



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

7th Session

10th Assembly

HANSARD
Official Report
DAY 16

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 5, 1986

Pages 602 to 648

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

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Paniloo. Are there any further written questions? This seems to conclude written questions for today. Are there any returns? I do not like to interrupt the conference at the far end but are there any returns for today? There do not appear to be any returns.

Item 7, petitions. Item 8, reports of standing and special committees. Mr. Wray.

ITEM 7: PETITIONS

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had my hand up but you did not see it.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, Mr. Wray, go ahead.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have Petition 7-86(1), from the community of Baker Lake requesting a library facility. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Wray. Are there any other petitions?

Item 8, reports of standing and special committees.

Item 9, tabling of documents.

Item 10, notices of motion.

Item 11, notices of motion for first reading of bills. Item 12, motions. Motion 15-86(1), Cruise Missile Testing Opposition. Mr. Gargan.

ITEM 12: MOTIONS

Motion 15-86(1): Cruise Missile Testing Opposition

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The motion reads as follows:

WHEREAS this Legislative Assembly has, by resolution, declared its opposition to the testing of the cruise missile in Canada and, in particular, over northern Canada;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada, in co-operation with the Government of the United States of America, continues the testing of the cruise missile over the Northwest Territories;

AND WHEREAS there have been 109 tests of the cruise missile in the United States with 44 failures during testing;

AND WHEREAS there have been five tests over Canadian soil with two test failures;

AND WHEREAS the last test over the Northwest Territories crashed into the Beaufort Sea;

AND WHEREAS the safety of residents of the Northwest Territories is at risk;

AND WHEREAS the environment of the Northwest Territories is in danger from any further failures of this cruise missile;

NOW THEREFORE, I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Natilikmiot, Michael Angottitauruq, that the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories reaffirm its opposition to the testing of the cruise missile in Canada and, in particular, over northern Canada;

AND FURTHER, that the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories ask the Government of Canada to reconsider, with a view to reversing, its decision on testing the cruise missile in Canada;

AND FURTHER, that the Speaker convey this resolution to the Prime Minister of Canada and to the leaders of the opposition parties in the federal parliament. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Gargan. Your motion is in order. You have the floor.

MR. GARGAN: Mr. Speaker, during the Ninth Assembly of the Legislative Assembly a motion against the testing of the cruise missile was introduced by Mr. MacQuarrie which was supported by the last Legislature. This motion is to reaffirm that position. Also regarding the testing of the cruise missile, the federal government's position at that time -- which was the Liberal Party -- was in favour of this testing and a lot of concern was expressed by the two opposition parties concerning the testing of this missile, and now because the Progressive Conservative are the government in power, I do not know whether that concern is still a position that they have.

Also under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms this testing of the cruise missile was challenged in the Supreme Court of Canada. The challenge did not go any further than that because there was no challenge in the Supreme Court of Canada. Also there were petitions from different organizations against the testing of the cruise missile which were also introduced. Also the women's groups in Canada were also protesting testing any further arms production in the world.

During the last session some of the Members have supported the testing of the cruise missile due to the fact that during the federal debate it was felt it was one in a million that the cruise missile would crash. Unfortunately that was not the case. Based on the statistics that were gathered in the United States, of 109 tests that occurred, 44 of them crashed. After this perhaps, northern Canada was chosen as a test site, so that any further tests might not endanger the lives of the Americans. I certainly do not like that approach. There are people living up here and it should be a concern of all of us to consider the safety of residents in the North. The five tests that were tested up here were considered free-flight tests and out of those five free-flight tests that occurred, two of them also crashed, which is the equivalent of what also happened in the United States.

The other thing I would like to mention, Mr. Speaker, is that there were concerned citizens in the North that opposed the testing of the cruise missile when the Canadian army was up here, and the people expressed that concern. It was not a meeting where whether we opposed it or not was considered. The intention was always to test the cruise missile regardless of the number of people that opposed it. This has been going on too long now, where there is that feeling that the army is looking at the North as though there are no people living up here, regardless of the people's concern or decision which has been ignored. Things like this cannot go on.

I would like the Members of this House to support my motion against testing of the cruise missile, or reaffirm it. I would also like to ask the previous Members of the Ninth Assembly to support my motion on the basis that, after the tests occurred, there were two crashes. So this might change their decision to vote in favor of the cruise missile. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Gargan. Mr. Angottitauruq, as seconder you may have the floor now.

People In NWT Concerned About Cruise Missile Testing

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess the motion has explained itself so I do not think I will have many words to the motion as the seconder. I would like to say again what Sam Gargan has said. I guess we are all worried about the cruise missile crashing in a populated area. Machines are controlled but once they are out of control, they sure can get out of control. I guess that is what the people of the Northwest Territories are concerned about with the testing of the cruise missile. There are many things that cost millions of dollars even with updated controls and computerized controls. Once they get out of control they sure do get out of control. It is not only the populated areas that we are worried about, we are also worried about the environment. I guess the Americans are just taking the Canadians, especially the ones in the Northwest Territories -- they are saying they are too easy. The federal government, if they are given a few dollars for testing, they would not worry about the population or the people of the Northwest Territories and would not worry about their concerns.

I guess sometimes it has to be recognized that the people of the Northwest Territories have concerns. Since we are under Canada, as a Legislature they cannot control us, but at least they have to be reminded that we are trying our best for the people of the Northwest Territories. In the motion it states that in the 109 tests there were 44 failures. In the Northwest Territories out of five tests there were two. So I guess what we are trying to say is that anything that is man made is not safe if it gets out of control, even if it does not have a warhead on it.

So I guess the people of the Northwest Territories are quite worried and I guess there are not too many words to use to try to make people understand. We are concerned about the testing of the cruise missile for many reasons and there are only a few that we can say. I guess the federal government and the Americans are saying we have to be armed in case of war, but I do not think we want any danger happening to our people before the war occurs. I will end my comments to the motion. Thank you.

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

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to speak in favour of the motion. I have spoken at length in this House on the matter on another occasion and I am pleased that the honourable Member has reintroduced the motion in light of recent events. It gives me an opportunity to say that I am still ardently opposed to the build-up and development of nuclear weapons. My words will be fewer, but as I said, the sentiment is just as strong. In my view it is absolutely insane to carry on with the build-up and development of nuclear weapons when there is already a stock, an arsenal, that is many times greater than that needed to annihilate man. There may be a little bit of an irony in all of us. We are told that the cruise missile has a complex guidance system, perhaps so complex one might compare it to the human mind. I am pleased to see that it may just have a mind of its own in view of what has happened recently. It appears to be rebelling at the rotten work that it is being trained to do. It may very well have more sense than those that are sanctioning its building, deployment and use.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MacQUARRIE: I am absolutely supportive of the motion introduced by Mr. Gargan. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased to see the motion and I will be supporting it. The testing of the cruise missile is very dangerous. At the time when they were testing the H-bomb around 1956, I was living in Pond Inlet then. When we were out hunting in the wintertime. It was dark. On our way back home we were not informed because we never had radios then, the whole sky was lit up at night. Maybe it was lit for 15 to 20 minutes and afterwards we were informed that Americans had tested this in the air. The following spring in that area where the testing occurred, there were some sort of abnormal things happening to the animals and even the skin of the residents living in that area. Also, during World War II, 1939-45, they used an awful lot of bombs at the time. They used to encourage people to drink only boiled water. The people who drank unboiled water had developed skin problems. For that reason this is very dangerous for the lives of northerners especially in Canada's North if they are going to do some cruise testing. I think they should do the testing elsewhere other than Canada. Recently when the cruise missile failed to operate, it was mentioned on the news that it could easily drop right on a community, a populated area and that people were scared. For that reason, the motion was just put forward. I will be supporting it with all my effort and I would urge the rest of the Members to support the motion also. Thank you.

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

Growing Concern About Peace In NWT And Canada

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had the honour of seconding the motion that was introduced by Mr. MacQuarrie in the Ninth Assembly on this subject and spoke to it at some length at that time. I do not propose to restate again my deep concern about the implications of testing a carrier for nuclear weapons in the NWT and my deep concern about the madness of the arms race. But I would like to say to the people of the NWT and to the 10th Assembly with regard to the risk of crashes, "I told you so." In September of 1983 when we had our debate, I challenged the honourable Member for Inuvik -- of all places -- who said in his opinion the chances of loss were negligible. At that time, Mr. Speaker, there had been 50 tests in the US with two losses and I calculated the risk at four per cent. I noted that one missile had been so lost that it was never found. Mr. Speaker, it now seems, based on the experience so far in the NWT, that I should have predicted the risk was 40 per cent.

The other comment I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is that I do believe that it is appropriate that in this Assembly we should consider these fundamental issues, even though they are a matter for the Government of Canada. I believe the Government of Canada is reassessing or should be reassessing its position with respect to testing this weapons system in Canada and in the NWT. I would like to note that since this Assembly last debated this matter there has been, in my view, a growing concern about peace in the NWT and in Canada. I was pleased, prior to this session, to have attended and supported a group of concerned citizens in my constituency of Iqaluit who are anxious to work toward peace, not only with respect to nuclear weapons but also peace as an alternative to violence in situations of everyday life. I am quite confident that I speak for my constituents and that group of concerned citizens in particular in fervently supporting this motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. To the motion. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. T'SELEIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the motion. I just have a couple of points that I would like to make with respect to all of this. One of the things that strikes me is that a big majority of, at least people that I represent, have no knowledge of what the cruise missile is, no knowledge of what the purpose of testing is and really no benefit of what all of this involves. Therefore, for those of us who make it our business to know why these things are being done, we come to a point where we decide that perhaps it is not in our best interests to support these types of things especially when there seem to be obvious dangers in this military type of things taking place.

The other point that I wanted to make is that some people seem to be saying that it does not make any difference whether or not this government says yes or no, that the military will just go ahead anyway. I think that it does make a difference. I do not think that we should lie down and pretend that nothing is happening. I would go as far as to say that we have a certain duty, to make sure that these types of military exercises, etc., are doing us some good. If we conclude that they are not, then I think it is our right to object as strongly as we can. Those are the points I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. T'Seleie. To the motion. Mr. Ballantyne.

Canadian Government Commitment To NATO And NORAD

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do have some very grave concerns about the militarization of the world. I personally had some experience. I was in Vietnam and Cambodia and Laos and I have seen what the total devastation of war can mean. I was in Ethiopia, and in a war in Eritrea in Ethiopia that has gone on for 25 years. At the time I was there, the Americans were in Ethiopia and the Russians were in Somalia and it seemed it changed sides within a matter of days some years later they changed sides and the Russians went into Ethiopia and the Americans went into Somalia and nobody in either country quite understood what was happening. It is horrendous to see it first-hand, to see bombs dropping and people blown into little pieces. I was also in Hiroshima. I saw the results of nuclear war. That is something, unless people have seen it, that is hard to imagine. It is the moon coming here on earth. Everything is flattened for miles and miles around.

It seems to me that our governments, both the former Liberal government and the Conservative government, have bowed to pressure from the Americans. I guess for a number of reasons, it seemed to our governments that by allowing the Americans to test the cruise in Canada it is an inexpensive way to provide our commitment to the defence of North America. And I do believe we do have a commitment to NATO and to NORAD. I do not think the Russians are as benign as some people lead us to believe they are. Look what they are doing in Afghanistan and other areas of the world. I think there is a real threat, but I do not think the testing of the cruise is an appropriate way to undertake our commitment. I think that if everyone remembers Lester Pearson and his concept of quiet diplomacy and peace keeping it was probably the time in Canada that we had the most impact in the world, and changed a little bit the course of world affairs. The recent failure of the two cruise missiles in the NWT greatly concerned me as they concern many of my constituents. I believe that we have a responsibility to send a strong message to Ottawa. We are very unhappy with this present situation, so I give my full support to this motion. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. To the motion. Mr. McLaughlin.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, am concerned about the possible dangers to communities in the NWT over which the present path of cruise missiles being flown, that there are some dangers to life in populated centres that the flight path might be too close. So I support that one part of the motion that asks the government to reconsider. I know that the Hon. Harvie Andre, the Minister responsible, has told the House of Commons that his government has requested the US to put testing on hold until safety considerations can be taken into consideration.

However I, like my colleague Mr. Ballantyne, believe that Canada does have obligations under its NATO and NORAD agreements. The protection of democracy is a very important thing. Democracy is fragile. We have seen in Haiti and in the Philippines, where dictators have recently been brought down, people that took democracy away from the people. In this case the US government was actually able to keep something in the air. In those other places it was dictators being taken away from their country. But I have to say to Members, I, like everybody in the world, fear nuclear holocaust, the thought that somebody might push the button someday and we in the North are one of the most vulnerable areas in the world because any war between the US and the Soviet Union will result in missiles actually flying over our heads. I have to say that I fear that. However, people also have to look at the other side of the coin, that from 1946 until now is the longest period in modern history of the world that there have not been major world conflicts. The fear that all countries have over nuclear weapons is one of the reasons why nobody has dared to make major assaults on either side because they fear that if anyone starts it there cannot possibly be a winner in the end. So I have that fear.

Testing Necessary Before Missiles Are Armed

But I do have a feeling of personal support for the fact that Canada has an obligation under NATO to defend democracy on this continent; that the Russians are a threat to democracy and life as we know it; that their capability to attack our country, possibly with cruise missiles, is something that is a reality that is out there and that we have to defend ourselves against that. I believe that the Americans should test these devices which are going to be used for defence in the North American continent and perfect their ability to operate them without problems. Eventually if they are going to arm these devices I would like to know that they were tested and that they are capable of flying, because I do not want them launching over our skies and then having them fail when they are armed with a nuclear bomb. I think that the testing of these missiles is necessary and I think if Canada has to participate in this small way with the US, I am in favour of it. If we have the terrain that is necessary to test these missiles in, then I am in favour of it. I would like to support the Member that I think the testing area should be changed to less populated areas of our country, possibly areas where there are virtually no structured communities. But because of the fact that it asks us not to continue testing, I am going to have to vote against the motion because I believe that Canada does have a commitment to defend democracy in the Western Hemisphere and this is part of Canada's contribution to that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. McLaughlin. To the motion. Mr. Erkloo.

MR. ERKLOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to mention that I will be supporting the motion. I think as northerners, as aboriginal people, it should be the case that we support it. The reason is my community and the area around do not go for oil exploration and mining because they do not want to lose their livelihood, the animals, in that area. So I think my people would really support against the cruise missile testing if they had this over in their area because it would be very dangerous for the environment and the wildlife. It would be a threat to the communities, even to ourselves. If it were to land in the community or on me, we would not be existing today. The same thing with the animals. For that reason, as MLAs we should be able to consider what our people think and we have to inform the federal government and the whole Canadian population about the concerns of the northerners. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Erkloo. To the motion. Mr. Appaqaq.

Making A Better Place For The Next Generation

MR. APPAQAQ: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be in support of the motion and I just wanted to make a short comment. As Members have stated, the testing of this cruise missile could destroy a lot of things. As Mr. Pudluk mentioned when there was testing of something similar to this, the sky lit up, etc. I remember when I was little, ever since that time when I was a young kid, the colour of my nails changed and I had a skin rash. Also I would like to say that all the

Inuit population had a very bad skin rash because they had no medicare system. They had to use the fat of the dogs for medication. They were killing their dogs because they were losing their skin because of this skin rash. We were not even aware as to what the reason was and nobody ever informed us of this. If these test cruise missiles were ever blown up it would be really dangerous and it will be worse than before. We have heard that people will have lung cancer and all the people would be dying from these bombs. It is very hard to see the future. When we talk about the next generation and what we want better for them, if these missiles are being used and implemented in these areas, I do not think it is going to be much help for the next generation. I think we have to put this testing, implementing and the making of these missiles to a halt. If we are going to try, as we say, to have a better place for the next generation, I think we should do something about it right now. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Appaqaq. To the motion. Question being called. Mr. Gargan, do you wish to close the debate?

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to conclude by saying that as far as arms build-up goes, I believe that we are raising the consciousness of the public with regard to the arms race. There are initiatives by the politicians with regard to arms reduction. I can use as an example, perhaps, Mr. Trudeau, on his peace initiative that he did just before he left politics. There was Mr. Gorbachev's position too, with regard to the summit, in which he suggested the elimination of nuclear missiles in Europe and the world. Just a couple of weeks ago there was a concern expressed by Mr. Reagan because Congress was not supporting his budget on the build-up of weapons. Also with regard to the space shuttle that blew up, I believe it did put some delay into the Star Wars project. So, I believe this is the time now that we, as politicians, should take a leading role in our peace initiative because where at one time there was a race, perhaps there has been a stalemate. This would be a good time to express our concern over any type of nuclear tests that could possibly eliminate mankind.

I also would like to say too, as to the budget speech by Mr. Wilson, a lot of the basic survival programs that are delivered to the little people in Canada are being jeopardized by greater expenditure of billions of dollars toward the military. I would like to think that that would change, that more would be put toward the basic survival of mankind and less on the elimination of mankind. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Motion 15-86(1), Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Gargan. Are you ready for the question? All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Item 13, first reading of bills.

Item 14, second reading of bills. Item 15, consideration in committee of the whole of bills and other matters: Bill 1-86(1), Appropriation Act, 1986-87; Bill 2-86(1), Income Tax Act; and Bill 3-86(1), Institute of Chartered Accountants Act, with Mr. Gargan in the chair.

ITEM 15: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS AND OTHER MATTERS

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL 1-86(1), APPROPRIATION ACT, 1986-87

Department Of Social Services

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): The committee will now come to order. We are on page 15.13, financial assistance services. Would the Minister like to bring in his witnesses?

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring in the acting deputy minister, Blair Dunbar, as well as Mr. David Waddell.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Minister. Is it agreed by the committee that the Minister brings in his witnesses?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed