



**Nunatsiavut kavamanga**

**Nunatsiavut Government**

**SECOND ASSEMBLY**

**OF**

**NUNATSIAVUT**

---

**SPRING SESSION 5<sup>Th</sup> Session 1<sup>st</sup>**  
**SITTING**

---

**kAVAMALIGIJET**

**KAUJITITSIUTINGA**

**PARLIAMENTARY**

**REPORT**

**March 6<sup>th</sup> – 7<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

**Speaker: Patricia Ford**

**In Attendance:**

**Speaker of the Nunatsiavut Assembly, Ordinary Member for the Canadian Constituency, Honorable Patricia Ford**

**President of Nunatsiavut, Honorable Jim Lyall**

**First Minister of Nunatsiavut Affairs, Ordinary Member for Rigolet, Honorable Darryl Shiwak**

**Minister of Education, Training and Economic Development, Ordinary Member for Hopedale, Honorable Susan Nochasak**

**Minister of Finance, Human Resources, and Information Technology, Ordinary Member for the Canadian Constituency, Honorable Daniel Pottle**

**Ordinary Member for Nain, William Barbour**

**Ordinary Member for Upper Lake Melville, Minister of Health and Social Development, Patricia Kemuksigak**

**Ordinary Member for Upper Lake Melville, Gary Mitchell**

**Ordinary Member for Makkovik, Deputy Speaker, Denise Lane**

**Minister of Lands and Natural Resources, Ordinary Member for Postville, Glen Sheppard**

**Chair Person for the NunaKatiget Community Corporation, Malcolm Winters**

**Chair Person for the Sivunivut Community Corporation, Edward Tuttauq**

**AngajukKâk for Nain, Anthony Andersen**

**AngajukKâk for Postville, Diane Gear**

**AngajukKâk for Makkovik, Herb Jacque**

**AngajukKâk for Hopedale, Wayne Piercy**

**AngajukKâk for Rigolet, Charlotte Wolfrey**

**Deputy Minister of Nunatsiavut Affairs, Toby Andersen**

**Deputy Minister of Lands and Natural Resources, Carl McLean**

**Deputy Minister of Finance and Human Resources, Information Technology, Rexanne Crawford**

**Deputy Minister of the Nunatsiavut Secretariat, Secretary to the Executive Council, Kate Mitchell**

**Acting Director of Communications, Bert Pomeroy**

**Deputy Minister of Tourism, Culture and Recreation, Dave Lough**

**Director of Legal Services, Loretta Michelin**

**Legislative Advisor to the Nunatsiavut Assembly, David Hamilton**

**Clerk of the Assembly, Mary Sillett**

**ABSENT:**

**Minister of Tourism, Culture and Recreation, Ordinary Member for Nain, Honorable Johannes Lampe**

**The Nunatsiavut Assembly proceedings**

**were recorded in Inuktitut and English.**

**March 6<sup>th</sup> – 7<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

**Assembly commenced at 9:00 a.m. on March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

**MS. FORD:** President to give his opening address. Members will note we will be following the revised Standing Orders that were adopted during the last session. I will do my best to assist all Members while going through the Orders of the Day, and if Members require assistance with preparing for items on the order paper, please feel free to discuss procedures with our Clerk, Mary Sillett. Order of the Day, item number two, address by the President. I would like to recognize the Honourable President of Nunatsiavut, Mr. Jim Lyall.

**MR. LYALL:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. Madame Speaker, when I was elected nearly four years ago, one of my key priorities was to establish a strategic plan that will guide our Government into the future. We initially contracted the services of St. John's-based GDP Consulting to assist us in initial development of this plan. A number of sessions were held involving elected officials and key staff, and a draft was completed in the spring of 2010. We then fine-tuned the draft and prioritized a number of issues we felt would form a good basis for charting our course for the future. I am pleased, Madame Speaker, to stand here today and to present to the Nunatsiavut Assembly, the Nunatsiavut Government Strategic Plan for 2012 to 2015. This plan, Madame Speaker, will help guide us in reaching our vision of ensuring our people and our communities are vibrant and self-sufficient, where our culture and traditions are practiced and protected. The primary function of every government, Madame Speaker, is to build for the future, to ensure the necessary tools are in place to encourage economic growth and social stability. As Labrador Inuit we are all connected by a common bond and a shared hope for the

future. While the Strategic Plan does not address all of our needs, it is a good start. By supporting each other and by working together as Nunatsiavumiut and using our resources wisely, we will overcome any challenges that come our way. I encourage all Assembly Members, as well as all the beneficiaries of the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement to support this plan, this blueprint for the future. I want to also acknowledge Members of this Assembly, both past and present, as well as Members of the Public Service for contributing to the development of this plan. This is a good plan, Madame Speaker, and I am confident at the end the result will be positive for people, for all of our people and all of our communities. Madame Speaker, since being elected as President, I have heard loud and clear, the need for improved and adequate housing for people in our communities. While this is an issue throughout Nunatsiavut, the needs are much greater here in Nain and in Hopedale. This issue has been dear to my heart from the beginning, and it continues to be a huge priority for me. We have brought this issue forward at every opportunity possible. It's been discussed with federal and provincial politicians and bureaucrats, and with the Provincial Housing Corporation. It had been raised and highlighted at regional, provincial and national conferences. It's a difficult issue, Madame Speaker, but we are making progress. This past fall we met with Federal Minister Leona Aglukkaq, as well as Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Minister, John Duncan, and our MP, Inter-Governmental Affairs Minister, Peter Penashue. We explained to them the seriousness of this issue and the urgent need for the Federal Government to provide more funding and more programs. We also raised the issue with the Provincial Minister responsible for housing, Tom Hedderson. During a visit to Hopedale in December Ministers Aglukkaq and Penashue had the opportunity to see first-hand some horrible conditions some of our people are forced to live in. Both Ministers said that they recognize our concerns and would work with us to address this issue. Minister Pottle and Minister Nochasak raised the issue again in early February during a follow-up meeting with Minister Duncan. While the Federal Minister made no commitments, he did instruct his officials to keep on top of this issue. We will continue to aggressively pursue this matter at their federal level, and we'll leave no stone unturned to achieve positive results. I should also note that ITK President, Mary Simon, will raise the issue during an upcoming nationally-televised interview with George Stroumboulopoulos. As you know, Madame Speaker, there is a tremendous need to improve infrastructure throughout Nunatsiavut. One of the most pressing needs is a new air strip for Nain. I am happy to report that we are also making some progress on this issue. First Minister Shiwak, as well as Government officials, was informed early last month by Federal Transport Minister, Denis Lebel, and Minister Penashue that the Government of Canada would be advising the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to commit a total of \$7 million to this project, money that has not been spent by the province under the Building Canada Fund. Minister Shiwak and Pottle raised this issue with Provincial Transportation Works Minister Hedderson a couple of weeks ago, and were informed that the province was working on securing additional funds to help make the proposed Nain air strip a reality. One of the key pieces of the puzzle necessary to begin the planning for an airstrip is a weather study. I am pleased to report, Madame Speaker that Minister Hedderson has committed to have this study started as soon as possible. In fact, we expect to hear an announcement within days. I also want to note, Madame Speaker that negotiations are continuing with the Government of Canada on a new five-year Fiscal Financing Agreement. These negotiations have been difficult, particularly with respect to the Non-insured Health Benefits Program. As Members of this Assembly know, Madame Speaker, the Nunatsiavut Government has had great difficulty in trying to effectively administer this program with

the funding we received from the federal government. In fact, since 2006, we have run the program in the red each year. We have asked the federal government to cover off this deficit and to ensure adequate funding is provided on a go forward basis to ensure we are able to effectively administer this program. We have informed the Government of Canada as late as last week that we will turn over the administration of this program back to Health Canada if we are unable to find a solution. Everybody acknowledges, Madame Speaker, that we do a good job in running the program. The fact of the matter is we can no longer continue to run huge deficits. Before I conclude, Madame Speaker, I want to inform the Assembly that Amos Onalik of Hopedale has been appointed as the Nunatsiavut Government's rep to the Torngat Mountains National Park Co-Management Board. As well, Madame Speaker, people from all over Nunatsiavut, the province, and indeed right across the country, have been moved by the tragic death of Burton Winters. I want ask the Assembly to bow their heads in a minute of silence to remember this brave, young man. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek, Honourable President. Item number three on our orders of the day. For the information of the Assembly, the pages are Bertha Saimat and Eva Obed. The interpreters/translators are Wilson Jararuse and Rita Andersen. Andrew Hamel and Robert Ford are the IT staff helping out for this Assembly. As well, we would like to recognize the OKalakatiget staff, Sarah Abel and Simone Kolmeister. I would like to welcome those in the gallery today and thank them for their interest in the Nunatsiavut Assembly. I would like to give special recognition to Fran Williams, past President of the Labrador Inuit Association and the first Inuit nurse in Labrador. If there are any questions around travel and logistics, please see Hilda Hunter or Debbie Dicker. Do any Members wish to recognize visitors in the public gallery today? We'll move down onto number four on Orders of the Day, Minister Statements. Are there any Minister Statements? I recognize the Honourable President.

**MR. LYALL:** Well, thank you, Madame Speaker. Madame Speaker, as you recall, the Assembly stipulated that the Environmental Protection Act and the amendment to the Labrador Inuit Lands Act would not come into force until the Environmental Protection Act regulations were adopted. Today, I am pleased to inform the Assembly that the Environmental Review Regulations were assented to last week, and I have executed the orders bringing into force the Environmental Protection Act and the amendment to the Labrador Inuit Lands Act lifting the moratorium and the mining and milling of uranium on Labrador Inuit land. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek, Honourable President. I would now like to recognize the Minister of Lands and Natural Resources, the Honourable Minister Sheppard.

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I'd like to also recognize people in our gallery today. It's good to see some interest here from the public. Having said that, we have many files in this department, Madame Speaker, and to try to shorten it up and cut down on a bit of time, it's broken up into two parts. So without any further delay I will start. Madame Speaker, the Department of Lands and Natural Resources had continued to be busy over the last number of months in all sectors of the department. I would like to provide an update on the status of the key files our department is actively engaged in. Madame Speaker, as Minister, I continue to be actively engaged in department's key files as well as participated in many meetings. I will now provide a quick update on our key files. Madame

Speaker, one of the key files of this division was to co-ordinate our involvement in the Land Use Planning Process and our review of the draft Land Use Plan. The Regional Planning Authority hired a commissioner and the commissioner conducted public hearings on the latest draft Land Use Plan. The Commissioner's Report was submitted to the Regional Planning Authority, and both the Nunatsiavut Government and the Province have provided comments to the Authority. The Authority Members met last week and expect to have a final draft Land Use Plan submitted to our government and the province by March 31st, 2012. The Director of Lands also met with provincial officials to discuss how an approved Land Use Plan will be implemented in LISA. It is essential. We have the mechanisms in place to implement the Land Use Plan once it is approved. Madame Speaker, our GIS specialist has been working hard to complete all of the land descriptions for the certificates of Inuit Freehold Title for the applications approved under the traditional 10-year process. I am pleased to report that these land descriptions are nearly completed and we hope to start issuing the certificates of title within the next few months. We continue to process land applications as time permits. Madame Speaker, I would like to update the Assembly on several key files for the Environment Division. We have also been corresponding with the province, federal government and Nalcor regarding their proposed Lower Churchill development. Our correspondence has focused on downstream impacts of the proposed development including the following four major issues; metal mercury, sea ice, land and resource use, and socio-economic impacts. While the panel report question the economics of the project, it is our opinion that the strongest outcome of the environmental assessment and panel report was in the area of downstream impacts. Nalcor basically ignored these in preparation for the project, a massive gap in their work-to-date. While others are concerned about economics, Inuit are concerned about one major issue, the right to safe and healthy environment where Inuit rights, as established under the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement, are protected. We will continue to press the provincial and federal governments, as well as Nalcor, to ensure that they recognize the significant adverse environmental impacts of the project on Inuit rights as established under the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement. Pending funding, beginning this summer the Environment Division with university partners plan to lead the most holistic and comprehensive research program ever undertaken in the Upper Lake Melville area, specifically related to Inuit rights, community health and well-being and a proposed Lower Churchill Hydro-Electric development. We plan to conduct community consultations in May with the Field and Community Research Program beginning in the summer. Through this program we want to ensure that Inuit rights are protected in the long term as they relate to this possible development. Madame Speaker, we need to develop a more holistic understanding of the impact of the Voisey's Bay development on Inuit, Inuit communities, and their surrounding environment. This development has been ongoing for 10 years and we need to better understand the impacts on both workers and non-workers. We plan to undertake a research project to better understand these impacts. The results of this research program will help inform and guide decision-making with respect to possible future development in Nunatsiavut. We will be beginning this research program, this upcoming fiscal year too. Madame Speaker, we continue to work hard to ensure that the province lives up to their obligations to clean up the contamination at Hopedale as a result of the former military site nearby. We were pleased when the province committed \$6 million towards the clean-up; however, we know that the clean-up costs will be higher. We will continue to work on it in co-operation with Hopedale Inuit Community Government to ensure that the residents of Hopedale have a safe and healthy environment to raise

their families. Madame Speaker, we also recognize that the Nunatsiavut Government and each of the Inuit Community Governments must work together in order for our communities to prosper. For this reason, we work with the Joint Management Committee to run a sustainable community's workshop in Hopedale in early February. This workshop allowed us to take stock of where we are with respect to successes and challenges in community development from both a planning and engineering perspective. It also was an opportunity to bring an expert in sustainable community development for other Arctic regions to talk about their experiences. As a result of this workshop and through direction from the Joint Management Committee we will be working on a large sustainable community's initiative in partnership with each of the communities over the next three to four years. This initiative will include such things as community development plans, development standards, housing-related issues, all guided through an Inuit cultural lens. Madame Speaker, the Environmental Protection Act is in the process of being implemented. We have worked hard to ensure that the Environmental Review Regulations were completed by March 9th deadline, you set in the December session. As noted by President Lyall, the regulations have been assented to and the Environmental Protection Act is now enacted. We have also ensured that the standing orders for detail reviews were also completed in order to be reviewed by the Assembly. I would like to advise the Assembly that the Assembly needs to establish rules and procedures for carrying out detailed environmental reviews of initiatives under the Environmental Protection Act, and later on the Orders of the Day I will be introducing a motion to adopt the recommended Detail Review Rules together the Environmental Review Regulations. We will ensure that there is an Inuit-owned process for environmental decision-making on Labrador Inuit Lands and that we are no longer dependent on federal and provincial environmental assessment processes. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek, Honourable Minister. I would now like to recognize the Honourable First Minister.

**MR. SHIWAK:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. First off, I'd like to say that there's an upcoming Presidential Election. This election has been called between the dates of March 11th and 16th, and it will be called sometime between that date. Repairs to the administration building is an ongoing process with the insurance company. NG did get three quotes from construction companies and forwarded it to the insurance company. We are now waiting for response on how the repairs will be done to the building this summer. The DHSD building in Nain is at a stage of substantive completion and should be ready for occupancy March 15th, 2012. This is the first infrastructure project that NG's undertaking, which is four months ahead of schedule and within budget. I invite all Assembly Members to visit the building if time permits while you're here in Nain. We expect that we will go to tender for construction of the proposed Makkovik office complex, Daycare Centre this spring, with the construction beginning this summer. We are currently in the process of land acquisition and project design, management and engineering for the project. We've also advertised for a tender to deliver and install such a system in the Torngat Mountain National Park base camp. We have received sponsors from businesses; however, we are awaiting a decision regarding possible funding from ACOA for the cost. As President Lyall has mentioned, we did have several meetings with provincial and federal ministers. One meeting with Minister Hedderson. Marine transportation, again, was a big issue for us due to the inadequacy of

service that was provided last year, particularly, towards the shipping. Minister Hedderson has ensured us that he's looking at a longer term plan to address the shipping issue so that we have an adequate service here on the north coast of Labrador in Nunatsiavut. Minister Hedderson has committed to communicate with Nunatsiavut Government before awarding the contract for shipping within Nunatsiavut. We also raised the issue that a lot of our communities need repairs to our docks in the marine front where the ships come in. And, as President Lyall suggested, we also met on a Nain air strip and the President had indicated that he has committed to doing the weather study. Another issue that was raised with the Minister is the need to identify our relief operators for your ships at all the Inuit communities. Minister Hedderson was not fully aware of the problem and has committed to do so. And as President Lyall said, we did have several meetings at housing. One of the issues that we have identified between the Department of Nunatsiavut Affairs and the Secretariat is the need for an adequate housing assessment. I'd like to announce that we have confirmed the funding for a housing assessment for Nunatsiavut. It's a tripartite agreement between Nunatsiavut Government, Federal Government, Provincial Government, and we'll conduct in the very near future a detailed housing assessment for Nunatsiavut. The Local Annual Report. A grant was received from Canada to translate and print the 2010-2011 Annual Report prepared by the Implementation Committee. It will be tabled with the Nunatsiavut Government, Nunatsiavut Assembly after this table with Parliament. The NG Annual Report, 2010-11 will be tabled in the next Assembly sitting. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek, Honourable First Minister. I would like to recognize the Honourable First Minister again.

**MR. SHIWAK:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. As you're aware, Minister Johannes Lampe is not with us at today's sitting, so I will be doing his presentation for him. Minister Lampe is taking important time to support his family and spend time on the land. Johannes is a true ambassador of Inuit values and culture, and we look forward to having him back to continue his important role in our Government. Culture. In our new strategic plan language and culture have been identified as a priority and our department's working to development a comprehensive cultural plan for Nunatsiavut. Language. Rosetta Stone, we are finalizing level two. It will be complete this spring. The Labrador Inuit Inuttitut training program, Curriculum Development Team is working on further refinements in the delivery programs. Pilot Family Inuttitut Training Program will be held this spring. Discussions on participating in a national language task force with ITK have begun. We will develop a position on Inuttitut language standardization this year. We are finish the Titus Joshua- Joshua Obed translation and we're looking to publish this year. The Torngâsok Cultural Centre PHB/Saunders is an engineering company, has been awarded the final architectural and design contract. Requests for proposals will be issued in April in partnership with Parks Canada. For exhibit design the Nain Inuit Community Government has provide the land and legal transfer has occurred. The new site is targeted for completion in the spring of 2014 in time for Nunatsiavut hosting the ICC 2014 Conference. Interpreter/Translators. One of our long-time staff, Louisa Kojak has retired and we thank Louisa for her long-time service with LIA and the Nunatsiavut Government. We are in the process of filling Louisa's position and an additional position in the next few weeks. Archaeology. Our Archaeology Office has completed our 2011 Annual Report. Repatriations at Zoar and Rose Island were significant; however, there was also a significant amount of



activity in research and referrals. Field work was conducted in Makkovik area with the help of Todd Broomfield in the Nutak area with the help of member, William Barbour and Henry Lyall. In February we met with the Rigolet Heritage Society on the potential Double Mer archaeology site. Nutak. A working committee is preparing for the placement of a plaque in Nutak this August. This will be a final step in the relocation apology in 2005. The Hebron plaque was erected in 2009. Hopedale. Johannes', Minister Johannes' department has worked closely with the Department of Education and Economic Development to assist the Agvituk Historical Society in Hopedale and to begin a process to assess the historic Moravian Mission complex and to prepare a plan to ensure that this Canadian treasure is preserved and adapted for use, plan and develop. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek, Honourable First Minister. I would now like to recognize the Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. It's an honor here and a privilege to sit as a Member of the Assembly in Nain. It's a rare occasion that we have the chance to sit outside of Hopedale, and we had no other choice this year because of water issues with the building in Hopedale. So, I guess, Madame Speaker, there's a silver lining to every dark cloud, and it's an honor and a privilege, as I said, to be here in Nain today. Madame Speaker, I'm just going to provide a brief update from the three divisions within the department, from the Division of Finance, Human Resources and Information Technology. The Finance Division, Madame Speaker, has been extremely busy over the last period working on several projects. We are negotiating, as alluded to by the President and the First Minister, with the Government of Canada, a new Fiscal Financing Agreement with the goal to have the major components of the agreement settled by March 31st of this fiscal year. This has been a very difficult and time-consuming process, specifically in regards to the amount of funding, again as reiterated by the First Minister and the President regarding the NIHB program and the deficits that we've incurred over the last five or six years since we undertook this program fully from the federal government. There were two external audits, Madame Speaker, completed in this time period. The Canada Revenue Agency performed an audit of 2010 and 2011 payrolls for the Department of Health and Social Development. There were no discrepancies to be found within these audits, Madame Speaker. The Workplace Health and Safety Compensation Commission performed an audit for 2008, 2009 and for 2010 for the Department of Health and Social Development. Again, Madame Speaker, no discrepancies were found and the department retained prime thus saving approximately \$28,000 a year. We continue, Madame Speaker, through the Joint Management Committee, to work on capital works projects for all of the Inuit communities. Madame Speaker, as I reported in my last report to the Assembly, the financial information that I'd like to impart today is taken from our Budget Act for 2011. Some of the revenues coming out of the budget in 2011 for personal income tax was approximately \$2.5 million. The Goods and Services Tax Agreement, \$1.4 million. Interest Income, \$514,000. Mining Royalties, \$1.8 million and 31,792,000 from the Fiscal Financing Agreement. In the division of Human Resources, Madame Speaker, for the period of December 1st, 2011 to January 31st, 2012, the Human Resources Division held 11 job competitions with three competitions completed with successful recruitment. In particular, Madame Speaker, we hired the following positions. A new FASD Co-ordinator, an Environmental Assessment Manager and Environmental Protection Analyst. In February, 2012, Madame Speaker, we

saw the resignation of our Director of Economic Development, and the Government has started the job competition process to fill this position. Madame Speaker, the division has been revising and streamlining a number of forms within the Government to make them uniform for all departments. We are currently preparing unpaid leave forms, by way of example. That will be implemented in the first quarter of 2012, 2013. And we are also currently undertaking our annual review of the Employee Policy Manual. In 2012, 2013 our division will be undertaking a review of the housing and Labrador allowances provided to our employees. With respect to our Information Technology Division, Madame Speaker, we have been receiving a consistent amount of help desk calls but had been challenged with our end use - or it's within the Civil Service and Assembly preferring to contact the IT Department employees personally. We have implemented a help desk that allows us to log and track all support calls and document their resolution, Madame Speaker. By not utilizing either the support email address or the help desk website, it has increased the workload for our support staff. Therefore, Madame Speaker, we encourage all employees to utilize the IT Support email, or visit the IT Support website, or the help desk as your first point of contact whenever possible. These links are also on the home page of our intranet. We understand that there may be times when these communication channels are not effective or appropriate, but our experience indicates that the majority of our call volume can be received and tracked on line. The additional benefit of using these tools is that we can track the support history and report on trends and help desk calls allowing us to better plan for future technologies, training and resources. Our network backup implementation is continuing its efforts to implement a new backup strategy for all our offices. As part of this process, Madame Speaker, we have begun eliminating tape backups in some of our offices relieving the administration staff of that task and further automating the data backup procedure. Our network bandwidth has delayed the initial remote backups from the offices in the Inuit communities to our offsite backup location. As I work around, the IT Division is considering other options for initial remote backup from each office. We will be performing a task, a complete disk backup in each location. Then we'll physically carry these data backups to the remote backup site whereby these one-time backup deployments will be synchronized with their new home server for ongoing backup. Finally, Madame Speaker, the Volume Licensing Agreement, the IT Department received proposals from qualified vendors for renewed volume licensing of Microsoft Office desktop productivity software. By choosing the volume licensing route we estimate a savings of approximately 30 percent versus going the retail route. Further, a volume license will provide additional resources from the vendor potentially including training credits, a home base purchase program and technical support that is otherwise unavailable as part of retail purchase. We plan to finalize a license agreement before the end of the fiscal year. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek, Honourable Minister. I would now like to recognize the Honourable Minister of Health.

**MS. KEMUKSIGAK:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I was asked two questions at the last sitting so I wanted to answer the two questions. Looking into the reasoning behind why the Status of Women is under the Department of Health and Social Development, this is what I discovered. Madame Speaker, in the past the Nunatsiavut Executive Council decided that the most appropriate department for the Status of Women to fall under was the Department of Health and Social Development supervised under the

Director of Social Development. NEC stated that the Status of Women Co-ordinator fit best under the Director as she will be dealing with many social issues. The purpose of the Status of Women Co-ordinator position was to liaise with the Inuit Women's Associations and the Nunatsiavut Government. In this way, the Status of Women Co-ordinator and/or the women's groups can bring the concerns of Inuit women and children to the Minister of Health and Social Development, which is I. The Minister can then act as spokesperson on behalf of the Nunatsiavut Government with respect to the matters of concern. Madame Speaker, I've had discussions with the Status of Women Co-ordinator and she is very pleased being under the Department of Health and Social Development as when she's planning activities she can call on the DHSD staff to help out such as help with Take Back the Night or International Women's Day. The second question was regarding increasing the space for the Makkovik Day Care. Madame Speaker, increasing the space for Makkovik Day Care. After looking at the operating costs for a larger day care to go from 14 to 16 to 21 and building construction costs, and we cannot meet all the day care needs in all of the communities, the NEC decided that we could not afford to construct a larger day care at this time. We do not, as we said, we do not have the funding and it could also delay construction to go and look at new drawings and floor plans for Makkovik. I just wanted to speak briefly on the Status of Women Co-ordinator. Tracy Evans is the Status of Women Co-ordinator. She's been involved with several activities over the last several months. She's been on the steering committee for the Provincial Aboriginal Women's Conference which was held in Goose Bay, February 14th and 15th. There were aboriginal women from across the province and five Inuit women attended the conference. Tracy is a member of the Justice Minister's Advisory Committee on Violence Against Women. The committee meets quarterly. They met in February. Tracy brought forward a concern around emergency protection orders and the lack of awareness of emergency protection orders in Nunatsiavut. Subsequently, there will be training on the EPO's in Goose Bay, March 28th and 29th, sponsored by the Department of Justice, and there will be a rep from each shelter in Nunatsiavut invited. March 8th marks International Women's Day. The Status of Women Office AnanauKatiget Tumingit and the DHSD are partnering together and will be hosting International Women's Day luncheons with a local guest in each Nunatsiavut Community and Northwest River. This year's theme in Canada is "Strong Women, Strong Canada, Women in Rural, Remote and Northern Communities." Tracy is part of a three-year project through the summer, Atlantic Summer Institute in PEI entitled, "Building Leadership Capacity Among Women and Girls in Atlantic Canada". Part of this project is to host a one-day regional workshop in each Atlantic Canadian province. For Newfoundland and Labrador the workshop will be held in Nain on May 5th, 2012. She will be sending out more information. I also wanted to speak briefly on AnanauKatiget Tumingit Regional Inuit Women's Association, and I'm glad to see the Vice President, Fran Williams, in the gallery. They were incorporated on March the 7th, 2011 as a non-profit organization and they're governed by a voluntary board of 12 regional representatives. So the President is Carol Gear. She's from Makkovik. Fran Williams, from Nain, is the Vice President. Elizabeth Zarpa is the secretary and the youth rep. Kim Campbell McLean from Northwest River is Treasurer. Caitlyn Baikie is the Nain rep. Sophie Pamak is Hopedale rep. Brenda Colbourne, Postville. The Canadian constituency rep is vacant at the moment, but they're working on holding an election. Justine Obed, Happy Valley-Goose Bay rep. Janice Connors, Gertie Palliser, Rigolet rep and Jane Shiwak from Rigolet is the elder rep. Myrtle Banfield is the Co-ordinator and she is situated in Goose Bay. They received funding from the Tasiujatsoâk Trust Fund for the second year to run their office, hold an AGM

and Board conferences. The AnanauKatiget Tumingit plays a vital bridging role between the Labrador Inuit women and all levels of Government. They receive funding through the province for two projects, one on a magnet promoting important emergency numbers for women and a traditional craft project which is taking place in all the communities. They put in a proposal under the Status of Women Canada and are awaiting approval for a three-year project to conduct community planning for women's economic security in the geographical area of Nunatsiavut, to determine program and service needs, as well as current and emerging issues of Labrador Inuit women. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek, Honourable Minister. I would now like to recognize the Honourable Minister of Education.

**MS. NOCHASAK:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. I would just like to mention that I will be reading my Minister's statement tomorrow in the next session. I do understand that I believe we're over our time limit already, and I think some people would like to move it along, so I will be reading mine tomorrow. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek. Then we'll move on to the next item on the Orders of the Day. Member Statements. Are there any Member Statements? I'd like to recognize the AngajukKâk for Makkovik.

**MR. JACQUE:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. First of all, I guess I'd like to just reiterate a briefing that the President announced regarding the loss of our young lad in Makkovik during the time of a crisis and tragic situation. The Makkovik Inuit Community Government would like to commend our local ground and search and rescue team during our sad time. They must be recognized for all the hard work and dedication that they had done. We would also like the support of Nunatsiavut Government to lobby Federal Government to ensure that Search and Rescue Centre be established in Happy Valley-Goose Bay and all of Labrador. It's time for action, equality, rights as Canadian citizens. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you, AngajukKâk for Makkovik. I'd now like to recognize Ordinary Member for Canadian Constituency, Danny Pottle.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. The Canadian Constituency would like to recognize the work that Stephanie Tama Fost, Susan Onalik, Ralph Webber Jr. and Angus Andersen of St. John's have undertaken to advocate and lobby for improved search and rescue services in Labrador as a result of the tragic death of Burton Winters of Makkovik. The aforementioned beneficiaries, Madame Speaker, have been instrumental in organizing vigils in St. John's and for bringing Labrador Inuit, as well as residents of St. John's, the province and the country, together to form a strong, collective voice in advocating and lobbying for an independent review into search and rescue services in Labrador, to seek answers from the federal government regarding the lack of response for search and rescue services in Labrador, and to lobby for the establishment of a permanent Search and Rescue Centre in Labrador. Madame Speaker, Ms. Fost and the others, are to be commended for their efforts. On behalf of the Labrador Inuit residing in the Canadian Constituency, Madame Speaker, I would like to offer sincere condolences to the family of Burton and to thank all those who have organized vigils in Labrador and elsewhere, and I would also encourage everyone to continue to lobby for answers to questions related to the search

efforts for Burton and to continue to pressure the Federal Government to establish a SAR Centre in Labrador. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek, Mr. Pottle. I would now like to recognize the Chair of Sivunivut, Ed Tuttauk.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. I'd like to take this time to acknowledge Sarah Townley of Northwest River, who we see graduated with her Primary Elementary Education Teaching certificate seven. This is her story, briefly. Sarah was held back from going to school until she was seven because she did not speak English. In 1978 she finished high school but did not graduate. She started adult education in 1979 and completed her high school in 1980. In 1981 she started a certified nursing assistant college program and graduated in 1982. After mentoring from the late Beatrice Watts in 1983 she started her Bachelor of Education degree with MUN. She successfully completed her degree in 2003 along, with her Teaching Certificate five. In May, 2005 she started working toward her Teaching Certificate six, Master's degree and Teaching Certificate seven. These were successfully completed in April, 2007, April 2010 and December, 2011, respectively. The only level of formal education beyond this is a Ph.D. in education. She managed to complete all her university studies while commuting daily to work from Northwest River to Goose Bay, usually traveling monthly out of town and often across the country, raising three sons and adoptive brother and helping a lot of other family Members in her community. She is currently in charge of the Inuttituk and Life Skills Program for the Labrador School Board. Congratulations, Sarah. On another note I would like to take this opportunity to stress the need for the Nunatsiavut Government to put more emphasis on enhancing and improving communication. Providing information is the way to ensure accountability and transparency within the Nunatsiavut Government. Without effective and timely communication and the release of information to all stakeholders, the Nunatsiavut Government will continue to be perceived as non-transparent and unaccountable. Sometime in 2008 I forwarded a copy of the Government of the Northwest Territories Communication Policy to the Director of Communications. I believe that it is essential that this Government establishes a communications policy that includes providing answers and messages to all elected officials as well as the public. As it states in the Government Northwest Territories Communication Policy adequate information should be provided to the public or its representatives so that the public is able to understand, benefit from and influence the development and implementation of Government activities, initiatives, policies, programs and services. I feel this policy can be adapted to suit our needs and I still have a copy if those responsible for policy development would like it. Again I would urge that the Nunatsiavut Government Communication Policy be developed and adhered to by all levels of government so that all stakeholders and beneficiaries can be kept informed as this will ensure that the government is visible, accessible and answerable to the public it serves. Nakummek.

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek, Mr. Tuttauk. I would now like to recognize the Ordinary Member for Upper Lake Melville, Mr. Gary Mitchell.

**MR. MITCHELL:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. My question today is for some concerns for some Nunatsiavut beneficiaries who are living in the Upper Lake Melville area, who I represent in the Assembly. In reviewing some of the transcripts of the Hansards from past Assembly sittings, September, 2011, to be exact, it is stated that \$20 million was allocated to the Inuit Community Governments for

Capital Works, another 20 million for economic development. As well, 3.5 million was allocated to a Senior's Home somewhere in Nunatsiavut. However, a decision has been made to set that money aside, but it hasn't been spent yet. It is all well and good and about time that the communities in the Labrador Inuit settlement areas are beginning to prosper and improvements to their community infrastructures and services have been long in coming to reach the present level and standards which they are at today. Having said that, I'm sure there still needs a lot to be done for these communities, especially related to economic development. Now I want to shift the focus here and speak with regard to my constituency, the Upper Lake Melville area, which has somewhere around nine hundred and thirty Members, according to the most recent Membership list that I received last week. That figure represents a large percentage of the total number of Nunatsiavut beneficiaries, and even though we live outside of the lands claim area, these numbers show a significant strength of the Nunatsiavut Government. We are equally as much a beneficiary as anybody who lives anywhere else and have been accepted as such in the 2005 Land Claims Agreement. We do have a different situation than our people who live in the land claims area, and aside from missing our homeland, we live in an area where much of the community infrastructure, social programs and services are available to us on a daily basis by our town councils and different levels of government in the Upper Lake Melville area. To get to my point, and this concerns all of us as Assembly Members, I am focusing here on our most important resource, our people. I don't know how many of you are aware, but there are beneficiaries living in the Upper Lake Melville area who are in dire need of housing and assistance, and this is something I'd like to bring to the forefront while we're all together in this Assembly. I don't have any statistics, but I'm told by local social agencies that there are people who have no homes, are basically shifting around from place to place, known as couch surfing, sleeping on people's sofas, some are sleeping in tents and even sleeping in old vehicles as there's nowhere else for them to go. I don't have any statistics, but within the past number of years or so a number of people have moved in to the Upper Lake Melville area from Nunatsiavut for various reasons, whether it be age, medical, education, health, marriage, employment. I, for one, moved with my family there because of my relocation with my former employer. My job got transferred there. Some other people have had to leave their homes due to an unfortunate turn of events in their lives and aren't able to come back. We can talk about all the community projects and the big new state of the art buildings that the Nunatsiavut Government have erected, but I think it's time for us to take a good hard look at the situation in Upper Lake Melville with people in need. I'm being constantly reminded that we are outside of the land claims area and this is a provincial jurisdiction, but do we have to let it go at that? I feel that this issue should be taken more seriously and supported by the executive to generate more dialogue on this situation. In a letter I wrote to the Executive Council on January 24th, I expressed some concern about the lack of affordable housing for beneficiaries in the Upper Lake Melville area, and related it to a Nunatsiavut Government media release on January 20th regarding the federal pre-budget consultations and statements that Minister Pottle had made regarding the social and economic well-being of our people. I inquired about this in my letter, which I wrote, but there wasn't any reference made in my reply from President Lyall on January 26th. These are Nunatsiavut beneficiaries and they feel they should be given some consideration for assistance. They are voting Members and need to be recognized that whatever their plight might be, all levels of government seem to be dragging their heels with regard to some social issues and this, especially this critical problem with affordable housing in Upper Lake Melville area. We cannot continue to ignore this problem. It's not going to go away unless

someone takes the necessary action to alleviate this urgent matter. The Labrador Friendship Centre is doing what it can, but this facility and this program should not be a standalone institution. It, too, needs more resources to carry out its valuable contribution to the Aboriginal community. And still with concerns for beneficiaries and their ongoing issue in the Upper Lake Melville is the topic of the Seniors Paddon nursing home. Concerned residents in Upper Lake Melville had been meeting for the past few months to discuss and try to get the Provincial Government to re-open the Paddon Home as a long-term health care facility is inadequate for the needs of the seniors in Labrador, especially in central and northern Labrador. So far I'm not aware that Provincial Government has made any commitment to that request. During the provincial pre-budget consultations early February I along with the Friendship Centre, submitted presentations to the committee regarding the Paddon Home and the needs to conduct the needs assessment of how many people in the region, the Labrador region, are waiting for space, or how many will be needing a home, the long-term health care. I think this is important to get these kinds of numbers. In response to a letter which I received from President Lyall in January, which included the issue of the Paddon Home he wrote, and I quote, "The Nunatsiavut Government has approached the Government in Newfoundland on numerous occasion and outlined some of the very points you note in your letter. We are on record of supporting any movement to see this facility maintained to address the needs of those beneficiaries who have long-term health requirements." End of quote. I would like to see direct support from the Nunatsiavut Government be stepped up a notch to put some pressure on the province and work with the local Paddon Home committee and the Friendship Centre in the Upper Lake Melville area, who is working on this issue. Constituents in Upper Lake Melville area feel that since there are a number of beneficiaries who will be using the facility that the Nunatsiavut Government show some support in getting the Paddon Home back into operation and show the beneficiaries that our Government will help them. And I just read in this booklet today that one of the rights and responsibilities is that Labrador Inuit look after the needs of the more vulnerable and needy. So that comes right in line with the strategic plan and I think that's for anywhere Inuit are living. I recently presented the presentation to the Combined Councils as well with regard to the Paddon Home, and also Minister Patricia Kemuksigak attended the session with me, as well as Jennifer Elson from the Labrador Friendship Centre. As with the issue of beneficiaries regarding affordable housing, so it should be with the seniors and disabled, that even though they live outside of the land claims area, the Nunatsiavut Government takes some responsibility for looking after these people. These are people who have contributed and brought us to where we are today and their vote carries as much weight as anyone living anywhere else. They must be recognized as beneficiaries no matter where they live and have entitlement to the resources and services that will enrich their lives, supposing it means amending the Land Claims Agreement. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek, Mr. Mitchell. I would now like to recognize the AngajukKâk for Rigolet.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I'm going to just make a brief statement. In my last statement to the Assembly, the last time I congratulated some people who had graduated from university and I'd like to congratulate Kelly Ann Blake who graduated with a degree in criminology from the University of New Brunswick, and also I was really glad to hear about the housing needs assessment. I, too, looked at the strategic plan and I saw housing in there. I did see one thing that was left out. It

talked about single families and seniors and low income families, but I think that one of the things, especially which are coming to light is homelessness in our communities. There are people, who are single people, but they're older and they have to live with their parents or go from house to house to house, and we have some in our community, so I'd just liked to point that out. And the other thing that I'd just like to say is that Rigolet, at the end of this week, will be welcoming all of the students from all of the communities in Nunatsiavut and I think in Natuashish to Rigolet for the winter sports meet, so I'd just like to make everyone aware of that. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you, Ms. Wolfrey Are there any more Member statements? I'd like to recognize the AngajukKâk for Hopedale.

**MR. PIERCY:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. I, on behalf of the Hopedale Inuit Community Government would like to thank Vale, along with Sid Pain, JP Winters, who, with the help of their electrician, have outfitted us with pumps and hoses to keep up the water pressure at operating levels in Hopedale. Also to Nain and Natuashish and Rigolet for the loan of pumps and hoses to aid us in our efforts to restore water pressure. We are still under the state of emergency and we are still waiting to hear back on how we are able to thaw the six-inch line that is still frozen from the supplementary pond to our water reservoir. It's been a stressful time in Hopedale. I'd like to say a big thank you and much appreciation to our employees who are still at the Water Pressure Issue as we speak now and have been doing so for over a month. Thank you to their families for the support and understanding for those who we have employed up to this point, and thank you to the residents of Hopedale for their understanding in our efforts to restore water pressure in Hopedale. On Sunday one of the boys got on shift at eight o'clock in the morning and we had blizzard conditions, we had a white-out. I, myself, we went to a house fire; a chimney fire at seven o'clock in the morning who happened to be my brother. We responded to the call and we dealt with the fire in the chimney and we had to return to the Fire Department which is on the opposite side of the harbor to retrieve a ladder and where there was a white-out condition. We lost our bearings and we had to make it back to the community and retrieve the ladder and go back over so we could fully extinguish the chimney fire and at about eight o'clock one of the men that I have employed he responded to the call as well on their switch-over. His hours of work were from 8:00 to 4:00 p.m. From about 8:30 till about three o'clock he was lost, and where the white-out conditions was there, he left the council garage. I spoke with him and I told him you follow the road home and then you'll be all right. At about eleven o'clock we had a call saying he never returned home. So along with the stress of trying to keep the generators and stuff operating in Hopedale we had to deal with one of our employees lost for that duration. It was lucky that the island just out from Hopedale, Ellen Island, had a grey fish box there and he spent his time there in the fish box waiting for the weather to clear. So this is just some of the problems with just the water issue in Hopedale alone, it don't include how we had to deal with issues of just being in Hopedale. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek, Mr. Piercy. Do we have any other Member Statements? Then we'll move down to the next items on the agenda. Number six, Returns to Oral Questions. There are no returns today as this is the first day. Number seven, Oral Questions. Are there any oral questions? I'd like to call on the AngajukKâk for Rigolet.



**MS. WOLFREY:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Finance, Human Resources and Information Technology. I was really glad to hear you say, Danny, that there's going to be a policy review of the policy because I think that one of the things that need to be looked at is the question of sick leave. For example, if you've got to travel outside the community and you've got a 15-minute appointment with a doctor and you live in Nunatsiavut, you have to take three days sick leave by the time so I'm just wondering can you look at some of those issues and maybe a lot a little bit more sick leave to people who have to travel away from their community to see for a doctor appointment. Someone, if you're in, where the doctor is already you take one hour off of your sick leave or two hours. From here it costs three days to go and see a doctor and then if you're going to St. John's it's probably five days by the time you leave and I'm requesting this because it's something that I think needs to be looked at and it's not only, I mean, if somebody who lives in Goose Bay got to travel outside to St. John's for a doctor's appointment then the same thing would apply. I'm not just asking for Nunatsiavut, but I'm asking to look at it from the perspective of having to travel when you've got to get a doctor's appointment. It's a lot more time taken off of your sick leave. If there was something we could do to alleviate some of that. Thank you.

**MS. FORD:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker, and thank you AngajukKâk for Rigolet for your question. We certainly will take that under advisement and consideration and when we're doing our review, we'll look at that issue. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** I would now like to recognize the ordinary member for Upper Lake Melville, Mr. Gary Mitchell.

**MR. MITCHELL:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. I'd like to direct my question to President Lyall because that's where I had the letter from regarding mention of the Paddon Home and in the letter, as I mentioned just now, it says that we're on record of supporting any movement to say the facility maintained to address the needs of the beneficiaries who have long-term health requirements. I'd like to ask the President. Is the Nunatsiavut Government prepared to provide any assistance or support in getting the Paddon Home re-opened? Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Honourable President.

**MR. LYALL:** Thank you. I'd like to thank the ordinary member for Upper Lake Melville. We'll certainly give assistance to support it, but I cannot commit to any financial support. Thank you.

**MS. FORD:** Supplementary. Go ahead.

**MR. MITCHELL:** When you say support, exactly, what kind of support do you mean because financial support is what we basically need to get the place up and running? What do you mean by support when you say you'll support it?

**MS. FORD:** The Honourable President.

**MR. LYALL:** So we mean by that any letters of support that you might need, if you're trying to convince the Federal Government or the Provincial Government for funding to get the Paddon Home on the go. We'll certainly give letters of support but, financially, I cannot give that commitment right now. Thank you.

**MS. FORD:** I would now like to recognize the Ordinary Member for Nain, Mr. William Barbour.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Nakummek, Ukattik. My question will be directed to the Minister of Lands and Natural Resources. Recently, going back to caribou consultations that took place in Nunatsiavut and even outside of Nunatsiavut, being Upper Lake Melville area, and what would the decision that the Department of Lands and Natural Resources has reached since that time and after the last Assembly sitting in Hopedale, and knowing that just how important, and I look around the table, I think each and every Assembly Member, including the clerk, have been party to caribou hunting and getting what they need, their level of need. Having said that, that is so important for people in Nunatsiavut who don't normally have access to fresh food, fresh foods as, say, in Goose Bay. My question to the Minister is this. Based on the consultations that took place I quote a section of the Land Claims Agreement. "If after a total allowable harvest has been established for a species or a population of wildlife or plant in the Labrador Inuit settlement area, that total allowable harvest is reduced for a period of time to a quantity that is less than that Inuit harvest level. All recreational hunting, commercial plant operation and harvesting of wildlife and plants by person other than Inuit and aboriginal people referred to in Section 12.5.5 in the Labrador Inuit settlement area directed at that species or population of wildlife or plant should be closed for that period and subject to subsection 12.5.5 the Minister shall allocate the total allowable harvest to Inuit." Really now my question now to the Minister is this. What I saw posted around my town was recommendation to limit two per household and that does not come close to meeting the level of needs of many, many families in my communities, frankly. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you, Minister Barbour. The Honourable Minister of Lands.

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Thank you, Madame Speaker, and I thank you for your question to Mr. Barbour, I've known for some time and yes, no doubt caribou has been a pretty hot and heavy issue over the last several months and your quote came out of the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement and then you relate it to a recommendation that you saw posted in public buildings and places within our communities. Now we have to keep in mind and I have to be upfront with everybody publicly and in this room, it's a recommendation. It's not law, and included in that is we have the provision, whether it's out there loud and clear or not, Madame Speaker, in the provision, there is provision provided there that if the speaker went out for a caribou hunt and the recommendation was two per household, that's not to say that she can't come back with five caribou. We are allowing or not allowing, but we're basically permitting that you can haul animals for other Members within the community, whether they're disabled, seniors or single parents, or what have you. Now I don't know if that quite answers your question to your satisfaction or not, but our recommendation is basically based on community consultations and when we have community consultations we can't take the community of Postville or Rigolet or Makkovik and put just one community's recommendations out to the whole general public.

We haul them together and bring it to the point and make a decision on what's the loud message here and what's most of the people saying? And for the most part, the recommendation from hunters within Nunatsiavut and Upper Lake Melville, there should be a number here. You should recommend the number. So, thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you, Honourable Minister. A supplementary, Mr. Barbour.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. My issue is this. In having quoted that section on wildlife and plants in the final Land Claims Agreement. This final Land Claims Agreement was a 25-year fight, Minister, and then at the first real test where the province if they allowed a total allowable harvest, we're the first group of people that must be protected in our level of needs, and that's what I'm not seeing, Minister, is this that are we going to protect or Land Claims Agreement for species of caribou so important to Labrador Inuit?

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek, the Honourable Minister of Lands.

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Yes, thank you, Madame Speaker, and I guess for information purposes there to your Ordinary Member from Nain, I have been in contact with the Provincial Minister and, yes, we will protect the Inuit hunting rights. You know, there's not ongoing discussions as we speak now, but there is some talks of a total allowable harvest for the next hunting season. I know we're not there yet. We're a long way from it, but there are some talks of going into that. We've had some correspondence back and forth from Minister Terry French as to me, this is a possibility that this will happen for next year. But to answer your question, yes, we will protect the rights of Inuit when it comes to hunting. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek Honourable Minister. I would now like to recognize the AngajukKâk for Makkovik.

**MR. JACQUE:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. My question is going to be directed to the Minister of Finance. Ongoing issue in our community. Banking. You'll know this has been tabled for quite some time now over two or three, four years. We are wondering what the status is on there. Thank you.

**MS. FORD:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, AngajukKâk for Makkovik, for your question. Yes, and I understand your frustration. This has been ongoing for quite some time. This issue was brought to the Department of Finance and we have had some consultations with the Bank of Montreal without very little success, Madame Speaker. We also have dealt with or referred the issue to the Nunatsiavut Group of Companies for consideration as well, and they have been doing some work and some consultation with Bank of Montreal to very little outcome or success on that. The Minister of Education Economic Development has had some consultations, I believe, as well, with several players regarding banking services in Hopedale. The biggest problem that we had to work through, Madame Speaker, at this point in time is one and we hope that we can work with the Nunatsiavut Group of Companies through our new partnership with Air Labrador if we're able to find and secure banking services for the communities.

One of the biggest issues is to find an insurable way to have X number of dollars transferred or brought to our communities without some sort of insurance or security on that. So that's a couple of issues that we're still working through, so hopefully we'll come to some resolution on this in consultation with and working with the Labrador Inuit Capital Strategy Trust through the Nunatsiavut Group of Companies. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek, Honourable Minister. I would now like to recognize the Chair of Sivunivut, Mr. Ed Tuttauk.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. I'd like to preface my question by referring to the Labrador Inuit Constitution, Section 5.9.1 which states, "Members of the Nunatsiavut Executive Council must respond to questions and requests for information made by Members of the Nunatsiavut Assembly in relation to the performance of Executive functions or the business of the Nunatsiavut Government," and it goes on a little further. My question is to the Minister of Finance, and it's one of the requests I posed earlier to the Executive Council in my letter, can I get a copy of the breakdown of the operating and maintenance costs of the Saputjivik building, especially for the last three fiscal years? Nakummek.

**MS. FORD:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker, and thank you to the Chair of Sivunivut for your question. I do have some figures here in front of me. It's not for the last three years, but those certainly can be provided for you, Mr. Tuttauk. By way of example, in 2010-2011 the actual costs for operation and maintenance of the Saputjivik building for 2010-11 was \$75,362. Of that \$75,362, \$22,604 were from municipal taxes; \$18,000 for janitorial, security, garbage removal and snow clearing; \$4,000 for repairs and maintenance, minor repairs and maintenance, sixteen hundred dollars for custodial supplies and \$17,000 for utility and hydro. Compared to this year, Madame Speaker, to date for 2011-2012 we've spent a total of \$69,557 for the operation and maintenance costs of Saputjivik. \$14,000 for municipal taxes, \$27,000 for security, janitorial, garbage removal and snow clearing, eleven hundred dollars for minor repairs and maintenance, \$29 for custodial supplies and \$20,000 for utilities, telephone and hydro, and we certainly can get you a breakdown for the years 2009-10, 2008-09. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek, Honourable Minister. Are there any more questions? The AngajukKâk for Postville.

**MS. GEAR:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. My question is to the First Minister. In your statement you mention about marine services for the upcoming summer. My question is do you have any idea how soon it will be going out to tender? Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. SHIWAK:** Thank you, Madame Speaker, and thank the AngajukKâk for Postville. We have not been given a firm date on when the request for proposals for the shipping will be completed or when the contract will be awarded. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you Honourable First Minister. Are there are any more questions? Supplementary question, AngajukKâk from Postville.

**MS. GEAR:** Thank you, Madame Speaker, and I guess this is more of a comment but can you make sure that we don't end up with the Dutch Runner again? Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. SHIWAK:** Thank you, Madame Speaker, and thank you again for your question. We have been assured by the Minister that we will not have the Dutch Runner doing our shipping for the upcoming season. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you, Honourable First Minister. Are there any more questions? If there are no more questions at this time we're going to take a 15-minute break.

**MS. FORD:** Order, please. We're continuing down on our Orders of the Day. We're now on item number eight. Are there any written questions? No written questions. Number nine, Returns to Questions. There are no returns today. Number 10, Petitions. Are there any petitions? No petitions. Number 11, Responses to Petitions. There will be no responses today. Item number 12, Reports of Standing and Special Committees. I understand there are no reports. We'll go down to number 13, Tabling of Documents. I'd like to recognize the President, Honourable Jim Lyall.

**MR. LYALL:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I had presumed that I already tabled, but I've been informed I have to do it "officially". On the table is Strategic Plan 2012-2015 for Nunatsiavut Government. Thank you very much.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you, Honourable President. And I would like to advise the Assembly that this document would be numbered as tabled document 125. I would now like to recognize the Minister of Lands and Natural Resource, the Honourable Glen Sheppard.

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. At this time I would like to formally table the proposed Standing Orders for Detail Reviews of Initiatives under Section 4.12 of the Nunatsiavut Environmental Protection Act, which is attached to your folder right in the back. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you, Honourable Minister. This document will be numbered tabled document 225. Is there any further Tabling of Documents? I'd like to recognize the Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. I'd like to table five documents, Madame Speaker, today, three of those documents being the Audited Financial Statements for the Labrador Inuit Land

Claims Agreement Implementation Trust for the year 2008, 9, and 10. These are requirements as per the Trust Deeds, Madame Speaker, that there have to be audited financial statements provided to the House of Assembly annually. So that's for the Implementation Trust for the years 08, 09 and 10, and I'd also like to table the Audited Financial Statements of the Labrador Inuit Settlement Trust for year ending December 31st, 2010. The final document, Madame Speaker that I would like to table is a report from the Northern Lights 2010 Conference that was attended by, I believe, 12 politicians and employees of Nunatsiavut Government. We struck a committee, Madame Speaker, comprised of myself, the Director of Communications and the former of Director of Economic Development, Darryl Dibblee to do some planning for Northern Lights Conference this time around, and we thought it was prudent and thought it was our responsibility to put the details of that conference into a report form, Madame Speaker, and there's also in the conclusion you'll note and most people will probably be interested in what the bottom line was for this conference and we spent a total of approximately \$56,000 to attend the Northern Lights Conference for this year, Madame Speaker. Nakummek.

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek, Honourable Minister. Are there any further Tabling of Documents? Then we'll move down to the list to the number 14, Notices of Motion. I would like to now recognize Minister of Lands and Natural Resources, the Honourable Glen Sheppard.

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I give notice that on Wednesday, March 7th I will move, seconded by the member from Hopedale, the Honourable Susan Nochasak, that tabled document 2-25 Standing Orders for Detail Reviews of Initiatives under Section 4.12 of the Nunatsiavut Environmental Protection Act be referred to Committee of the Whole for consideration and adoption. Furthermore, that Mr. Tom Sheldon, Environmental Director for Nunatsiavut Government is invited to appear before Committee of the Whole during consideration of the proposed Standing Orders for Detail Review Rules. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you. And again I recognize the Minister of Lands and Natural Resources, the Honourable Glen Sheppard, who I understand has another Notice of Motion.

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I give notice that on Wednesday, March 7th, I will move, seconded by the member from Hopedale, the Honourable Susan Nochasak, that the Nunatsiavut Assembly hereby approves an amendment to the Inuit Freehold Title, number LIL11C297COT in the name of the Hopedale Inuit Community Government to include the whole of Labrador Inuit Land Parcel 11C reserving there out and there from four subdivision lot numbers, 9-15, 9-16, 9-17 and 9-18. These four lots will be retained for Nunatsiavut Government purposes. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you, Minister. Any more Notices of Motions? Then we'll move to the next item in our Orders of the Day. Item number 15, Notices of Motion for First Reading of Bills. I recognize the Minister of Finance and Nunatsiavut Treasurer, the Honourable Dan Pottle.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. I wish to give notice that I will be moving two Bills for reading during this sitting of the Nunatsiavut Assembly, Bill 2012-01, Budget Act 2012 and Bill 2012-02, Torngat Co-operative Loan Guarantees Act. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek, Honourable Minister. Are there any more Notices of Motion? Then we'll move to number 16 on our Orders of the Day, Motions. I recognize the Minister of Lands and Natural Resources, the Honourable Glen Sheppard.

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I seek unanimous consent to move my Motion that I gave notice of earlier today to have the Detail Review Rules referred to Committee of the Whole. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you. Members, the Minister is seeking unanimous consent to move his Motion now. Are there any nays? There is none. Mr. Minister, proceed with your Motion.

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Thank you, Madame Speaker and Members. Whereas the Environmental Protection Act and the amendment to the Lands Act are enforced, and whereas the Environmental Review Regulations had been assented to and there is a need to establish rules and procedures for carrying out detailed environmental reviews of the initiatives under the Environmental Protection Act, and whereas the Minister of Lands and Natural Resources has tabled the proposed Standing Orders for Detail Reviews of Initiatives under Section 4.12 of the Nunatsiavut Environmental Protection Act. Now, therefore, I move, seconded by the member for Hopedale, the Honourable Susan Nochasak, that tabled document 2-25 Standing Orders for detail reviews of initiatives under Section 4.12 of the Nunatsiavut Environmental Protection Act be referred to Committee of the Whole for consideration and adoption. Furthermore, that Mr. Tom Sheldon, Environmental Director for the Nunatsiavut Government is invited to appear before the Committee of the Whole during consideration of the proposed Standing Orders for Detail Review Rules. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you, Mr. Minister. The Motion is in order. To the Motion, Mr. Minister, would you like to speak to the Motion?

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. Not at this time.

**MS. FORD:** Does anyone else wish to speak to the Motion? If no other Members wish to speak, does the Minister wish to make final comments and close debate?

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I'd like to conclude debate.

**MS. FORD:** The Motion is carried. We will now convene as a Committee of the Whole to consider tabled document 2-25 with Mr. Sheldon as a witness. The Chair recognizes Mr. Tom Sheldon, Environmental Director for the Nunatsiavut Government. The process we will follow for consideration of the Detailed Review Rules will be general comments and questions on the Detailed Review Rules, and once this is concluded, the committee will then proceed to review each page where you may ask questions on the details on that page, and then I will seek agreement and approval on each page. To begin I would like to ask the Minister if he has any comments?

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. Not at this time, other than, I guess to say this has been a commitment by this special committee earlier this fall, and we've committed to have something in place on or before March the 9th and I'd like to say here today that, you now, I'd like to

commend the employees in the Environment Division for doing the hard work and my Director of Lands as well, along with Legal, Ms. Loretta Michelin and Veryan so that's my remarks there, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you Mr. Minister. We will now hear from Tom Sheldon.

**MR. SHELDON:** Okay. Perfect. Thank you very much, everyone. So before I came in here somebody asked me, well, are you ready to give your long and boring presentation? And all I could say was yes. But it may not be as long and boring as the last one in Hopedale last year for those of you who were there. Anyways, in all seriousness, though, this is important stuff, I think, and this is part of the process of establishing an Inuit-owned process for decision-making with respect to proposed developments on Labrador Inuit land. So there was a first step taken last year with the Environmental Protection Act. That's been assented to and this is an important second step. So just to, and what I'll do today is you have the Standing Orders before you. This presentation focuses on a plain language summary of those Standing Orders. So we'll basically go through the entire document in plain language, and if you guys have any questions, feel free to ask those questions and I will answer them to the best of my abilities. So anyways there are two sets of documents that grew out of the Nunatsiavut Environmental Protection Act. One was the Environmental Review Regulations and those required approval of the Nunatsiavut Executive Council and the President. That's happened. The second document and the one you have before you here today is the Detailed Review Standing Orders, and those Standing Orders require Assembly approval because it's going to be an Assembly-led process through which detailed reviews take place and we'll walk through that process going forward. So basically what you are doing today is deciding if you agree with the Detailed Reviews Standing Orders and if you have questions, clarifications, those sorts of things and hopefully we can walk through those together. So in terms of Detailed Reviews there's a small section in the Environmental Review Regulations that have been adopted by the Executive Council and President, but the bulk and the meat and potatoes of it is in the Detailed Reviews. So all the detail of the Detailed Reviews is actually in this Standing Order document that you have before you. So just a quick reminder. What are Detailed Reviews and what are Summary Reviews? So Summary Reviews for this process, you don't have to worry about. They're the smaller proposed initiatives on Labrador Inuit land. So maybe fishing lodge next to a river on Labrador Inuit land, something like that. What requires a Detailed Review, though, that's an important question. Those are those larger proposed developments or larger proposed initiatives. So in the Environmental Protection Act you'll remember there were a few triggers for Detailed Reviews. One is that an initiative that requires an Environment Preview Report or an Environment Impact Statement under Part 10 of the Provincial Environmental Protection Act that automatically gets triggered for a detailed review within the Nunatsiavut Environmental Protection Act. Similarly, at a federal government level, if you have a comprehensive study or mediation or panel review that takes place under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act that will trigger a Detailed Review under the Nunatsiavut Environmental Protection Act. A great recent example of this, if it would have been on Labrador Inuit lands, it's something like the Lower Churchill Hydro-Electric Development, that one that was proposed. So if that type of development was proposed on Labrador Inuit lands that would trigger a Detailed Review process with the Nunatsiavut Government, itself. So what requires a Detailed Review? We went one step further and actually put into Schedule D of the Environmental Review Regulations things that would require



Detailed Reviews. And we did this for one specific reason. We know that the Federal Government is having the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act undergo a Statutory Review. We suspect, although we're not sure about this, that the sort of screening type of criteria to filter things to things like Panel Reviews is going to become tighter, so less things are going to go to Panel Reviews. So we don't want that to preclude those types of developments undergoing Detailed Review for Nunatsiavut and within the Nunatsiavut Government, specifically. So we've added specific examples of things that will for sure undergo Detailed Reviews. The other thing that we've done is we've given the Minister of Lands and Natural Resources the authority and the ability to order that an initiative must undergo a Detailed Review. So if something doesn't get captured provincially or federally through their Panel Review processes or what have you, the Minister can still order that that proposal or that that initiative undergoes a Detailed Review, if he or she feels that it will have significant impact and it's a large enough scale to undergo a Detailed Review, rather than that smaller, sort of, level review. So what happens here? The proponent. So company X thinks that they want to develop mine Y. What they would do is register that proposed development, and they'd register it with the Minister of Lands and Natural Resources. As soon as they do so and at the earliest possible opportunity, the Minister then gives written notice to the Assembly, and within that written notice the Minister has to identify who the company is. So what's the proponent? What's the location of the proposed development? What's the name of the proposed initiative? Just give a brief summary of the project and possible environmental effects. We know that that's not going to be a comprehensive study because this is so early on in the process so that won't be a comprehensive summary. When Assembly approval under Section 4.12 of the Nunatsiavut Environmental Protection Act which ran through the Assembly last year. Then the Assembly proceeds with the process laid out in the Standing Orders, and this is where we get into, okay, well, what is everybody going to do once one of these falls in our laps? The first thing that'll happen is a Nunatsiavut Assembly Environmental Review Committee will be established. That's a Standing Committee. It will consist of the Minister of Lands and Natural Resources who will also be the Chairperson of the committee, and it can consist of up to four other Members of the Assembly, and you'll notice in the brackets there it says 2.2 to 2.7. That's parts 2.2. to 2.7 within the actual written standard, or within the written Standing Orders there. So you can cross-reference all the time. So that Standing Committee needs to be established. The process for establishing this Standing Committee is done so that you'll point additional Members to the committee. It's done in accordance with Rule 65.5 of the Standing Orders. So similar to how, for example, a Standing Committee was established for consultation on the Nunatsiavut Environmental Protection Act last fall. There'd be a similar process for appointments under this one. At least one member of the committee must be an Ordinary Member of the Assembly or an AngajukKâk from the nearest Inuit community to the site of the initiative. So we always want a local presence on those communities or within the committee. We want communities that are going to be impacted the most to have representation on these committees. And for actual committee procedures a quorum, so requires at least 50 percent of Members. So in order to have a functioning committee meeting or public hearing or what have you, it requires 50 percent of the Members there. Within Part 2.8 there's contingencies related to the committee's Membership, and that's simply an administrative way to deal with, okay, well, what happens if one of these reviews overlaps an election? What happens if a Minister's no longer a Minister, or one of the Members of the committee is no longer a member of the committee? So we deal with those within Section 2.8, what

happens? We do that because we want this process to have as much continuity as possible, okay? We recognize that elections, they're just a part of government life. But the day to day process of the government needs to continue effectively and efficiently. So we've dealt with those sorts of contingencies under 2.8. We want committee Members and I think what's ideal that committee Members that attend a hundred percent of committee meetings or hearings or activities. If a committee member is not present, the rest of the committee proceeds as normal as long as quorum is met. If an individual committee member cannot attend at least 80 percent of all meetings, hearings or activities, they cannot participate in the writing of the committee report to the Assembly. The idea with this is that we only want committee Members who are truly, truly knowledgeable all about that project, have followed it along through the entire review process, had heard comments from the public throughout the entire review process to be part of the formulation of that. We think it would be unfair to the public review process if a committee member wasn't present for a lot of the committee hearings, but then had substantial input into the committee report. So we think that's something that's natural that can happen. Ideally, within the Standing Committee we want decisions to happen by consensus. If not, there's a vote. The Chair has one vote as a member of the committee. If the votes are tied at the end of that first round of voting, the Chair has a second deciding vote, but ideally, as with most things along the coast, we want things to happen by consensus. That's the best approach and that's the goal we're striving for here. The Standing Committee will have terms of reference and those terms of reference will be established by the Assembly. The terms of reference will include things like a scope of review, the timeframe for completion of the committee's report, things like participant funding. So how can we help Inuit participate in the public consultation process in the Detailed Review Process that will require funding on occasions, and things like public consultations, themselves, how should they be conducted, those types of things. Those terms of reference are established by the Assembly and they're sort of the marching orders given to the Standing Committee from the Assembly. The Environmental Review Committee, one of the things that was clear is that Members of the Assembly wanted to be the decision makers on behalf of Inuit. You guys are the elected Members on behalf of Inuit. You represent Inuit. Through this Standing Committee we think that we've developed the process by which the elected Members will mark these detailed reviews right from start to finish. Having said that, it's a lot of work, and it will especially be a lot of work on the Minister of Lands and Natural Resources. So that Standing Committee is going to have support. And its support, there's going to be three main support functions. There's going to be a Secretary, a Chief Administrative Officer and a Secretariat. The Secretary is under the direction of the Chair. They're a member of the Nunatsiavut Civil Service and they will do important administrative functions, things like they'll be liaising with the Communications Division on an ongoing basis. For things like community and public meetings, they'll do a lot of the logistical arrangements, who's going where, what time, order of people participating in these public reviews, those sorts of things, and also they'll be doing record keeping with respect to all of the review process. The Chief Administrative Officer will be under the direction of Chair too. Their main role is going to be sort of the environmental research analysis and advice to Secretariat. So they're doing - yeah, go ahead.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** This position to the Chief Administrative Officer, is that an NG employee, or will that be a paid position or?

**MR. SHELDON:** There's flexibility there. They need to be a member of Nunatsiavut Civil Service. So depending on what's established, in lots of cases it may, for example, be me.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** The CAO needs to be a member of the Civil Service as well?

**MR. SHELDON:** Yes.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** Okay.

**MR. SHELDON:** So In lots of cases it may be myself. Could be somebody else internally, or for certain proposed developments, the Nunatsiavut Government and the Assembly might decide, hey, it makes more sense to hire somebody on to be the Chief Administrative Officer because there's going to be a bunch of work here, and so that person becomes dedicated to serving that support role to the Standing Committee. So there's flexibility there in terms of who it is. Chances are that the default button is going to be Tom in many cases, but that's not going to be the case all the time. So the CAO is going to basically provide a lot of that support in terms of environmental research analysis and advice to the Standing Committee and the CAO also oversees the Secretariat, and that's a group of people that are doing work providing the committee with assistance, gathering information, holding of public hearings or public consultations. They're providing assistance and advice in terms of the committee's analysis. They're reviewing the environmental impact statement that's prepared by the proponent, those sorts of things. So we sort of see this as the Standing Committee is really clear. They need to be the guides. They need to be the decision makers. They need to be the ones providing direction. The support structures, the secretary Chief Administrative Officer and Secretariat, those are the ones taking directions and doing work on behalf of the committee. So it's always committees providing direction and then they're getting work done for them in addition to doing a whole lot of work themselves and then that support structure is feeding information back up to them. So subject to the terms of reference, which are given to the Standing Committee by the Assembly and these particular Standing Orders, the committee can also make its own rules, procedures and guidelines for conducting Detailed Reviews. Those can be specific - they can be specific to that proposed initiative. So things like meetings of the committee, how are those going to take place? Participant funding. How do you want to administer that? Steps for public consultation. Rules of procedure for any public hearings. Now there's a lot of work that needs to be done here and, for example, public hearings there's a whole process laid out, or that could be laid out in terms of how to conduct public hearings. One of the things that we've done in the background is we've prepared some possible templates. Now the Standing Committee can throw those out and say we don't like those at all, or they can use them as guides and tweak them a little bit here or there with how they see fit. It's up to them, but just so the Standing Committee isn't starting from scratch all the time, there will be some background things prepared there and we have, for example, prepared some possible procedures for public hearings and those types of things. Translation and Interpretation. One of the things that we want to ensure is that there's open and effective participation in the public consultation process. Therefore, documents will be available in English and as the committee determines in Inuttitut. It's fully up to the committee to decide what needs to be in what language. If the committee decides, hey, everything needs to be in both languages, that's what the committee decides. That'll put huge stressors on our translation services, I can guarantee, but the

committee might also decide, hey, we think that all public hearings need to be available in English and Inuttitut, and we also think that all documents related to Inuit knowledge and culture, or culture and values need to be in Inuttitut, for sure. We don't think that that particular piece of technical engineering needs to be in Inuttitut. That's completely at the committee's discretion to decide. So one of the things that we've said, though, is recognizing that translation is challenging in terms of capacity, is that the release of one language version shall not be contingent on the simultaneous availability of the other. So what we've said is if a translation into either English or Inuttitut, most likely it's going to be into Inuttitut, is taking a few extra days, while we can release that notice, or that public notice for public consultations in English, and then three days later have that notice go out in Inuttitut.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** That's not breaking any of our laws, is it? No?

**MR. SHELDON:** No, it isn't. And having said that, I mean, if the committee decides, for example, I mean, the committee has discretion here so - which is important. Is every individual at this table who becomes a member of the committee for environmental reviews, you will have this discretion to make these determinations. One of the things that we wanted in here was some important guidelines but also flexibility for the elected Members to do what they see fit as best, given particular individual cases. So within detailed reviews it's important to note that the Nunatsiavut Government has standing in committee procedures. So the Nunatsiavut Government can act as a participant before the committee in its public consultation proceedings and may make submissions to the committee. So, for example, a proposed, I don't know, let's just say a proposed mine. I think it'll be important that the Department of Education and Economic Development can speak to some of the potential training aspects of this and some of the potential economic aspects of this, but I also think it's important that the Department of Health and Social Development can speak to some of the public health issues related to that proposed development, or some of the social issues related to that proposed development. So really there will be role to play here in terms of informing the Standing Committee for each and every department within the Nunatsiavut Government. One of the things that can't happen, though, is the Nunatsiavut Government cannot be represented by the Secretary, the Chief Administrative Officer, or else a person assigned to the Secretariat. That's Assembly Member, a division of NG, or an NG civil servant if they feel that that person or group has some specialized information or some key information that would help inform the committee's decision and recommendations in their report. So the committee's documents and records, the Secretariat, on behalf of the committee, compiles and maintains these. So you can see the Secretariat doing a bunch of grunt work here on behalf of the Standing Committee. The committee's documents and records, they're the property of the Assembly until the review is completed. Once the review is completed and the Minister issues a decision, the Secretary transfers the record to the Environment Division who's responsible for its maintenance and safe keeping. That becomes property of Nunatsiavut Government. Once that happens, the committee, the Secretary and Secretariat have fulfilled their responsibilities. So once that transfer documentation has happened, the Minister's had the decision, there's no more role to play for the Committee, or the Secretary, or the Secretariat. So that's some of the background in terms of what's going to take place. Now there are two chunks of public, sort of public input or public participation that I'm going to talk about. One is public consultation preparation and this involves public comment periods, and then there's an actual

public consultation itself, and that's a lot more of the personal interaction of people who have participated in federal and provincial environmental reviews will be familiar with things like panel hearings. That's where a resident of a community can go and actually speak to the panel personally about what they feel the impacts of the project will have. So the committee, they're going to start their work as soon as possible following their appointment, the establishment of the terms of reference and a referral of the initiative to a committee of the Assembly. The committee can retain the services of experts. Those can be Inuit experts. They could be other experts, experts on anything. It's up to the committee to decide who they would like to retain as experts to help them in their process of formulating a report. Their reviews will include - they'll review the registration document from the proponents. The proponent is registered with the Minister and submitted a bunch of information there. The Minister has actually reported on it to the Assembly already. They'll review all the information provided by the proponent, then they'll determine whether that registration information is adequate for a detailed review, or whether an environmental impact statement is needed. I can't think of an example where an environmental impact statement would not be needed for these types of proposed initiatives. They would almost always be required. In preparation for public consultation, the committee must visit the site of the initiative. So if the proposed initiative is wherever, way up north, way down south, whatever, the committee must visit the site of the initiative. The committee must ensure public access to information. That'll happen through Nunatsiavut Government office buildings. It'll also happen through the Nunatsiavut Government website. The committee needs to establish guidelines for an environmental impact statement. So if the committee has decided that environmental impact statement is necessary, they issue guidelines to the company and say this is what we would like to see and what we need to see within the environmental impact statement. Then the proponent must prepare and distribute that environmental impact statement. Chances are that's going to be a big document, fairly big document anyways. But the committee, for example, can establish guidelines that, hey, we want an executive summary of that environmental impact statement that is no longer than 25 pages long that has heavy emphasis on whatever. Those are the types of guidelines that can be given to the proponent. So the committee, once it receives just going back up the proponent, prepares and distributes their environmental impact statement. And then the committee establishes a 90-day public comment period. So that's available publicly, that environmental impact statement. And then the committee, the Standing Committee, will start accepting comments from the Nunatsiavut Government, the public, the Assembly, and I'll outline exactly what public means afterwards. The Assembly Authority. So Federal and Provincial governments' comments can be in writing, audio, video and those get sent back to the committee. The comments received during this public comment period are then made available to the company again who's allowed 45 days to respond. And then the committee, once again, once they get that response from the company, the committee determines whether the environmental impact statement with the additional clarifications from the company is adequate for purposes of public consultation. If it's inadequate, if you say, huh, that's not good enough, this major, it's lacking in this area big time, and the committee can basically require that they go through the process again. And you go through the process until the committee is satisfied that the environmental impact statement is adequate for public consultation. Then Public Consultation. So now, up to now there's been sort of a, I don't want to say impersonal, but it's been more of a back and forth at a distance between the committee and the proponent and the public. Now we get into the meat and potatoes of public

consultation, and this is sort of the personal back and forth between the committee and the public and the proponent. The Purpose. Your goal in life as a committee member is to access and incorporate Inuit knowledge, values and culture in relation to the initiative. We don't want this to necessarily replicate what the Federal and Provincial government are doing in terms of significant adverse impacts on species at risk A, or what have you. We want you to focus on what's meaningful to Inuit with respect to this project in terms of knowledge, values and culture. That is the priority in your life at this moment. In order to do that, you basically have a whole set of tools at your disposal in terms of types of public consultations. You can have public hearings. You can have round table conferences. Those round table conferences, if you'll remember last year we talked about them. It's basically groups of 2 to 15 Inuit. You can get whoever from on the ground in Nain, whoever, from on the ground in Makkovik, what have you, altogether to bring these various perspectives forward to help inform decision making. So you can establish this very, sort of, organic on the ground sort of round table conferences. Those round table conferences, you can decide, hey, we want those to happen at the site of the initiative. We don't want them happening in the boardroom, or we want them happening on the land for a week. We're going to go, we're going to do our thing and we're going to talk about this initiative when we have the time to do that because that's more appropriate than doing it in the boardroom. It's up to you guys to decide what's possible and what you would prefer to do as committee Members. You can have community meetings and community hearings. Those could be broad or focused. Usually now what happens in the Federal and Provincial process is they'll have community meetings and a panel will come up here and ask you what do you think, period, and it's really, really broad. The Standing Committee, through this process, could establish a community meeting; specifically on what do you think the impacts of this particular project will be on the George River caribou herd? And you can pull experts together, whether they're elders, whether they're harvesters, whether they're women, what have you. You can establish whatever process you like and you think would bring out the information in the most appropriate way. And you can do simple things like technical hearings or open houses too. You need to give, as a Standing Committee, a minimum of 30 days' notice of public consultations. So from the moment you decide what you're going to do to actually do any of it, there needs to be a 30-day time lag. And when you issue that public notice, you need to also issue sort of what's your procedures and schedule for that public consultation, and where are your consultation locations going to be? So are they going to be, and they will naturally be at the Inuit community nearest to the site, at the site, or on Labrador Inuit lands near the site. Might they be also in other locations? So do you want them to happen within the Labrador Inuit settlement area, within Upper Lake Melville communities, possibly St. John's, those types of things. Any and all those things are possible, and at the committee's discretion. In terms of the manner for carrying out public consultations, we said this before, but you can't emphasize it enough is your goal is to promote and facilitate participation of Inuit. A secondary goal is to facilitate access to Inuit knowledge as part of the committee and to offer Members of the public and public groups an opportunity to present their views. The Public. Here is important for you. The public. What does the public mean? The public means Inuit businesses, Inuit groups or organizations and residents of the Inuit communities. That's what the public means, and that's, as a group, who you're trying to consult with as you're doing public consultations. Those public consultations you want to ensure that they have a thorough review of the initiative and its possible environmental effects, especially from that Inuit cultural point of view. And, as I said before, or I didn't say this before, actually, this is a new point, sorry.

The committee determines how to engage the proponent in public consultation procedures. So just a quick example, I wasn't here for the Voisey Bay days so I don't know how it happened, but in the Lower Churchill you had sort of there was people here presenting to the panel over there and then Nalcor was over there, and you presented, then the panel could ask you questions, and then Nalcor could ask you questions, and it kind of felt like you're on the hot seat all the time and for a lot of people it's extremely uncomfortable. For me, it's uncomfortable and I tend to do this more often than I should. So I can imagine for people that don't do those types of things on a regular basis how uncomfortable that can be. So as a Standing Committee, your goal is to be able to incorporate Inuit knowledge, views and values and have that happen in a comfortable setting, and that's why we've said, like, that might happen best on the land. That might happen best in a variety of ways. That might happen best if the proponent isn't necessarily present for part of it. Who knows? But we want the public to be extremely comfortable participating in this process and saying what they really think about that proposed development. So that's public consultation. So in terms of the time frame for public consultation, we've established a bench mark of 90 days. Then there's the big caveat, unless the committee's terms of reference determine that a longer period is necessary. So, you know what, if everybody wants predictability in terms of how long is this going to take. Well, we tried to provide that in saying, well, we'll aim for 90 days, but if the Assembly, in developing the terms of reference, really don't think, hey, I don't think we can do this well in 90 days then so be it. Take 95. Take 100. One of the most disappointing things that happened during the Lower Churchill panel hearings was that the panel didn't actually travel to Rigolet. They did a video conference thing and that was because they needed to complete their public consultations, public hearings within 45 days.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Could they extend it after the process started? Like, if they were indeed bigger and decided that they weren't going to meet the deadline after 90...

**MR. SHELDON:** Yeah. There is that, there is that flexibility there and, I mean, I think that's one of the keys is that this process involves, as you get in the middle of the process some of the things that you're expecting at the start won't necessarily hold true. So that sort of flexibility is built in here. The overarching goal isn't necessarily to get a review done in a certain amount of time. It's to get a good review done; to get a good review done efficiently, but get a good review done, and that might take much longer than 90 days. Who knows? So once that public consultation public consultation has happened and say, hey, you've had trips with, I don't know, expert harvesters on the land, you've talked to them about whatever, you've had meetings in communities, you've gone to visit the site of the initiative with a group of people on the ground, those types of things, then that public consultation process ends and that closes the review record, basically. So five days after public consultation process ends, the record's closed, which means that the committee has all of the information that it's going to use in the formulation of its report and recommendations to the Assembly. If something comes in six days later, not allowed. And you do need an absolute cut-off there, but that's why we've built some flexibility in for public consultation. So we think that that's not going to be a problem. The committee then delivers its report to the Assembly, the proponent and the Federal and Provincial government within a hundred and twenty days following closure of the record. So you, basically, have four months to do it. That, obviously, will be done by the committee with the support of the Secretariat. That report

is prepared in camera. There's also the opportunity for consensus in minority report. So, basically, ideally, as we said before, we want to achieve consensus decision making and consensus recommendations within the Standing Committee process. But life says that might not always be possible in the future. Who knows? So in discussing particular items, the committee might say, you know what, the majority of committee Members agreed with this, but a minority also said this, and that's that, I mean, that's just putting the facts forward in terms of what the committee felt in their review. The contents of the report is outlined in Part 4-17. It's a big list. Fundamentally, though, that big list boils down to what does the committee feel will be the probable impacts on Inuit rights, values and culture if the initiative were to proceed? And whether that initiative should be permitted to proceed and, if so, on what terms and conditions? That's really what this is getting down to and there's a whole whack of rational that'll lead up to that process. And other things that'll be included, things like monitoring and follow-up, but there's a big list in 4-17. That report is in English and Inuttitut, unless otherwise directed by the Standing Committee. It is released to the public. So although the report's prepared in camera that report becomes public, becomes part of the public record. Now, I'm just going to get into some details here. Part 5 is about announcements and notices. This is a real, I mean, it's a housekeeping details-type session. It has time frames for certain review periods. Where announcements and notices must be directed, those types of things. So it's a real housekeeping in the weeds-type thing. And then Part 6. So After Report Completion. So we've said that that report becomes public, part of the public record. Well, how does it do so? The Chair of the Standing Committee, who is the Minister of Lands and Natural Resources at the time, reports to the Assembly on the committee's environmental review. The Minister reports to the Assembly on consultations with the authorities. So the Minister has to also report how did we consult with the Provincial Government? How did we consult with the Federal Government on this? Then the Chair of the Standing Committee tables a motion respecting the report for debate within the Assembly. Then the debate follows normal procedures. If following debate, it's approved, the project still needs the appropriate permits and authorizations and finalization of cost of payment associated with the review, those sorts of things. If it's not approved, well, it's the end of the line for that particular project. So the end of my long, boring presentation is on this slide. And this is basically summarized. I should have maybe just started with this. This is the whole process at a very high level in terms of Detailed Reviews. The Minister, they will put forward notice in the Assembly of registration of whatever proposed development it is. The Assembly establishes a Standing Committee for the Detailed Review. They establish terms of reference for that committee. The Standing Committee carries out the review process and they're supported by that Secretariat. So the Secretary, the Chief Administrative Officer and the Secretariat body there. The review process includes the proponents. So the company developing in the environmental impact statement, the public comment period, which it's sort of, to be honest, the Standing Committee is feeling out the public and the public's feeling out the Standing Committee and it's the feel out period in terms of this, and then the real meat and potatoes public consultation period, we've said that can take various forms, and I really, really, really encourage people that are represent or participants on Standing Committees to use the full suite of creative tools available to you to say, hey, that's what I think would be most appropriate for Inuit from the region with respect to this particular development. Really think outside the box in terms of that. Your purpose in life as a Standing Committee member is to basically formulate that report, but do so through the lens of Inuit knowledge, culture and values, and then the



Standing Committee, once that review process is done, the public consultation period has ended, you write the report for the Assembly, the Chair or Minister, well, the Chair and Minister, they'll be the same person, tables the report in the Assembly, and the Assembly makes a decision to authorize and then directs the Minister of Lands and Natural Resources to either approve the initiative, approve the initiative subject to terms and conditions, or not approve the initiative. Those are the three options. So that's how it's going to take place. The bottom line here and this was for, we heard this message loud and clear is I think Assembly Members wanted to be the ones in the driver's seat with respect to these potential large developments that might be coming through the region. So this adds additional workload onto you guys, but it firmly plants you in the driver's seat and, sort of, in the background you have a Secretariat that can support you. Go ahead, yes.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** It seems in some of the process is going to involve some disbursements of funds. Will the Minister of Finance have to include that in a budget?

**MR. SHELDON:** So what typically happened here is within the environmental - you're right. So there are costs associated with doing business and having a Nunatsiavut-owned process for this. Basically, what's going to happen is the proponent is going to be covering the costs of that. So throughout the review at two-week intervals the Secretariat, what they will do is submit, sort of, here's the time we spent and the cost allocation with that for the review, and those regular invoices get submitted so that the Nunatsiavut Government is never out a huge whack of cash, and then what happens too is when the Minister issues their final decision, at the same time you have a final invoice going out to whatever company. Now we want the invoicing at regular intervals because if the Minister issues a decision on the advice of the Assembly and that is, okay, well, Project X is not allowed to go ahead, we don't want it to go ahead, and at the same time you give this company an invoice, you recognize you no longer hold the carrot or the stick in order to get that invoice paid. So we'll be minimizing the cost of that final invoice so that the Nunatsiavut Government is carrying extremely little financial, like extreme. At the most it would be two weeks' worth of financial risk associated with those decisions. So with that regular, sort of, exchange of invoices and payment and those sorts of things the financial liability for the NG is slim to none. Go ahead.

**MS. WOLFREY:** But, Tom, having said all of that, there's not an endless supply of money. For example, if you're going to be given a bottom line, you wouldn't be able to rack up a billion dollars' worth of spending, there got to be some bottom line, wouldn't there?

**MR. SHELDON:** Yeah. And, basically, completely independent of the review process for these larger proposed initiatives, the Nunatsiavut Government and the company can enter into a cost recovery agreement where you're like, okay, well, these are our expectations of what this will require from our end in terms of capacity, time invested in those types of things so that the company isn't necessarily just saying, okay, yeah, well, here's the key to our vault and go to town. So for these larger proposed initiatives, that sort of cost recovery agreement can take place. For the smaller proposed initiatives where we don't need to worry about those here, though, we're not really worried about that at all because the cost of those reviews will be quite minor.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Tom, it was not that long and not that boring, just pretty good, boy, you did well, but what I don't, like, remember we used to talk about our process harmonizing with the Canadians and the Newfoundlanders? I didn't quite see that here in your presentation. Like, what I thought meant by harmonizing was, like, it would go together and there'd be a one stop shop, there would be one panel for the review that would include Canada's stuff and then Newfoundland's stuff and ours as well, you know, a one stop shop, but what you outlined here is like there will be almost like two or something, just you know what I mean, what I'm asking?

**MR. SHELDON:** I know exactly what you're asking. So, basically, right now if a project were to be registered on Labrador Inuit Lands, what would happen is that project, right now as it stands, would undergo a Provincial Environmental Assessment, a Federal Environmental Assessment, and a Nunatsiavut Environmental Assessment. So those three processes would happen. Now, so first point is that now the Nunatsiavut Government has its own process, its own, sort of, green light, red light system, or own process for establishing a green light, red light system. I think that's extremely critical. Having said that I think this is the Nunatsiavut process. So if you're to do something specifically with our process and our process only, that's it. Having said that, I think where we're going with this, in a similar way the Provincial and Federal governments are going, is they have their own processes, but they always harmonize. They harmonize on a case-by-case basis because no one wants to give up their power on sort of a block basis. So they don't want to say, okay, well, we'll give up our decision making power on a block sort of basis. So I foresee and I hope that this will result in case-by-case harmonized processes for environmental reviews. Within the environmental review regulations we have some guidelines in terms of what a harmonized environmental review process would look like. The important thing I think with respect to harmonized environmental reviews is what this process does now is I think it gives Inuit some additional leverage when they go to enter into a harmonized environmental assessment process, if that's the process the Inuit choose, to have more Inuit-specific processes, and sort of appropriate processes incorporated into that harmonized environmental review. I could foresee, for example, if the Lower Churchill panel hearings, let's just pretend that they would have been on LIL, and let's just pretend that we have this in place. I can foresee those types of panel hearings and that review process happening significantly differently than how they happened. I could foresee representatives from that harmonizer from one of those Standing Committees going out on a seal hunt. I could see - so things like that. I think this gives us the leverage to be able to harmonize more effectively whereas before we were just basically at the, more or less; the mercy of the federal and provincial processes, but that harmonization will need to happen on a case-by-case basis. So that's something that the Assembly needs to deal with. Essentially, when a particular development, proposed development, comes down the pipe, the Assembly needs to deal with that harmonization at that time so just because no one wants to give up their, sort of, powers across the board and say, well, we'll harmonize across the board for all developments. They want to do it on a case-by-case basis. Does that make sense, Tony?

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Yes. You answered my question very well....

**MR. SHELDON:** Okay.

**MS. FORD:** Tony.....

**MR. ANDERSEN:** You know, and this is just thoughts, okay, I suppose it's not really a question, but the Standing Committee carries out the review process. When Canada and Newfoundland does one, they do appoint an independent panel, they call it, or refer to it as an independent panel...

**MR. SHELDON:** Yes.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** ...just wondering why this Standing Committee had recommended this instead of an independent panel and would that not be some finger pointing by people to say that your review is in conflict because it's almost like internal structure? No.

**MR. SHELDON:** That's definitely a possibility, but, I mean, and we racked our brains forever, who would be most appropriate to evaluate proposed developments on Labrador Inuit lands from an Inuit cultural point of view? And we just kept on coming back to the elected Members of the Assembly. So it could result in finger pointing. This is definitely a possibility, but we think that it could result in that, but at the end of the day it also results in an extremely effective process and one where Inuit knowledge and culture and values isn't compromised in any way, shape or form to have some sort of outside expert involved in the panel. So it's a give and take. At the end of the day we didn't want to give on the Inuit knowledge, culture and values, so we sort of took from that expert, sort of, independent panel, I guess. The other thing that I think is the committee's report becomes public, so I think it's hugely transparent in terms of what the Assembly Members - what the Standing Committee is thinking in terms of the formulation of the report and the rationale for that report. So people can point fingers, but they can also read the report and if it's a really solid report, well, there you have it, and that should discount some of the finger pointing that could potentially result. A lot of this is happening -well, it is happening in the open. It's not necessarily happening in a black box, so and then it Federally and Provincially, I know, they do have independent expert panels - well, just the example with the Lower Churchill, I mean, the panel came out with a set of recommendations and who knows where that lands in terms of Provincial and Federal government response, right? So we think this is equally, if not even more so, transparent in terms of elected Members going through the entire process and providing rationale for their recommendations.

**MS. WOLFREY:** It couldn't be any worse than the province being the regulator and then telling Nalcor, or telling about the recommendations that came out to put them into place or not, so it can't be any worse than that.

**MS. FORD:** Gary.

**MR. MITCHELL:** It's a great piece of work what's been put together here. I just wonder you're just dealing with the environmental process. I just wonder about the impact agreement where would that kick in?

**MR. SHELDON:** So what I think this does - this was a discussion that I think it was, well, it must have happened even before I moved to Nain is, well, could we just do this through an IBA process? So we

know that for developments on Labrador Inuit lands, Inuit can say yes or no, and could we just sort of do this through an IBA process? I think at the end of the day what was said all along is that this process sets Inuit up to be able to use vast amounts of information to incorporate into an IBA. So when you go for IBA negotiation you don't have to start from scratch. You have had this public process that you can then incorporate into an IBA if the development is going to go ahead and I think it results in a better IBA at the end of the day. So the IBA would be sort of next step if the proposed development and that would be sort of if the Assembly approves it, subject to terms and conditions that, for example, would be one condition, would be the establishment of an impacted benefits agreement.

**MS. FORD:** Patricia.

**MS. KEMUKSIGAK:** I have a question that could be related to department research. For instance, our department could request funds to do research on health and social impacts of a development, for instance. Where would the money come from? Would it come from the proponent?

**MR. SHELDON:** The Standing Committee would develop those public participation, or public funding guidelines, and generally it would come from the proponent, yes. So that's the source of enabling public participation, definitely. And for something like a review of, I don't know, public health impacts, of a proposed development from DHSD, that's something that's really important so that would receive some prioritization, I'm sure, in terms of where the Standing Committee feels that fits in terms of public funding.

**MS. FORD:** Dan.

**MR. POTTLE:** Tom, just a quick question not related to the details, I don't think, of the Standing Orders for the review, itself, but I'm just trying to think forward here, and realistically, in your opinion, given or current capacity, how many reviews do you think we could handle at one time, would recommend us doing?

**MR. SHELDON:** From my calculations I think we could handle in the neighborhood of 15 to 20 at once. No, I'm just joking. No, realistically, in terms of detailed reviews, I think we would be maxing capacity and in the Environmental Review Regulations, not important for the approval of Detailed Reviews here, but one of things that we've established is sort of this first, and it's sort of step zero, which is informal notice, which is a company, if they are thinking about registering, they go to the Minister of Lands and Natural Resources or the Environment Division and say, hey, I think that we're ready to register here, what do you think? And they get some informal non-binding advice from the NG. And the NG could be very frank at that point in time saying, hey, we already have a significant, a complex Detailed Review happening. We're at maximum capacity. We don't see that, us being able to deal with that, until whenever, can you hold off on that registration for six to eight months or something like that? And we know that'll affect companies, but that's just being honest, and I think that's the way it's going to be. So it's good that we have our own process, but I do think that it's going to push our capacity boundaries big time. And we'll never really know until we get into the thick of it, and then we might be sorry, but, no. Yes, so I think one detailed review at a time is where we're going in terms of capacity.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** For registering projects now is that one stop shop too, say that, you know, someone wants to register that project for, Strange Lake, through error, do they have to register with Canada and Nunatsiavut as well, how would that work, that part?

**MR. SHELDON:** So right now let's just say that happened, theoretically. They would register with the Federal and Provincial government. That would automatically trigger our registration, or a registration under our process. We've said that registration Federally and Provincially is a trigger for our process. So it's essentially, it is not quite one stop shopping, but it's essentially, like a domino effect. Okay, yes, you need to register here too. So that triggers our process.

**MS. FORD:** Do anyone else have any questions or comments for Tom? Okay, go ahead, Susan.

**MS. NOCHASAK:** Just to add to that question. In regard to capacity, let's say something like that did happen with Strange Lake and they went to the Provincial or Federal government and he said it would enact ours, right? It'd start up ours, but what if we're already at capacity and we're already working on something else and they had already gone to the Federal and Provincial people?

**MR. SHELDON:** That's a really good question, and that's where I think sort of that's where the informal process to this is really key. It's really key for the Department of Lands and Natural Resources to have really good communication with people on the ground, we know that, but especially companies that we think might be on the verge of registering really, really, really important to have that ongoing dialogue and ongoing communication and to make our abilities and our positions and our capacity issues clear to them. We think at the end of the day the process is better for Inuit, it's better for companies, this is just better regionally, but that informal dialogue and conversation before the formal process actually happens is absolutely key, absolutely key. So I think we're trying to hedge that possibility off by really taking that informal process meaningfully.

**MS. FORD:** Any more questions or comments for Tom? Jim, go ahead.

**MR. LYALL:** No, I just wanted a comment and thank Tom. I think he's done a wonderful job; he's been under pressure ever since we put a deadline on him last fall. He's been working night and day, and if there 36 hours in a day, I'm sure he would have been working a 36-hour day, but I want to thank Tom very much. I think he's done a wonderful job. Thank you, Tom.

**MR. SHELDON:** Well, the other thing is Legal had a huge hand in this. Tom's not a drafter, Legal had a huge hand in this and so did the rest of our department, especially the Deputy Minister. So as with all things it's never just one person. It's a team, right, so.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you, Tom.

**ASSEMBLY:** (Applause)

**MS. FORD:** Because of the time now and the work that we have left to do, could I suggest that we break until 6:30. Okay. So we'll be back at 6:30.

**MS. FORD:** Okay. The Assembly's in session and we'll begin where we left off a couple of hours ago. We're still in Committee as a Whole and right now we'll go through this page-by-page review. Page one, any questions on page one? We're on Contents, page one. Any questions on that page? Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page two. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page three. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page four. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page five. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page six. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page seven. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page eight. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page nine. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page 10. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page 11. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page 12. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page 13. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page 14. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page 15. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page 16. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page 17. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page 18. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page 19. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page 20. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page 21. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page 22. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page 23. Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Do the Assembly agree that the Detail Review Rules are adopted?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you. The Detail Review Rules have been approved and adopted by the Assembly. And we will now reconvene into Assembly. We'll go down to the next item on our Orders of the Day,

which is item number 17, First Reading of Bills. I recognize the Minister of Finance and Nunatsiavut Treasurer, The Honourable Dan Pottle.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. Madame Speaker, I seek unanimous consent to wave Standing Order 49(1) to give first reading to Bill 2012-02 today. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you, Mr. Minister. Members, the Minister is seeking unanimous consent to give first reading to Bill 2012-01 now. Are there any nays? There is none. Mr. Minister, proceed with first reading.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. Madame Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to deliver our Government's 2012-13 Budget. My second as Minister of Finance, Human Resources and Information Technology. Madame Speaker, while we continue to face many challenges as a Government, I am proud to say that we are building for the future and the future of Nunatsiavut on a very sound financial foundation. Madame Speaker, my department has worked closely with other government departments in putting together this year's budget, and I am confident that the initiatives I will announce here today will help charter a course towards prosperity for Nunatsiavut. Madame Speaker, this year's budget was developed with our strategic plan in mind. As the President outlined earlier, our strategic plan will help guide this government over the next three years. We have a vision, one that will strengthen us as a people culturally, economically and socially. In keeping with our commitment to implement our strategic plan, this year's budget strikes a balance between fiscal realities and building for our future. Madame Speaker, for the 2012-13 fiscal year, the Nunatsiavut Government is projecting own source revenues of \$19,962,101. Broken down, Madame Speaker, we expect to receive approximately \$3.2 million in personal income tax, \$1.3 million from self-government funds, \$845,000 in interest revenue, \$2.2 million in GST, \$1.2 million in program revenue, and \$5.5 million from the mining tax royalty, and \$20,000 from the rental of properties. I am happy to report, Madame Speaker, that we also have a surplus of more than \$5.6 million from the last fiscal year. In reviewing income statements for each government department we saved some \$1.5 million, mainly the result of vacancies and less spending on professional fees and travel. As well, we were able to offset some departmental costs with external sources of funding. This careful fiscal management on the part of all government departments, combined with the funds we received from the Implementation and Settlement Trust for the 2010-11 year is the reason for this surplus, Madame Speaker. While negotiations are continuing with the Government of Canada, we are projecting to receive nearly \$40 million from the Fiscal Financing Agreement, which is the backbone of program service delivery for our Government. Our combined revenues for the 2012-13 fiscal year will amount to nearly \$60 million. This, Madame Speaker, represents the highest amount of revenue the Nunatsiavut Government has ever received in any given year. As noted earlier, Madame Speaker, the Nunatsiavut Government is committed to investing in the future. The implementation of our strategic plan, we believe, Madame Speaker, will enable us to address the social and economic needs of our people and our communities. As per the Labrador Inuit Constitution, Madame Speaker, the Nunatsiavut Government is required to maintain a contingency fund. This money may be used by the Executive Council for needing temporary excess of authorized expenditures paid out of the Nunatsiavut Fund over revenues paid into the Nunatsiavut Fund. It can also be used to provide a working balance for the Nunatsiavut Fund to meet



any unforeseen emergencies while responding to an urgent and immediate need to implement a new program or service for the good of Labrador Inuit. I am happy to announce, Madame Speaker that we have budgeted a total of \$360,000 for this fund for the 2012-13 fiscal year. As outlined in our strategic plan, Madame Speaker, there is a need to clarify the roles, responsibilities and mandates between the Nunatsiavut Government, the Inuit Community Governments, and the two Inuit Community Corporations. To that end, Madame Speaker, funding has been set aside to enable the Nunatsiavut Secretariat to hold workshops to clarify our roles, and to produce a working document which will clarify the roles by the end of June of 2012, Madame Speaker. Funding is also being provided to the Secretariat for the maintenance of the electronic registry of Inuit laws. As well, our Communications Division will invest in a photo library of the Nunatsiavut Resource Center. This will allow us to store and maintain our extensive photo and graphic design collection. Madame Speaker, our legal requirements have been steadily increasing resulting in additional pressure on our Director of Legal Services and an increased reliance on external help. As a result, we are committing the necessary funds to hire an additional lawyer for the Government. We are also increasing funding to our Membership committees in order to ensure that they are able to effectively carry out their mandate and to obtain necessary training. As well, Madame Speaker, we have set aside funds to hire a Membership Co-ordinator on a contract basis to co-ordinate the regional Membership list. As a government, Madame Speaker, we are committed to protecting our land, our resources and our environment. The establishment of a permanent fishery specialist position, a \$500 thousand fund for the purchase of fishing opportunities such as quotas or licenses, \$100,000 for research for a second counting fence to be established in the Lake Melville, Rigolet area, as well as the construction of two Quonset huts to store equipment for our conservation officers which will better position the Renewable Resources Division of the Department of Lands and Natural Resources to effectively carry out its mandate. In our Environment Division, Madame Speaker, we are sitting aside funding to create an additional position to assist with the implementation of our Environmental Protection Act and Regulations. We are also increasing our research budget to study the impacts of the proposed Lower Churchill Project. This money will allow us to leverage more research dollars. As well, we are committing \$75,000 to assist with the operation of the Nain Research Centre. With an increasing workload within our Lands Division we are also setting aside funds to hire a permanent lands manager. Madame Speaker, the Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism will see a significant increase in its 2012-13 Budget. A total of \$60,000 will be set aside for the Torngat Recreation Committee. As well, three new positions will be created in the Cultural Division, a permanent archaeological assistant and two part-time language liaison positions in two communities. We will also purchase a number of capital assets such as canoes and outboard motors for the Archaeology Division. This Budget, Madame Speaker, provides for an interpreter/translator conference. Funding for the Language Nest, Family Inuktitut Classes and Inuktitut Speak-Off for learners. We are also committing funds to assist with the restoration efforts at Hebron, for a ceremony at Nutak to mark the relocation of former residents, as well as for the Labrador Inuktitut Training Program. In our Tourism Division, Madame Speaker, we are setting aside funds to extend the product development specialist position, as well as for the marketing programs to enhance our Hebron Ambassador Program. Madame Speaker, the Department of Education and Economic Development will receive an increase for professional fees to meet commitments under the strategic plan. Funding will also be provided for the student program at base camp. Students on Ice, a wage subsidy program, and for the Inuit Bachelor of

Social Work Program as well as for the Community Economic Development Fund. Madame Speaker, the Nunatsiavut Government, through this Budget, will continue to fund much needed infrastructure in our communities. The Torngâsok Culture Centre, once completed, will tell the Inuit story through architecture, design and exhibits in such a way that it will be a compelling reason for visitors to come to Nain, and through the exhibits be inspired to explore the rest of Nunatsiavut, including the Torngat Mountains National Park. Madame Speaker, the Centre will make Inuit proud of our history and our culture and provide others with a better understanding of who we are as a people. The total projected cost of the Torngâsok Culture Centre Project is about \$15 million to be cost-shared equally between the Nunatsiavut Federal and Provincial Governments. It is our hope, Madame Speaker, that this project will be completed by the summer of 2014. To that end, Madame Speaker, I am happy to announce that we have committed a total of \$1.6 million towards this project. This money, combined with funds, we have received from the Tasiujatsoâk Trust represents our one-third share of the costs of the project. We are also setting aside funding to construct a new office complex in Makkovik to house our staff as well as a Daycare Centre and dental clinic. Madame Speaker, we have also provided additional funds to the Nunatsiavut Assembly for a new receptionist position. We are also providing funds to allow for a modest increase in salaries for elected officials. The extra expenditures for the House of Assembly will be offset in part by decreasing constituency allowances as well as professional fees. In conclusion, Madame Speaker, this budget represents a significant investment in our future, increased Government capacity within our communities and enhanced programs and services will ensure increased opportunity for our people and our communities, while at the same time allowing us to follow through with our strategic plan. I trust, Madame Speaker, that the Budget I presented today will have the full support of the Members of the Assembly. Nakummek, Madame Speaker. Madame Speaker, I move, seconded by the First Minister, the Honourable Darryl Shiwak, that Bill 2012-01, the Budget Act, now be introduced and read for the first time. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** The motion is in order. Does anyone wish to speak to the principle of the Bill? Okay. Sorry. The Ordinary Member...

**MR. MITCHELL:** Can I ask a question?

**MS. FORD:** You can talk to the Bill, but there are no questions. Questions can come later.

**MR. MITCHELL:** No, I understand. I can ask the question on the second reading. Is that correct? Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Yes. No one else wishes to speak. No one wishes to speak to the Bill. The Honourable Minister of Finance, would you like to conclude the debate?

**MR. POTTLE** Yes, Madame Speaker, I wish to conclude debate. Nakummek.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you, Honourable Minister. That concludes debate on first reading. Is the Assembly in favor of approving Bill 2012-01 on first reading?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Any nays? The motion is carried and accordingly Bill 2012-01 has had first reading. I would now like to recognize the Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. I seek unanimous consent to wave standing order 49(1) and give first reading to Bill 2012-02 today. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** We're going to break for five minutes.

(Recess)

**MS. FORD:** Our Assembly's back in session. I know now that we're working with our new Standing Orders, so I would like to ask the Honourable Minister of Finance if he would conclude with first reading.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. In accordance with Standing Order 54(3), I seek unanimous consent to wave Standing Order 54(1)(d) to have the Assembly proceed directly to second reading of Bill 2012-01. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek, Honourable Minister. The Minister is seeking unanimous consent to wave Standing Order 54(1)(d) to proceed with second reading of Bill 2012-01, The Budget Act 2012. Are there any nays? There is none. Minister, you have unanimous consent so the Bill can proceed to second reading, which will come up under Item 18. We are still on item number 17, First Reading of Bills. I recognize again the Minister of Finance and Nunatsiavut Treasurer, the Honourable Dan Pottle.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. I seek unanimous consent to give first reading to Bill 2012-02, The Torngat Co-op Loan Guarantees Act 2012 today. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek, Mr. Minister. Members, the Minister is seeking unanimous consent to give reading to Bill 2012-02 now. Are there any nays? There is none. Mr. Minister, proceed with first reading.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. Madame Speaker, I move, seconded by the First Minister, the Honourable Darryl Shiwak, that Bill 2012-01, the Torngat Co-op Loan Guarantees Act 2012 be now introduced and read for the first time. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** The Motion is in order. Does anyone wish to speak to the principle of the Bill? The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. As most Members of this Assembly know, and for the benefit of new Members of the House of Assembly, since 2007 the Nunatsiavut Government has been providing loan guarantees to the Torngat Fish Producers Co-operative Society for their operating line at the Bank of Montreal. We have not had to act on this guarantee since we have been providing the guarantee since 2007. Madame Speaker, in 2007-08 the Assembly approved a loan guarantee for a term of six months of \$600,000 to the Torngat Fisheries Producers Co-operative. In 2008-09 we provided a second loan guarantee for a 12-month term for \$750,000, and that happened in subsequent years in 2009, 2010 and 2011. Madame Speaker, the Provincial Government also provides a \$2.1 million loan

guarantee based on the cash flow projections provided by the Torngat Fisheries Producers Co-operative. They are able to support their operating line without the Government having to provide monetary support. Madame Speaker, our Government is recommending that we provide the loan guarantee to Torngat Fisheries Producers Co-operative for \$750,000 for the term of April 1st, 2012, to December 31st, 2012, as per their request. I ask that the Members of this Assembly support this loan guarantee as we've done in past and given the history that we have not had to support, or they've never defaulted on this, and they've never had to call upon the Government to support their operations, even though we provided that support in the form of a loan guarantee. Therefore, Madame Speaker, I ask Members of the Assembly to support the Bill. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Nakummek, Honourable Minister. Do anybody else wish to speak to the principle of the Bill? If no other member wishes to speak, does the Minister of Finance, Human Resources and Information Technology wish to conclude the debate?

**MR. POTTLE:** Yes, Madame Speaker, I wish to conclude debate. Nakummek.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you, Minister. That concludes debate on first reading. Is the Assembly in favor of approving Bill 2012-02 on first reading?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** The motion is carried and, accordingly, Bill 2012-02 has had first reading. I would now like to recognize the Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. In accordance with Standing Order 54(3), I seek unanimous consent to wave Standing Order 54(1)(d) and have the Assembly proceed directly to second reading of Bill 2012-02. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you. The Minister is seeking unanimous consent to wave Standing Order 54(1)(d) to proceed with second reading of Bill 2012-02, the Torngat Co-op Guarantees Loan Act, 2012. Are there any nays? Minister, you have unanimous consent so the Bill can proceed to second reading and will come up under item 18. We are now on Orders of the Day, number 18, Second Reading of Bills. Mr. Minister, second reading of Bills.

**MR. POTTLE:** Madame Speaker, I move, seconded by the First Minister, the Honourable Darryl Shiwak that Bill 2012-01, the Budget Act 2012, be read for the second time. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** The Motion is in order. I now recognize the Honourable President.

**MR. LYALL:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I request the Assembly convene Committee of the Whole for second reading of Bill 2012-01 and to allow witnesses to appear. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** At the request of the President, the Assembly will now meet as Committee of the Whole for second reading debate of Bill 2010-01. The procedure for second reading debate will be a page-by-page and clause-by-clause review of the Budget. The committee will first consider the annex to the Bill,

page by page, beginning on page seven. Once this has been completed, we will then go page two of the Bill and go clause by clause. If Members have comments or questions on any page of the Bill, you have up to 10 minutes at a time. If you still have questions or comments once other Members have spoken, you will be given another opportunity to speak. If the President, First Minister, or a Minister requires assistance of a witness then please indicate and the witness can come forward and be recognized for the record. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Thank you, Madame Chair. I'd like to call the Deputy Minister to the table to assist with the details, the discussion on the details of the Bill.

**MS. FORD:** Okay. The Annex page of the Bill on page seven. Does everyone agree?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** On page seven, any questions or comments on page seven? All agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** That's the Annex page.

**MR. POTTLE:** Excuse me, Madame Chair?

**MS. FORD:** Yes.

**MR. POTTLE:** If I just may for a minute for the benefit, Madame Speaker, of new Assembly Members who hadn't had a chance to participate in debating the Budget Bill, I'd just like to give a brief explanation of the details on page seven for the benefit of new Members. You'll see we have Annex A, which our Consolidated Financial Plan for the Government beginning April 1st, 2012 and ending on the 31st of March, 2013. We have listed each of the departments of Nunatsiavut Government as well as the Nunatsiavut Assembly, the Inuit Community Corporations and the Inuit Community Government. We've set out the dollar amounts coming out of administration dollars, which is mainly our own sources of revenue for Nunatsiavut Government, and in the second column, you'll see monetary amounts that's provided to the Nunatsiavut Government under the Fiscal Financing Agreement, and the third column is your total combination of Fiscal Financing Agreement contribution dollars and our own sources of revenue for administration.

**MS. FORD:** AngajukKâk for Nain.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Dan, that's what she said just now, but Mr. Minister, I mean to say.

**MR. POTTLE:** For the Committee of the Whole, we don't have to be that formal.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Okay, Dan. Thank you. Now administration is now, just to be certain, and that's what it is, is that's what it's spent on, administration? For instance, like, under Nunatsiavut Affairs, that 4.6 million is under the heading, "Administration," but that does it include capital projects, like, or infrastructure products as well? Okay. So and but it's still...

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Yes.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** ...why does it then say, "Administration"...

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Well, I guess what we could title it is "Own Source Revenue," so these are items that we're funding through our source revenue that you'll see on page nine.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Maybe you can call it that then...

**MS. CRAWFORD:** I can.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** ..."Own Source Revenue," instead of "Administration," because...

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Yes.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** ...when we read that, at least me, I think it said that's what it, how much it takes to run the department, you know? But I guess I'm just commenting so.

**MR. POTTLE:** Yeah. And that is well taken, Tony, but I mean that - those administration dollars include what you see in those amounts there. By way of example, for the Nunatsiavut Assembly, that includes salaries, professional fees, etcetera, for the operation of the House of Assembly, and likewise could be said for Nunatsiavut Affairs. By way of example, the part of the \$4 million includes salaries, professional fees, etcetera, for the Department.

**MR. BARBOUR:** On your opening remarks on first reading of the Budget Bill, 2012, you made reference to the Torngâsok Cultural Centre. You made mention of a lot of funds that is now accumulated for that building has come from Tasiujatsoâk Trust Fund. Now where would I see that, would it be under Nunatsiavut Affairs or under Department Culture, Recreation and Tourism, that Nunatsiavut Government, itself, is putting into that?

**MS. CRAWFORD:** You would find under Nunatsiavut Affairs because the building for Torngâsok Cultural Centre is public property and Nunatsiavut Affairs has responsibility for public property.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Like money that you get from the Trust is considered Own Source Revenue?

**MS. CRAWFORD:** No. Any money that we receive from either a Trust or the Federal Government under, like, a proposal-driven process, that's not part of this Budget Bill because it's monies that we've put out and we get a proposal for - we put a proposal in and we get funding for, and it doesn't have to be included in the Budget Bill, itself.

**MS. WOLFREY:** I thought I had it, but I don't know if you confused me, Rexanne, so in the Nunatsiavut Affairs' portion of this budget, which totals \$8 million, that doesn't include the money for the Cultural Centre is that what you just said?

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Now, one of the things we talked about in, or that the Minister spoke in his budget speech is that our contribution to the Cultural Centre is one third, so 5 million. We've budgeted so much under our Own Source Revenue, which is under page 15 for capital infrastructure. That one

800,000 for this year, you will find under the Budget for Nunatsiavut Affairs. The other 800,000 is the next year and the rest of the funds came from proposals that have been submitted to the Tasiujatsoak Trust.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Tukisivunga. Thank you.

**MS. FORD:** Any more questions? Okay, we're going to page eight. Any questions or comments for page eight? Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page nine. Any questions?

**MR. ANDERSEN:** I didn't quite understand. When you're talking about the mining royalty, I couldn't quite match the figures is all because back here somewhere where you mentioned there was, I think, there was more money than you thought you were going to get there. You budgeted at 1.21 and you received 6.345807. We are budgeting the residual amount of actual funds received.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Yes, plus there - we budget it. So that would be 5.1 million, 6.3 less 1.2.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Yes. A matter of fact and your 5.135807, but that's not the figures here...

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Mm-hmm.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** ...5.522899.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Yes, we've taken in some other monies that we had from deferred revenue from, like, the year before we would have had some surplus dollars so we brought that back into the Budget in the current year.

**MS. FORD:** We're on page nine. Any more questions or comments? Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page 10. Any questions? Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page 11. Any questions? Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** One, sorry, one question there. Go ahead, Wayne.

**MR. PIERCY:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. Go back to page three we've got a surplus of 5.6 million. If you go back then to page 12....

**MS. FORD:** Point of Order here, we're not on page three.

**MR. PIERCY:** Sorry. I'm just trying to make reference to the 5.6 million. Where did that happen to go after, if we're referencing budgeted back to 2011?

**MS. CRAWFORD:** I think if I understand your question, you're looking at the five-year plan. So what we had budgeted in 2011...

**MR. PIERCY:** Yes.

**MR. CRAWFORD:** ...versus where we have a surplus, correct? So our surplus when we look at our actual audited financial statements, things - we may not - and part of the explanation was given by the Minister in speech, so we had \$1.5 million that we had budgeted under departmental budgets that we didn't spend. Part of the reason was come January of last year when we knew we were running a deficit on our NIHB we didn't hire any new positions so we had several director, I think there was three directors positions that were vacant. There were a couple other administration positions that were vacant. We didn't hire because we wanted to try to save as much money as we could. We asked that people only travel absolutely on necessary business. We try to save money that way. So while we have the budgeted numbers here, we haven't gone back and put in actual figures. Other things that happen is when you put in a proposal to the Federal Government, you're always allowed to get 15 percent administration costs, so those go against running our departments and it gives us savings in the end of the day. So this is only what you would have seen if you went back to the Budget Act in 2010, that's what the numbers would have been there.

**MR. PIERCY:** Thank you. I just asked because it was 5.6 million.

**MS. FORD:** Any more questions for page 11? Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye. Page 12. Any questions? AngajukKâk for Nain, go ahead.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** What is that ministerial tour, 15 grand? Is that something new to the Budget or....

**MR. POTTLE:** No, Tony, that's nothing new. That's something that's been there for the last couple of years, and that \$15,000 is budgeted if the President so chooses to do a tour of each of the communities or elsewhere to take the Ministers to meet with the Members of the public or whichever way he wants to use that \$15,000 as part of that ministerial tour.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Have you ever spent it then?

**MR. LYALL:** Yes, well, I don't think we spent it last year, but we spent it - I did a tour in all the communities of in 2008 and part of 2008 and part of 2009.

**MR. POTTLE:** And if it's not spent it just goes back into the general revenue fund and accumulated as part of this year's Budget, or how can I say, not used, but is brought forward into this year's Budget to offset some of the expenditures that we fund ourselves. So that's what we're using. If it's not used, it goes off to set off other expenditures in the budget here next year.



**MS. FORD:** Gary.

**MR. MITCHELL:** Yes. Can those tours include the Upper Lake Melville area because I'm sure there are people up there that'd like to meet the Ministers and the President, other than a campaign?

**MR. LYALL:** I believe that was in 2009. I haven't done any tour since, although we make efforts - we're in the communities. As an executive to meet with the communities, we usually have open houses. We had an open house in 2010, but we had very few people show up.

**MS. FORD:** Any more questions for page 12? Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page...

**MS. CRAWFORD:** If I may, if you go to the financial plan that we had sent out on March 1st, it's actually all one page, and on the Budget Bill it is one page, it's just the printing.

**MS. FORD:** Page 13, anybody got any questions or comments for page 13? Agreed? Oh, sorry, go ahead, Ed.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** Just for clarification purposes, can you tell us what the decrease in the constituency allowances was?

**MR. POTTLE:** That decrease came; we had budgeted in previous years, \$52,000 each for the Ordinary Members for Canada that this year has been cut by \$20,000. So each Ordinary Member for Canada will now receive \$32,000 as opposed to 52.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** It was in the...

**MR. TUTTAUK:** Isn't the overall...

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Yes.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** ...constituency allowances?

**MS. CRAWFORD:** I had to go back. I think I have the Budget Bill from last year here. But the Upper Lake Melville constituency allowance was also reduced, but that was all approved at the December sitting. I think it's 4,000 per member in Upper Lake Melville, 35 or 32 in Canada and the remaining communities, I believe, were, the same. I...

**MR. TUTTAUK:** Yes. Just so whereas, where I can have it in my head, like, what was the actual amount we decreased it by, I can't remember...

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Oh.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** ...what was before?

**MS. CRAWFORD:** It was 182,000 in last year's Budget Bill, and this year it's 100,000. And last year we would have budgeted it at 50, well, a hundred and something for the total for Canadian constituency and we made a significant reduction in there.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** And the AngajukKaat, right, was included last year.

**MR. POTTLE:** Yes.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** And it's too bad that, sadly to see the Canadians have lost a portion of theirs, but it's too bad that you took that money from us, the AngajukKaat, that each of you, six of you over there know that we need that money than any other person in the Assembly, and we didn't get the fair consideration that it could be brought back under a different heading, had to say that.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Again, just going back a couple years, been on two special committees of the Assembly, going back to the fall 2010 and then you again this past fall, first under the Environmental Protection Act, second, on the moratorium question. And when I look at the travel for those committees and I'm assuming each, for all of the Assembly including going to Hopedale and each travel for those Standing Committees and the special committees are we within budget there?

**MS. CRAWFORD:** We have been in the past. The travel, the 141 is travel for the Assembly sittings, and the committees, we've, in the past few years we have been within budget, actually, under budget for the total Assembly.

**MS. FORD:** Any other questions for page 13? Gary, go ahead.

**MR. MITCHELL:** You mentioned that the constituency allowance for us in Upper Lake Melville was cut?

**MS. CRAWFORD:** It was approved in December, 2011 at the Assembly, we approved the policy for elected officials and in the policy it outlined what the constituency allowance was for each constituency. That's based on that. One of the reasons for looking at the Upper Lake Melville one, in particular, as well was amount of use over the last five years. The donation portion is now no longer available. So in looking at those different items, the decision that was brought forth and approved by the Assembly was to reduce Upper Lake Melville as well as Canadian Constituency.

**MS. FORD:** Any more questions for page 13? Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page 14. Any questions for page 14? Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Page 15. Any questions for page 15? Agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** One moment, please.

**MR. BARBOUR:** I just wanted to confirm our earlier question. When I look Torngâsok Cultural Centre, 800,000, 2013 and budget 800,000 for 2014 that would be the Nunatsiavut Government's contribution to that Bill. Thank you.

**MS. FORD:** Any questions for page 16?

**MR. MITCHELL:** What is meant by self-government?

**MR. POTTLE:** Under the Fiscal Financing...

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Sorry.

**MR. POTTLE:** Sorry about that. Under the Fiscal Financing Agreement, that's one of the negotiable items, or dollar amounts that we receive from Canada every year and that's for self-government funds and as per our Fiscal Financing Agreement, once we receive that money, Gary, we can use that for other budgetary items as well. We don't have to use it for self-government, per se.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Just to add, well, we do have to report back to Canada on how use our dollars, fiscal financing. One of the things I'd just like to draw attention, which may be a little bit different than prior years is that this is all projected dollars. We are in negotiations with Canada. They're not finalized and until they're finalized, these numbers are subject to change, but we budget what right now we think and hope we're going to get because if it's not budgeted according to our Financial Administration Act, we cannot spend it.

**MS. FORD:** Any more questions for page 16? Go ahead.

**MR. MITCHELL:** I have a question on the Post-Secondary Education Fund. I guess that's what it is, PSSSP? Now, this is Nunatsiavut's contribution to the program because I understand there's a - negotiations ongoing now for post-secondary funding, like, every five years isn't there, isn't there negotiations every five years for our post-secondary?

**MR. POTTLE:** Not only for post-secondary, but for Health and Social Development by way of example, funds for operating the Inuit Community Government's funds for housing. All those line items that you see there are dollar amounts that we've negotiated every five years under the Fiscal Financing Agreement. So this is not Nunatsiavut Government's own source of revenue, per se. These are dollars that's transferred as a part of our negotiation under the FFA.

**MS. FORD:** Any more questions for page 16? Agreed or, sorry, Wayne, go ahead.

**MR. PIERCY:** Thank you. Under the Education part where we now own 51 percent of Air Labrador, will any of these numbers change for travel?

**MS. CRAWFORD:** These numbers here won't change. This is the money we are getting from Canada. I can't speak to the business side of Air Labrador because it's owned by the Labrador Inuit Capital Strategy Trust, not necessarily as the government. While we hope that there are benefits

transferred back to the beneficiaries, I'm not sure if it's going to be in reduction of rates any more than we have because I still have to operate a sustainable business.

**MR. POTTLE:** And if I may just add to what Rexanne said, we're currently in negotiation and finalizing agreements with Air Labrador for discounted rates so that those agreements have not yet been finalized and there could be some savings to travel and post-secondary, but we still have to wait and see.

**MR. PIERCY:** Thank you for your answer. So if there is any savings in travel, will that be going back to the same pot so that we can have more children or people to go to schooling? Thank you.

**MS. FORD:** Any more questions for page 16? Go ahead.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** I think I've got them lined up right here. Housing. Is that a Torngat housing budget for...

**MS. CRAWFORD:** It's not entirely Torngat regional housing budget because we're still under negotiations with the Government of Canada on housing dollars. They have offered us some dollars, but we're still in negotiations, and it's still not finalized whether it would all go to Torngat Regional Housing Association, or if it would be used for other housing projects. So the title is, "Housing"...but you know that's the amount we're looking at using towards housing projects.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** I'm not sure that I understand you because I know that the Torngat's budget for - they've already made community allocations in terms of numbers of houses and I don't think that it's...

**MS. CRAWFORD:** No.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** ...anywhere close to that, but would you be so kind as to cover that.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Well, there's no decision on that, but we're still in negotiations for that money from fiscal financing. We have asked and are lobbying very hard, as the President spoke about in his speech, for more money for housing, and as we all know the costs of building houses includes capital works money...

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Yes.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** ...so Torngat Housing has done their budget for the year based on the dollars that they received last year. That's the very base that we can look at because that's the very minimum that Canada would give us. They have put on the table an offer for some additional dollars which one of the key priorities for the Government is housing, but along with housing, also goes capital works, so it could be divvied up between the two. We've asked for more money, so we can't say that right now we're going to give \$4.3 million to Torngat. We haven't signed a Fiscal Financing Agreement, but if we don't put it in the budget we can't allocate it. So right now at Torngat has got a budget done up for is what they received last year under the Fiscal Financing Agreement. If we get more money than we can go back to Torngat Regional Housing, if that's a decision to go back and get them to build more houses if there's lots available. I mean, we all know the, the constraints.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Oh, yes, and it wouldn't necessarily have to be spent on, what, the Torngat Housing, or okay. Because you can't really tell us what it's going to be spent on. It may be social housing, it may be...

**MS. FORD:** Okay. I'd like to call the Assembly back to order. Continuing with our Orders of the Day, we're on item number 14. Motions. I recognize the Honourable Minister of Lands to move Motion 225.

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. Whereas the Hopedale Inuit Community Government was issued Inuit freehold title LIL 11C297COT to Labrador Inuit Land Parcel 11C for the purpose of the Berry Road Subdivision Development. And whereas the Nunatsiavut Assembly passed resolution number 2010-05 on October the 5th, 2010 for the issuance of Inuit free hold title to the Hopedale Inuit Community Government for the whole of Labrador Inuit Land Parcel 11C reserving there out and there from four subdivision lot numbers 9-14, 9-15, 9-16 and 9-17, as selected by the Nunatsiavut Government and agreed to by the Hopedale Inuit Community Government, and whereas the Hopedale Inuit Community Government and the Nunatsiavut Government have agreed that the four lots reserved out of the Inuit free hold title should be amended from lots number 9-14 to 9-17 to lot numbers 9-15 to 9-18. Now therefore I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hopedale, the Honourable Susan Nochasak, that the Nunatsiavut Assembly hereby approves an amendment to Inuit freehold title number LIL11C297COT in the name of the Hopedale Inuit Community Government to include the whole of Labrador Inuit Land Parcel 11C, reserving there out and there from four subdivision lot numbers; 9-15, 9-16, 9-17 and 9-18, these four lot numbers will be retained for the Nunatsiavut Government purposes. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you, Minister. The Motion is in order. Mr. Minister, would you like to speak to the motion?

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. Not at this moment.

**MS. FORD:** Does anyone else wish to speak to...

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Thank you, Madame Speaker, I'd like to close debate.

**MS. FORD:** That concludes debate. All those in favor of the Motion?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Any opposed? The Motion is carried. We'll move down to item number 15, First Reading of Bills. There are no first readings today? Item number 16, Second Reading of Bills. Honourable Minister of Finance for second reading of Bills.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. I move, seconded by the First Minister, the Honourable Darryl Shiwak that Bill 2012-02, the Torngat Co-op Guarantees Loan Act 2012, be read for the second time. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MS. FORD:** The Motion is in order. The procedure for second reading debate will be any general comments on the Bill, and then we will proceed with a clause-by-clause review of the detail of the Bill. We start on page 16, sorry, 3. Okay. Page two, clause one, Short Title. All agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Clause two, Definitions. All agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Clause three, Conflict with Inuit Law. All agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Clause four, Authority to Guarantee the Payment of Torngat Co-op's Obligation. All agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Clause five, Maximum Amount and Purpose of Loan Guarantees. All agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Clause six, Term of Guarantee. All agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Clause seven, Security Required for Guarantees. All agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Clause eight, Access to Financial Records. All agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Clause nine, Additional Terms and Conditions and Recovery of Costs. All agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Clause 10, Payment of Guarantee. All agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Clause 11, Borrowing to Pay Guarantee. All agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Clause 12, Guarantees to be a Charge on the Fund. All agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Clause 13, Acquisition and Alienation of Property Given as Security. All agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Clause 14, Execution of Instruments. All agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Clause 15, Repeal of Torngat Loan Guarantees Act 2011. All agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** Clause 16, Coming into Effect. All agreed?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** That concludes the clause-by-clause review of the Bill. Does the Minister wish to conclude the debate?

**MR. POTTLE:** Yes, Madame Speaker, I'd like to close debate. Nakummek.

**MS. FORD:** Thank you. That concludes debate. All those in favor of second reading of Bill 2012-02?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MS. FORD:** All those opposed? The Motion is carried. Accordingly, Bill 2012-02, the Torngat Co-op Guarantees Loan Act has had second reading. Number 17 on the Orders of the Day, Assent to Bills. Mr. President, the Assembly has given second reading to Bill 2012-01 and Bill 2012-02 and wish to present them for assent.

**MR. LYALL:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. Madame Speaker, Members, as President of Nunatsiavut, I wish to assent to Bill 2012-01, the Budget Act 2012, and Bill 2012-02, the Torngat Co-op Guarantees Loan Act 2012, and hereby sign them into law.

**MS. FORD:** Order, please. We're going down on our Orders of the Day, number 18, Adjournment. Right now I would like to recognize the Honourable President.

**MR. LYALL:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I rise at this time. I have a couple of announcements I want to make, both of which I don't really want to do. I received a letter of resignation from Minister Nochasak. She's resigning as Minister as of 5:00 p.m. today. She's resigning for personal reasons. I'll have subordinate legislation here where our Minister, the First Minister will take over as Minister of Education, and he'll have all the powers, the functions and responsibilities of the Minister of Education and Economic Development of the Nunatsiavut Government including, without limitation, the powers, functions and responsibilities assigned to the Minister of Education and Economic Development under the Nunatsiavut Government Organization's Order. I hereby transfer to the First Minister of Nunatsiavut, who shall, until further ordered, have and exercise all the powers, functions, and responsibilities of the Minister of Education and Economic Development. I also wish to announce today

that I won't be seeking re-election the next election. This is my last Assembly. It's difficult, but I find that, I feel that I've accomplished a lot by four years and I'm really pleased just to hand out just the Strategic Plan for the Nunatsiavut Government. I think we have to keep in mind that we're the Government of Nunatsiavut, that we're working for the beneficiaries of Nunatsiavut and all of our aims and objectives, whatever we can do for our people in our region, I hope that you will continue to serve our Government well and I certainly support you all. Thank you very much.

**ASSEMBLY:** (Applause)

**MS. FORD:** That concludes this sitting of the Assembly in Nain, and I would like to thank the people of Nain and particularly the support we have been provided with by the staff in the administration building. You have helped make things a lot easier. It was also good that a number of the Members were able to be with family and visit friends. I would also like to acknowledge, Mary Sillett, her assistant, Hilda Hunter, and David Hamilton, who always provide us with excellent support and guidance. The premier film title, "Till We Meet Again," will be shown here at 1:00 p.m. The Charter is expected to arrive here at 3:00 p.m. The Assembly is now adjourned. Safe travels home.