishment, into the media, into the environmentalist groups, into political parties, into the universities, it reaches out and touches many people.

I would like to read within my time too some comments--and this is an old memo which probably many of you have seen, confidential notes to counsel which some have attributed to Mr. Mel Watkins dated September 18, 1975, "The essence of our case before the Inquiry is no pipeline before land settlement. This is the single and overriding conviction that we want the judge to impose. As we shall see in a moment that fundamental assertion breaks down into a number of propositions." This document goes on and discusses rights that they will be putting forward "A pipeline before land settlement is prejudicial to the land claims, the claims for the right to control what happens in the 450,000 square miles of Dene land. The Dene Declaration asserts the right to national survival and self-determination. Above all, what is at issue is the right of alternative development to community based development rather than the colonial pattern of the development. Dene rights have not been extinguished and there are now just two aboriginal rights elsewhere in the world. The struggle of the Dene for self-determination is within Canada but nevertheless has analogies with the third world."

Berger Report Recommendations Too Hot To Handle

Their expectations -- Mr. Berger's report would stress and illuminate those analogies with the third world. What I am pointing out here is that I feel that the Government of Canada will turn around on May 15 and find the Berger report almost too hot to handle because of the recommendations it makes. We will see orchestrated and gaining momentum over the next five or six weeks along with the publication of that report, activities by the southern support group, appearances on the media, appearances on the CBC, book reviews, books being published, appearances here and appearances there, all coming down and pressing this major concept which they have been putting forward now for three years. They are impressing this idea, this opinion on the people of southern Canada. They have left the North and concede to the North that the battle of the North is over, but the battle is now being waged around Ottawa, beginning the siege of Ottawa with these concepts. I do not think there is a better example of how successful they are than is shown in this cartoon which I will circulate to Members. This is a cartoon by a very famous Canadian cartoonist, Mr. Yardley Jones. It shows a giant footprint stamped into the sand and crushed into that footprint is a little stick figure of obviously an Indian fellow who is crushed down with his face in the mud and the placard that he is holding is broken and twisted and it says "Save James Bay". The next figure also a stick figure of an Indian fellow who is holding up his hand while above him is descending the shadow of another gigantic foot. In his hand a sign says "Save the Northwest Territories".

An Emotional Climate

I believe that the southern support group, and the people who have made representations to Berger across the country have been very, very successful in getting that idea across. This idea is false. It is not true. This is a shameful blot on Canada. This in no way represents the manner in which this country has dealt with its native peoples. Sure there have been problems and sure there has been 100 years of neglect but the last ten years or the last 15 years has seen a nation attempting and striving to rectify that blot and this cartoon that Mr. Yardley Jones thinks is so true is not true. Yet that is the emotional climate in which the Berger report will be published. That is the emotional climate in which the Government of Canada will attempt to react to the Berger report. That is the emotional climate in which we, Members of this Legislature, will be getting our input in.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): Deputy Commissioner Parker.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Just a point of clarification. Do I understand Mr. Butters correctly to say that he himself believes that portions of Mr. Justice Berger's report have already been made available to some parties?

MR. BUTTERS: My answer is yes, I believe that. I believe that for the simple reason that my understanding is that the translations have had to be done in summary and there is a very strong rumour extant that such material is in the hands of certain people. There is a very strong rumour that this report, this summary exists in Yellowknife today. I have not seen it, but I believe it does exist, I believe it is in other people's hands, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): Thank you. Are there any further speakers? Hon. Arnold McCallum.

Quotes From The Paper "Northern Perspective"

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get too much involved with it, with the motion as such and you may indicate that the remarks that I would be making are really not apropos to it, but nevertheless I think that the apprehension as expressed by Mr. Butters is the kind of thing that is being passed around by media people. I am not sure whether everybody gets this particular paper,

the "Northern Perspective" or not, but it is put out by the Canadian Arctic Resources Committee who put forth and spent a lot of time and energy, money as well, in the day to day participation in the Inquiry and CARC had made up their minds. They conclude, and this is a direct quote from it, "That the Mackenzie Valley gas pipeline is dead. It is dead because the Delta gas is not now needed in Canada, because the project is too costly, because its social and environmental impacts are intolerable and because there are alternatives which would better serve the nation."

In further areas in this material, that is 12 pages in length, they refer and talk in addressing Mr. Justice Berger, they talk about federal and territorial governments. They refer to the Carrothers Commission of ten years ago and they go on to say "Mr. Berger, you are familiar with the recommendations of Dr. Carrothers and his fellow commissioners and you are aware of the important steps that have been taken such as the establishment of a territorial capital at Yellowknife and the relocation of many government services there to implement their recommendations. In the context of managing social, economic and environmental impacts your assessment of the appropriateness and competence of government services and operations could provide the direction for the next decade."

They ask questions of Mr. Justice Berger: Is the territories ready for further major steps towards self-government? One of the steps they ask is: Is the provincial model suitable, should management be reserved for federal ownership and control? They talk about Mr. Justice Berger in his report making sure that he does bring about recommendations that lead, or that deal specifically with more self-government and responsible government. I think there are a great number of areas that Mr. Butters refers to, and I think that is the apprehension that I share with him in terms of the Berger Commission, about what groups such as the CARC are demanding and have demanded of Commission counsel.

Involvement With Legislation Concerning Development

I believe that we have to be involved with legislation concerning any kind of development and I agree with the suggestion or recommendation of Hon. David Searle in looking towards that. My greatest concern is that the kinds of alternatives that are suggested that Mr. Justice Berger brings forth in his report are the kinds of concerns and recommendations that we have and that we should be making, as a legislative body being involved in it, and if we are not careful, if we do not press for it, we will not have the opportunity. The CARC conclude in their discussion of federal and territorial governments in their recommendations to Mr. Justice Berger that in their view his report must set a precedent for responsible government that will endure far into the future life of the territories. I say that that has nothing to do with the Berger Commission at all, it has to do with this body, and I think that we have to do something to ensure that we have input into it. I share with Mr. Butters, as I am sure others do, the concern over our input into it and I think that is what he is attempting to do with his motion and I believe that the suggestion that has been raised as I indicated earlier is the route we should go and that is a valid one.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): Thank you, Hon. Arnold McCallum.
Hon. Dave Nickerson.

A Grave Abuse Of Judicial Privilege

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, I am absolutely astounded to hear what Mr. Butters reports regarding the fact that it is rumoured or is said to be true that summaries of Mr. Justice Berger's report is now in the hands of certain leftist organizations. This is a terrible state of affairs, this is something terrible that has happened if this is at all true. If it is true you must think that it constitutes one of the gravest abuses of judicial privilege that I have ever heard of. If Mr. Justice Berger has deliberately allowed this to fall into such hands, or if he has allowed this to happen just by default, you know, to me

it is something that judges, members of the judiciary should just not allow to happen. It is intolerable to think, if it is true, that it has happened, that this report is in the hands of real radical groups who would try to use every influence and every tool they possibly can get to disrupt things. If they have been allowed to receive this before the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development who commissioned the report, and I think if there is any justification at all for thinking that this has happened it is our duty, our duty as Canadian citizens to advise the Minister and to inform him that we have reason to believe that this has taken place. I think that the Minister should then, in fact he would have to make a very thorough investigation to find out whether or not this is true and, if it is true, then I think he has no alternative but to severely discipline Mr. Justice Thomas Berger for allowing this to happen, either deliberately or just by default. I think we should undertake to do that and do it right now if indeed there is anything to substantiate what Mr. Butters has said.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): Thank you, Hon. Dave Nickerson. Are there any further speakers? Hon. David Searle.

Amendment To The Motion

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Coming back if I may to the motion, I would like to suggest an amendment along the lines previously spoken of which seems to have some support. What I would move is that the words in the resolved clause, following the word "construct" where it says "a special committee of the Legislative Assembly" that should be struck and in their place put the words "the standing committee on legislation be asked" so that the motion would then read: "Now therefore, I move that the standing committee on legislation be asked to develop the territorial legislation..." etc.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): Thank you. We have an amendment, "Now therefore, I move that the standing committee on legislation be asked...", could you go further, Hon. David Searle?

HON. DAVID SEARLE: "Now therefore, I move that the standing committee on legislation be asked to develop the territorial legislation..." etc.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): Thank you. The amendment reads, "Now therefore, I move that the standing committee on legislation be asked to develop the territorial legislation that will be requested..." etc., etc. To the amendment, Mr. Whitford.

MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am just wondering if the standing committee on legislation has enough Members to go ahead and proceed with that, or perhaps we may have to add a couple of more Members with this legislation, or to this committee.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): Thank you, Mr. Whitford. Did you want to make that in the form of a motion?

MR. WHITFORD: No, Mr. Chairman. What we must do is go back to the committee and check on the names or the number of people on it, the Members on it and see if we are satisfied with that first before we proceed into this, I would think.

Increasing Members On Legislation Committee

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): I am not too clear on the procedure. I wonder if I could ask some of the senior Members like Hon. David Searle to see if in fact we could increase the number of Members of the standing committee on legislation?

MR. WHITFORD: Or are you satisfied with that?

HON. DAVID SEARLE: If you look in your Members' Manual at tab 14 there is an indication there who the Members of the committees are. The legislation committee has Mr. Lyall, Hon. Peter Ernerk, Mr. Fraser, Hon. Arnold McCallum, Hon. Dave Nickerson and Mr. Whitford. So, that is six out of 15 Members of the House.

I guess that is really a separate question. If you decide to refer it to the standing committee then presumably it would be up to the chairman, Mr. Lyall, to seek the addition of more Members if he felt that there were not enough on his committee but that is really a separate question, I would think, Mr. Chairman. In other words, let us decide first whether we refer it to that committee and if Mr. Lyall does not think he has enough people to do the job then I guess he would indicate that to Hon. Dave Nickerson, or is not he the one who goes around and finds out who would like to be added to what committee? I am just thinking of how it is done. I am not so sure, Mr. Chairman, that the point is relevant to the amendment. I guess it might be something you would consider if the amendment passes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): If I might make a suggestion then, Mr. Whitford, if we could leave this with Mr. Lyall's committee and if he sees fit to increase the number of Members then he would probably make the recommendation to the committee at some later date. Would that be acceptable?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): Now, back to the amendment, "Now therefore, I move that the standing committee on legislation be asked to develop the territorial legislation that will be requested to be in place before or shortly after approval is granted to construct the Mackenzie Valley natural gas pipeline." To the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): All those in favour? Ten. Opposed? The amendment is carried.

---Carried

Now, the motion as amended is carried. Shall I report progress now?

MR. BUTTERS: Report the motion.

Motion Carried As Amended

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Peter Ernerk): Report the motion, thank you. To the motion, all in favour? Opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

So, the motion is carried as amended.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will come to order. Hon. Peter Ernerk.

Report of the Committee of the Whole of Motion 24-60, Formation of a Special Committee for Development of Territorial Legislation before the Construction of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, your committee has met to discuss Motion 24-60, Formation of a Special Committee for Development of Territorial Legislation before the Construction of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline. There is an amendment to the "Now therefore" clause and the amendment is so that it now reads, "Now therefore, I move that the standing committee on legislation be asked to develop the territorial legislation that will be requested to be in place before or shortly after the approval is granted to construct a Mackenzie Valley natural gas pipeline" and that is as amended.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Hon. Peter Ernerk.

Gentlemen, under Item 12 the only thing that I see left is Sessional Paper 1-61, Devolution, a discussion paper. Is that paper available and are we ready to proceed on that? Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: I realize that is all you see there but my motion, Motion 5-61 is still outstanding, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 5-61, presumably when I am in the chair, such as at a time like this, you might wish to request that we return to Item 8 and unless you do that we will skip on to Item 13. Deputy Commissioner Parker.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, rather than see the matter of Sessional Paper 1-61 left dangling, may I remind you that there was a committee review of that paper and it seemed at the time that all of the questions to be looked at were answered but progress was reported rather than any conclusion. Of course it is in the hands of Members whether they wish to continue the discussion of that paper but from the administration's standpoint the paper was brought forward only as an interim paper and it contained no final recommendations or conclusions.

If I could be so bold as to make a suggestion to you, I have the feeling that this Legislature examined it as thoroughly as it saw fit to and the administration stands ready at a future session or sessions to bring the matter forward again when it has progressed perhaps a bit further and we can then report in more definitive terms on the matter of decentralization.

MR. SPEAKER: Unless some Member has a further point that they feel strongly they should make, based on what the Deputy Commissioner says I would not propose to put Sessional Paper 1-61 back into committee. Therefore, does anyone feel strongly that they would like that to go back into committee for further discussion? Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Well, there was one question I wished to raise relative to that agenda item but rather than sending it back into committee possibly the Deputy Commissioner could answer it, just a question with regard to the experience of Mr. Creery, the experience he had during his recent swing through the Mackenzie district on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: If you want to discuss it even ever so briefly I had better be cautious enough to put it back into committee because if I do not do that, after you ask a question, then someone else presumably would want to take the same liberty that I allowed you. So, do you want to ask that question, because if so we will put it into committee?

MR. BUTTERS: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: We will resolve into committee of the whole to complete our discussion of Sessional Paper 1-61, Devolution, a discussion paper, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

--- Legislative Assembly resolved into Committee of the Whole for consideration of Sessional Paper 1-61, Devolution, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER SESSIONAL PAPER 1-61, DEVOLUTION.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The committee will come to order to discuss Sessional Paper 1-61, Devolution. Mr. Butters.

Funding Of Various Programs

MR. BUTTERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the committee for allowing me this opportunity to put the questions to Deputy Commissioner Parker. When Mr. Creery was in the Delta and he outlined to the settlement councils his understanding of the word "devolution" some raised questions with regard to shouldering the costs of such transfer of responsibilities and administrative procedures to the third level of government. There was a concern that a settlement might accept responsibility to take over a function currently carried on by the territorial government and then, a couple of years down the road it might find that fulfilling that responsibility requires that they have to find and develop additional funds to carry it out. The question is not untoward because I think we have seen many cases where the federal government has played that kind of trick on the provinces with their various LIP programs and other types of programs which the federal government has established, turned over to the provincial government and then the provincial government has had to find the money to pay for these programs. I am just wondering how the territorial government will ensure that, as I understand its intention, will ensure that the financial cost for providing such programs be paid by the territorial administration.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, in the transfer of any responsibilities to communities, that is responsibilities which they do not now have, it certainly would not be the intention of the government to load them with costs which they had not anticipated. If we transfer any programs it is incumbent upon us to be very, very careful to transfer the necessary funds and I would expect to build into any agreement means whereby there can be escalator causes if the same level of service costs more in the years to come. That is something we have to examine with great care. We believe in the third level of government, we believe very much in the city, towns, villages, and hamlets accepting as high a level of responsibilities as is consistent with the abilities and desires of the people living in those places, but we do not have any intentions of loading them down with financial responsibilities. I guess the short answer is that we would have to make the transfers with very great care, bearing in mind the future costs that might be incurred and always we stand ready for communities to come back to us to renegotiate a matter if the situation has changed. I think that is only common sense.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I wonder if the Chair could be allowed a question? I think it is a matter of record that in the United States and Canada that all municipal governments are in trouble and have been for the last 20 years and there does not seem to be any hope of them ever getting out of it. If this is the case, then how do you propose to keep the Northwest Territories municipalities out of their problems?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, if you go on the basic assumption that they are now already in trouble, then we simply have to hold the line.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): No further comment. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

Basically An Information Item To The Assembly

HON DAVE NICKERSON: I will not make any comments about the impartiality of the chairman, Mr. Chairman. The thing that I want to make clear here is that this paper was presented to this committee, or to the Legislature, basically as an information item, to find out whether the committee feels that the right track has been taken or, if that is not the case, then to redirect the efforts of the Assistant Commissioner's committee. I think I have to say that because it is

quite apparent from reading through this that it is written in what I call Creeryese and our good friend Mr. Creery has a diabolical knack of very often saying the wrong thing at the wrong time although he means well.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Do you want me to report on the Creeryese now or later? Mr. Whitford.

MR WHITFORD: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if this is relative to the devolution paper or not, but a great concern that has come out of this and I was hoping that we would have got it looked at in the budget but somehow I missed it in going through the constituencies again, the people there are awfully concerned in terms of gas and the money that they get back on it in terms of rebates. A lot of hunters and trappers do not keep their invoices from the purchase of gas and therefore are unable to send these receipts in for their rebate and I am sure it is not just in the western regions but also in the High Arctic and Eastern Arctic as well where the Inuit faces the same problem. I am just wondering if the administration could possibly look at the purchase of purple gas that would have given us a lower cost for fuel and would be able to help the hunters and trappers in that regard.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): You are wandering quite a ways, Mr. Whitford.

MR. WHITFORD: I realize that, but it is an important issue and unfortunately I was hoping there would be something I could link it to and I see the only thing left is devolution. So, I would ask the Honourable House -- I wonder if the administration could do something about it.

---Laughter

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I am afraid that is all the gas I can accept from you today.

---Laughter

At least on this subject, Mr. Whitford. I think though they have got the message.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes, we got the message.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Is there anything further on the paper on devolution? Mr. Steen.

Advantages Of Devolution To The Local Communities

MR. STEEN: I would like to ask a question on this particular subject. Will this devolution concept help the local communities set up their own bylaws and their own terms of working conditions in the hamlets? I got the message when Mr. Creery was going to talk for instance that we found, in the hamlet of Tuktoyaktuk especially, and maybe in some other smaller communities, that they really do not understand the ways of running a hamlet or a town, and then here comes this devolution thing that further complicates the whole thing. This is what I found when Mr. Creery was in Tuk. I think before it goes too far that we should begin to start getting at these communities and helping them out, helping them understand what government already exists in the communities.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Deputy Commissioner.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, if this study and review results in recommendations for further powers for hamlets, then, of course, the matter will be brought before the Legislature and it will be recommended to you and would be a matter for your discussion as to what powers should be extended, additional powers extended to hamlets.

I understand very well Mr. Steen's concern that the hamlets and settlement councils, having been formed, and existing, now requiring more training and assistance so that they can understand their operations, so they can handle

their bookkeeping, so that they can handle their elections, so that they can do all of the things that are their responsibility, that they have accepted. That is the reason why the administration pressed for and developed local government training programs, and the training program was meant to be a very straightforward kind of a program to help the settlement councils and hamlet councils which are already formed in every place in the Northwest Territories to do the jobs which they had accepted. So, I think I would have to answer him by saying that that is our full intention and we recognize that a number of councils have been formed and they do need help, they do want to do the right job, they do want to accept the responsibilities given to them and now they need our help in showing them how to do it, all of the find points and all of the extra work that they have taken on, they require help on. We are now trying to concentrate on that side of local government.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Are there any further speakers? Hon. David Searle.

Motion To Report On Sessional Paper 1-61__

HON. DAVID SEARLE: I would move that you report the discussion completed on this paper.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

---Carried

MR. SPEAKER: The House will come to order. Mr. Stewart.

Report of the Committee of the Whole of Sessional Paper 1-61, Devolution

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been discussing Sessional Paper 1-61, Devolution, and wishes to report that this paper has been studied.

MR. SPEAKER: Gentlemen, that completes Item 12.

Item 13, third reading of bills. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Just to point out, sir, that I will not be asking for unanimous consent to return to motions.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 13, third reading of bills.

ITEM NO. 13: THIRD READING OF BILLS

Bill 1-61, the Council Ordinance, Hon. Peter Ernerk.

Third Reading Of Bill 1-61, Council Ordinance

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 1-61, An Ordinance to Amend the Council Ordinance, be read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Lafferty. On third reading of bills, it may be debated. I was just refreshing my memory on that. So, Bill 1-61 has been moved and seconded and is there any discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

MR. SPEAKER: The question being called. All in favour? Contrary? Third reading is carried.

---Carried

Bill 3-61, Appropriation Ordinance, the main estimates. Hon. Arnold McCallum.

Third Reading Of Bill 3-61, Appropriation Ordinance, 1977-78.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: MR. SPEAKER, I move that Bill 3-61, An Ordinance Respecting Expenditures for the Public Service of the Northwest Territories for the Financial Year Ending the 31st Day of March 1978, be read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Hon. Peter Ernerk. Any discussion? Mr. Butters.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

MR. BUTTERS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was seriously considering moving an amendment at this time to the bill, and I would just read the amendment I considered moving and that is namely that \$984,999,000 be transferred from Local Government activity 2021, research and development, to Local Government activity 2022, municipal division. I will not be making the motion because it might be considered by some to be frivolous but I do feel that we have seen demonstrations that the department of research and development is a department and section which should be given long and hard scrutiny to determine whether that section or department is meeting with the direction and guidance which has been given to it by this House. I mention this because only today we learned that some of this money could be spent on what they call or what the Commissioner described as "Tactics for Radicals". As I say I will not move the amendment to the motion but this is very alarming to me that a section of this government has embarked on these kind of activities. I certainly do not feel that this is the direction that this House has given, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any further debate? The question being called. All in favour? Carried unanimously.

---Carried

Bill 4-61, the Municipal Ordinance. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

Third Reading Of Bill 4-61, Municipal Ordinance.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 4-61, An Ordinance to Amend the Municipal Ordinance, be read for the third time.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

MR. SPEAKER: The question being called. All in favour? Contrary? Third reading is carried.

---Carried

Bill 5-61, the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation Loan Ordinance No. 1, 1977. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

Third Reading Of Bill 5-61, Northwest Territories Housing Corporation Loan Ordinance, No. 1, 1977

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 5-61, An Ordinance to Authorize the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation to Borrow Funds, be read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Whitford. Any discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

MR. SPEAKER: The question being called. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

--- Carried

Bill 6-61, Financial Agreement Ordinance, 1977. Hon. Arnold McCallum.

Third Reading Of Bill 6-61, Financial Agreement Ordinance, 1977.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 6-61, An Ordinance Respecting a Financial Agreement between the Government of the Northwest Territories and the Government of Canada, be read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Hon. Peter Ernerk. Any discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

MR. SPEAKER: The question being called. All in favour? Contrary? Third reading is carried.

---Carried

Bill 7-61, Loan Authorization Ordinance No. 1, 1977-78. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: On a point of privilege. I was momentarily occupied with the Legal Advisor but I wish that my vote against Bill 6-61 be recorded. The reason for this, Mr. Speaker, is that the principle of the bill is that in return for a grant in lieu of personal and corporate income taxes the Northwest Territories will refrain from imposing those taxes which it is allowed to do by virtue of the Northwest Territories Act.

Very recently, or not very recently but several weeks ago now when we met with the Honourable Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development he undertook to advise us why the territorial income tax ordinance had been withdrawn and would not be allowed to go through as a government bill. So, he has not as of this present time done as he so promised at that time and I feel I can not vote in favour of this particular bill.

MR. SPEAKER: It will be recorded that Hon. Dave Nickerson votes in the contrary respecting Bill 7-61.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Bill 6-61.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 6-61. Fine. Bill 7-61, Loan Authorization Ordinance No. 1, 1977-78. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

Third Reading Of Bill 7-61, Loan Authorization Ordinance No. 1, 1977-78

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 7-61, An Ordinance to Authorize the Commissioner to Borrow Funds from the Government of Canada and Make Loans to Persons in the Northwest Territories during the Fiscal Year 1977-78, be read for the third time.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

MR. SPEAKER: The question being called. All in favour? Contrary? Third reading is carried.

---Carried

Bill 9-61, Public Inquiries Ordinance. Hon. Peter Ernerk.

Third Reading Of Bill 9-61, Public Inquiries Ordinance

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 9-61, An Ordinance Respecting Public Inquiries, be read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Whitford. Any discussion? Hon. Dave Nickerson.

Motion To Delete Paragraph 13(c)

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: This, sir, is the reason why I was delayed in that I was discussing Bill 9-61 with the Legal Advisor and she tells me that Bill 9-61 as it stands is slightly out of order because of certain amendments that were made earlier on when we were discussing this. In order to fix up these mistakes it will be necessary to delete paragraph 13(c) and I would move that this deletion take place at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: You are moving an amendment to the motion on third reading.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Paragraph 13(c) says, "The Commissioner may make regulations respecting (c) the procedures governing the conduct of an inquiry; and ...". Is that right? So, Mademoiselle Legal Advisor you agree it is duplicated and should properly be removed?

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: So that paragraph (d) would become paragraph (c) in clause 13. It has been moved that paragraph (c) of clause 13 be deleted and that is supported by the Legal Advisor. Is there a seconder? Mr. Butters.

Motion Carried

On the amendment. Is there any further discussion? The question being called. All in favour? contrary? The amendment is carried.

---Carried

On the motion, which is the third reading motion advanced by Hon. Peter Ernerk. Is there any discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

Third Reading Of Bill 9-61, Public Inquiries Ordinance, Carried

MR. SPEAKER: The question. The question being called. All in favour? Contrary? Third reading is carried.

---Carried

Mr. Clerk, those are all the bills are they?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 14, assent to bills. Would you see if the Commissioner is available to assent to bills?

ITEM NO. 14: ASSENT TO BILLS

THE COMMISSIONER: Please be seated. As Commissioner of the Northwest Territories I hereby assent to Bill 1-61, Bill 3-61, Bill 4-61, Bill 5-61, Bill 6-61, Bill 7-61 and Bill 9-61.

ITEM NO. 15: TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT SESSION

In accordance with the next item on your agenda, Mr. Speaker, I would submit the following proposal, that the next session of the Assembly be scheduled to open in the city of Yellowknife on May 9th.

ITEM NO. 16: PROROGATION

I now prorogue this the 61st session of the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories.

--- PROROGATION

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