



Nunatsiavut kavamanga  
Nunatsiavut Government

SECOND ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NUNATSIAVUT

---

FIRST SESSION

1st SITTING

---

**KAVAMALIGJET  
KAJITITSIUTINGA**

**PARLIAMENTARY  
REPORT**

*September 13th, 2011*  
Speaker: Honorable Patricia Ford

**In Attendance:**

Speaker of the Nunatsiavut Assembly and Ordinary Member for Canada, Honorable **Patricia Ford**

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

President of Nunatsiavut, Honorable **Jim Lyall**

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

Minister of Health and Social Development, Ordinary Member for Upper Lake

Melville, Honorable **Patricia Kemuksigak**

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

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

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 Canada, Honorable **Daniel Pottle**

Ordinary Member for Nain, **William Barbour**

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

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

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 the Nunatsiavut Secretariat, Secretary to the Executive Council, **Kate Mitchell**

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

Deputy Minister of Education and Economic Development, **Tim McNeill**

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

Acting Director of Communications, **Bert Pomeroy**

Director of Legal Services, Loretta **Michelin**

Clerk of the Assembly, **Mary Sillett**

**Absent:** Ordinary Member for Upper Lake Melville, **Keith Russell (leave of absence)**

*The Nunatsiavut Assembly proceedings  
were recorded in Inuktitut and English.*

*September 13, 2011*

*Assembly commenced at 9:00 a.m.*

**MADAM SPEAKER:** I'd like to ask John Jararuse to open this session with a prayer.

**ASSEMBLY:** Amen.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Nakummek, John. We'll move to number 3, Announcements and Recognitions from the Chair. Section 25 of the Nunatsiavut Assembly Act states, the term of office of the Deputy Speaker shall be for one session of the Assembly, only except that a Deputy Speaker may be re-appointed by the Speaker for additional sessions. Denise Lane was appointed in March, 2011 to be the Deputy Speaker for the balance of the spring session. So for the fall session I'd like to re-appoint Denise Lane to remain as Deputy Speaker of the Nunatsiavut Assembly. Do you accept, Denise?

**MS. LANE:** Yes, I do.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** I'd like to recognize the interpreters, John Jararuse and Wilson Jararuse. Robert Ford is here from IT. From the OK Society are Mitchell White and Sarah Abel. Our pages are Priscilla Nochasak and Davidee Ningeok. Our laborers are Frankie Sillit and Davidee Ningeok. Our helpers are Nancy Rose and Victoria Winters. For travel and administrative questions, please contact Hilda Hunter. I'd like to welcome the visitors in the gallery. Keith Russell, the Ordinary Member for Upper Lake Melville is on leave of absence and will not be present at this sitting. We offer our congratulations to Max Winters, as the successful candidate in the NunaKatiget Inuit Corporation by-election, and President Lyall will administer the Assembly Member's Oath of Office. I now recognize the Honourable President. (Max Winters, Chair of the NunaKatiget Corporation, was sworn in at this time by President Lyall). The presenters for the Implementation Settlement will be Isabella Pain, Rexanne Crawford, President Lyall and Minister Dan Pottle. The presenters for the Tasiujatsoak Trust will be Isabella Pain, President Lyall and Minister Dan Pottle.

**MR. LYALL:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I request that the Assembly convene a Committee of the Whole to hear presentations from Implementation Settlement and Tasiujatsoak Trust and Labrador Inuit Capital Strategy Trust. I request that the Speaker would Chair the Committee. Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Thank you, Honorable President. The Assembly will now convene as a Committee of the Whole to have witnesses from the Trusts and to make presentations.

**MR. LYALL:** Madame Speaker, I would suggest that we might take a five-minute break. I think that the Chair, the people presenting the Trust will be here very shortly.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Okay. We'll take a recess for five minutes.

**MS. PAIN:** ...being in place and getting that up and running, and we don't have our financials done yet for this coming season. We think we did better than we did last year. We probably did not make a profit this year either, but what we're hearing in the tourism industry is when you come out with a new product and new destination, it will take probably up to five years before you start attracting the right kind of visitor and generating enough buzz out there in the market to get the people you want to make a profit. So we're hoping, and we will know pretty soon whether or not we did better than last year which, from the looks of things, we think we did, and so we'll keep on improving and keep on learning. There's been lots of promotion around that whole base camp. We got some really positive news out there this summer when people were up there and did the Salikulikri RE-Burial and on APTN, Ozzie Michelin did some stories, which were really, really good promo pieces almost for the base camp. They came across really, really well and we had a number of writers up there who will be hosting some events on CBC, who'll be getting this story out as well about the base camp. So we think it's an opportunity to improve but, no, we didn't make a profit last year and we don't think we did this year, but I don't think the losses are such that we need to cut that business yet. We think that we have to give it a few more years to see whether or not it can become profitable as a tourism destination.

**MS. KEMUKSIGAK:** Thank you. My second question is: have you ever considered partnering with the Innu Nation Business?

**MR. THORBOURNE:** I guess the answer is yes, on a number of different levels. We are partnered with the Innu Nation on a couple of small joint ventures. There's helicopter joint venture with the Innu and ourselves, and both Canadian and Universal Helicopters. There's also a fuel joint venture that we have a small percentage in that is a joint venture with the Innu Nation as well. So those are existing ones that we're doing now. We are in talks with them, not talks, but we meet with them on a fairly regular basis to look at other potential opportunities to work together. Sometimes it will make sense, and other times it won't make sense, but so our task is to find the ones where it's a win-win, and in situations where it isn't then, you know, we go our separate ways.

**MR. DAVIS:** Okay. So this is a bit of the foundation of moving forward for the Nunatsiavut Group of Companies. It sounds a little benign to say we want to create a for profit company, but as I mentioned earlier in the presentation, LIDC, while it was holding itself out as a for profit company, its mandate, itself, was somewhat contradictory and, at the same time, its operations didn't necessarily demonstrate that it was a for profit company. So in this particular case, we are looking at creating a for profit company, being the Nunatsiavut Group of Companies, which is a bit of a holding company over all the interests that we actually have. What we want to do is certainly retain our subsidiary companies, those that we see as profitable, are actually doing well right now, and those with potential as well, maybe not hitting where we, they should be, but those with potential to actually turn around and grow. We're looking at appointing a professional board for the Nunatsiavut Group of Companies, which will be, in turn, accountable to the trustees, and then the board, itself, would obviously hold management accountable for its profitability, and we're looking at three members of LICST to be on that initial board, and then two other members who may or may not be beneficiaries, but someone certainly with the skill set in business who would be able to provide his or her expertise for that particular entity. , go ahead.

**MS. WOLFREY:** So is the Labrador Inuit Development Corporation, is it dissolved, or will it be dissolved, or where's that at?

**MR. DAVIS:** So we'll get into that. What we'll be doing is essentially parking it, and there are a number of different tax issues and some legal issues that actually would have to be addressed. We're going to be moving some of those assets that are not fully utilized, sort of talk Post Mill Lumber and etcetera, but it, we'll be addressing that over time, so...

**MR. JACQUE:** Thank you. I was just wondering about, you mentioned earlier about the temporary closure of TUC and Hopedale Stone Plant. Do you foresee those projects coming forward again and, if so, when or how long? Thank you.

**MR. DAVIS:** So as we mentioned before, obviously, there was a strong reason why we had to temporarily close it. We, in our briefing, with Executive Council, as a condition of the closure, we actually agreed to engage in an exploration program to determine the economics of the quarry, itself. We wanted to see what the quality of the stone was, and so that's the whole purpose of engaging in that particular exploration right now. The exploration, itself, we expect to take for another couple of weeks. We'll determine what the quality of the product is, and if there's a strong business case, then we'll make a decision as to whether or not we'll open it up for the upcoming season.

**MS. PAIN:** Just to add a little bit to that, one of the things we found in our last year of operation with the quarry was that we were running into a lot of stone that had discoloration or fractures. A lot of the rock was fractured and wasn't of the quality that we could actually sell. So one of the things we're doing with this particular exploration program is drilling to test out, number one, whether or not it's colored, you know the yellow discoloration you sometimes see in the stone that we have. If that's what we're going to encounter in these new areas that we're looking at, or if there's an extensive fracturing in the new areas that we're looking at. So those are two other things that we're looking at, as you know, what the quality of the stone is because we've, quite frankly, had difficulty selling some of the stone that didn't have the high quality of some of the initial stone that we found.

**MR. DAVIS:** So just building on the previous slide about looking at the purpose and the role of the Nunatsiavut Group of Companies again, the holding company, LICST, as I mentioned earlier, we have a very expanded mandate, so it's not just simply business-oriented, but we're also, we're required to look at some of the more socio-economic opportunities that exist for Nunatsiavut and supporting beneficiaries in that way. We're going to be able to pursue that, but we're going to be separate and distinct from Nunatsiavut Group of Companies as well. Any of the excess money capital that we would actually generate from some of our subsidiaries after ploughing money back into reinvestment into our businesses, some of that money would be channeled back to LICST so that we can meet that larger mandate, be it, sort of job creation programs. We'll probably work very closely with the Nunatsiavut Government to determine what the need is for some of our beneficiaries, which will expand beyond our corporate side.

**MS. PAIN:** Just in terms of that, I can give you a real example.....one of the things that we're requested to do almost every year is to bring wood on the barge to some of our communities and, quite

frankly, that's a really expensive venture, because somebody has to pay, for, number one, the barge, the vessel, the staff, the fuel, and that runs us the operation of the barge. Tug and barge costs us...four thousand a day. So somebody has to actually cover those costs of four thousand a day, and we know that Nunatsiavut Government expects us to do it and wants us to do it, and at the same time beneficiaries need it, but we're spending-, up until now we've been spending money that we don't actually have. Because it's not something that we're, you know, we can't just do it and have it cost nothing. So what our vision is that once we have companies that are operating and making a profit, the money can come back to ICST where we can turn it back in and actually do some of that good stuff for our communities and for our beneficiaries.

**MR. DAVIS:** So it'd be almost like a dividend that a company would pay its shareholders. A company would only pay its shareholders a dividend provided that actually has the money to, in order to do that. You want to take that excess capital and reinvest it into some of your operations. Above and beyond that, if you had the money for dividend, that's what they would do, and that's what we would see here. We actually did quite a bit of work on sort of setting the strategic, I guess, direction for Nunatsiavut Group of Companies and we are able to, and we're very excited, I'm very excited about this, just simply because I don't think we've sort of done this before, and this is something which, actually, really establishes the identity of any company that exists across the world. So we did quite a bit of work on trying to identify our mission vision and core values, and so, as many of you probably know, the mission is, essentially, describing what you're all about. The vision is where you want to be, and your core values is what do you consider important. So and it's not an easy, as all of you know, it's not an easy thing to be able to identify. This year, actually, I wanted to have it as a little bit of I guess, an elevator speech and, and something where everyone, all employees for Nunatsiavut Group of Companies, can relate to something like this, right? So, obviously, with our mission to create wealth and trust for Nunatsiavut beneficiaries by owning profitable, sustainable businesses, so not only profitable, but sustainable, making sure that they are ongoing as well as probably working in balance with the environment, as well as our values. We want to be an Inuit-led business leader in the north, and some of our core values are culturally respectful, socially responsible, accountable, open, transparent, etcetera. So this is what we envision a new org structure, and this goes to your question earlier about what would actually happen to LIDC in the short term. So we don't see, sort of, the relationship where you actually have a formal kind of day-to-day operational relationship with Nunatsiavut Government. We still have that dotted line. With ICST, ICST would certainly be that organization overseeing Nunatsiavut Group of Companies, and what we're looking at is certainly restructuring some businesses and creating new businesses. So some of the new ones that you actually see are, are Nunatsiavut Marines, so some of our assets utilizing that with tugs and barges. CAI Nunatsiavut Marine. So that's obviously the Operation of Northern Ranger, Sir Robert Bond, and all the coastal services that we have right now, and as James mentioned earlier some of the activities from Post Mill Lumber, we would actually transform that into Nunatsiavut Construction. You see that there's other operations that we currently have that are making money clearly with PAL, I guess, the Innu Mikun? No. The Innu, Innu Joint Ventures and so on. So any questions about this, unless you wanted to make here some comments? ?

**MR. ANDERSEN:** The fishing licenses quota, I was going to ask, I suppose, because we have not heard how the talks are going lately with the Torngat Fish Producers, who operate the in shore plants, and have been losing money forever and a day, but in the past they have held some quotas, shrimp license. You have half a one, I think, and I also have some turbot core, of course, some crab, and I wonder those discussions, how are they going? I mean, what you have listed there is fishing licenses quota. It doesn't talk about that when we were last updated on it, what we had to call, I suppose, and the one fishing entity for Nunatsiavut which included in shore/off shore. And they know that there have been some discussion between Nunatsiavut and the LIDC and Torngat Fish Producers Co-operative, but it's been just silent now for at least for at least one year, and in that structure it shows, I guess it doesn't show what our expectation was at least back a year ago.

**MR. DAVIS:** So we came together in a meeting in St. John's and the three parties, like you said, Tony, came together with Nunatsiavut Government, ICST and Torngat, and the discussion was to create a bit of a working group to see, to do an analysis of the proposal, itself, for one fishing entity to see whether or not it would fit within all of our respective interests and so that work was done and the recommendation that came back was to have more of an administrative arrangement, I believe, so not necessarily going down the road of a, one fishing entity. Did you want to (track goes silent) Oh.

**MR. THORBOURNE:** So discussions have been underway since I started back in January on the one fishing entity. The sort of the path that they're following at the moment is not creating one corporate entity, but to have a number of management agreements so that the resources are managed together and to gain the efficiencies and the buying power and the management power of doing that and having it happen under one roof, with the input of all of the people that have assets. We have some of the quotas. We have some of the licenses, as do others. So throw them all into one pot, manage them together, but don't throw them all into the same company and, and have one corporate entity, but keep the various shareholders as part of one group with the efficiencies that that brings. That's the rule that they're following at the moment, and I know they're making progress. I can't tell you what the date is for consummating all of that, but I know that they're working towards that.

**MS. PAIN:** I'm not sure if Rexanne and Carl are both here and they've been working on that working group from Nunatsiavut side. I don't know if it's appropriate, or if, if they want to answer, or,

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Yes. No. That's okay. It's, that's pretty good, I mean, I could have asked the questions, I suppose, to the Minister at a different time? I mean, I'll tell the Minister that, you know, there was the discussion that was going on between Nunatsiavut, LIDC and the Torngat Fish Producers was.....it came from this Assembly and should be reported back to this Assembly in a, you know a timely manner.

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Thank you, Tony. I'm sure this will be a part of our discussions at later during the Assembly.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Very good.

**MR. POTTLE:** One thing that we see all the time in Nunatsiavut, in particular, and I think it's related to some of the social things that maybe LICST could be doing in future to, I guess, give a better quality of life to our people from a social perspective and where I'm leaning towards is food. We all know that people need to eat. We all know the high cost of food and the state of food coming into Nunatsiavut, whether they're outdated, they're rotten, they're what have you. I mean, is there any plans from LICST's perspective to get into that, I guess, wholesale business with respect... or co-ops to be able to provide a better quality of food and service to the residents in Nunatsiavut?

**MR. THORBOURNE:** Thanks. They pass the mic to me because that's one of the things that I said that we should be looking at when I first started. My previous life with the Inuvialuit we had a grocery chain and smaller grocery stores in some of the remote communities in the western arctic, specifically for that purpose. So I can say, yes, we are looking at and are exploring a number of opportunities. Nothing-, we haven't agreed on one yet, but we are very much looking at it because we think there's room there to provide a better product, faster and higher quality for people on the coast.

**MR. PIERCY:** Is there any reason why we're not partnered up with Air Labrador, seeing as the Innu is paired up with Provincial Airlines because every time somebody steps or flies with Provincial, they're getting a portion of their fees, right?

**MR. THORBOURNE:** I don't think it's any secret that we've been having some discussions obviously with both airlines and about a year ago, was that right, Isabella, or a little over eighteen months we actually had, the three trustees had a discussion with Executive Council and so it came, we got the message loud and clear from Executive Council that getting into air transportation was a very important thing, or would be considered a very important thing for our beneficiaries on the coast. We certainly took that to heart and basically said that we certainly would want to do that, provided that there's a strong business case for it as well. So the first course of business is that we actually hired expertise because none of us were experts in the airline's market, or the airline industry, and determined whether or not there was actually a market here. The result of that study was, in fact, there is the potential for a market here. Clearly, if one airline actually has a monopoly, that's a great market, but even if there is that level of competition that both airlines could actually survive. So, and your question's an excellent one because as we told the story about the situation we were in in 2010, where we were sort of on the verge of bankruptcy clearly getting access to capital, to money, dealing with some of our HR challenges and stuff, as you can imagine, that took priority over determining whether or not we could actually purchase an airline or become a partner in an airline or something like that. So we kind of went through that. Our financial situation is on the mend and starting to improve and so we've, as I said, we've been having some discussions and I think, needless to say, we'll probably come out with some sort of decision over the next eight weeks or so.

**MS. PAIN:** Yes. Can I just add one thing? You asked about, you know, commenting on whether or not we're going to get in with Air Lab because the Innu actually had a partnership already with PAL. One of the things we were actually looking at, we've explored both airlines. We've looked at a partnership with Air Labrador, but we've also looked at a partnership with Innu Mikun and the Innu Nation because it goes to one of the things that Minister Kemuksigak talked about was a relationship with the Innu



Nation.....so that is not going to be the deciding factor, but we wanted to explore that option as well so that we're looking at partnering, as a possible partnering. So we're exploring all options, as Clint says we're going to be probably making some decisions in the next few months about whether or not we're going to be getting into the airline business.

**MS. GEAR:** Yes. I was just wondering about Post Mill Lumber. What do you see the future of Post Mill Lumber as? Do you see it maybe as more of a construction company or what?

**MS. PAIN:** For Post Mill Lumber one of the issues we've had is that there's not really a forestry industry there anymore. It was originally created to deal with the forestry and produce forestry products dealing with timber. There's not a huge market for that anymore and the direction that Post Mill Lumber has been going in is more of a construction company so they've been doing the- we acquired a rock crusher. They've been doing the crushing of all the gravel for the Inuit Community Governments and for the community needs. We're looking at continuing that mode for Post Mill and turning them into Nunatsiavut Construction and continuing with the crushing and the aggregate, putting together aggregate that can be used by the Inuit communities, but also the larger water and sewer issues if we can find the right partner to work with them to do some of those kinds of things in the Inuit Communities to take advantage of the work that we have in the Inuit Communities, but also using our own beneficiaries to do the work. So in terms of forestry, there's not really much demand for forest products at the moment.

**MS. WOLFREY:** I am, I too, I was on a plane one day too and I was reading Atlantic Business and it was talking about the forestry industry in Nova Scotia and it's not just about lumber anymore. It's about those wood pellets and about all those other kinds of things and are we going to-, because I think that Rigolet got a lot of trees too. And are we going to look at some kind of stuff that can sustain our communities too because it isn't-, and I'm told that the wood around Rigolet is no good for lumber, but is certainly good for burning. We all burns wood and there's these pellet stoves, and like we got to be thinking beyond, beyond just those kinds of things, I think, and thinking of new things, but-, and one of the concerns, I mean, I know when you're talking about the Labrador Inuit Capital Strategy Trust, or whatever it's called, you're talking about our beneficiaries, but I think that we got to remember that we got five communities that need to somehow sustain themselves, and I think that this, that the businesses that we're making and stuff, you know, we should start to look at what we can do in the communities so that because we're not going to be sustainable like we are. We're going to be all retirement communities with all our children gone, if we don't look at some kind of something for our communities.

**MR. THORBURNE:** With respect to the wood pellets, it is something that we are not really closely looking at yet, but what we have found is that where they've been successful, they've usually been associated with a saw mill where they generate as a bi-product, wood chips, or saw dust and then that is taken and created into the wood pellets. The, the ones that are, that are made just from cutting trees and drying the trees and either dry the, the wood to a certain level of dryness so that it will burn well later, are more difficult to do at a, in a profitable way. So typically you see them associated with a

lumber-type industry and using the, the by-product of the saw mill. Not to say that we're not wanting to look at it closer, but that's what we've sort of come across so far.

**MR. DAVIS:** But, certainly, I mean, I take your, we take your point as well in terms of when we're looking at some of the businesses, what are the positive impacts on the communities, and I think without a doubt, when you look at our trust mandate and what we're required to do as trustees, and Nunatsiavut Government beneficiaries of the claim are the beneficiaries of our Trust and so we're working to the best of our ability for your specific interests and the interests of the beneficiaries. So when we go through our criteria to determine what business to invest in, we do take into account the positive impact on the community 'cause we-, sorry. Okay because we do want to see these sustainable businesses. It makes no sense to be in a situation where you're losing your top talent in your youth, right, and you become a retirement community so....

**MS. PAIN:** Just one addition to what James said about the wood pellets. That is an item that the Innu Nation has approached us to discuss. I mean, we know that they're looking at it as well, especially in relation to lower Churchill and what might happen there. They've been looking at that. So they have raised that with us as a discussion item. We haven't moved forward on that with them at this point, but it is there on the table. And in relation to the communities, one of the things we do realize fully is that we do have a mandate to look at opportunities for all of our communities and for the entire region, and so that's not lost on any of the trustees that we have that we have to try and look all of our communities.

**MR. JACQUE:** Thank you. I'm just wondering about banking services or Credit Unions. This has been a demand in our communities for quite some time. I'm just wondering if any work has been completed there, or where do we stand? Thank you.

**MR. THORBOURNE:** The one that we're looking at, specifically, is in Nain, and the existing facility at the post office is-, the post office doesn't really want to do it anymore. So we've actually signed, began the process with the Bank of Montreal to look at the possibility of us providing that service to the people in Nain. After we find the right model that works, then we would look at moving that model to other communities along the coast. I wanted to add something to what Clint and Isabella said if that's okay. And I want to talk from a general perspective and from the perspective of someone coming into the scenario that we have here. I want to tell you why it's exciting and why I think, ultimately, over the next several years we can do some really good things. I mean, look at this chart. We see a bunch of companies there, but the really strong situation that we're in is that we have two really strong things going for us. We have a lot of assets that are good assets and they weren't used to their, to generate a lot of profit in the past. They were used and people have the skills to use them but, but part of making a business profitable is to take your assets and to put them to work. So this Nunatsiavut Construction that you see there is going to have assets from Post Mill Lumber and TUC. It's going to have something like five excavators, a couple of bulldozers, a couple back hoes, three or four cranes, some T-Rex dump trucks. My original training was in engineering and that's great stuff. You can do water and sewer projects. You can build roads. You can move a lot of dirt. So the hard assets are there. The skills are there. People know how to use the equipment and there are opportunities there. There are mines that

are going to need to build the things. There's construction in Goose Bay. All of the ingredients are there to make this work and to without coming, inventing new things right away, we can take the stuff that we have and put it to work and help us get into a healthier profitable situation and build our balance sheet. Then when you have a good income stream coming in, then I think, as Clint and Isabella has been saying, then we can start looking at some of the things that may not make the really high margins but maybe really good things, sustainable things to do in the communities like a pellet plant, or like things that may not be as high profit, but you can still sort of break even or do a little bit better, but you need to be in a strong financial position to do that. And what I see that makes me excited is that the ingredients are there in this region and the assets in this company to pull up and to put all of that together. The other examples are our two tugs and our two barges. When they started working in the commercial charter market last fall they generated about a million dollars of earnings for LIDC and then saved them. You know.....we don't need to worry about making payroll these days. We're not loaded rich, and we're still actually into our line of credit, but it's a whole lot better than what it was a year ago and the primary reason for that is using these assets that were already within the organizations and putting them to work. So that's what I think the opportunity is and I think the room to make profits from the assets and have profits to use to other things, I think is great in this scenario. That's it, so... Tony, you have a question there?

**MR. ANDERSEN:** The worse thing to ask, or about, I mean, in the Group of Companies, it's not on your-, like, ever since the Voisey's Bay boom there has been, started to notice that there is opportunities for mining.....and, you know, it's encouraging news from Strange Lake and....you know. I'm not suggesting that you start, do not set up uranium today, but, you know, what, whether it's exploration or even to be joint venture with juniors or more senior companies even in, is there some talk there, or is there...

**MR. DAVIS:** Certainly, as a part of our meetings that we have, Tony, we try to have a monthly meeting and then we also try to do quarterly face-to-face meetings and James and his team kind of comes forward with some of our different opportunities that would exist and, needless to say, we do see that this is starting to bubble up, right? And we're trying to make sure that we actually have the right, sort of, companies in place in order to capitalize on whatever happens out of the whole uranium industry here in Nunatsiavut. We've spoken about exploration. We haven't had a formal proposal for consideration. On the, on, personally, for me, exploration is-, my understanding of it is it's very risky. It's high risk. Exploration companies, they don't make money, right? They actually spend it because they actually have to go out and they drill it, and if they find something, that's when they sell it. They have no intention at all ever to have an operating mind. They sell their interest and that's where they actually make their money and they go ahead and do it all over again. Is that something we'd explore? I think at this point I'd say, look, we're going to look at anything provided it meets certain criteria and it work in the best interest of beneficiaries and for Nunatsiavut Government, that's what we'll do so, but certainly Isabella has brought up the whole opportunity around exploration a couple times and that's what, sort of, where we're at. Max.

**MR. WINTERS:** Yes. The PAIL contract will be coming up very shortly, I think, and we have a quite a number of beneficiaries working with Nasittuq. Has the LICST entered the contract, or the bidding?

**MR. THORBOURNE:** The trustees haven't directly, but I'm on the board of PAIL. Chris Webb is on the, the management committee for Nasittuq, which is the name of the joint venture between PAIL and Atco that actually does the operations and maintenance of the North Warning System. So, that very issue has been very topical for the last couple years. We've met with Government, meaning DND, Public Works, and Government Services to explain to them why it's a good idea to re-award the contract to the existing entity. They are under some pressure to go to a competitive bid and the positive thing for them in re-awarding it is that PAIL and Nasittuq have achieved very high levels of Inuit content in the work force and because PAIL means equity ownership in that company for the various Inuit organizations, we, we get around 450 - \$500,000 of cash every year because of our 18 percent ownership in PAIL, and that money comes back to the region to support the various activities that happen. So, you know, our lobbying and our discussions with the Government to try to re-award it to us are based on those points and we hope that that's what's going to happen. However, if they feel the pressure that they really need to go to a competitive bid, they will, and Nasittuq is preparing themselves, making themselves lean and mean so that they can be competitive in a bid should that happen. That decision will be made some time next spring. Chris Webb and I were in Ottawa just the other week and met with the Lieutenant-Colonel in charge of the project and they'll make the decision over the next three or four months as to whether they're going to go to competitive bid or not. So that's where it's at.

**MR. DAVIS:** How are we doing? Are we doing okay for time? Okay. Because we have about six slides left, so we'll just-, so this slide is something which is extremely important because, if anything, it does differentiate our Group of Companies, our Trust from many other aboriginal development corporations that exist across Canada, and I can tell you that based upon the experience I have. I think there's at times, you know, a tendency for all of us to be able to think about, you know what, this business sounds like a great idea, let's jump into it. But the critical thing, I think, for us is to make sure that we actually have set criteria to determine where we're going to invest our capital, our money, and who we're going to partner with, if it is a partnership, and to do the due diligence about the particular industry. And so some of the things-, this is the first time we've ever had something like this, and as I, can tell you before, very few aboriginal development corporations across Canada actually has something like this. So this will actually make us a leader in terms of how we're going about our particular business decisions. We've received different proposals on a regular basis that would, wouldn't come near some of the criteria that's determined, and so having something like this enables us to kind of weed through what we see is not the most preferable proposals and actually try to focus on where we think we're going to be able to make some money. Right off the bat we actually have a hurdle rate of above 15 percent. That means that we want to make sure that whatever we invest we earn 15 percent on that per annum. We want to see some positive cash flow. Everyone will tell you cash is king. We want to be able to generate cash for distribution to the shareholder. In this particular case, it'd be LICST to meet our expansive mandate. We want to see some diversification of our portfolio. The worst thing you can do in a business is to put all your eggs in one basket. We want to make sure that we can actually tap into and have businesses that are covering a number of different industries, which give us a competitive advantage here in Nunatsiavut. Manageable business risks, you're not going to go into business if you're not willing to take risk, right? So now there's no-, if anyone ever tells you, tells you something that this is a sure thing, chances are it's not a sure thing. So we have to absorb some risk and when we're looking

at partnerships and joint ventures, we actually have to make sure our goals as a shareholder are aligned with the other shareholder as well. I think we've had some horror stories of some of the past partnerships we've had. A perfect example is what Isabella made reference to in terms of the Pharma Save. Clearly, that was a situation where the shareholder goals were not aligned, and if we had utilized this particular investment criteria, the situation could have been different. Some of the goals that we think about in terms of our shareholder goals, we want to take into account that whenever we actually have a business, is there going to be a positive impact on beneficiaries who own their own businesses? Is there a way that we can actually flip them business as well so that everyone benefits? I don't think it's a positive thing that ultimately down the road that the Nunatsiavut Group of Companies owns all the businesses in all the communities because essentially we're like a Crown corporation. You're going to create sustainable communities once you have a vibrant, entrepreneurial environment and that means individuals that own specific businesses. What's going to be the impact on the environment? Obviously, Inuit are seen as, and we pride ourselves in the fact we're stewards of the land. There's no sense for us to actually engage into some businesses which will have a devastating impact on the environment if we know full well that it will have. As well as, is there a positive impact in terms of employment opportunities for our beneficiaries? So those are some of the things that we're actually thinking about, and we'll be listing this particular criteria, so that when this will be the criteria that's going to govern us to make the decisions to meet the interests of the Nunatsiavut Government, Nunatsiavut beneficiaries. I made reference to this earlier, a long-term goal, as Isabella said, is to hopefully deliver some sort of annual dividend that will enable us to be able to meet more of our expansive mandate around some socio-economic opportunities. This is what we're looking at in terms of where, of our budget for the remainder of 2011; we're looking at a profit of about \$2,000,000, which is quite significant when you looked at the previous slide where you saw a lot of the bars which were underneath the line. Now, we're actually seeing them on the positive end. Nunak properties, clearly there's challenges there where we're hoping to improve that situation, but CAI Marine has been quite lucrative for us, as well as PAIL. It's the fuel JV and the helicopter JV, not bad, but in some respects, they don't even meet our criteria now because we want to be actively involved in our businesses, and that's not necessarily the case for these particular businesses. This just kind of highlights a couple of the things that we expect for our budget. Net cash came about 1.2 million, and we're very proud of the fact that we've been actually able to streamline our costs, sorry, general administrative costs, to approximately just one half of where it was before and that's the result of lesser people is doing more stuff and being very productive at the same time. So this is sort of a I guess, dashboard of performance for our particular businesses, and this is what we'll be looking at in order to see whether or not our businesses are doing well, and if they're not, we'll have to make decision as to how we're going to address it. The money here is, are in thousands. So 577, that's not \$577, 577 thousand. ROC is return on capital, so what is our return on the money that we've invested? You see that Nunak and Post Mill are certainly in the yellow, which under the legend means that there is some caution there, but they, it does have potential, provided that, you know, there's some changes made around pricing and improving operations. But pretty much the other businesses we have, tugs and barges, CAI, Nunatsiavut Marine, etcetera, are certainly meeting our criteria and it's something that we're looking at continuing on. The bottom four; it's hard or impossible to determine a return on capital simply because we never made any capital investment in them. Ed.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** Just curious, getting back to the Innu partnerships. Is there any discussions regarding the Lower Churchill? Possibility with partnerships.

**MR. DAVIS:** Actually, I should ask James. I mean, you would because you meet with Paul Rich on our...

**MR. THORBOURNE:** Yes, there have. They get first priority and, but there's, I think the number is something, then you order a 4 or 5 hundred million dollars of Aboriginal set aside of which they have first priority, but we've talked about construction equipment being put to use. We've talked about a number of things with him. There is nothing set in stone. There's no agreement yet, but we are discussing opportunities. There's going to be so much work there, that'll be hard not to get a piece of it because they don't have the capacity to do it all either.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** Yes.

**MR. THORBOURNE:** So I do think there's opportunity there, but there's nothing, there's nothing set in stone yet.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** Just long as you've got it on your radar.

**MR. DAVIS:** It's kind of hard to ignore that one 'cause that's a, that's a major capital project for the country. So what do we see for the future? Well, it's extremely bright. We have a baseline of working assets to be sustainable, huge opportunities, as I was mentioning earlier for Nunatsiavut and beyond. Even in some of the discussions that we've been having when we have our quarterly meetings, we invite, we've been able to identify up to \$60 million in projects, so that's projects around Lake Melville and north, right, when you're looking at the \$60 million. So that's not even looking at the lower Churchill and some of the potential around some mines that it haven't even started yet. So without a doubt \$60 million is something that certainly can contribute to our sustainability as an organization. Like any company, we're obviously going to be limited in our ability to find working capital, or the money, the cash flow in order to meet our ability to pay our bills and commercial financing, but certainly we are moving in the right direction when it comes to that. Moving forward and this is the last slide, so we truly believe that we actually have done a decent amount of work over the last number of years to build that foundation upon which we're going to lead to some significant success. So we have been able to right the ship, and pardon the pun, with the CAI Marine. I guess it was part, right the northern ranger, I guess. We think that being very clear on establishing the Nunatsiavut Group of Companies, which is clearly a for profit entity, will contribute to that mindset that we are there in business trying to meet certain criteria for investments and that this will definitely lead to success. Is that to say we're going to be, you know, successful in every single thing we're going to do? Sometimes there are other variables that exist that you don't anticipate. I don't think very many people anticipated the terrorist attacks which had a huge impact on the economy in 2001. I don't think any people anticipated the financial meltdown which, you know, brought the US economy to its knees. No one anticipated that, but it had a devastating impact on businesses, not only through, not only in the United States, but in Canada and, indeed, across the world. So, you know, what we're trying to do is trying to put our best foot forward to make sure we actually have those criteria to have a good sense of what we can invest in

and a good sense that we're going to be able to achieve success. We have done a presentation with the Tasiujatsoak Trust, when was that? That was in the spring, I believe. Was it in the spring? May, late spring. Where we're looking at trying to assist in capitalizing the organization, right? In order to capitalize on opportunities, you need money to do that, right? You need money to invest and so without the necessary cash flow that can be a challenge for us and so we've actually had a discussion with them about what to do with the loan and to try and capitalize and provide us with funding in order to take advantage of that, and so there's conversations and some have been very positive, and I think you'll hear a bit more about that later on with the presentation from Isabella, who will be doing all the presentations today. So, needless to say, we're very, very supportive and, or very, very excited about where the future is going. We hope that we can get support as well for our activities from Nunatsiavut Government and from all of you as members. One thing we'd like to encourage, and encourage Ministers and encourage Nunatsiavut Government is that whenever there is opportunity for development within our territory that, you know, maybe having us at the table so that when you see opportunities for development, think about what are the business opportunities and how can Nunatsiavut Government or Nunatsiavut Group of Companies benefit from that. And so perhaps having us at the table would be a very good thing and, certainly, we can contribute 'cause we can see what we can do around some of the businesses. So thank you again for your time and, oh, I shouldn't be wrapping it up. I guess I could ask for more...

**MR. POTTLE:** Not a question, just an observation...Clint, I guess, I mean, I would encourage as an Assembly member, relative to Charlotte's question with respect to sustaining our communities, that an olive branch be extended to the community governments as well because they are self-governing in their own right.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** I was going to say that because, you know, we're, some of us are not happy with the services that we have received from outside engineers and outside construction companies. We're now hopefully on a good road to making an arrangement with Post Mill on managing of a quarry. We know that they have a little crusher operation, but if they can manage as well, you know, so we're moving down that line. I believe that Wayne's interested in working with them as well. But if you think about the massive amount of infrastructure that's going to go into communities over the next few years with the announcement from Makkovik and Hopedale, and of our, we have in Nain a multiple-purpose centre that's going to tender within a few weeks, maybe. And all the money that we're going to get from Nunatsiavut Government over the next few years, you know, any construction and engineering company can do well, eh? The water and sewer continues through ongoing thing. We're hoping that within the next few years we'll have a brand new multi-million-dollar airport in Nain and a road to it, you know, so there, there is certainly, and we hope that, you know, that you'd only show up here once in a while to show us a few slides, but to actually come to our communities and to meet with Inuit Community Governments and then to realize just how much potential there is for making-, for your companies to do well right in our little communities.

**MS. PAIN:** Just to respond to that about coming to the communities, one of the commitments that the current trustees have made is that we will hold at least one of our meetings in each of the Inuit communities. So we're going to try and get the, each community to hold one of our, hold some of our

sessions for that exact reason so that we can, you know, do our business, but as, as well, meet some of the Inuit communities, meet some of the businesses and look at some of the opportunities around each of the communities as well.

**MR. THORBOURNE:** I just wanted to follow up on the point about the quarry and what we're talking about there, Post Mill Lumber would like to get in the business of operating the pits and quarries for the communities. Probably what you have found and what we have noted is that when a contractor comes in, they get their permit to do their blasting. They kind of high grade the material, take what it is they need and then leave. Next time there's a project, they get another permit. Maybe that's the right place to go; maybe they go some other place. There, there's no long-term planning. There's no sustainability to it, and you end up, the community ends up with a mess. What we, as Post Mill Lumber, would like to do is to and we think we're going to be doing that with Nain and, and Hopedale, is to get the quarry license operated with a 10 to 20-year horizon, ensure that the community has a ready supply of the type of material that they need, and also operate it in a professional way so that it doesn't look awful, so that it doesn't, so that it gets remediated properly after, after the quarrying is done, and that it's done in a way that allows it to be carried out in one spot for a longer period of time. So, that's the concept that we're, that we're trying to promote.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Just a question about changing the name of Post Mill Lumber, if it's going to be a construction company, are you going to call it something else?

**MR. THORBOURNE:** A good question and, yes, we are. So perhaps we can just go back to the slide with... that one. Maybe I'll stand up. Is it okay if I stand up and point? Plus my legs are getting stiff so. So this light blue box here are the companies that are going to park and set aside, and in that blue box, you might not be able to read them, but it's TUC, Stone Plant and Post Mill Lumber. Not that we're writing them off, but we're putting them there for now, and we're going to use the assets that we can that are in those companies in the other one. So the assets in Post Mill Lumber, as well as the heavy equipment in TUC, will end up in Nunatsiavut Construction. So really that's the company that we're going to move forward with. If we find that the quarry is economical and we would re-open it, it would probably re-open as TUC, or something different, but we would use the heavy equipment and Nunatsiavut Construction to run it and to operate it. Nunak Land Corp, that's the company that will have the real estate assets so we have the commercial buildings in, in Goose Bay, Nain, Hopedale and, and Makkovik. Right now they're in Nunak Land Corp and LIDC, but we'll be combining those in one. So these are the ones that get parked to the side. These are the new ones and some existing ones that we're going to go forward with.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Do anybody have any more questions? Okay. Diane.

**MS. GEAR:** I'm just wondering about Post Mill. Will it be based in Postville as such, or will you be moving that to another place on the coast?

**MR. THORBOURNE:** No. It will be in Postville. We have our best-, well, as of right now, our best quarry operation there. There, there's great material there. The rock crusher will probably be back there after it's through in Nain and Hopedale and Rigolet this summer. So the office would be there.



And we're not going to, you know, abandon the lumber aspect either. If there's a demand then we'll use it, and that's where that operation is set up as well, and we've invested with some grant money in office infrastructure at the facility in Postville. We'll have to change its name, combine it with some other stuff, but it will stay in Postville. It will do work wherever the work is.

**MS. GEAR:** Because they've been doing work for Voisey Bay, like core boxes and stuff like that, right? Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Herb.

**MR. JACQUE:** Thank you. . I'd just like to comment on something that Isabella said earlier in regards to being open for future development. It's been brought to my attention in my community like the fish plant now has been closed, so it could be in operation an additional three months of the year. In the past it has, right? So what we were thinking about, it was brought to my attention that maybe it could be converted to bottle operating facility during three months of the year or maybe longer to create employment in that way, but I'd like to talk to you about that later between me and myself and see how to submit a proposal and where to go.

**MS. PAIN:** Okay. I think if people have ideas and want to explore opportunities the best thing I would suggest is to contact James and Chris, possibly, in the Goose Bay office because they will then start to do the evaluation, look at the work, look at what needs to be done to get a proposal to us as trustees. So as a first step, if you have, if you can identify opportunities, if you have something in your communities that you would like us to explore contact James, James and/or, or Chris and we can move forward from there so that they can actually do the work and bring it to the trustees once they've done some evaluation and some work on it.

**MR. THORBOURNE:** And it, again, I can't reinforce enough, sort of, this is the investment criteria that we're going to be utilizing. Obviously, there's some flexibility to depend upon the particular project, but this is what we're looking for and if someone's coming forward, if they can demonstrate how they hit all of these, then that's certainly a much more positive thing than, than not, so....

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more questions? You're finished your presentation there?

**MR. THORBOURNE:** Yes, we are.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Then I would like to say thank you to Isabella Pain, Clint Davis and James Thorbourne for your presentation. We're now going to take a break for 15 minutes. We are still in Committee of the Whole. We'll come back then to hear presentations from the other Trusts. We are still in a committee as a whole here so we'll now call upon Isabella and Rexanne to do their next presentation on a Trust.

**MS. PAIN:** Thank you, Pat. I'm going to hand around copies of this presentation in English. I also have Inuttitut; if anybody wants it, but so I'm going to hand them down this way and you can write your notes or whatever on it. Just as a note before we start, a point I wanted to make is myself and Rexanne will be doing the presentation on the implementation trust and providing the annual report to the

Assembly. As a note for everybody, a reminder to everybody, neither Rexanne nor myself are trustees of the Implementation Trust and we're going to get to that in a minute in our presentation. As Pat mentioned earlier, Mike Flatters was supposed to come but, unfortunately, he couldn't make it at this time. So Rexanne and I, we attend all of the updates with the Implementation Trust as well, and so we're going to go through the presentation, answer any of your questions to the best of our ability. Basically, Implementation Trust was created through a Trustee and it was established on the 17th of May, 2007. The Implementation Trust includes the \$151,000,000, which is to be paid by the federal government for implementation of the Labrador Inuit Land Claim Agreement. That amount is set out in Chapter 23 of Labrador Inuit Land Claim Agreement. So, if you want to look at where the numbers come from and the payment schedule, it's all in the Land Claim Agreement. The Trust Deed that established the Implementation Trust sets out what the objects of the Trust are. We did a presentation to the Assembly last October and we went through these things. So this is probably just a reminder for most of you. But the objects of the Implementation Trust are to receive and invest the money through which are received through Chapter 23 of the Labrador Inuit Land Claim Agreement, and to also create a capital reserve of 75 percent of the amounts received from Nunatsiavut Government. So the money goes to Nunatsiavut Government and then it comes to the Implementation Trust. The only beneficiary of the Implementation Trust is Nunatsiavut Government. Unlike the Labrador Inuit Capital Strategy Trust, which we just talked about where the beneficiaries are Government or individual beneficiaries, the only beneficiary of this one is Nunatsiavut Government and it's for the implementation of the Agreement. The trustees, the initial trustees of the Implementation Trust were William Anderson III, when he was President, Patricia Pottle, Sharon Pevie and Mike Flatters. Because two of them have resigned and William Anderson was a trustee by virtue of being President and being a trustee at that time, we only have two current trustees, Michael Flatters and Sharon Pevie. They have been the only two trustees for a couple of years now. In order to be able to find replacement trustees, there's a process that we have to follow. During the presentation that Mike Flatters and I made to the Assembly last October, we outlined that process for new trustees, the remaining trustees, like with all the other Trusts, the remaining trustees have to recommend names to the Assembly for people to be appointed and elected by the Assembly. So that process applies to this particular Trust as well. So those two trustees have to come forward with names. The Implementation Trust Deed sets out very specific requirements for people who can be trustees of the Implementation Trust. Two of them have to be eligible beneficiaries. So they have to be beneficiaries of Nunatsiavut Government, and we have to have one who's not a beneficiary of Nunatsiavut Government. Of those trustees, one has to be an eligible beneficiary who resides in the Labrador Inuit Settlement Area. One trustee must be an eligible beneficiary and also must be a Government person. Therefore, they must work for Nunatsiavut Government. And one of those trustees must not be employed by Nunatsiavut Government or be a member of the Assembly. That clear? And, well, you can have one person who meets more than one of these qualifications. So you can have somebody who's a non-Government person who's also an eligible beneficiary, in LISA, so example, so it doesn't mean that you have to have one person for each of the, these criteria.

**MR. SHIWAK:** Could you back to...

**MS. PAIN:** Yes.

**MR. SHIWAK:** The first one that says one trustee who's now - one trustee is an eligible beneficiary, and on the last one, it says, cannot be a member of the Nunatsiavut Assembly. Can that person be a member of the Assembly?

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Member of the Assembly?

**MR. SHIWAK:** Yes.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** You mean an elected official?

**MR. SHIWAK:** Yes.

**MS. PAIN:** Currently, our Trust Deed says, yes, they could be.

**MR. SHIWAK:** Yes. Because I'm just confused by the last one because one cannot be a member of the Assembly.

**MS. PAIN:** One of the trustees...of the three

**MR. SHIWAK:** So the other one...

**MS. PAIN:** It has to be one who isn't an Assembly member.

**MR. SHIWAK:** But the other one can be.

**MS. PAIN:** Yes.

**MR. SHIWAK:** Oh.

**MS. PAIN:** Technically.

**MR. SHIWAK:** I didn't think.....that was the way, but...

**MS. PAIN:** ...if you recall, the discussion we had last year when we came to the Assembly, we had the whole discussion about whether or not Assembly members or elected people wanted to be on the Trust. I don't believe, or I'm not sure if that issue ever came back to the Assembly for a decision or a discussion. So that, currently, Darryl, that is possible, but I guess it's up to the Assembly to decide who they want to have as trustees. Last year the recommendation, the initial trustees recommended that Michael J. Flatters be re-appointed, that Isabella Pain be appointed and that Wyman Jacque be appointed as an implementation trustee. With these trustees, you would meet all those three criteria. So those were the names that were recommended last October, and they're making that same recommendation again now. I'm not sure what the process is for that, but I'll leave that for Assembly to decide on what the process needs to be.

**MR. SHIWAK:** That was going to be my question.

**MS. PAIN:** Yes.

**MS. GEAR:** So you just need three people?

**MS. PAIN:** Yes.

**MS. GEAR:** Okay.

**MS. PAIN:** This Trust right, now because Nunatsiavut Government is the only beneficiary, the whole role of this particular Trust is to invest money. Is to take all the money that we're getting through the implementation chapter and to invest it with investment advisors. They really don't make any allocations at this point, so it is about investment only. I want to talk a little bit about the investment policy. The way that the Implementation Trust decides what to do with its monies that they have created an investment policy. The investments that the Implementation Trust has comprised generally of Canadian and foreign equities, which are basically the shares of publically-traded companies, and the allocation to that is 70 percent of investments will go towards equities. We also have 30 percent of the investments. The investment policy says 30 percent should also be in fixed income cash or bonds, and so that's the allocation, equities and bonds, 70/30. A note that we should make at this point is that as of August 31st, 2011, there's about 30 million in short term investment funds. This does not meet the investment policy. We were in a process in this Trust, along with another Trust, of finding a new company to invest our money. We had collapsed some of our investments because we were trading managers, and then we were, after meeting with the investment advisors, they said the current time to go into the market was not looking good. That was just before the last drop we've seen in the markets. So we invested the money in short term investments until the market started to pick up again, and so we do have about 30 million in STIFS at this particular time. To date, Canada has paid the sum of \$143,760,938 pursuant to Chapter 23. That's what we have in that particular fund. The book value of the Implementation Trust was \$107,689,401. We did have a realized loss in 2010 of \$3.3 million. That loss came about because we changed investment managers. You'll all recall in 2008 when we had the financial crisis that the value of some of the investments declined, as the trustees at that time said to the Assembly, you don't crystallize the loss until you actually cash out, so the loss is still there, but the money can recover and can recuperate. Until you take the money out of a certain manager, then you crystallize a loss. What we did in June of this year. We actually crystallized the loss. We had an investment firm that was constantly not doing well. They were below their performance levels and we decided to terminate the arrangement with that particular management company. Once we made the decision to cash out, we actually did crystallize a loss of 3.3 million. We think at the end of the day that we will more than recover that when we go with another investment management firm. There are a number of reasons an investment management firm could lose money. What we found in this case is that number one, they weren't sticking to the investment criteria that they had. One of the reasons we hire a certain management firm is if they're going to manage money in a certain way. They weren't doing that, and the second thing was that they had lost a lot of their key people. They had a huge change in personnel, so the way they were doing things had changed and we found it no longer met with our criteria and so we have changed managers.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** I just want to point out; the book value date is December 31, 2010 of 107. So the realized loss happened in 2011. So our book value at the end of July, which gives us a comparable, is actually about a hundred and five million. So we, we've got about \$5.3 million fair market value over the actual cash that we took and invested. So our investments are doing well, and we're hoping now, once we get into a new fund manager, you'll even see these market values a lot higher than the book values.

**MS. PAIN:** And that's basically the last thing, was the fair market value. That's the end of that presentation. As I said, this Trust is really about investment and making investment decisions about where the money is going to go. We can try and answer questions, if anybody has questions for us.

**MS. WOLFREY:** I do and I probably don't understand it in the first place, but I do know that at one point we were talking about a \$21-million... I'm going to call it a loss, but people said it couldn't be called a loss. So what I'm getting at, I guess, is this \$3.3 million-loss. Now, is that in addition to that 21 million, or is that 21 million still an investment? Instead of the 21 million we lost 3.1...

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Well, what it is, is when you talk about an unrealized loss, an unrealized loss means that it's only on paper because you don't actually, and the term is values was crystallize it, unless you took your money out. So if we investment a hundred dollars and when that crash occurred in 2009, all of a sudden that hundred dollars was only worth 70. According to these numbers now in 2011, that hundred dollars we invested then, is now worth a hundred and ten dollars. So the markets are rebounding. The \$3.3-million loss is in actual cash that we did lose because we were an investment fund manager that was not performing. Our money was not earning the returns that we expected. So we said we can't stay there. It's not an not a decision the trustees are not, but the trustees couldn't make-, keep that money there knowing that it wasn't going to make the money that we wanted, we expected, and so they actually crystallized that unrealized loss. So it's a realized loss versus an unrealized loss. Did that help?

**MS. PAIN:** Is that better, Charlotte?

**MS. WOLFREY:** Okay. I just wanted to know was well, did we actually lose 18 million, or we lost 3?

**MS. PAIN:** Three.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Okay. Thank you.

**MS. PAIN:** When you were talking about a \$21-million loss, we said it wasn't a, a real loss because it was just on paper. So now we're telling you that what you thought might have been a \$21-million loss a number of years ago have now turned into an actual loss of \$3 million. So we expect that with the investment portfolio we have and the policies we have, that will pick up with a new investment manager.

**MS. WOLFREY:** That was the question I was trying to ask. Thank you for clarifying it.

**MS. PAIN:** Anything else on the Implementation Trust? I'm not sure if you all still have copies of the Trust Deed. If anybody would like to have copies again of the Implementation Trust Deed, I have a copy here and I can certainly email them to you just so you have that, if you like, and I'm not sure if that would help in any of your deliberations, but we have that here as well.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** There are no more questions and you want to move on to your next presentation.

**MS. PAIN:** The Labrador Inuit Land Claims Trust Fund, the Nunatsiavut Government has designated the Labrador Inuit Settlement Trust to receive and administer the Chapter 19 capital transfer of \$140 million in 1997 dollars. That is outlined in the Labrador Inuit Land Claim Agreement again. That's where those numbers come from and you can see the payment schedule. It's outlined again in the Land Claim Agreement. This Trust Deed was only settled on March 1, 2010, so this is a relatively new trust that was created. The current trustees of the Settlement Trust are James Lyall, who's the President, Daniel Pottle, who's the Treasurer of Nunatsiavut, Isabella Pain, Rexanne Crawford and then Michael Flatters. So we are the current trustees of the Settlement Trust. The objects, as outlined in the Trust Deed for the Settlement Trust to receive and invest the Chapter 19 payments received under the Labrador Inuit Land Claim Agreement, as well to provide a broad range of social, cultural housing, health, education, economic assistance to eligible beneficiaries. Recall that in the Implementation Trust I said there's only one beneficiary of the Implementation Trust and that was Nunatsiavut Government. In this case, the Settlement Trust, there are a number of eligible beneficiaries, including Nunatsiavut Government, Inuit Community Governments, beneficiaries of the Labrador Inuit Land Claim Agreement, or any class of eligible beneficiaries, and a registered charity or non-profit organization for the benefit of Inuit. We have the same investment policy as we have for the Implementation Trust. So again the investments are that we have 70 percent in equities, Canadian and foreign equities, and 30 percent in fixed income cash or bonds. To date, Canada has paid the sum of a hundred and thirty-five point six million dollars pursuant to Chapter 19. The negotiation loan has to be repaid out of that amount, and we have repaid about \$27.8 million back to Canada for those, on the Chapter 19 dollars. The book value of this particular Settlement Trust on July 31st, 2011, was \$71.9 million. The fair market value at July 1 was \$74 million, which includes the \$3. million realized loss. So back to the same thing. We had a realized loss in this particular trust as well. Again, because we changed the same investment managers, they were investing; they were looking after the money for both of the trusts. So we had a \$3 million loss in this one, but as Rexanne identified or explained in the last trust that the book value the market value was still higher than the book value at July 31st, 2011. And, again, that this Trust as well has about \$36 million in cash or in short term investments and that, again, is Implementation Settlement is due to uncertainty in the global financial markets. So we had this cash because we got all the money out of the one investment manager that we were terminating our Agreement with. They gave it to us in cash and instead of putting it right back into the markets; our advisors were telling us that we were coming up to a particularly volatile time. So we haven't re-invested, but we have started the process now to start to, to get the cash back out there with the investment managers. And that's the end of that particular trust. I don't know, Rexanne, if you want to add anything about the numbers.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** No. I think that's it.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** If there are no questions on this one, then - oh, sorry, we have a question here.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Just one. First of all, Clint Davis touched on it a bit this morning and Mike Flatters and Isabella, yourself, over a year ago when you discussed Danny and Jim as trustees of this particular Trust, how far have the discussions gone in terms of potentially taking the President's and the Minister of Finance away from this Trust as well, or have those discussions taken place?

**MS. PAIN:** I'm not sure if either Minister Pottle or the President want to answer this question but, to my knowledge, we have had no real further discussion on that since we met with the Assembly last year and I'm not sure when we were here I wasn't sure that there was any clear consensus on which direction to go from the Assembly on that, and so I think the recommendations were made but nothing has happened since on that particular issue.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more questions?

**MS. PAIN:** Just the last thing I'd like to say again is that if people have lost their copies of the Trust Deed or, you know, if we have some new people who may not have received copies of the Trust Deed, we can certainly circulate those to people again for their information, if they like. They can just let me know.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more questions on this one? Then we'll move on to the next trust.

**MS. PAIN:** Okay. The next trust that I'm going to present on is the Tasiujatsoak Trust. Copies of the presentation are coming around so that you can have it in front of you. I'm going to start by again explaining what the objects of this particular Trust are. The objects of the Tasiujatsoak Trust are to receive and invest the payments under the 2002 Impact and Benefit Agreement that was signed between Nunatsiavut Government and Vale Inco. We still missing one?

**MR. SHIWAK:** Yes. Tony's missing one.

**MS. PAIN:** Oh, here's, I have a couple more so here's one. And, as well, to disperse funds to enable Nunatsiavut Government to meet its obligation under the IBA, so the Tasiujatsoak Trust has to ensure that Nunatsiavut Government can fund its portion of implementing the Impact and Benefit Agreement. It also has an object, to assist the seven community volunteer centres; to meet community needs to reduce negative impacts of the Voisey's Bay project, to promote social, cultural, educational language and business initiatives. The eligible beneficiaries of the Tasiujatsoak Trust are the Nunatsiavut Government, charitable organizations with specific criteria which are outlined in the Trust Deed and a community or class of Inuit. And all of those are further expanded upon in the actual Trust Deed, itself. The current trustees of the Tasiujatsoak Trust are Jim Lyall, as the President, Dan Pottle, as the Minister of Finance, HR and IT, Michael Flatters, Sharon Pevie and Isabella Pain. The Statement of Investment Policy. One of the things, as in the two previous Trusts, we have to create a Statement of Investment Policy, which basically says how much money we're willing, or how much risk we're willing to take in terms of investment, investing the money. We have the same balance between equities and bonds. Again a 70/30. So 70 percent is in Canadian foreign equities and 30 percent are in fixed income or cash

or bonds. Part of what we have to do is to allocate investment between equities, which are stocks and sometimes riskier, and fixed income, which are usually safer but don't have as high a return as some of the equities. Historically, equities out-perform fixed income over the long term. We've seen that a number of times, and if you want to really make money you'll go into the stock market, but you also be, had better be prepared to take some losses because as we just saw in 2008, 2009, there, it's particularly volatile and you can lose a lot of money. We have the same note that as of August 31st, we have \$30 million in cash, or in short term investment fund, which is very similar to cash because it's easily to cash in. And, again, due to uncertainty in the markets, we had just wound up using one particular money manager. We ended up with a lot in cash as we collapsed those investments and we have not put that out into the market, but as with the other two Trusts, we're in the process of getting that back out into the markets again. The Trust Deed priorities, as I said, to cover the IBA Implementation Budget, so we get the draft budget from the people who deal with implementing the Impact and Benefit Agreement budget on behalf of Nunatsiavut and we have to fund that for them. We also have direction in the Trust Deed that tells the trustees that they have to set aside 30 percent of all capital receipts and 10 percent of all net income to be set aside to a heritage fund. That heritage fund is to be there for the future generations for future beneficiaries of Nunatsiavut so that this generation doesn't spend all of the money from the investment because once the nickel is gone, it's going to be gone and so this is being set aside for future generations. So the trustees are directed also to consider the desirability of setting aside up to 50 percent of capital receipts and 25 percent of income each year into this heritage fund. We also have to allocate \$100,000 to each volunteer centre in each of the communities, in each of the Inuit communities as well as Goose Bay and North West River. Funding, this became a, I guess, a little bit of a controversial issue recently. The Tasiujatsoak Trust makes available funding on a proposal basis. So we accept proposals two times a year from people who are interested in receiving funding. Our applications are reviewed two times a year, and the deadlines are September 30th and March 30th of every year. So there is an application form, and if people want to receive funding, they send the proposals in and we will review them two times a year. This slide is a little bit small, but I wanted to give you some examples of some proposals that we funded so far in 2011. I'm not sure if you can read that, but again, based on proposals that we received, we fund things such as DHSD, for example, Youth and Care. We've allocated money there. We provide money to Culture, Recreation and Tourism for language camps, elders' gatherings. The Nain Heritage Committee has, in Nain has received money. The Makkovik Inuit Community Government was the recipient of money this year for the craft shop. OKalakatiget Radio for operational funding receives funding from the Trust. We provided money for these, the Zoar Project to OKalakatiget to be able to film the whole repatriation of those, of the remains that were repatriated in Zoar this year. The Digital Story Telling Project in Rigolet received funding from the Tasiujatsoak Trust. The Nunatsiavut Government Status of Women has received funding from us, and Culture, Recreation and Tourism again for things like, for Inuttitut classes and memoirs of, to publish memoirs of Titus Joshua and Joshua Obed. So to do a cultural publication. If you'll go back to what I talked to you about the objects, we believe that these types of proposals from the Nunatsiavut Government meet the objects that are outlined in the Trust Deed to us. There were some proposals that we did not fund and I didn't put them in here. I'm not sure if I should, but we don't fund everything that we receive. We basically decide what the priorities are and where we think the funding should go. We do receive a number of, of applications and not all of them are eligible beneficiaries, number one,



and not all of them can be funded just due to the sheer volume of requests that we receive. Sources of payments that the Tasiujatsoak Trust has received to date, the initial payment was \$46 million, which was basically a loan. We loaned it back to Inco and we're receiving the interest according to a payment schedule set out in the IBA. We also had a million dollars, which was a harvesting payment and that was for harvesting compensation to people who were impacted by the negative impacts on harvesting in the Voisey's Bay area. And that \$ 1 million harvesting fund is actually managed by a committee that was established to deal with applications for harvesting losses. So that's been in existence for a number of years. 2002 to 2010 we had interest payments of \$24.2 million. Between 2002 and 2010 we had supplemental payments of \$2 million. And in 2007 and 2008 we had an additional payment of a hundred and seven million dollars. I want to talk to you about these different categories of payment just for a minute. In the Impact and Benefit Agreement we actually have three different types of money that we receive from the company. The first was the initial payment of \$46 million, which we then loaned back to the company. The second I'll talk about, is the additional payment. And the additional payment, basically, is a payment we receive if the company does really well, if the price of nickel is higher, if they make more money than we all predicted we also get to share in that. So Nunatsiavut Government received money in those years as well through their mining royalties from the Province, they had increased cash because the company did so well. Well, we did really well in addition to them, and we a hundred and seven million dollars in additional payments. The third category of payments that I have there are supplemental payments and we received them twice. One was 2 million, one was 2.5. One of the things that we saw in the IBA is that the company will be able to have certain cash savings because there's, they have to make an IBA payment to us so we wanted to share in the tax savings and the interest savings that they have when they filed their tax claims and other sources of cash that they receive. So we said we deserve a share of what they will save. And so this is our portion of that. In this past fiscal year we actually did an audit of Vale. One of the things that we have in the IBA is the right to audit their books on what they're actually paying us. We believe that they had made an error in their calculations and so we, they worked with us. They were fully co-operative. We went in and we had an auditor go in and audit the books and we got the additional money because we found some errors that they had made in their calculations and so we were able to receive extra payment from Vale through an audit. So excluding the loan receivable from ICST, which Clint referred to earlier of \$6 million, the fair market value of the Tasiujatsoak Trust at July 31st was, approximately, a hundred and thirty million, and in addition to that we have 30 million in short term investment funds. And again for the same reason we have not gone back into the markets at this point because of uncertainty, but we're getting ready to re-deploy the cash into the markets. .

**MR. TUTTAUK:** When you say these trusts have 30 million in short term investment funds or cash, is that 30 million for each of the Trusts...

**MS. PAIN:** Yes.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** ...basically?

**MS. PAIN:** I'm talking here about all the Trusts, but each of the Trusts does all of its accounting and bookkeeping separately, so everything is accounted for separately, because they each have different

obligations. So we talked about the having to have a 75 percent capital reserve in the Settlement Trust, for example. So we have to ensure that we account for that accurately. Because we have to have a Heritage Fund in the Tasiujatsoak Trust, we have to account for those things separately as well. So each of them is done separately. .

**MR. PIERCY:** Where there's a, for that Torngat recreation where it was overlooked for the 60,000 this year, what they was usually getting, is there any way that the deadline can be amended for something like this that's really beneficial to our beneficiaries, because I think with this loss, I think over the winter now when people starts to calm down like after the summer break and that, I think the money is going that they lost out on, is going to be badly needed, I think.

**MR. LYALL:** Thanks for the question, Wayne. I think that it's quite clear that the deadlines are the 30th of September and the 30th of March. You still have three weeks to get the application into the Trust for it. I think all the community Government's well aware of Government deadlines for the last two or three years. And I think if you want to put in proposal to Trust, just make sure that they meet the deadlines. We won't be amending the Trust Deed.

**MR. POTTLE:** If I may, just to complement what the President said, Wayne, for your information, the Trust has received an application from Torngat Recreation Committee, which we'll be reviewing next month.

**MS. PAIN:** Can I just add to that a little. One of the things we have is that over the first few years that the Trust was in existence they did accept some late deadlines and they looked at exceptional circumstances. As a Trust, we decided that we had had the application out there and people knew what the timeframes were. And in order to be fair to all applicants, we said, no, we're going to stick to these deadlines of accepting them at a certain time so everybody knows what the rules are, and that as a fair, level playing field for anybody who's an eligible beneficiary to apply and so we've been trying to stick by that so that we know when we sit down and after one of our deadlines, we know that we have all of the applications for that part of the year that we're dealing with, and so we can allocate the money that we have set aside for that particular time. And so it was really an effort to try and be fair to all people who might be interested in submitting a proposal that we've done that. We're going to try and advertise more about our application process, and I think we've got that out a little more about the deadlines and where people can get applications. So that was really why we made those, that particular decision.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Trust Deed priorities. It says 30 percent of all capital receives 10 percent of all net income to be set aside to Heritage Fund, and as well, the trustees are directed to consider desirability of setting aside 50 percent of capital receipts and 25 percent of income each year. Are you able to tell us the actuals of the, the percentage of capital receipts and the net income that is actually being set aside to the Heritage Fund?

**MS. PAIN:** I should be able to, if I can find my right document. One of the things that we're going to be tabling with you is our audits. We're required to table with the Assembly the audits. For the past couple of years they've been delayed, but I do have copies of both the 2008, 2009 audits in both English

and Inuttitut to table with the Assembly, so you'll have that. In that particular audit, it does tell you what all of the allocations are and what the amount of money is. So as of December...

**MR. ANDERSEN:** And I can wait for that, if you want.

**MS. PAIN:** Could you wait? Okay.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** If I can wait till then. I do...

**MS. PAIN:** Okay. Well...

**MR. ANDERSEN:** ...I do have another, but I can wait till the audit...

**MS. PAIN:** Okay. You'll find it...

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Yes.

**MS. PAIN:** We weren't going to bring the auditors, but we were going to table it, so if you want us...

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Yes.

**MS. PAIN:** ...to go through it, we can, but there is a section in here that tells you what we have set aside in each of these particular funds, the Heritage Fund and the IBA Fund. So that's all laid out in here as well as an outline of some of the payments that we've made to various people who have applied in the proposal. So all of that is going to be in the audit. The one thing I would like to say is that we're going to present, or give to you, copies of the 2008, 2009. We don't have our audit for 2010 completed. We have our drafts audits ready. We have to review them before we finalize the audits. We're going to be doing that in October. So they'll be ready to present whenever the Assembly sits again after October, so that you'll have the most recent will be the 2010 audit.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** I have another question. I suppose....as well, might be answered in the audit, but it's a good thing that you don't have the Finance Department after you for audits because if we don't get ours done in a timely manner, Inuit Community Governments, they are phoning us up and rightly so. Very good. This, on this sheet it says examples of proposals funded in 2011.....is that just examples, or is that, in fact, the full list?

**MS.PAIN:** I say its examples, only because 2011's not over and we're going to be reviewing more applicants next month. We're, we have already received some application, so that was everything that was funded in the first round that we received at the end of March and we allocated in April. So, again, we're going to have another meeting in October to review applications we've received up to September 30th.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Ask one more question, only one more, eh? Does the Trust document give direction to the trustees that they on time, from time-to-time consult with the Assembly on priorities of whereupon they might be directed in Nunatsiavut?

**MS. PAIN:** I don't think it says to consult with the Assembly. I think it says to consult with Nunatsiavut Government, which we do with having the President and the Finance Minister, who sit and bring Government recommendations forward. In addition to that, we receive proposals from a lot of the departments, and we're looking to what Government strategic direction is in terms of what we should be funding. The exception we made to that may not be an exception, but was in 2008 when we received the additional money, the Trust actually allocated and I should have put a slide in here, I thought I did. But we actually made some allocations that we haven't dispersed to date. Some have been dispersed. As an example, \$20 million was allocated to the Inuit Community Governments for capital works. So for those kinds of things that you couldn't get under the fiscal financing at that time, 3.5 million was allocated to a senior's home somewhere in Nunatsiavut. So that hasn't been spent. A decision has been made to set that money aside, but it hasn't actually been spent yet. There was an allocation of \$20 million, I believe, for economic development purposes at that time, and then there was also the allocation of \$20 million for community recreation centres that had been decided, but had not been spent yet, but hopefully, we're going to be spending some of that money in relation to Hopedale and Makkovik in the next, next year or so. So some of the money has been allocated, but not actually dispersed. And those were based on priorities that we felt we got the additional money. We said what are some of the needs? We looked at the kinds of requests we had been receiving from applicants and said where the needs are and what can we do?

**MS. KEMUKSIGAK:** I had a similar question on priorities and how do the Trust determine priorities, and another one I had was how much do you allocate for proposals each year? Do you have a fixed amount?

**MS. PAIN:** In relation to the priorities, Patricia, we basically refer to our Trust Deed as we go forward, and it's set out in terms of the objects, and then, so they're laid out for us. So question is, you know, number one, is it IBA Implementation Fund? If so, we don't question that that goes, it has to be funded. The volunteer centres have to be funded. And then we receive other proposals, and the priorities are they, are we mitigating impacts created by the Voisey's Bay Project? Obviously, a lot of things that we have done aren't really related to the Voisey's Bay Project because we don't necessarily get a lot of proposals in that specific area. So then we look at number one, how much is it going to cost? We, we do set aside an amount of money. We get, we, we look at how much money we're going to have to come in for the year. We determine how much we have to set aside for the Heritage Fund. We determine-, so that sets what we have to allocate in a particular year, and then we basically keep half and half to say we'll do half now because we're receiving proposals up to the end of March, and then again in September. And then so some proposals we receive are actually for more than the total amount we have to allocate in a year and so we say, well, we can't really do that, but we try and follow the Trust Deed with the priorities and the allocations. We also look to Government, and the Government people who are sitting there to say which direction is Government going in and what are some of the things that Government's trying to achieve?

**MR. POTTLE:** I have just one more thing to complement what Isabella said regarding priorities. Patricia, one of the practices that we've been implementing lately is, I mean, if a proposal comes in to the Trust from a department, by way of example, Culture, Recreation and Tourism, we're encouraging

the department, through the Minister, to write a letter of support to accompany that application so that the Trust understands and sees that this is a priority for a department and overall in the Nunatsiavut Government.

**MR. LYALL:** Yes. And I, if I could add just very briefly, and I think it's very important to understand as well when we receive proposals, we get a number of proposals saying, you know, we need \$35,000 or, let's say, a hundred and fifty-thousand dollars to add to, or complement a building or even for structure, and I, but, I mean, if you don't have the money there to administer to your structure, then it's not very likely you'll get funding for it. And I think it's really important, if you don't have a full-, something that really makes sense, then you probably won't be funded.

**MR. POTTLE:** I guess one other thing I should say is that on occasion we do have proposals for multi-year funding. The Trust doesn't entertain multi-year funding because we don't see that as fair to all the other applicants who are lined up in the queue. If we commit a million dollars this year for a proposal, a million dollars next year, by way of example, for a proposal, obviously, then somebody gets left out. So we look at that as being unfair so that we don't entertain multi-year funding applications.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Like the other Trust documents, are we able to, as Assembly members, have a copy of this, this particular one? Or is it something like...

**MS. PAIN:** oh, yes.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Okay.

**MS. PAIN:** Yes.

**MR. POTTLE:** And any of the Trust Deeds are available to each of the Assembly members and the public. They are public documents, so all you have to do is request those.

**MS. PAIN:** I just want to go back to an answer I gave to Patricia and just elaborate a little bit on the priorities. One of the things that the trustees often consider is how much impact funding will do for all of the beneficiaries. So we try to fund projects that will benefit a number of beneficiaries. We have had proposals from individuals, as an example. So, for an individual may come forward and ask for money for a certain program or something like that. We haven't really funded them because we see that only one person is benefitting and so we try to fund proposals that will fund as many people as possible. So things that we see one of the departments doing that'll fund impact a lot of people, something that the communities are doing that'll impact the community and have a broad impact, and so we've, while it's not prescribed anywhere, we try and fund those things that will positively impact as many beneficiaries as possible.

**MS. WOLFREY:** I'm just going to ask a question about the \$4 million that was, or the \$20 million that was allotted to the communities for recreation or multi-purpose buildings. The 4 million that was allotted, for example, for Rigolet, I guess now is probably worth 1 million, and we still got no, I don't know if it's worth that much, but you know what I mean, the longer you keep the money, the less it'll buy in the years down the road. So for whatever years ago, four or I don't know how many years ago,

three years ago, Rigolet, while people in Rigolet believed that we had \$4 million and that we could use that money to try to get a multi-purpose building, like a rink or a rink and some other building, but in the meantime, all the, all the engineers are telling us that the, you know, the longer we keep the money, the less it's going to be worth down the road and stuff, but and so I guess what I'm getting at is this is that there was a one-time allotment of that money and Rigolet has not been able to use that money. We've been keeping that money as a leverage to get other money just like Hopedale and Makkovik was, but Rigolet hasn't been able to find other money to go with that money to build the building that they want. And I think we had talked about, we had asked the question about could we apply to the Trust to try to get some more money on top of that. I remember, Tony, we were up in the hotel and we talked about trying to leverage some more money from the Tasiujatsoak Trust so that we could use the money that we had and to make buildings and to do something with it for our communities because they're becoming impatient with us, and rightfully so. They know we got that amount of money that we're not spending and we've got a community hall that's moldy and falling down. You know, people are getting impatient.

**MS. PAIN:** I think we've been asked that question as well as another question which is can we have the interest on that money, and we've said, no. We said the money is here, we've committed \$4 million. So when the communities are ready to draw it down and spend it, there's 4 million available, and I think that was a decision of the Trust, knowing the other disbursements that we've made, and the other allocations we've made, at the same time paying attention to the Heritage Fund that we have to keep certain amounts of money for a Heritage Fund. I'm not sure what the answer's going to be on applying for more money. We haven't entertained that, that idea to date to receive more money for a recreation centre. We've said there was \$4 million for each community and that was, really was; the idea was to leave her other funds from either the Provincial or Federal Governments.

**MR. LYALL:** The only thing I would add to that, I mean, there's nothing to stop me from putting in a proposal for more money for the trustees to consider. You know, it's not guaranteed you're going to get it, of course.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more questions? Well, at this point then I'd like to thank Isabella and Rexanne, the Honourable President and Honourable Minister of Finance for the presentations. Honourable President, would you like to close this Committee of a Whole?

**MR. LYALL:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. Yes, I would.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Okay. We'll now take our lunch break and reconvene at two o'clock where we'll start our next item on the agenda.

**MR. POTTLE:** In the departmental report that's not in the binder, Madame Speaker, I'd just like to inform the Assembly that the Department of Human Resources and Finance has been successful in recruiting and hiring a Director of Human Resources who will take undertake his duties as of September 27th in Nain, and a Director of Economic Development is also being hired and is in the process of

relocating to Nain as well, Madame Speaker. The last report that I would like to table, Madame Speaker, is relative to the section 111 of the Nunatsiavut Assembly Act, which just sets out what the Assembly has been paying out with respect to salaries and what dollar amounts has been contributed to support the work of Assembly members who sit on various committees. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honorable Susan Nochasak.

**MS. NOCHASAK:** Thank you, Madame Speak. I'd like table the annual report for the Department of Education and Economic Development, the highlights through 2010 through 2011. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MR. SHIWAK:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I'd like to present two reports. One is the annual report for Nunatsiavut Affairs for 2010, 2011. The other is, it's been a long time coming. I'd like to present the annual report for Nunatsiavut Government for 2009, 2010. This is the fourth annual report of the Nunatsiavut Government. You might question why it's such a long time coming. It's because if you recall, we just received the financial statements this past March, and they've been incorporated in this annual report. So it gives it a clear picture of what Nunatsiavut Government has been trying to achieve for that period of time. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MS. KEMUKSIGAK:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I'd like to table the annual report, 2010, 2011 for the Department of Health and Social Development.

**MR. LAMPE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker I just want to table that I am presenting an update on what the Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism had done over the year. Nakummek.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Nakummek, Honorable Minister. Any more tabling of documents or petitions? Then we'll move on to the next item on our agenda, number 7, which is Minister Statements or announcements. Do you have any Minister Statements or announcements? The Honourable Minister of Lands.

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. Madame Speaker, I'd like to speak on the Department of Lands and Natural Resources Nunatsiavut Assembly from a Minister's perspective as a statement from the department on a quarterly report, September the 13th. Madame Speaker, the Department of Lands and Natural Resources has been extremely busy over the last number of months in all sectors of department. I would like to provide an update on the status of the key files our department is actively engaged in. Minister's Office: Madame Speaker, since becoming Minister in March, I quickly became involved and educated on all key files. I quickly came to realize that the Department of Lands and Natural Resources have a large responsibility for many important files. I would like to update you on many of the 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 of the review of the draft Land Use Plan. The Nunatsiavut Government adopted in principle the June, 2011 draft of the Land Use Plan in early July. The next step in the process is for the regional planning authority to hire a commissioner and hold public hearings on the draft. The authority has hired a commissioner, but has recently requested an extension to March 31st, 2012 to complete the plan. Last week the Executive Council agreed to grant

the extension to the planning authority. In July the department was successful in recruiting a GIS specialist. Eldred Allen was hired in this position and he's working out of our office in Rigolet. Unfortunately, the processing of land applications are well behind schedule, as Deputy Minister's duties have left little time for the lands division duties. We hope to be able to get further capacity to help the situation this fall. Madame Speaker, Environmental Division. I would like to update the Assembly on several key files for the Environmental Division. The division is presently in the middle of recruiting candidates to build the positions to a Minister, the Environmental Protection Act and draft regulations that are required. Madame Speaker, the research file has also kept this division busy. Research activity has continued this summer and researchers have utilized both the Research Centre in Nain and at Torngat Mountain National Park. Discussions have been held with the President of Memorial University on how we can increase our co-operation on research in Nunatsiavut. We are looking forward to advancing these discussions. Madame Speaker, we have been actively engaged in the environmental assessment process for the Lower Churchill Generation Project. The Environmental Assessment Panel Hearings concluded on April the 15th, 2011. The panel overseen the assessment, submitted their report to the Provincial and Federal Governments in late August. We are pleased to see that the panel accepted many of our recommendations and we look forward to discussing the reports, recommendations with the proponent Provincial and Federal Governments over the next few months. Madame Speaker, the Hopedale Contamination Project is another of our key files. We have recently completed a dietary assessment that will assist in determining the human health risks as we move forward with this project. Ourselves and the Hopedale Inuit Community Government will continue to push the Province to advance plans for the remediation project and to make some significant progress this year. Madame Speaker, we have also been supporting the Nain Inuit Community Government to solve the public health and environmental issues related to the newly-constructed, Trouser Lake Road. As we know, the construction of this road resulted in the declaration of a state of emergency by the community. We are now supporting the Nain Inuit Community Government to ensure that the engineer responsible for this construction and the state of emergency are held accountable and for most importantly that the road is no longer a threat to public health or the environment. This is about the beginning of a renewed relationship where the Nunatsiavut Government and Inuit Community Governments hold a shared objective of sustainable and responsible development in our communities for the benefit of our members. To further this, we will work with the communities and Joint Management Committee to host a sustainable community development workshop this upcoming winter. Non-renewable Resource Division; Madame Speaker, in late March, Brent Denniston was hired as Director of our Non-renewable Resource Division. There was, there were several key files in this section. With regards to uranium issue, our department organized a three-day workshop on all specs of uranium. It was delivered by Golder Associates Limited in Goose Bay from August 9th to 11th, 2011, for the Nunatsiavut Assembly and relevant staff. A final report was distributed to all participants and will be payable at this Assembly sitting. Mineral exploration in Labrador Inuit Lands has decreased due to the combination of moratorium on the mining of uranium and the lingering effects of the global economic downturn. To date, five exploration companies have received work plan approvals on various properties in Labrador Inuit Lands. Freeport Resources Incorporated has mineral rights in the Iron Strand area. They received a NG work plan approval in 2010 to complete a granite bulk sample program at the Hutton Beaches in 2011. This program did not go ahead as they were unable to co-ordinate the logistics



of the proposed program. Quest Rare Earth Minerals Ltd. continues to explore for rare earth minerals on both the Quebec and Labrador side of the border near Strange Lake. They want to expand their deposit and have been conducting preliminary environmental base line studies to advance the project. We understand they preferred supply and shipping route for this project is a road through LISA and LIL coast near Voisey's Bay. Quest will meet later this month with me, Deputy Minister and Director of Non-renewable Resources to provide an update on their exploration program. Impact and Benefit Agreement Section; Madame Speaker, our impact benefit coordinator has been active in coordinating our responsibilities around the Torngat Mountain National Park Impact Benefit Agreement and the Voisey's Bay Mine Impact and Benefit Agreement. Madame Speaker, due to major changes in the VALE staff, a lot of time we spent on educating the staff on the IBA commitments, especially in the area of employment and business. VALE has also implemented a secured services way of doing business with HR on contracting being handled mostly out of Toronto. The IBA coordinator, along with VALE, travelled to St. John's and Toronto to educate and review IBA commitments with shared services staff in those offices. We are continuing to ensure IBA commitments are being honoured in all areas. On the Torngat Mountains IBA we are continuing to ensure this IBA being implemented. We met to discuss the proposed wildlife regulation changes and how it will affect our IBA. In addition, we attended CMV meetings as observer and discussed with our representatives along with Tom Sheldon and Jimmy Goudie of our department caribou numbers in the park and discussed further management of the Torngat Mountains caribou herd. We expect these discussions to continue. Madame Speaker, each of the one fishing entity the NG, LIDC and Torngat Co-op, have been meeting regularly on this file. We now prefer to refer this to this file as a joint partnership, rather than in one fishing entity. By forming partnerships rather than a one fishing entity, each of us, NG, LIDC, and Torngat Co-op, can ensure each organization can meet each organization's objective, maintain their assets by forming partnerships, and plan to be able to maximize benefits, increasing and to be able to pursue opportunities. The three parties are now drafting management agreements that will advance all of our interest in the fishery. We hope to have the agreements finalized and in place by the next fishing season. Renewable Resource Division; Madame Speaker, our Renewable Resource Division has been kept busy this last quarter. Fishery and wildlife-related issues are extremely important and we have worked hard to manage these important files. Madame Speaker, the 2011 fishery is coming to a close. Crab catch rates were down considerably from last year. In 2J South, 2H South and also in 2J North at the beginning of the season. The Turbot Fishery and the Makkovik plant are now closed. There are, approximately, 280,000 pounds landed in Makkovik this year. What should have been a two-week fishery was drawn out over five weeks. This can be attributed to DFO's Turbot management regime. Changes in Turbot management in order in Labrador are required to make this a viable fishery for Nunatsiavut. We will continue to pursue DFO on this issue. In fact, myself, President Lyall met with Minister Penashue and DFO Minister Ashfield last month and we raised these issues with them. The 2011 shrimp fishery has been truthful with the increased and the demand for shrimp commanding higher prices, it is anticipated that the entire 1260 metric tonne quota will be harvested by beneficiaries in the in shore fishery this year. The department plans to conduct community consultations this fall on commercial fishery policy for Nunatsiavut. We look forward to these consultation sessions. Madame Speaker, on wildlife issues we have also been busy. In June the department attended a George River Caribou Workshop held by the Province where new findings on the George River Caribou Herd were presented. Signs continue to indicate that the

herd is on a downward trend with the population projected to continue decreasing by approximately a third every year from 2011 to 2015. The department had scheduled community consultations, along with representatives from the Torngat Wildlife and Plants Co-Management Board and the Newfoundland Department of Environment. The consultations were scheduled to take place in the Upper Lake Melville area September the 14th to the 15th and September the 18th to the 22nd for Nunatsiavut. Unfortunately, the Province informed us just yesterday that they were withdrawing from participating in consultations until after the election. We feel it is essential to have Provincial representation at the sessions as they hold the scientific information on the state of the herd and can answer those questions. We are postponing our consultations until the Province are available to participate. We will re-schedule the sessions as soon as possible. The department is currently reviewing a decision on the polar bear total allowable harvest by Torngat Wildlife and Plant Co-Management Board. The department will be sending a letter to the Minister of Environment and Conservation once again pursuing an increase in allocation to 12 polar bears. In 2011 the Minister of Environment and Conservation approved Torngat Wildlife Plant Co-Management Board's decision to implement a 35-moose total allowable harvest for LISA. The department is presently discussing how the moose allocation will be managed. Madame Speaker, I would like to commend departmental staff for their hard work over the last number of months managing all of these files and other files that I have not mentioned here today. We will continue to move these issues forward for the benefit of Nunatsiavut and our beneficiaries. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Nakummek, Honorable Minister. I'd like to call on the Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. Just two quick announcements from the Department of Finance Human Resource and Information Technology. I am pleased to report to the Assembly, Madame Speaker, that the consolidated financial audit statements are ready to be received by the Department of Finance. We expect those within the next day or two to be reviewed by the department, brought back to the Assembly for December of or the next sitting, December, Madame Speaker, in which time we hope to bring the auditors to present the audited financial statements. It's my pleasure, Madame Speaker, to commend the Department of Finance Human Resources and Information Technology for the quick turnaround on the audited financial statements this year. It's my pleasure to announce that we're approximately six months ahead this year than where we had been in previous years. The second announcement, Madame Speaker, I believe every Assembly realizes and knows and are aware that we are now starting the budget process for the next fiscal year and we welcome consultations with each of the departments to prepare our budget for the next fiscal year. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Nakummek, Honorable Minister. I'd now like to recognize the Honourable Minister of Health.

**MS. KEMUKSIGAK:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I would like to report on activities in the Department of Health and Social Development. Since I started my position in March, 2011, the new Department of Health and Social Development office is starting to be built in Nain. They are now

working on the foundation. The building is expected to be complete by February or March of 2012. The AnânauKatiget Tumingit Regional Inuit Women's Association held their AGM in May, 2011 in Nain and elected a new President and executive. Carol Gear of Makkovik is the new President. They also have a new coordinator, Myrtle Banfield. I met with the Association at the AGM and they brought forward some concerns to me. Ongoing core funding, right now they have funding from the Trust, but they'd like to have ongoing core funding from another source, children being apprehended by Child Youth and Family Services and sent to Newfoundland, setting up a Status of Women's Council for Nunatsiavut, an advocacy on behalf of Inuit Women and Children to the Nunatsiavut Government. Madame Speaker, I'd like to update the Assembly on various meetings; meetings with the Provincial Ministers. In July the Deputy Minister, Michelle Kinney and I met with Minister Kennedy of Health and Social Develop, Social Services and Minister Patty Pottle, Aboriginal Affairs. On Mental Health and Personal Care Home Issues. The Province gave Nunatsiavut Government an additional 75,000 to assist with suicide prevention within Nunatsiavut. We had several meetings regarding the closing of the only personal care home in Happy Valley, Goose Bay, in which 13 of the 14 residents are Nunatsiavut beneficiaries. The Province was considering leasing one wing of the Old Paddon home to a non-profit agency, but that has been taken off the table as they feel they will need more clinical space for the anticipated Lower Churchill Project. They will now use the Old Paddon home for other services, such as community health or mental health. On September 6th the Deputy Minister and I met with the Minister of Child, Youth and Family Services, Charlene Johnson and Minister Pottle, regarding the amount of children being placed in foster care outside of Labrador. There are presently 29 children in care in, in Roddickton, Newfoundland. This is very disturbing and we want to work with the Province to try to bring the children back to our communities and to help set up more foster cares, foster homes in our communities. The new Child Youth and Family Services Department should be set up for Labrador before March 2011. It will no longer be under the Health Board. On September the 7th, the Deputy Minister, Myrtle Banfield, of the Inuit Women's Association and I met with the Minister responsible for the status of women, Susan Sullivan, and Minister Pottle regarding funding and support for the organization, roles, mandate, and how we can work together. From that meeting we are going to ask Minister Penashue to arrange meetings with Federal Ministers, such as the Status of Women Canada and Indian and Northern Affairs regarding funding. I would like to thank Minister Patty Pottle for her dedicated work on arranging meetings with other Provincial Ministers. Madame Speaker, I'd like update the Assembly on some Federal meetings as well. In May there was a meeting with President Lyall and Nunatsiavut Government Chief Negotiator, Isabella Pain, Minister Dan Pottle and I with Assistant Deputy Minister of Health regarding the NIHB deficit. Minister Penashue has arranged two meeting, had arranged two meetings with Federal Ministers; one on social issues and one on residential schools. Minister Wong held a meeting in Goose Bay on August the 20th with Innu, Inuit and Metis on seniors' issues. The need for further space for long term care and personal care homes were major issues, as well as changes in Old Age Security, changes in the RAP Program, Elder Abuse and Neglect, and the serious need for housing for seniors. On August 27th, Minister Penashue held a meeting with his key staff and the Deputy Minister for Education, Tim McNeil and I regarding including the Labrador Inuit in the Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement. Madame Speaker, I'd like to talk on truth and reconciliation events. Department of Health and Social Development received funds from INAC to send 17 people to the Truth and Reconciliation event in Inuvik in June/July. There were major problems with accommodations when

we arrived and it took a few days to get them all resolved. Some people gave public statements and the majority of the group gave private statements. Minister Dan Pottle and I attended on behalf of the Nunatsiavut Government. We publicly invited the Truth and Reconciliation Commission to come to Nunatsiavut. There will be a Truth and Reconciliation Atlantic event in Halifax, October 26th to the 30th. We are involved in the planning of this event as we were not involved in the planning with, for Inuvik. There are various committees that our staff is involved in. They will be coming to Hopedale on September 22nd and 23rd for community event where people can give public or private statements. They will be in Goose Bay on September 20th and this event will include the Inuit, Innu and Metis. We have applied for funds from INAC for the Halifax event, but we only received a small portion of what we requested. And to end I would like to speak on trauma and addictions training. Trauma and Addictions Certified Training started yesterday and will go on till June, 2012. It will be held one week a month for 10 months. Twenty-six people are registered for the training and the majority of the trainees are Department of Health and Social Development staff. Madame Speaker, I'd like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak and to update the Assembly on the Department of Health and Social Development. Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more Minister Statements or announcements? The Honourable Susan Nochasak, Minister of Education.

**MS. NOCHASAK:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. Madame Speaker, since last sitting we have been extremely busy in a number of areas. The Post-Secondary Student Support Program is continuing to be challenged as our membership has grown substantially over the last number of years and as well because we had more interested students in pursuing post-secondary studies. For this current fiscal year we are taking 144 full-time students, 38 part-time students. We have taken all the students who have applied from the Nunatsiavut communities and we have 19 wait listed from other parts of Labrador and Canada. We have accomplished by transferring funds from our Teacher Training Program as well as capitalizing from funds from other sources. Madame Speaker, the IBSW Program is moving along on schedule. The Inuit Bachelor of Social Work has 19 students who are now in their third year of studies and will spend this fall semester in the field for their first of two work placements. It was a challenge finding 19 placements, but the task was accomplished and the students started in the field this past Monday. Over the summer session we had a course developed and offered to assist students with their writing and grammar skills. This has proved to be most beneficial to the students and we hope to continue with other seminars throughout the remainder of their program. We also established a Leniency Policy, Madame Speaker. This was established to give students who received funding in the past but who have penalties that prevent them from returning to full-time studies. Through this initiative, they will have the opportunity to submit a request to the Ministerial Appointed Committee who will review the circumstances which gave them cause to losing their funding to determine if they should be allowed to return to their studies. Madam Speaker, we have entered into two new Return of Service Agreements; one for medical school and the other for environmental studies. This has been done in conjunction with other Nunatsiavut departments. As many of you may realize, we are under a new Agreement with Inuit Pathways called the Aboriginal Skills Employment and Training Strategy Assets with a greater focus on building partnerships and providing work experience which will lead to

employment for our clients. Because of this new focus, we have, unfortunately, not been able to provide training support to as many clients as we have in the past. We are, however, providing more support through partnership training, partnership development and actually assisting clients to gain employment. We were able to continue with summer student employment and work experience programs, and we have spent, approximately, 65,000 in that area over the summer. As I mentioned earlier, building partnerships with potential employers is a new focus of the Agreement, and staff has spent a considerable amount of time on that issue. In actual fact, I will be travelling to Lab West next week, along with my staff, to meet with H. J. O'Connell and hopefully ILC to discuss new partnership agreements for student placements, work experience and potential employment. Since the Nunatsiavut Business Centre was dissolved, our Business Development Officer, Molly Shiwak, is now over my department, and we have a proposal into ACOA for additional funds to hire a second person so we might provide more services to Inuit businesses, both new and as well those already operating. Madam Speaker, since the last sitting of the Assembly, we now have arrangements in place with Labrador School Board and the Provincial Department of Education for the development of a new high school credit course called Labrador Inuit History. Finally, the position of the Director of Economic Development has been filled and a new employee will be beginning his work with us in Nain in early October. Finally, Madame Speaker, LIDC is currently involved in a number of projects that provide economic activity in Nunatsiavut, as we had heard a bit this morning. Exploratory Drilling at Ten Mile Bay. LIDC commenced in an exploratory drilling program at Ten Mile Bay early this September. The purpose of the program is to drill approximately 10 meters into the granite at numerous locations to determine the quantity and quarriable stone at Ten Mile Bay site. This information is required so that LIDC can examine the economic viability of re-opening the quarry. The program is employing six people; four of which are Nunatsiavut beneficiaries. Post Mill Lumber is crushing a total of approximately 45,000 tonnes of stone in the communities for the, in the communities of Nain, Hopedale, Rigolet and Postville. The work commenced in July and is expected to be completed in November. This work provides employment for eight people, crusher operators and heavy equipment operators, laborers, four of which are Nunatsiavut beneficiaries. LIDC also operated at the base camp again this year. Madame Speaker, the base camp operated for a total of five weeks and provided safe accommodation for several hundred people; researchers, students, geologists, and tourists. The base camp operation was managed by Wayne Broomfield and employed 16 people, including bear monitors, cooks, maintenance, reservation coordinator, all of whom are Nunatsiavut beneficiaries. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Nakummek, Honorable Minister. Any more Minister statements or announcements? The Honourable President.

**MR. LYALL:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. The Nunatsiavut Secretariat is one of the central departments with the Government responsible for the running of the Executive Council, Inter-Governmental Affairs, Planning and Priorities and Communications. While Government infrastructure falls under the Department of Nunatsiavut Affairs, I think it's important for me, as President, to highlight the importance of the opening of our Administration Building in Nain on March 29th of last year. The Nunatsiavut Government Administration Building belongs to all beneficiaries of Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement. It serves as a symbol of our strength as a people and a resolve to control our own

destiny, and a reflection of the great changes that we are taking as a Government, not only in Nain, but throughout the whole of Nunatsiavut. Our ultimate goal now is to carry through on our plans to ensure we have the necessary Human Resources in place at this building so that we are able to effectively deliver programs and services to all of our beneficiaries, no matter where they live. This building is an investment in our community and in our future. Looking ahead, I believe that in the next couple of years we will make significant progress as a Government as we move forward in carrying out our vision of having healthy and vibrant communities where we, as Inuit, are self-sufficient practicing our unique culture and traditions. It is my hope that we will move into our new Assembly building later this year. It is a very impressive building, as most of you saw last night, something that all Labrador Inuit can be proud of. Another key priority from my department is the development of a strategic plan that will guide our Government into the future. We contracted the service of St. John's based GDB Consulting to assist us in the initial development of this plan. A number of planning sessions were held early last and the draft plan was completed and presented in early spring. We have since made further changes to the plan and prioritized a number of issues we feel will form a good basis for charting our course for the future. It is my hope that we will have a final plan approved this year. In October, the Executive Council was invited to meet with then Premier Danny Williams and the Provincial Cabinet in St. John's. This was an historic meeting, as it marked the first time in the Province' history that both of our Governments held such a high level meeting. And we discussed a variety of issues, from Resource Development to Health, Education, Housing, Transportation and Economic Development. It was a very positive meeting as it strengthened relationship between our two Governments. I am hopeful similar meetings will be held on a regular basis. We also had the opportunity to meet with Innu leaders in early February in an attempt to open lines of communications and to reach an agreement on future meetings to discuss specific common issues, including Economic Development, Joint Business Ventures, and an Overlap Agreement. Again, this was a very positive meeting and we agreed to hold similar meetings to further our common issues. In February, the First Minister and I, along with our respective Deputies, were in Ottawa to attend the Inuit Leader Summit on Resource Development hosted by the Inuit Circumpolar Council. There were discussions on a number of issues; particularly off shore oil development and uranium mining. There is a lot of interest from companies wanting to explore these resources here in Nunatsiavut, and that is the case in other regions as well. It was clear that we had to be careful about entering into Economic Development Projects that may harm our land and our environment and those developments must be sustainable. As leaders, we agreed to develop a declaration of responsible Resource Development in Arctic Regions. This document is currently being worked on and is expected to be presented at the next Arctic Council meeting to be held in Nuuk Greenland later this year. Some of the concerns we will address in the declaration include making sure companies respect the rights of Inuit and other Indigenous peoples, balancing the risks and benefits of development and making sure such developments are sustainable and calling for International Fund to deal with any liability and compensation for oil spills and other polluting acts in Arctic off shore waters. Throughout the summit it was stressed by all Inuit leaders that our regions are open for business with respect to Resource Development but not at any cost. Senior civil servants gathered in Nain this spring to take part in two policy development workshops. It is our hope that as a result of these workshops, our senior managers will be better positioned to develop sound policies for the Nunatsiavut Government as we strive to meet our goal of self-governance. I should note the talks continue with the Government of Canada on a new

Fiscal Financing Agreement. Through our senior negotiator, and each relevant department, we are expecting a response from the Federal Government to the proposal we submitted last year by the end of this month. We will begin negotiations as soon as we receive their response. Housing continues to be a major issue for this Government. We are in the process of developing a Needs Assessment to determine our next course of action to ensure adequate and affordable housing is available for all our people. Through our Communication Division, members of the Executive Council receive training in Media Relations. It was a worthwhile exercise, as it provided us with a good perspective on how to deal with various issues, including particularly in times of crisis. As well, the Communications Division was once again awarded a contract from the Federal Government to write and design the Annual Report of the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement. The result is a high-quality publication second to none. The Division, through the Nunatsiavut Resource Centre, also produced a Nunatsiavut Government's Annual Report. I want to thank Assembly members for their hard work and dedication over the past year. While we have had to overcome some challenges and some adversity, I think it's important to realize that the decisions we make are always in the best interest of Nunatsiavut and beneficiaries of the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Nakummek, Honorable President. Do we have any more Minister Statements or announcements? Then we'll move on to Item 7, sorry, Item 8. Member Statements. Do we have any member statements? AngajukKak for Makkovik.

**MR. JACQUE:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. On behalf of the Inuit Community of Makkovik and the Community of Makkovik in general, I'd just like to say thank you and commend the Nunatsiavut Government and the Provincial Government for providing funding for our new arena. Makkovik was a very happy community. With the arena coming on stream for Makkovik, and the multi-purpose building for Hopedale, the Inuit Community Government would like to ask if we can make an amendment to the Procurement Act to implement a clause to ensure that our people will be employed when the contractor comes to do our work. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Thank you, AngajukKak for Makkovik. Any more Member Statements. The Ordinary Member for Canada, Dan Pottle.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. In July of last year, Madame Speaker, I approached the City of St. John's to solicit their interest in partnering with myself, the Ordinary Member for Canada on the Angel Street Project. The Angel Street Project, Madame Speaker, was an initiative that was started by the former Mayor of Iqaluit and the current President of Pauktuutit. This project is intended to raise awareness around the issue of domestic violence and send a message to the broader community that domestic violence is unacceptable. Part of my work, Madame Speaker, as Ordinary Member for Canada, is to work in consultations with various other stakeholders to look at the issue and to continue to raise awareness around the issue of, of violence against women in general. I'm happy to report, Madame Speaker, in this statement that the City of St. John's, namely, Councilor Sheila O'Leary, immediately bought into the initiative and got the support of the City of St. John's Council to move the project forward. Since July of last year, Madame Speaker, the Canadian Constituency Office in the City of St. John's has been able to work with other stakeholders to bring this project to fruition. We have

partnered with the St. John's Downtown Development Corporation, The Grand Concourse Foundation, and the Provincial Government through the Women's Policy Office, the St. John's Native Friendship Centre, the Status of Women's Council for St. John's, the St. John's Sexual Assault and Crisis Prevention Centre, just to name a few partners, Madame Speaker. I'm happy to announce that on October 20th St. John's will be naming a park on the corner of Duckworth and Prescott Street, Angel's Corner in recognition of this wonderful achievement that was started by Elisapee Sheutiapik, and I'm proud and honored to work in partnership with the various stakeholders to ensure that this very important issue continues to be addressed and to send the message to the people of the Province and to the country that violence against women, in particular, is not acceptable and we must do our best to ensure that the issue is continually brought to the floor to end the violence that we currently see in this country, in this Province against women. Angel's Corner will be dedicated on October the 20th and if any member of this Assembly or interested beneficiaries is in and around St. John's, we'd love to see you on October 20th to dedicate Angel's Corner in recognition of the Angel Street Project. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Nakummek, Ordinary Member for Canada. Do we have any other member statements? If not, then we'll move to the next item on the agenda, number 9, which would be Oral Question Period. Any questions? If there are no questions at this time, we'll move into now Item number 10, Written Questions. Does anybody have any written questions? The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. Please correct me, if I'm out of order here, but I was passed a note in response to the AngajukKak for Makkovik's question regarding an amendment to the Procurement Act. Madame Speaker, we can incorporate into the tender document that they hire qualified beneficiaries and/or residents of that community. We have done this by way of example, Madame Speaker, with our Department of Health and Social Development Administrative Building, and I guess just to further answer the question put forth, if there was to be an amendment to the Procurement Act, that would have to come in the form of a bill to amend the Act at a future session of the Nunatsiavut Assembly. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Nakummek. Any more written questions? From now, we're going to take a 15-minute break.

**MR. POTTLE:** Appendixes to the report. Appendix A is a draft amendment to the Nunatsiavut Assembly Act, which we will be recommending as well, and Annex B is the revised Standing Orders that we're hoping that the Committee of the Whole and the Assembly will adopt. As the speaker reiterated, the Standing Committee on Rules and Procedures is established in accordance with Section 414.8 of the Labrador Inuit Constitution and Part VIII of the Assembly Act. The development of the Standing Orders, just for some background information, the current Standing Orders are appendixes to the Nunatsiavut Assembly Act and these Standing Orders were drafted in advance of the election of the First Assembly and adopted by the Transitional Government and came into effect on December 1st, 2005. It was by necessity that the Nunatsiavut Assembly Act and the current Standing Orders be developed in advance so there would be in place, rules to guide the elected members in conducting their proceedings.



Successive assemblies have had to use the Standing Orders to conduct business, and it has become evident that a review should be undertaken to address concerns as to the effectiveness and interpretation of a number of the Standing Orders. The President, Ministers, Ordinary Members, AngajukKak and Chairs have become more familiar with the operation of the Assembly and its proceedings and have found that some of the Standing Orders do not reflect processes, that as members, we found they would like to see. It's important that the Standing Orders be rules to make the Assembly work efficiently and effectively. This is particularly important in the consensus-based Government that is at the heart of Labrador Inuit and the chosen form of Government for Nunatsiavut. The concerns of past speakers or members, as well as current members, the Clerk of the Nunatsiavut Assembly Legal Counsel and Government Officials identified inconsistencies as new questions of procedure arose which required interpretation of the Standing Order by the speaker. The Standing Committee believes that members have managed to deal with procedures as they arose, even in the absence of unanimity by using their inherent sense of what is right and fair. This was supplemented by guidance from the speaker and advice from legal counsel, and the clerk of the Assembly about what to do whenever a new, unscripted situation or question arose. Standing Committee members, from experience, understand that the rules that members follow in the Assembly may have been foreign to begin with, but they are becoming more familiar of how the Standing Orders can be used. The Standing Committee agreed that the Assembly has to take ownership of their rules of procedures and to come up with procedures that are then translated into the Standing Orders that reflect the Assembly's practices and needs. The Committee Review, itself, Madame Chair, the Standing Committee met at the Nunatsiavut Government Office in St. John's on May 10th and 11th to review the current Standing Orders and procedures of the Assembly to ensure that they relevant, understood and work in a consensus system of Government. In reviewing the Standing Orders and procedures, the committee was, was guided by the following objectives. To ensure that the Standing Orders continue to be consistent with Labrador Inuit Constitution and the Nunatsiavut Assembly Act. To ensure the rights and privileges of all members to participate in proceedings, to ensure the Standing Orders reflect what the Assembly wants and how it works within consensus decision-making body, and to ensure that the Standing Order reflects the practices that have been developed. More simply put, do the current Standing Orders work? During the review, the Standing Committee addressed itself to the following general provisions to ensure they reflect the current practices. These general provisions are laid out in front of you in the report and I will not go through them verbatim, but they took into consideration things such as sittings of the Assembly, member statements, how to deal with petitions, what's the function and procedure of the committee on consensus, and the Committee of the Whole, what's the role of the speaker in debate and records keeping by the clerk, just to name a few of the general provisions that we looked at. One of the things that we had earlier questioned was, and one of the, I guess, problematic things that we are faced with when we're dealing with our orders of the day, by way of example, is when is it appropriate to convene as a Committee of the Whole or a Committee on Consensus? By way of example, for reading, first and second reading of bills, as the current Standing Orders state prior to the Assembly Ken asked that a bill be referred to a Committee for review prior to second reading, that sort of thing. Traditionally, we had been waving that timeframe and just proceeding directly to second reading, which always sometimes I don't think is practical and the Committee believed that sometimes we rushed things through too quickly and we should be adhering

more to and using the Committee on Consensus by way of example to deal with reading of bills. So that's what that, basically, that second, or the Standing Orders and the consensus style of Government talks about, some of the things that we found there. Sittings of the Assembly; We reviewed how the Assembly currently sits and we looked at what's currently in the Constitution and in the Assembly Act, and we also looked at other Assemblies in Canada on how they structure, I guess, their sittings of the Assembly. We found that the consensus style Government of the Territory of Nunavut and the North West Territories was a good model. They work from a thick schedule so, and again, some of those examples are outlined in this section of the report, Madame Chair. One of the things that the Committee on Rules and Procedures looked at was related to the sittings of the Assembly to create certainty with planning. Many times we found over the first life of the Assembly and now as we proceed into the second general Assembly of the Nunatsiavut Assembly, it's probably better to do more planning so that there is some certainty with respect to what needs to be done from sitting to sitting to sitting. Again, it seems to the Committee on Rules and Procedures that we often rush through things and we don't take the time necessary to plan our Assembly sittings and we feel sometimes we don't do proper diligence to and things may get overlooked and not be taken into consideration because we have a tendency to come into Hopedale, get out, conduct our business and leave as soon as possible. So that's one of the things that we looked at there and believe that if we had a fixed sitting that there would be more opportunity for the Executive Council for Assembly members and for the departments to prepare for what we need to deal with when we come to the Assembly. One of the things that we found confusing in the Assembly Act, itself and in the Standing Orders was the distinction between a term of the Assembly, a session, and a sitting of the Assembly. So this report recommends that we look at a term of the Assembly as a four-year life of an elected Assembly and, of course, with the current Standing Orders, the recommendations that we're looking at here don't deviate a lot from sessions and sittings. We're still recommending a fall session and a spring session. Within that session there could be a number of sittings, this example being the fall session; this would be our first sitting. We could have a sitting in October, November, December, within that one session. So we found that somewhat confusing and people, I don't think, really appreciated those terminologies, so we tried to soften that a little bit and make it more relevant to how we actually proceed and practice. You can see some examples, in the first Assembly we sat for 37 days. And the second Assembly to date has sat for six days. One of the things that we looked at as well, and is outlined in the report and it's being recommended that we fix a calendar sitting and we work from a legislative agenda. Again to ensure that due consideration is given to what we need to do, I'll just use some examples in trying to, and I guess, put this in context and explain what this section is about. If we had a fixed sitting, we would know exactly when we come to Hopedale, how long we're going to be here for, and if we work from a legislative agenda. That will be developed with the President in consultation with the Executive Council and First Minister, the speaker and the clerk of the Assembly so that we know in each session fall and winter. If we work from a legislative calendar and a legislative agenda, we know exactly what we're up against and we know exactly what business that we want to take care of within session to session, as opposed to now, I mean, you know, being rushed as I think the clerk can probably attest and her staff and the speaker, we scramble every time that we're coming to Hopedale. Things come at Mary and her staff and the speaker staff in order for us to get ready for this sitting, which forces us again to do a lot of quick work. Yes, it gets done, but I don't think it's fair to put that pressure on people to achieve what we want to achieve

and that's such a short period of time without some further planning and consideration around that. Facilities for holding sessions, again, the Committee here looked at, and we recognize that there are many challenges with respect to what the Assembly has to face with coming to and travelling to from sittings; things like limited accommodations, facilities for holding sittings in Hopedale and with the new Assembly Building, hopefully we'll have that worked out and we won't be pressed for finding space. By way of example, we have our own building, we know where we're going to sit, that sort of thing. Some of the things with respect to holding fixed sittings and working from an agenda, we looked at from a cost saving perspective, is probably more fiscally responsible and prudent if we had those sessions. We know exactly when we're coming in, how long we're staying for, it's easier to plan and budget and take into consideration some other things that we need to do in planning for, for a sitting. Under the review of the Nunatsiavut Assembly Act, in reviewing the Assembly's rules and procedures, the Standing Committee had to consider the Nunatsiavut Assembly Act for two reasons; one, as I already mentioned, because the Standing Orders and procedures are annexed to and made part of the Act. And two, to be sure that the Standing Orders being recommended by the Committee are consistent with the Act. If we leave these Standing Orders as a part of the Assembly Act in order to change or revise those Standing Orders that would mean that we would have to amend the Nunatsiavut Assembly Act. So if we adopt the recommendations outlined in the report for that, the Standing Orders can be revised by a simple majority vote of the Nunatsiavut Assembly, which will not require an amendment to the Assembly Act. And I guess to end off; the Committee has put forth four recommendations in the report.

Recommendation number one, the Standing Committee on Rules and Procedures recommends the Standing Orders appended to this report be adopted by the Assembly and furthermore, that the Standing Orders come into effect with the passage of amendments to the Nunatsiavut Assembly Act which implements that decision and, as I stated, there is a draft amendment to the Assembly Act to make that happen. Recommendation number two, again, I'm just reiterating what I just said. The Standing Committee on Rules and Procedures recommends that the amendments to the Nunatsiavut Assembly Act be appended to this report introduced and passed at the earliest opportunity.

Recommendation number three, the Standing Committee on Rules and Procedures recommends that the President and the Executive Council consider preparing a legislative agenda for the four-year term of the Assembly. And recommendation number four, the Standing Committee on Rules and Procedures recommends that the Assembly appoint a special committee to undertake a comprehensive review of the Nunatsiavut Assembly Act and prepare amendments for consideration by the Assembly. Appendix A, as you can see, is the draft bill to amend the Nunatsiavut Assembly Act, and if this is accepted and okayed by the Assembly, as recommended in the recommendations, that we do this as soon as possible, but before we can go to that, we have to get the approval of the Assembly to adopt what's in the report, including the recommendations. Appendix B to the report is the revised Standing Orders for the Assembly. I think, and I would call upon other committee members to assist me. I'm not going to go through this again because it is quite lengthy, we've had this in our possession for a number of days, and I hope people have had a chance to review it. I think the main thing and the main changes to the current Standing Orders that this has adopted, will give clarity to processes that we sometimes question. Committee of Consensus, Committee as a Whole, that sort of thing. What's the process for first reading of bills? What's the process for second reading of bills? I think the work that we've done on this, this makes it a lot more easy to understand and easy to follow and it lays out the process a lot better than

what is in the current Standing Orders. Some other changes that we made to, or recommending, are essentially dealing with definitions and more clearly defining what a term is, what a term is not, that sort of thing. By way of example, in the current Standing Order, I think that there's a definition of member of the Assembly. We all know that members of the Assembly are comprised of Ordinary Members, AngajukKaat, Chairs of Community Corporations, that sort of thing. So that's some of the things that we looked at with respect to making that a little bit more clearer of who, exactly, is a member of the Assembly, just to set the record straight a little bit on that. Am I missing anything, any other committee members want to add anything to this? I guess that's my summary, Madame Speaker, Madame Chair, of the report, and if any individual members of the Committee of the Whole has questions on this, we certainly will take your questions.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The AngajukKak for Rigolet.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I got a lot of little yellow tabs and, first of all, I'd just like to point out that there are a couple of typos and I don't know if I want to go through them or just present them afterwards. There are a couple of typos that I found. So I'll just point them out to you guys afterwards...

**MR. POTTLE:** Or, Charlotte, it might be, I mean, appropriate, to point them out now so that all members are aware of some of these things and we can make those changes before we actually...

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Okay. Can we do this by going through page by page and then come up with it there? Okay. So then we'll start off then by page by page and then you can note the typos or errors when we come to that page. So we'll start off by the Table of Contents, which is page 26.

**MR. POTTLE:** Page 26 of page 77 of the report.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Do anybody have any questions or comments for the Table of Contents, page 26? The Chair of Sivunivut.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** There's a typo under, Rights and Privileges. Privileges need to be spelled correctly.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Where?

**MR. TUTTAUK:** Under Rights and Privileges, the 11th one down, Rights and Privileges.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Okay. Okay. Got that one. Any more for this page? Page 27, the Index. Page 28 of 77, Authorities and Interpretation.

**MR. POTTLE:** One thing that I may want to point out to one of the things that the Committee believed would be useful, if we put marginal headings here as well, so that you can get a quick capture of what is in 1(1), by way of example. It just talks to the Standing Orders. If you go down to 1(4), it talks about consensus decisions. So it's a quick, I guess, overview of what is in that section or in that part of the Standing Order.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Everybody okay with page 28, Authorities and Interpretation? Page 29, AngajukKak for Rigolet.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I just, I think that I got a question here and, by the way, some of the typos I found were in the report, so they count now, right? Okay. But I just got a question because under F, under Definitions, and I might have missed it somewhere else, but it says, the First Minister means the First Minister of Nunatsiavut appointed by the President, and in somewhere else I saw appointed by the Assembly. So what is it?

**MS. POTTLE:** I believe, Charlotte, what you've seen and you're correct, and thank you for pointing that out. The First Minister is nominated and considered by the Assembly, and if the Assembly consents to that nomination, the First Minister is appointed by the President.

**MS. MICHELIN:** And that reflects the language in the Constitution in 326 of the Constitution it says that the President of Nunatsiavut has to appoint the First Minister of Nunatsiavut. So one of the things that we have to do in the Standing Orders is conform to the Constitution and that's the language in the Constitution.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Charlotte, yes, go ahead.

**MS. WOLFREY:** No, thank you, and I got that one straight. Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more questions or comments on page 29? Then we'll move to page 30. AngajukKak for Rigolet.

**MS. WOLFREY:** I only got a comment here and it's on (k) and I guess I know the reason, but it's just that I know it's about Ordinary Member and I don't, I know it's in our Constitution and we can't change it, I guess, but I really think that we should all be Ordinary Members, we're all elected through a process. That's, that's just my opinion. That's all. And if we're going to go reviewing stuff and changing stuff, that might be a time to look at it, I guess what I'm saying.

**MS. MICHELIN:** It's because an Ordinary Member has a specific definition. An Ordinary Member represents a constituency. AngajukKak are mayors of communities, chairs of chairs of corporation. Ordinary Members represent constituencies, and that's why there's a real distinction between the job, the definition, the jobs that Ordinary Members do and the jobs that AngajukKaat do and the jobs that Chairs do. So that's why an Ordinary Member is a specific, has a specific responsibility, and that is to represent their constituents and constituencies.

**MS. WOLFREY:** I know, Loretta, and that's what I'm doing too, I'm representing my constituents, and I'm just saying I understand all that. I said that in the beginning, I know, but if we're looking at reviewing things, why can't we look at something like that, if all of us were supportive of I know, when, maybe, no, maybe we might have made some errors along the way. That's what I'm saying is we can't really...

**MS. MICHELIN:** Yes. You'd have to amend the Constitution... Constitution is set up. Ordinary Members represent constituencies. AngajukKakaat sit in the Assembly to represent their communities. Chairs sit

in the Assembly to represent members of their corporations. Ordinary Members have a totally different responsibility. They represent the constituencies of the Canadian Constituency, Constituency of Upper Lake Melville, Nain, Hopedale and Makkovik. That's why it's all set out in the Constitution, and it has, unless you're ready to look at amending the Constitution, we have to stick by what's in the Constitution.

**MS. WOLFREY:** I know. I guess that's what I was asking. If we're reviewing stuff, why can't we go there?

**MR. POTTLE:** If I can just respond to that. I guess the mandate of the Committee on Rules and Procedures was to review these Standing Orders and not the Constitution. So that's why we, we didn't go down that road, and I guess just to complement what Loretta has said, Ordinary Members are elected to the Assembly in general elections. Yes, there are separate elections for AngajukKak of community Government and for Chairs for Inuit Community Corporation, and the AngajukKak and the Chair of a Community Corporation are deemed to be defacto members of the Assembly, or members of the Assembly by virtue of the position of the office that you've been elected to.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Chair, it wouldn't hurt that since every other Minister, Ordinary Members, President, or it wouldn't hurt to add AngajukKaat and Chairs of Community Corporations under the definitions, clearly.

**MS. MICHELIN:** And what definition?

**MR. ANDERSEN:** What we're on now, Definitions.

**MS. MICHELIN:** You mean put in a, a specific definition for AngajukKak and a specific...

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Yes.

**MS. MICHELIN:** ...definition for Chairs...

**MR. ANDERSEN:** ...since Ministers and Ordinary Members and the President is, has, you know, like the President means the President of Nunatsiavut and includes any person acting as the President and Ordinary Member, the definition is there. There is a definition for Ministers.

**MS. MICHELIN:** Yes.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** It would not hurt as a process...

**MS. MICHELIN:** No.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** ...with our part of the Assembly as well to...

**MS. MICHELIN:** Yes. There's that...

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Yes.

**MS. MICHELIN:** ...that could be done, yes. It could.

**MR. POTTLE:** I think, Tony, your point is well taken too, but I think subsection (i) covers off that, when we define a member, means a member of the Assembly and includes the President and a Chair unless the context otherwise requires. One of the things to...

**MS. MICHELIN:** That's the speaker.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** ...I know, yes. And I say that, but there is a definition for an Ordinary Member. There is a definition even for the President, you know, and...

**MS. MICHELIN:** I think, Tony...

**MR. ANDERSEN:** If we need a definition for the President, perhaps we need a definition for AngajukKak and for the Chair of Community Corporations as well, you know.

**MR. POTTLE:** On that, may I suggest, and one of the things that I didn't reiterate in the report, there will be a glossary as well to the Standing Orders. So maybe that would be the place to...

**MS. MICHELIN:** No...

**MR. POTTLE:** No?

**MS. MICHELIN:** well, it's not to the Standing Orders. It was decided that that glossary would be a separate document. It wouldn't be annexed because...

**MR. LYALL:** No, I'm not saying that it would be annexed, but there are plans for a glossary to this, and I guess if you're stuck on that and you would like to see that in there, then the way to achieve that at this Assembly is to make an amendment to include that definition.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Yes. And, okay. But because I'm a little bit lost because, you know, we're going through this page by page, clause by clause, but for what?

**MS. MICHELIN:** Yes.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** You know.

**MS. MICHELIN:** We can...

**MR. ANDERSEN:** What is the purpose here now? If you can ask questions or make suggestions then... I only made that suggestion because Charlotte asked the question, and there was no definition here for AngajukKak. By the way, you could have pointed out to her right away. Here is the definition.

**MS. MICHELIN:** What...

**MR. ANDERSEN:** You surely do not stop on anything.

**MR. POTTLE:** Don't take offence to that bad choice of words and, yes, Tony, I think we can make that change too.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** We need it.

**MR. POTTLE:** And, I mean, if I'm hearing what the Chair and the other member of the Committee is thinking, it's okay to make these changes now so that if the Committee as a Whole accepts it, then we just go back into the house, put forth a resolution to adopt this report and the annexes as changed through this discussion.

**MS. MICHELIN:** If it's decided here that there should be a definition for Chair and AngajukKak in the Standing Orders, we can accept that now, put it in. The definition would reflect the definition of Chair of Corporation and AngajukKak as is outlined in the Constitution and at the end when there's a resolution to pass the report with recommendations and Standing Orders, we can just say, "Standing Orders as amended," okay?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more questions or comments to this page 30? Then we'll move to page 31 for any questions or comments. AngajukKak from Rigolet.

**MS. WOLFREY:** On (q) it says Quorum means six Ordinary Members and the President personally present in the Chamber for purposes of sitting of the Assembly. I'm, what my question is is if that's a quorum, then is not the Executive Council a quorum of the Assembly, or is that a typo or what?

**MS. MICHELIN:** Once again, the definition of quorum reflects what is in the Constitution. What the Constitution says under Part 415 is quorum for decisions. Six Ordinary Members of the Nunatsiavut Assembly and the President must be present before a decision may be made by the Nunatsiavut Assembly. So that reflects the definition of what a quorum is in the Constitution.

**MS. WOLFREY:** And if we go to the report on page 12 of 77, it says, a quorum of the Assembly shall be six members and the speaker, unless otherwise stated in the Constitution or elsewhere in this Act. So what's a quorum? Is it six Ordinary Members and the speaker, or six Ordinary Members and the President? Because to me, with six Ordinary Members and the President, then that's almost the Executive Council. I'm sorry.

**MS. MICHELIN:** This is just the report. It's the Standing Orders that are important. So the Standing Orders reflects the definition of, for quorum that's outlined in the Constitution.

**MS. WOLFREY:** And that's a quorum of the Assembly, is it...

**MS. MICHELIN:** Yes.

**MS. WOLFREY:** ...for the Assembly to convene?

**MS. MICHELIN:** Yes.

**MS. WOLFREY:** A quorum is six Ordinary Members and the President?

**MS. MICHELIN:** Yes.

**MS. WOLFREY:** And no speaker?



**MS. MICHELIN:** Personally, you put-, well, the speaker...

**MS. WOLFREY:** So that's what I'm asking, I'm asking is the Executive Council then a quorum of the Assembly?

**MS. MICHELIN:** Well...

**MR. LYALL:** No. It says, no, it says six Ordinary Members. It doesn't say six Ministers.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Sorry. Do you understand what I'm saying?

**MS. MICHELIN:** Yes. And Ordinary Members include Ministers, because Ministers have to be Ordinary Members. So there are, there are also Ordinary Members plus the President.

**MR. BARBOUR:** If I understand you, if I understand you correctly, Loretta, what you're saying is that there must be six Ordinary Members, at the very minimum, along with the AngajukKaat to make a quorum. There must be six Ordinary Members, right? No?

**MS. MICHELIN:** There must be six Ordinary Members regardless of whether they're Ministers or not, plus the President.

**MS. WOLFREY:** So, Loretta, my question of is the Executive Council a quorum of the Assembly stands because there's six Ministers, or they're all Ordinary Members and the President, so are they a quorum of the Assembly and they can make decisions? They're a quorum of the Assembly. We don't need an Assembly then.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** I suppose, Chair, if the President tried to convene a member, a sitting of the Assembly without inviting the rest of us, wouldn't his head be on the chopping block for it, eh?

**MS. MICHELIN:** But each member of the Assembly has an obligation to attend Assemblies unless they have a very good reason not. So, what the Standing Orders and what the Constitution says is at a bare minimum. There has to be at least six Ordinary Members and the President in order to form a quorum. Now, that's not counting the speaker, because the speaker doesn't vote anyway. But to make a decision, you have to have at least six Ordinary Members and the President.

**MR. SHIWAK:** I think what Charlotte's trying to ask is if me and Jim and the rest of the Ministers were sat around this table, and the speaker, can we do business of the Assembly, if it was just us? That's what you're asking, right?

**MS. WOLFREY:** Yes. And I'm asking because it says even without the speaker. I think if it said this...

**MR. POTTLE:** The Assembly can't conduct business without a Speaker.

**MS. MICHELIN:** The speaker, you have to have a speaker in order to conduct an Assembly. To take a decision, you have to have six Ordinary Members and the President. But there is an obligation on every Member to attend Assemblies, unless you have a very good reason not to because the AngajukKaat are

there representing their communities, the Chairs are representing their corporation, so you have an obligation to be here to represent your members.

**MS. WOLFREY:** And that's not what I was getting at, Loretta. All I was getting at was that I understand what you're saying, but I also am trying to say that an Assembly sitting-, according to this, a quorum could be, of the Assembly, could not include the speaker. Why don't you just include something there that, or does it say it has to have a Speaker.

**MS. MICHELIN:** It's because we're talking about how many people you need to take a decision. The speaker doesn't take part in the decision. So in order to have a vote on a specific issue or decision, you need six Ordinary Members and the speaker. It's a given that the speaker is here to conduct the Assembly. The Assembly cannot go forward without a speaker, but the speaker doesn't get a vote. Quorums are about votes on decisions.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Anyway, okay, I'll leave it.

**MR. POTTLE:** But before you do, Charlotte, though hypothetically that could happen. I mean, you know.

**MS. MICHELIN:** But it's highly unlikely.

**MR. POTTLE:** But it's highly unlikely that it ever would. I would hope that if that ever happened, that the President, if he was here, would ask for a deferral of the Assembly so that there would not be only Ordinary Members. That's what I would hope.

**MR. LYALL:** Okay. Could I just add, I think it's very important to take this a little bit further, and if an Assembly is called and only six Ordinary Members decided to come and the rest of them say, to Hell with it, I'm not going to that one, it's their own fault if they don't show up to the sitting unless they have an absolutely good reason not to.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Anyway, I was thinking something of like the, let's just say the Environmental Protection Act and it wasn't passed, or whatever. Six Ordinary Members and the President could say we're passing it, and that would be their decision. That's what I was trying to get at, but never mind, I know what Loretta's saying, you've got to have a speaker, and you've got to have, you've got to call a sitting of the Assembly.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more comments or questions for this page, 31? If not, we'll move to page 32. Charlotte. AngajukKak.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. It's a typo this time only. On sitting of the Assembly, number 4, it says the Assembly shall meet on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays from 9:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. So I think it should be 9:30 a.m.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** I think that what it's saying there, it should be 9:00 a.m. and not 9:30, because we're always used to starting at 9:00 and not 9:30. And what about the 5:30 too, should be 5:00, right?

And I think the 5:30 should be changed to the 5:00 instead of 5:30. So instead of 9:30 to 5:30, it should be 9:00 to 5:00. Charlotte.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Thank you. And then in number five it should be at 5:00 p.m. on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesdays and Thursdays then instead of 5:30. Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Then we'll go to the next page, 33. No questions or comments for this page? Then we'll go to page 34. Any questions or comments on page 34? Then we'll move to page 35. Mr. Pottle.

**MR. POTTLE:** At the top of page 35, number 2, if we're looking at typos and picking up things, there should be a period after 16(2).

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Okay. Got that. Thank you. Any more comments or questions for this page? Then we'll move to page 36 for any comments or questions. Chair of Sivunivut.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** Just a question of semantics for number 7. The statement there where the AngajukKaat, that there is plural, should be AngajukKak. Singular.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Right. Put that one. Thank you for that one. Anymore questions or comments on this page? Then we'll move to page 37. If you have no comments or questions for this page, we'll go to page 38. If you have no comments or questions for this page, we'll go to page 39. Chair of Sivunivut.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** This is mostly for a definition purpose. Could we get a definition of the prima facie?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Again, we were going to change that. Okay.

**MS. MICHELIN:** That was, we were supposed to put that. It's kind of is like an obvious-, what was the wording we came up with was... that was supposed to be changed to ordinary language, and it's like an obvious breach, it's prima facie. We'll put that in common language.

**MR. POTTLE:** Loretta, if I may, I believe the Committee had some discussion on that, and again we were going to try to explain that in a glossary.

**MS. MICHELIN:** Glossary. That's right.

**MR. POTTLE:** Basically, what it means is at first glance, or at first look...

**MS MICHELIN:** Yes.

**MR. LYALL:** ...it appears to be.

**MS. MICHELIN:** Yes.

**MR. LYALL:** That's what that term means. It's Latin, of course, and right? It's really hard to put that into common language with one, with just one word.

**MS. MICHELIN:** Members will be getting a glossary of terms commonly used in legislatures. It won't be attached as an Appendix to the speaking orders, but every member will get a glossary of terms commonly used in legislatures. It won't be attached as an Appendix to the speaking orders, but every member will get a glossary of commonly used expressions and terms.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more comments or questions for this page, 39? Then we'll move to page 40. Any questions or comments for page 40? Then we'll move to 41.

**MR. LYALL:** Now, just, just a typo on (h). An officer of the Assembly should be an officer.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any questions or comments for page 42? Then we'll go over to page 43. Any questions or comments for page 43? Then we'll move over to page 44. AngajukKak for Rigolet.

**MS. WOLFREY:** I've got a question. I don't know who can answer it, but and I don't mean any disrespect, I want to know that, right, but I'm just thinking of other things that happen. What if we have someone who comes in and don't want this prayer? What's going to happen then? You know what? I mean, because that's happening in some places where you're not allowed to say the Lord's Prayer in school or whatever. I'm just asking, would we just deal with it then or what?

**MR. POTTLE:** I would assume we would deal with it then. But keeping with Labrador Inuit traditions and customs, we seldom open a meeting without a prayer. That's been common practice in our culture so, I mean, I think that that's why it's there, and that's what our people want to see. I mean, I have had even at a constituency meeting the question why aren't we opening our constituency meeting without a prayer? Well, I would assume we would just have to deal with it and then, Charlotte, if it did arise, it would be then I, it would then again have to be the will of the Assembly, and if all Assembly members are in favor, or the majority is in favor of continuing with that tradition, then I would say the majority would rule.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak for Hopedale.

**MR. PIERCY:** I think it should left there because it's part of our tradition where it's always done in Inuttitut for the opening and closing prayer. I don't think that should be removed. Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more questions for page 44, or comments? Then we'll move on to page 45. Any questions or comments for this page? Then we'll move on to page 46. Any questions or comments for page 46? Minister Pottle.

**MR. POTTLE:** Just an observation, Madame Chair. As we witnessed today and it's gotten to the point somehow where Ministers statements have become a forum for giving reports, and lengthy reports, I guess, on activities what, with respect to what's going on in the department. I think the original intent of the original Standing Orders was for Minister Statements to be similar to member statements and it's somehow gotten to be a reporting requirement. How do we see that continuing to happen? Would that be more appropriate for a Minister, by way of example, to give an update on the activities in their department by putting that into a report or a document and tabling it as such? I just put that question out there, because it, as you see with the new recommended changes under 29(1) make a short, factual

statement or announcement on Government policy, which, to me, is interpreted as one, as opposed to a series of statements or announcements.

**MR. LYALL:** Well, then in the next clause it says that you, the Minister statement shall not exceed 20 minutes, so you'll still be able to make statement up to 20 minutes, I presume.

**MR. POTTLE:** I think that's the whole time allocated for Minister Statements, itself.

**MS. WOLFREY:** For every Minister, is it?

**MR. POTTLE:** I'm not sure how we would interpret that. Would that mean in 29(2) the time allocated for Minister Statements shall not exceed 20 minutes. So if there are seven members of the Executive Council who wishes to make a statement, you could be taking those statements for a hundred and forty minutes. Total, right? The Minister statements. That's the intent, isn't it...so you're going to be hard-pressed for each Minister to make a statement if you're giving, you get about two and a half minute, And that, I guess that was the point that I was trying to make where the current Minister statements have become a form for reporting on the activities of your department versus a statement, a brief statement on a policy or something that's going on in your department. I think we all agree that that's very useful and a lot of information is now being imparted, but I'm wondering in the Standing Orders how we could achieve that outside of Minister Statements. Would it be appropriate, or would the Assembly expect that I do a written report, by way of example, provide it to the Assembly a few days in advance of a sitting and then just table that as a document?

**MS. MICHELIN:** Just a comment, I think it's important that Ministers give reports on their departments. That's how they get the information out to the rest of the Assembly as to what they're doing. This might need to be amended a bit to reflect that. It depends on what the Assembly, if the Assembly feels that it's important that Ministers have a chance to report on what's happening in their department, then we could re-word 29 to reflect that.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak for Rigolet.

**MS. WOLFREY:** I think I was looking at number 34, but that's a, that's a member statement where they're saying that you can make a member statement, but not about your responsibility as a Minister. But I think if we were given a report beforehand, and we had time to read it, we could come here and ask questions on it. Whereas, if it's a report that's given, just a verbal report that's given and you don't have time to think about it, or kind of form the questions in your head that you're going to answer. If you had the reports beforehand, then you could have a better chance, I think of getting the questions that you wanted answered out. I mean, I can, for me; a written report is good for me. That's what I'd rather have because and then we don't take up so much time in the Assembly. We already got little time.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak for Nain.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Yes. I agree with Charlotte. That's what I was going to say, that if we can get these reports in a timely manner, like, not Friday afternoon because we usually get a lot of stuff on Friday and

we don't want to spend the weekend before we come here reading them. But if we get them-, like, some Ministers did send out three or four days in advance last week, but I certainly don't want to read that and then come here and listen to the Minister stand up and read this off again. That'll be a waste of time. Maybe a summary or something, but if we could, you know, come to some understanding that don't, you know, if you're going to send something on Friday afternoon, don't even bother, you know, just read it here on Monday because they're not going to read stuff on Friday night and Saturday and Sunday, you know? Preparing for the Assembly is one thing, but expecting us to read, you know, to prepare on the weekend is not fair.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Chair of Sivunivut.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** I am pretty much in agreement with what the AngajukKak had said, but, and I like Minister Pottle's recommendation. If this is approved and we get the legislative agenda in place and know when our sittings are going to be, then there shouldn't be an issue with Ministers sending off the reports to be ready for review by all members, and then which I think will help with question periods and to make things run a lot smoother.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** And the Honorable President

**MR. LYALL:** I think we're losing something here. I think it's important that our beneficiaries are people that aren't here in Hopedale, that aren't at Assembly, that follow the Hansard, get reports from the Ministers. Well, are we reporting only to the Ordinary Members who aren't members of the Executive Council? We're reporting to everyone. I think it's important to people that are here that will be standing for election in a couple years from now that they also want to get the message out to their constituents in their communities. I think it's important that people in Nain and Hopedale, Makkovik, and Postville and Rigolet know what we're saying here at the Assembly. If we bring a report, we'll all see the report, but who, in your community's, going to see it?

**MR. ANDERSEN:** I guess there's a lot more of waste for the Ministers to communicate to beneficiaries of Nunatsiavut and here as well. And perhaps they could take advantage of some of those through their newsletters and radio, but, you know, the President has a point, sure, but...

**MR. LYALL:** And I would also just like to point out that you're basically saying the Minister, probably, if we all speak, we've got two and a half minutes each, roughly. The Ordinary Members, who aren't Ministers, have five minutes each. So I think we should at least have the opportunity to speak for five minutes.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Minister of Lands.

**MR. SHEPPARD:** I'd just like to make a comment here, just as, as being the Ordinary Member elected in 2010, I had some concern about the amount of information provided at the Assembly and I think it was a number of people and a short while after that, we came to hear and I wasn't the Minister at the time, but we came to hear all the Ministers giving their reports on their Minister statements and they got a big cheer because of the information they provided. Now I'm hearing, they may be getting

double all the information. Almost sounds like too much provided, so, you know, I don't have a problem with providing information to the Assembly and, and also to the gallery, I think it was very important. Now, an amount of time, we could maybe take a look at this, but providing information verbally, I think at this Assembly, gives us the opportunity to speak and to let the constituents know whether it's in Hopedale, Postville, Nain, Rigolet or Makkovik, like, that's, that's my take on it.

**MS. SILLETT:** Could I say something? The reason that the Minister statements is being proposed here was because we never had that before, and it was very difficult to advise on what the rules were. There were no rules for Minister Statements. So what has happened now are the Ministers use this opportunity to make announcements or to provide very detailed departmental updates, and there are no time limits on the Minister statements? What we tried to do was to try to develop rules, and if those rules are not good enough, you know, you can either go back to the way you were, which was not to have any rules on that, or to have some rules that you can live with but, obviously, you know, what about suggesting that, or writing in what you do already, which is, that the Ministers do make announcements, they provide departmental reports, that's what you do, and I think the time allocated for Ministers usually goes to about 60 minutes, or it can be less than that, but usually that's what it is now.

**MS. MICHELIN:** We also know that a lot of beneficiaries read the Hansard because they, they contact people within the Government with questions based on what they've read in the Hansard.

**MR. LYALL:** I think that the simple answers, is allot five minutes to each Minister, same as the Ordinary Members, and there are times when all the Ministers don't speak, or have report, so it, I mean, the most we're going to take up is 35 minutes. And most members don't speak at all and take any more than five minutes anyway. So if we allotted five minute most of the Ministers are probably done in two, three, or four minutes.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honorable First Minister.

**MR. SHIWAK:** Thank you. I don't have a problem with this here, given the fact that when we do get into longer sittings you're going to get 20 minutes every day for Minister Statements. If the Ministers goes over the 20 minutes, whether it's 10 minutes for one Minister or 5 for another, the speaker can cut them off and say, that's it, you're 20 minutes is up for Minister statements. If you want to give the rest your statement, you do it tomorrow in the order of the day tomorrow. I just don't see anything wrong with what we have here. But it keeps everything in a tight timeframe as well. Thank you.

**MR. WINTERS:** Thank you. I don't have a problem here, but I think if a Minister comes and don't have a statement, he's not doing his job or her, simple.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak for Hopedale.

**MR. PIERCY:** I think if we left it the way we got it, it would be better because it's not broken. Why should we fix something that's not broken? The more information that's left that everybody leaves here without reading the material because sometime you'll skim through the material, but at least if you're

saying whatever you need to say, we say our piece, and you listen to us, you say your piece, and we listen to you, but we might yawn every now and then, but at least then when somebody has something to say, every now and then you're looking eye to eye so that you know you're getting your point across.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak for Nain.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Yes. This is a question for the Committee. Under Member Statements, it says that, Under member statements a member may make a statement on any matter, and then right to number two it contradicts that a little bit by saying, The speaker may order a member who makes some proper use of member statement to take his or her seat, Now, then, you can speak on any matter, but the speaker then can say, sit down. And I wonder why the Committee thought to put that in there and not to say that members could make bad use of their time, but Ministers, we just take it for granted that they're not. Now, maybe they should be told to sit down once in a while, I know. If they're not making good use for their time, if they're trying to campaign or, you know, make their department look good, whatever it is, but and I wonder, like, because that was not in the old Standing Orders about the speaker telling someone to sit down because you're making good use of the time, but I wonder, like, what kind of things were you thinking of that might be considered to be improper use of a member statement?

**MR. POTTLE:** Tony, the whole intention of that was to make sure that the member is speaking on something that's relevant to them and their duties and responsibilities, and not to become-, because member statements and Minister statement periods are not debatable. Like I can't ask the question, or you can't ask the question of me, or you can't, after I make my statement, that's it. The statement is made. The hope and intent was here and it may or may not happen, but what happens if somebody gets up and in their member statement starts slandering you, by way of example, or saying stuff inappropriately about you or somebody else in the Assembly? I think that's what that was intended to capture.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Yes. I understand that, Minister, but wouldn't that kind of scenario be captured in the order, point of order? Wouldn't-, if someone was to slander another member that you wouldn't need to-, you still wouldn't need to have the improper use because that's part of the speaker's job, to ensure that those kind of things aren't done, and I suppose we all have that responsibility anyway...

**MR. POTTLE:** Or, and, and sometime...

**MR. ANDERSEN:** And why would, why could it not happen that from your side that you couldn't, you know, start to say bad things about Eddie over here, you know?

**MR. POTTLE:** Because, I guess, I would know the difference as being a member of these, this Assembly for a second term. For people who may not be familiar with processes and understand, I think that that would be helpful for the speaker to call and bring the person into order. Maybe know, somebody don't know what a question of privilege, or point of order...



**MR. ANDERSEN:** Well, that's true, but you know, four of the Ministers over there were in their first term. They're just in and, I mean, some of us are over here in the second term, but...we certainly have been sitting here longer than most of the people over there.

**MR. POTTLE:** And I hope and I guess the whole debate started with me asking the question here on Minister Statements becoming a forum for whatever. When we started, it was clearly understood, I think, that Minister Statement or member statement was, as we have here, a short, factual announcement or a statement on a position, and then it became a forum for reporting. There is, as per the legislation, the Assembly Act, by way of example. There are reporting requirements there, and for those new people, I think, I mean, when I was sitting on that side of the table, I was one of the people that was taking offence to not having enough information. Then we started getting this side of the table a hard knock for that, and then all of a sudden, Minister statements became a forum for reporting, I guess, to get more information out there. And I guess what I wanted to ask was is this the appropriate place to do that, or should we have another order of the day specific for reporting on activities of departments.

**MS. MICHELIN:** Tony, I think I would interpret 32 to mean any member, regardless of whether they're an Ordinary Member, a Minister or just a member of the Assembly.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Okay.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak for Hopedale.

**MR. PIERCY:** To get us out of the hole that we just dug ourselves in, for 29(1) instead of it reading Ministers may make a short, factual announcement, can we cross out short? Thank you.

**MR. POTTLE:** And make it plural instead of singular? You could say factual announcements or statements. That would let you do one, more than one or...

**MR. PIERCY:** That would delete short.

**MR. POTTLE:** Delete short and make...

**MS. WOLFREY:** And the time allotted would be the same then, or are you going to change it to 35 max?

**MR. PIERCY:** As long as it's factual, you can keep on going.

**MR. POTTLE:** I like the President's suggestion. I mean, you know, for extended member statements for a limited five minutes, then we should at least...

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Everything cleared up there? Any more questions or comments for that page? Then we'll move to the next page, 47. Chair of Sivunivut.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** I have a question for the Committee as well under number 4; the President or Minister may, and under (c) declined to answer the question. Can you give us an example of a question that a Minister or the President may decline?

**MR. LYALL:** I can think of a couple and now that I've been asked a couple of questions in the past, I think, that they referred to me, personally, almost, or any sort of personal question that I wouldn't answer. But other than that, I don't know.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** If it's an inappropriate question, if you feel it's an inappropriate question, then you can decline to answer the question. AngajukKak for Nain.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** But it doesn't say inappropriate question here. It says declined to answer the question, and if it's written this way, then it's written, it has to be interpreted the way it's written, and it's written in such a way that he can just say I decline to answer that question. If it's an inappropriate question, then it has to say that.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Chair of Sivunivut.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** But if a question is deemed inappropriate, wouldn't the speaker determine that and make that question invalid?

**MR. ANDERSEN:** ...you can just take that one out; we won't ask inappropriate questions on this side.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** So do the Assembly want (c) removed from there? Okay. Any more questions or comments on this page, 47? Then we'll move on to page 48. Any questions or comments for this page? AngajukKak for Rigolet.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Under, "Written Questions," lately haven't they been read out in the Assembly? Is that going to be a practice or... because I think I heard some written questions being read out, and is that going to be a practice or is it just going to be you can write a question and not get an answer and...

**MR. SHIWAK:** It has to be filed with the clerk, that's any written question. So it has to go on file, right?

**MS. MICHELIN:** Yes. They have to be read in.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak for Nain.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Well, who can ask these written questions anyway? Is it just from other members, right? It's not from some beneficiary or non-beneficiary somewhere?

**MS. MICHELIN:** I think the practice has been that written questions are read out, and if you go further down, if there's a response to a written question, like a written response, then all members have to get a copy of that and it's because everything in the Assembly is in the public domain. So written questions should be read in so that people are aware of what the questions are, and the same goes for a written question. They have to be tabled with the clerk and members get copies.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Is there any more questions for page 48? Then we'll move to page 49. Chair of Sivunivut.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** Just another question for clarification. Under number five, under, "Petitions," A member presenting a petition shall be answerable for any impertinent or improper material that it contains. Can the Committee expand on how that member will be answerable?

**MS. MICHELIN:** A member is responsible for everything they table in the Assembly. So that's what that speaks to. If you table something, then you should be ready to answer questions on it.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more questions or comments for this page? Then we'll move to page 50. Any comments or questions on this page? Then we'll move to page 51. Any comments or questions for page 51? Then we'll go to page 52. Any comments or questions on page 52? Then we'll move to page 53. Any comments or questions for page 53. AngajukKak for Nain.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** With respect to 50, and, but then at the bottom of page 51, Members shall give notice. This is about motions and before we lose the page, even, motions can be tabled at any time still. Is this correct, or what do you call them again? Is it motions? . Can table a motion at any time. Is that not correct?

**MR. POTTLE:** You had to give notice that you're going to. Under the Standing Orders, you had to provide notice that you're going to put forth a motion, under "Notices of Motions".

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Okay. In the old Standing Orders, though, and maybe my thoughts are screwed. Maybe using the wrong word, but resolution or motion could be tabled at any time and has to be addressed and spoken to at any time. Is that not correct, Speaker, Chair? Or is that only special in the special rules?

**MS. SILLETT:** Tony, are you referring to 3(a)?

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Yes.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Where's 3(a)?

**MR. ANDERSEN:** On Page 53, is it? Motions and Amendments.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Tony, what's the question?

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Can they introduce a resolution or a motion at any time? I thought we were able to table them, without giving notice.

**MS. SILLETT:** On the, Tony, on all the orders of the day there's Notice of Motion...

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Okay.

**MS. SILLETT:** ... and that's what our Standing Orders right now say. You have to give Notice of Motion. Then...

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Yes. Okay.

**MS. SILLETT:** ...you give motion.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Oh, all right...

**MS. SILLETT:** Okay?

**MR. ANDERSEN:** ...I was just a little bit confused, but correct me, if I'm wrong now, but, like, under the old, there are, and I suppose we'll come to that, such things as urgent matters, and you could introduce a motion on urgent matters that will be tabled without notice. Hey.

**MS. SILLETT:** There are exceptions to that rule.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Okay.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any questions or comments for page 52? If not, then we'll move on to page 53. Any comments? Page 54. Any comments? AngajukKak from Nain.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Yes. I have a question for the Committee on their voting, and quite clear, a lot clearer than the last Standing Orders, but I wonder during your discussions on voting and I don't see it here that there's any special clause now for that secret ballot, which was very unparliamentary. I thought that has been come up, crept up a few times in during this second Assembly, and I wonder if the Committee had any discussion on that, or whether we can see now from the Standing Orders that that is a thing of the past, secret ballot issue, which is very unparliamentary for Governments such as ours.

**MR. POTTLE:** Tony, I don't think we gave any consideration to that and I think, as one of the Committee members already pointed out, there are exceptions to some of their rules. So if, by way of example, the Assembly is debating and taking a vote on a matter, if anybody, by way of example, feels that an Assembly member may be put at risk by a show of hands or whatever, then I think that would be a call of any Assembly member who had that concern, and I use the example, when our first instance and hopefully our only, our last instance where we voted, took a vote to remove a member from the Assembly, and I think there were some matters of safety and concern around there. That's why there was some flexibility around that, so I don't think that we should clothe, as a Committee Member, I wouldn't like to see that be just a rule of thumb where that would not be allowed... to a secret ballot, depending on the issue.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Okay. But perhaps there should be something in these Standing Orders then that will give us some understanding of what the exception is to this rule because there have been a number of cases, I think, other than the one you mentioned that perhaps there wasn't a need to have secret ballot. And because secret ballot goes against the very spirit of the kind of Government that we have, in my mind.

**MS. MICHELIN:** Number 47 to the assumption is that all votes will be by, in this, what it says here is by rising. So if there was to be a secret ballot, I would see the only way it could be conducted is if somebody puts forward a motion for a secret ballot and it's voted upon by the Assembly, but the assumption is, under 47(2) that all votes are open and transparent.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Okay.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more comments or questions for page 54? Then we'll move to 55. Any comments or questions on that? No questions or comments for page 55? We'll go to page 56. Any questions or comments for page 56? Then we'll look at page 57. Any questions or comments for this page? Then we'll go to page 58. Chair from Sivunivut.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** Just another question for clarification. Number 60, Section 2, can you explain, Disorder in Committee of the Whole may be censored only by the Assembly on receiving a report from the Committee?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honorable President.

**MR. LYALL:** I believe it's there, because if there is disorder in the Committee as a Whole, we're not in a formal sitting in a normal thing...we'd have to go back to the Assembly for the censor before we could. That's all it's stating, I think.

**MS. SILLETT:** In the Assembly Act under section 55, it says, this very clearly states that it's only the Assembly members.

**MS. MICHELIN:** ...of privilege or contempt. So I think that's back to that.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** So if we're in a Committee as a Whole and where somebody's being censored, we go back into the Assembly, do the censoring, they can go back to Committee as a Whole? Is that what that says there?

**MR. LYALL:** No. What it's saying. It's obvious, whoever the speaker is would realize that there, there's been disorder by a member of the house saying order the Committee as a Whole back into Assembly session to deal with it.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Page 59.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** I have a question on 58, though.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Okay. AngajukKak from Nain.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** At the first sitting after general election, the 64(1), the speaker shall name the members of Standing Committees of the Assembly on the recommendation of the Assembly. Now, it goes on to say what the permanent Committees are, but if Committees are not named at the first stage, does that mean that they're will be no Standing Committees, or can they be added later, like, for instance, Standing Committee, education, finance?

**MS. SILLETT:** As a Special Committee unless it's...

**MR. ANDERSEN:** No. You can have a Standing Committee on education... Standing Committee does not have to necessarily be a Special Committee.

**MS. MICHELIN:** There are legislated Standing Committees, obviously, the Member Services Committee and the Committee on Rules and Procedures. Those are legislated Standing Committee, so they're always there. Then the Assembly can establish other Standing Committees and Special Committees...

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Okay, actually, I think it's on the next page. You answered my question.

**MS. MICHELIN:** Okay. All right.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Page 59, any questions? AngajukKak from Nain?

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Only that 65(5) answered my question, I think.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Page 60. Any questions or comments for page 60? Then we'll move to page 61. Any comments or questions for page 61? Then we'll move to page 62. Any questions or comments on page 62? Page 63. Any comments or questions for page 63? Then we'll move to page 64. Any comments or questions for page 64? Page 65. Comments or questions? Any comments on the indexes? A member of the Rules and Procedures Committee will propose a Notice of Motion where appropriate. So we'll now come out of the Committee as a Whole. Do you agree? We'll convene back into the Assembly?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** We will break for two minutes. Before we take a supper break, I'm going to recommend that we come back this evening at seven o'clock for an hour. Honourable President.

**MR. LYALL:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I would request the assent of the Assembly to continue our meetings tonight till the sessions all are completed. Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Is everyone in agreement with that?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Then we'll be back here at 7:00.

**MS. LANE:** Thank you Madam Speaker. As per section 8.7.2 of the Labrador Inuit Constitution the Nunatsiavut Assembly sets the salaries and benefits of the members of the Assembly, the Executive Council and the Inuit Court. The Constitution further provides that the salaries and benefits be set for a period of five years and may include a provision for increase during the five-year period. The Member Services Committee of the Assembly which advises the Assembly in relation to the salaries and benefits of the members of the Assembly. Recommended the speaker of the Assembly to retain Knightbridge, Robinson and Surette, a Human Resources consultation firm to provide input for the Committee's consideration. Background. The consultant held discussions with and revised documentations from the speaker and the clerk of the Assembly to ensure a clear understanding of the background and the objectives of the review. It was agreed that the consultant would collect comprehensive information from the elected officials of Nunavut and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. This information is to be presented in summary form together with analysis and comprehension to the

speaker for discussion. The position in respect to which information was collected is Ordinary Members, Speaker, Deputy Speaker, Minister, First Minister and President. The compensation information that was collected included base salaries, position, indemnities, retirement plan, constituency loans, severance pay, Northern allowance, travel benefit and family trip. The general findings were that the salaries and benefits in the other two jurisdictions exceeded those for the elected officials in Nunatsiavut, and the other two recommendations were that all Ordinary Members be paid the same base salary, even though that they may have different years of service, and that the annual cost of living adjustments be set at 2 percent. We welcome any comments from the Assembly members, but it is in the intention of the Member Services Committee to have an in-depth discussion on the report this very near future with the goal of making recommendations on the salaries and benefits for Nunatsiavut elected officials in the time for 2012/13 budget. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any other member, members of the Member Services Committee want to add to that? Any comments from Assembly members on that report? The Chair from Sivunivut.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. For clarification purposes, the positions in respect to which information was collected, Ordinary Member, is that members of the Assembly, or just Ordinary Members? Nakummek.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Well, right now, if you don't mind Deputy Speaker

DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, sorry, go ahead.

**MR. BARBOUR:** ... when we say Ordinary Members that includes the base salaries for Ordinary Members who don't hold Executive Council positions for Deputy, or Speaker or Deputy Speaker. All the rest of us Ordinary Members without Executive Council position, AngajukKak, or Chair of Community Corporation, we had the same base salary.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any other questions? The Member Services Committee will be meeting in the future to make recommendations for all elected officials. If there are no more questions for this, oh the AngajukKak for Makkovik.

**MR. JACQUE:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. Just for clarification purposes, I don't know if this is the right time or appropriate place to ask about it, but we would like clarification on the constituency allowances to our understanding that the constituency allowance for AngajukKak isn't cut out. Am I correct in saying that? Could you answer that? Thank you.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Thank you, that's a separate issue that will be dealt with in elected official policy and we can speak to it at that time, but I can just point out that the constituency allowance that we know today, there's a portion that Member Services Committee is recommending taking out a portion of the constituency allowance and we can explain that in detail later.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** If there are no more questions on this, we'll move on to the next report of the Member Services Committee, and I would again like to recognize Denise Lane.

**MS. LANE:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. Madame Speaker, I wish to present to the Assembly the Member Service Report. This report outlines the Committee's recommendations for changes to the Elected Official's Policy. Madame Speaker, in order for the members of the Assembly to consider the Committee's Report, I would, on behalf of the MSC, request the consent of the Assembly to have the report considered in a Committee of the Whole. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Thank you, Ms. Lane. Does the Assembly agree to convene as a Committee of the Whole to consider the report of the MSC?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** We will now convene into a Committee of the Whole. I'd like to recognize Denise.

**MS. LANE:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. Draft Elected Official's Policy. Since early 2009, the Member Services Committee, the MSC, has identified the need of the comprehensive sets of policies for elected officials. There is an employee manual governing the working policies of the Nunatsiavut employees, but there has been no equivalent for elected officials. In the absence of such policy, elected officials have unofficially adopted the Senior Service Management Policy related to fringe benefits, which includes annual leave, sick leave, family leave, hunting and fishing days, civic and optional religious holidays. However, this did not address the need for specific policies for the elected officials, as elected officials are not employees of the Nunatsiavut Government. It was felt that policies for elected officials along would be more appropriate if an attempt to address these. The MSC did propose resolutions related to the salaries and benefits, which the Assembly approved in March, 2008. The Assembly approved a severance package benefits for the elected officials in June, 2009. The Assembly provided resolutions related to the constituency allowance and an elected official package and reporting requirements. In March, 2010 the Assembly approved travel benefits for elected officials representing Canada. The proposed then the draft Elected Official's Policy document is to address the policy issues that has been identified for elected officials since early 2009. These have been thoroughly reviewed by the MSC and have been previously distributed to the Nunatsiavut Assembly. In preparing this draft the MSC has interpreted the mandate broadly on basis of the definition of Member Services Committee. In section 2 of the Nunatsiavut Assembly Act, in doing so the Committee has considered issues related to the Internal Affairs and management practices of the Assembly, in addition to matters that fall within the Committee's financial terms of references under section 79 of the Assembly Act. The draft that is distributed to the Nunatsiavut for approval and at the appropriate time on the orders of the day does include the provision of the family trip for elected officials. The provision has been removed as a benefit for the NG civil service, but the MSC felt that it should remain a benefit for the elected officials. We wish to repeat that the benefits for elected officials and civil service in any Government are never identical, and because of the extraordinary demands placed upon the elected officials, we felt the family trip should remain as a benefit. The draft also deleted the paragraph under 6 of the constituency allowance eligible expenditures which reads, Limited community contributions to support civil services of Labrador Inuit 30 percent maximum contribution of allotted constituency allowance related to activities such as culture, language, education, school and community programs, health, except suicide



prevention, recreation and social events, community festivals and feasts and unforeseen circumstances, tragic events, such as death and house fires. There is four of the Member Services Committee and this paragraph generated made discussions and in the end three members voted in favor of deleting it and one voted against. The three members felt that the legal opinion provided to the MSC on this provision warranted the deletion. A detailed, written legal opinion was provided to the MSC and two verbal opinions were given. The Assembly has been provided with the written legal opinion in summary states. It is not legitimate to use constituency allowance for the things like donation of contributions to community events. Constituency allowances are a category of expense allowance. Section 93 of the Nunatsiavut Assembly Act authorizes expenses allowance for members. Section 94 of the Act states that the purpose of which members were given expense allowance for the purpose of paying expense and related to the performance of the duties of the member. The duties of the member did not include donations or contributions to community events. The resolution of the Assembly passed on June 23, 2009, regarding constituency allowance which permits members to make donations or contributions and inconsistent with section 94 of the Assembly Act and cannot override that provision of the Act. It is therefore a misappropriation of the expense allowance to use any part to make contributions or donations. In addition to being inconsistent with the Nunatsiavut Assembly Act, the June 23rd Assembly resolution did not provide a clear and comprehensive set of rules which respect to expense allowance, it is my opinion to advise that the Assembly should pass the Standing Orders setting out clear, comprehensive and principled rules governing all aspects of members. Expense Allowance. These rules should cover all categories of the expense allowance and should ensure that only expense directly related to the members' duties as members are allowed. The rules should also spell out what expenses are allowed under the constituency allowance. I make suggestions in that regard. The rules should also prohibit certain expenditures. In my opinion, donations and contributions, all kinds, should be expressly prohibited. The second legal opinion conducted that the MSC make recommendations to include the donation portion of the constituency allowance section to the Assembly after being presented with these legal opinions and would have no defense against any possible fall outs. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Thank you, Denise. We all have a copy of our Elected Officials Policy manual here now that we will go through page by page. So we will start out on page 2, schedule 1. Do we have any comments and questions on page 1? Page 2, sorry. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Just a point of clarification, Madame Chair, if I may, under 1(b) Defined Contribution Plan, Elected officials will contribute 5 percent of their gross salary and the Nunatsiavut Government will match the elected official salary contribution up to 5 percent of the base salary. I'm just wondering what the intent there is because the current policy is that the Nunatsiavut Government will match the 5 percent contribution. I'm kind of thinking that if you leave the wording there up to 5 percent, it could be less than that 5 percent that was previously agreed upon and accepted by the Assembly.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Madam Chair, I'm assuming we're still in Committee of the Whole here.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Yes, we are.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Okay. It could have been oversight on our part, Minister. It is still my understanding for the most part we just cleaned up our existing Elected Officials Policy and we make note of that, that it should be-, that was not an issue for the Member Service Committee to start changing in any real way, something of that significance. Okay. So it's noted. It's noted now.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any questions or comments on page 3? Then we'll move on to page 4. Any questions or comments for page 4? The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Just a point of clarification again, Madam Chair, if I may? The travel allowance is only paid if one applies for it. It doesn't necessarily mean that you have to apply for it. Am I correct in that assumption?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** We invite Rexanne to the table here to explain.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** On April 1st of every year you have to fill out a form for your travel allowance and indicate if, you know, how many dependents, how many, your spouse, and then at that point, it's, you know because it is a taxable benefit and some people may not want to avail of the benefit. So that's what we do, as a rule, you know, on April 1st you'll usually get an email from Dotty with the forms to fill out and send back to her signed before she'll, before it gets processed through payroll.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak for Rigolet.

**MS. WOLFREY:** And even if you don't get it, you've still got to fill out that form because I didn't apply for it. I didn't want to, but I still had to fill out the form. HR told me even if I didn't get that travel allowance; I still had to fill in a form.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Sorry, without the form in front of me, but I think there's a box you tick to say you don't want the allowance too, so it's just a document that we have on file that supports us not putting it in your bank account and/or supports how much to put in your bank account.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honorable Minister of Health.

**MS. KEMUKSIGAK:** For the travel allowance, did that cover the year before, or the year ahead?

**MS. CRAWFORD:** It's based on your 12 months, like your service for the year before and gets paid on April 1st of the next year. And I'd have to double check what's in the policy manual and check with my department, but I'm pretty sure it's pro-rated too for the number of months that you've been elected. So if you were elected in May, you wouldn't qualify for a 12-month period, you'd get 11 months for in, on April 1st.

**MS. KEMUKSIGAK:** Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more questions or comments for page 4? Then we'll move on to page 5. Any questions or comments for page 5? Go ahead, William.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Thank you, Madame Chair, and that family trip, it talks about, basically, elected officials who are travelling more than 40 percent of their work year, it's the work day, Monday to Friday. That is when you qualify. Why we had to make sure that this was clear is that during our posting of elected official salaries that we had to post and receive comments back. Well, it gave the impression out there to some beneficiaries that all of us get to travel once a year with family members. In effect, as far as I know, for the last two or three, no one could avail of this because they just didn't travel 40 percent of the time a year. So we just had to be clear on that one.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honorable President.

**MR. LYALL:** I just had a question for Member Services Committee, did you consider including Saturdays and Sundays? I mean, I travel a lot and I work a lot on Saturdays and Sundays when I'm travelling.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Then I would stand to be clarified. I would stand to be corrected on this and maybe Rexanne can help me here. Or it's just that my understanding was even with Civil Services, Senior Civil Service, that calculation is based on the work days of the week and does not count weekends, and that would apply to elected officials as well. Now, I stand to be corrected here.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** The calculation as presented here is correct. It looked at working days and, you know, we try to minimize the travel that we would have to do on a weekend. I think even if you were to change a calculation and look at the number of weekends, you know, and then you look at the total number of days and the total number of days that you were travelling versus the total number of days in the whole year. We'd have to look at the number for stat holidays, but it still gets down to where you travelling more than 40 percent of your time, and the benefit are meant to negate the negative effects of travelling and being away from your home. So I think if we look at just, even at that 40 percent number were you travelling more than 40 percent of the year and how we derived the number, it either includes weekends in both factors, or it doesn't include weekends in both factors to get to 40 percent.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more questions or comments on page 5? Then we'll move on to page 6. AngajukKak from Nain.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Yes. I would like to ask the Committee because I'm a little bit confused about something that has happened recently, and that is with respect to carry over; annual leave has to be taken before the end of September. I notice that it doesn't mention that in this schedule 1, and perhaps if that is the case then it should be written down because when I received this notice late August, or in August, it was first time that I became aware of it, and so, like, they you had a few days left that they have to take before the end of September, my carry over leave, and I wonder if that's something that was pulled out of the Civil Service manual and perhaps shouldn't apply, or was not meant to apply to elected officials, and just for clarification, I mean, I'm not saying that it should be treated better than Civil Service and not have to, but I'd just like to be clear in my mind.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Okay. I can see the notice that was sent out because our Civil Service Policy manual does say that you are allowed to carry forward up to one half of your annual leave entitlement, but it has to be used within the first six months of the year up to September 30th. So without an Elected Officials Policy manual that would give us direction on whether elected officials versus employees, the notice was sent out to anybody who was close to remind people that by September 30th to use up this carryover of annual leave.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak from Nain.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** So does that mean then it also applies to elected officials, and if it do, then there should be mention of it in this schedule under section 3 for the next, for the next people that get elected that don't know, and if it's not mentioned in here then maybe they'll be confused, like me, who was here before.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Chair for Sivunivut.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** Just for clarification purposes under the Pay Leave, section 2, elected officials may carry up to, what is that figure supposed to be?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Go ahead, William.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Okay. So I think Patricia explained it best. Then when we say annual leave there, it talks about annual leave. What we can't carry over is hunting, fishing days, religious days. We can't carry those. They must be used up before the fiscal year is out.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak for Postville.

**MS. GEAR:** I think my question might have got answered, but I was just going to ask was this email sent out to all officials because I didn't have one. I don't know if any of the other AngajukKaat did or not.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Are you talking about the carry over? You might have not had...

**MS. GEAR:** Yes.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** ...carry over. You might have your carry over all used up. So it was probably sent to people who didn't have their carry over used up and we wanted to remind people that if you had carry over and it was getting close to September 30th, to remind you to use it so you wouldn't lose it.

**MS. GEAR:** Thanks.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honorable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Just to pick up on the point that was raised by the AngajukKak for Nain, I certainly didn't hear a response to his question. I'm reading here that you can carry over your three weeks, but you have to use that allocation within the next year. You don't have to use it by September. Is that what I'm hearing being recommended in this section here? I believe that's what I'm hearing.

**MR. BARBOUR:** I'm probably just like the AngajukKak for Postville. I didn't get that notice either, okay because I had nothing to carry over. So I didn't get that notice either. I'm assuming that's coming from the Senior Civil Service requirement as well. That's assumption on my part.

**MR. POTTLE:** But I guess my question was the Member Services Committee is recommending that you can carry over three weeks, but you don't have to use it by September of that year. You can use it throughout that whole year period.

**MR. BARBOUR:** I guess, as Committee of the Whole, we're just saying we're taking that what the Senior Civil Service can carry over, we would like to carry over too as well and not lose it, which has happened in some cases, okay. That's what all we're trying to do is not lose leave.

**MR. POTTLE:** Okay.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak for Hopedale.

**MR. PIERCY:** So we're cutting out the September 30th deadline?

**MS. SILLETT:** Danny said, you know, I think that was the intent, is that you wouldn't have until September 30th, like the Senior Civil Service, to use your carry over.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Page 7. Any questions or comments on page 7? The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Under Bereavement Leave (a) being recommended that elected officials can have up to five days of, or five days of paid bereavement leave, which is again different than the civil service. So should this policy apply and elected officials have more bereavement leave than the civil servants are entitled to?

**MR. BARBOUR:** Thank you, Madame Chair. When we did this, there are a couple things that we looked at, Minister. There is number of years that we put more in, or the Member Services Committee is recommending more than in some area than even the civil service. One, the reasoning that we're using, or the biggest reasoning, really the only reasoning, we've got a guaranteed four-year life, if that, if that. There was a case in point earlier in the year, we let someone go from the Assembly with no benefits, nothing. The reasoning being for some of this is that we've got a guaranteed four-year life. That's it, no more than that, and that's where some of the, where we're asking for more than even the Senior Civil Service.

**MR. POTTLE:** Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more questions or comments for page 7? Then we'll move on to page 8. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Again, just for the record and I assume the Member Services Committee responds and, which is acceptable to me, would be the same under Family Responsibility Leave, section 2. That's the

rationale there again. Mr. Barbour, the same as your rationale for more bereavement leave for elected an official, that's your same rationale.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Yes. And, again, thank you, Madame Chair. That's exactly that, exactly where we're coming from and, again, we just talked about, and I talk about people like the President and Minister of Finance, and Minister of Lands and Natural Resources many times, the Minister of Health. These people spend so much time away from home that it's not funny and we've got to take that into consideration because this time away from home takes a toll on families.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak for Nain.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Thank you, Chair. The question is about accumulated sick leave. Ministers and Community Chairs and AngajukKaat are, how do I say it, are paid upon till an election when they either get re-elected or they don't get elected, unlike Ordinary Members who become unemployed when the Assembly is dissolved, and I suppose, at that time they collect their severance, but does that mean then that, you know, how should I say this best, the 420 hours, for instance, for the Ministers and AngajukKaat and Community Chairs, if he, you know, are elected again for another four-year term, there's no break, really, so can they collect another 420 hours? Because those guys who, do they lose their 420 hours, Ordinary Members, when the Assembly is dissolved? They're given a slip and, you know, they can run in the next election certainly and get re-elected, but they're effectively no longer members and they don't get paid from the time that the writ is dropped; they're very much unlike us. Am I confusing you? No. Hey. You know what I mean; many of you do, anyway. Some of you are looking at me like I've got two heads, but - because, you know, it's quite different and when the last, in the last Ordinary Member election there were some people who were just gone, you know. Like, you know, did you lose your 420 hours last time, Minister, because you were, no, you weren't, you were Speaker there, I mean...

**MR. POTTLE:** Just to answer your question, Tony, if I may, with the consent of the Member Services Committee, that was a question that I had been pondering in my own mind as well, and I believe when I saw my leave travel tracking form, the latest one, I have accumulated 400 and something hours up to the end of this year that's being projected. So that's a question that was sticking with me too. I mean, as an incumbent do I have to start accumulating that sick leave all over again in the four-year period.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** In that respect, for instance, to use an example, maybe you can ask him, he's on Member Services Committee. William Barbour was an Ordinary Member, was gone at the end, but he did get re-elected, but there was a space in time that he was unemployed. Did he lose his 420 from the last sitting? He should have because he was gone, you know. He was no longer a member until he was re-elected. It's a little tricky, but maybe there's some allowance in there that can...

**MR. BARBOUR:** Both to Danny's point and I appreciate your point, Danny, and to the AngajukKak for Nain, it's a question I don't think the Member Services Committee thought to have any recommendation on, or it wasn't an issue that was high on the Member Services Committee's list to deal with. But it's a question; I think it's a valid question.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak for Rigolet.

**MS. WOLFREY:** I'm just going to make a point to what Danny was saying. If he was saying his latest form says that he got 420 hours accumulated sick leave at the end of April, or whatever it is at the end of March this year, then he must have lost his sick leave last year, unless he used it all.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** No, because he was qualified under five in this tax year.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Oh.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** This is only year one in a term.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Right. Okay. But you never lost it then if you've got, still got 420?

**MR. POTTLE:** I stand to be corrected on that, but I believe when I reviewed my last leave travel tracking form, the accumulated sick leave that I would have up to the end of March this year was close to 400, or a little over 400 hours. So that tells me, unless there's been a mistake, which I have no problem rectifying, and I question should that sick leave, as an incumbent elected official, been brought over and accumulated to a four-year period over the next four years, say, would I be entitled to 840 hours sick leave.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** The way I would interpret it from number 3, is that you would always only have a maximum of 420 hours. So whether you hit your four-year term and you get re-elected, your maximum still is 420. Now, Tony's question is the time that the writ is dropped and you're no longer an Ordinary Member, you're now effectively not employed by the Assembly or by the Government, does that re-set you back to zero, and I have to get an opinion on that, like, from a legal standpoint what it would mean. I know we didn't pay out severance unless someone wasn't re-elected because we kept that and then it, because you still accumulate your one month for every year of service. So whether we paid it at one point to another point, we're still accumulating it, but I'd have to get an opinion from, I guess, from a labour lawyer to kind of figure that one out for an elected official.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Go ahead, William.

**MR. BARBOUR:** So, again it's just another point I guess that the Member Services Committee must now look at. I mean, you know, you, I said it earlier; there are some things in here that are more than in even the Senior Civil Service. This could be exactly why we want a little bit more even from the Senior Civil Service, exactly why.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more questions or comments for this page?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Okay. The Member Services Committee is going to have to have another look at that section in the near future. Okay. Page 9. Any questions or comments on page 9? AngajukKak from Rigolet.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. On top of the page it talks about being stuck out for weather, is there going to be a limit on that, or it's just going to be left like it is because it just says

you're entitled to paid weather leave? So if you get stuck out there for two weeks, the wind is getting high but, I mean, is there going to be a limit on there? Are you just suggesting we leave it like that?

**MR. BARBOUR:** This happens so often, especially this time of year when you're out in a boat. I mean, why this was put there, and this goes back to a long time ago, LIA days, when people, whether they were on skidoo, or in boats, especially this time of year in a boat. We didn't put a time limit on it per se, but I hope nobody stuck out for two weeks, besides, they're probably going to be starving to death anyway, you know. Either that or major search and rescue operation out there looking for whoever is out there. But usually a day or two days, usually and we're gone on weekends anyway when we do do this, usually, or on annual leave, if we are gone on week days. So we didn't put a limit on it. Just that where we thought about this is that whether it's elected official, any civil service member, if that's in the Civil Service Act or policy, what we were thinking about is Charlotte Wolfrey trying to get home like crazy to make the next work day and put ourselves in jeopardy. That's what we thought about.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Go ahead, Charlotte.

**MS. WOLFREY:** The Civil Service, they got a limit on theirs, it's one day a year. So they've got to hurry up and try to get home. Me and David could be out there on land. I can stay and he got to try and go home, but I'm being serious. But the Civil Service got a limit on theirs of one day as I guess. That's why I ask is there going to be any limit.

**MR. BARBOUR:** I guess the Member Service Committee has got to remain open to that too as well.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Is there any suggestions on their time limit for this? AngajukKak for Hopedale.

**MR. PIERCY:** I think with our ice conditions and stuff that we've got now and the way the weather turns so fast, you can't predict it anymore. Before you could see the weather coming and stuff. I think if you puts a time limit on it and says two days, and somebody can't miss a day because they've got all their annual leave used up, I say it's better off leaving it as is because when you get home, you get home, right. Because if you're stuck out and search and rescue, I'll come look for you if you are really overdue. So I think if you're trying to force somebody to come home and tie it up here and the Bay's changed and got the ice opened up, you'd be taking a chance to come on home.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more.... the Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** I have a tendency to agree with the AngajukKak for Hopedale in taking into consideration what **MR. BARBOUR**, the Member Services Committee member, has said. Maybe leave it there for now and let the Member Services Committee ponder it more and come back with a recommended change to that, if they so choose to.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more questions, recommendations or anything on this page? Then we will go to page 10. The Honourable President.



**MR. LYALL:** Could you clarify (b), number 2, the Government rate will, shall be paid with boarding at private homes. This figure includes meals. Does that mean that if, if I'm at a private home, that I can also charge my meals? If that's the case, I have a real problem with it. I often stay at private homes. The person I'm staying with may not be home at a lunch hour because they're working and not at home when I get home in the evenings at five o'clock because they're working late. What am I going to do, go out to a restaurant and pay for my meal, but I can't claim for it? And not only that, I think it's unfair in a sense that we only pay \$70 for boarding home. That's just to stay there, as far as I'm concerned. The hotel is going to cost you the hundred and fifty, two hundred dollars a night. Plus you're charging your meals for it. And that's probably for \$300, compared to my \$70 a day.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honorable Susan Nochasak.

**MS. NOCHASAK:** I'd just like to comment on what President Lyall had just said. I do agree with his sentiments in regards of paying private accommodations, \$70 to stay there, including them to feed you and to keep you there with their families and things. I don't think it's a fair rate and, like he said, within regards of the meals and hotels and stuff and the rates for the hotel rooms. It's just not fair.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Chair of Sivunivut.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** Much the same question, along the same lines. Is there any consideration given to the meal rates that we currently use now? I don't think we've had an update. The rates for meals haven't changed in the last number of years. I don't know if any consideration has been given to that, especially with the increases in everything else that we pay for now. Just a question.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Thank you, Madame Chair. In terms of that portion, the whole accommodations portion, we just took directly from the Civil Service, directly. In terms of the issues being raised, I think that because we took directly from the Civil Service, I think this one almost has to go back to Department of Finance and let them look at increases. That would be the case, delays in price for those that are staying in private accommodations, but if I'm staying in the hotel room away from the coast and there's flight delays for me I get to claim additional because I'm out there, other than from on the coast, but I think the issue, itself, being raised by the President and the Chair for Sivunivut, I think that issue has to go back to Finance, because we're just taking this directly from the Civil Service.

**MS. SILLETT:** I do want to say that I think that this is an issue that caused a lot of, a lot of discussion with the MSC, and I think that the MSC we're prepared to make a recommendation to the Assembly that the, there be a rate paid when boarding of \$75 or whatever it was, plus you could have your money, daily meal allowance. That never went anywhere with Finance. In fact, Finance really was very, very, very strong and shut it down basically saying, you know, for fiscal reasons, for financial reasons, you cannot have that. So I guess Member Services Committee, after presenting the same kinds of arguments as Jim has and as Susan has in saying that it's not enough that it's, you know, a bare amount to pay a boarding house and expecting them to pay. It's really unfair. And I think that's why the Member Services Committee were persuaded, were basically to make this recommendation saying that, you know, we had to be a fiscally responsible Government and that there was no other option.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honorable President.

**MR. LYALL:** I think it's more fiscally responsible for me to be staying at a private home and costing the Nunatsiavut Government only \$70 a day. I could easily go and check into a hotel, get all my meals and all my services paid for. But I think it's a good thing for our communities to sometimes to donate to the beneficiaries, if you're living in a community, and in the case in Goose Bay I have family there that are not well off that I try to stay with them. But I think that in a way you missed my point. There are times that I just can't get in there to go and have my dinner and my supper. The people are not at home. I don't have time to go home and cook my meals because I'm at meetings. If I go out with the boys for the restaurant for to have my dinner or my supper, I think I should be able to claim for it and I've been unable to do that.

**MS. SILLETT:** Jim, those are the very same arguments that the Member Services Committee people make, exactly the same. So I didn't miss your point.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** I understand and agree with some of the concerns raised, but the bottom line is right now we cannot change what currently is in place because that has been approved and appropriated as part of the Budget Bill. I would have to make a recommendation that if you're looking to change this, then that has to be done in preparing next year's budget for fiscal year 2012, 2013. Neither the Member Services Committee, nor the Assembly has the right to make any changes to what's currently approved as per appropriations under the Budget Bill.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Well, if you can do, if the Department of Finance, what we can do is take your direction and you mentioned the rates haven't changed in a number of years and we can do our research and come back with, you know, looking at what are the different rates offered across, you know, federal, provincial, different municipalities, the way they do private accommodation rates versus the way they pay meal rates. I mean, I worked in a private industry. We got a private accommodation that was just directly paid and then we got our meal allowance on top of that to account for such instances as the President has mentioned. So we can do research on that and then propose it and bring it to Executive Council for approval and build it into next year's budget. Danny is correct on the budget. The budget has been based on the current years and the current meal rates and the current private accommodations. We have to make sure we stay within our appropriations, but from the Department of Finance, we can do that research and look into an increase or a change in the rates in the way the rates are applied.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honorable President.

**MR. LYALL:** I don't think I'm asking for a change in rates. I'm asking for a change in policy. The policy being, if I'm staying in a hotel, it's going to cost you a lot more than if I stayed in the private home, and if I have to go to a restaurant with the boys when I'm meeting in Goose Bay, for instance everybody goes out to a restaurant for lunch and I go along and eat with them, I can't claim for my meal because I going to have private accommodations. I think it's absolutely ridiculous.

**MR. PIERCY:** And going on what President just said it is true if you're budgeting, if you come here now, you're paying a certain rate. You go to Goose Bay, you pay a certain rate for the hotels, everything included. You go to private accommodations; you pay a hundred dollars plus the meal. Well, you send in your bill, you're \$75 less than what you would pay for the hotel. We should be able to arrange it that it could be possibly done before the next budget 'cause if you budget \$250 a night, if you're going here or there, and then you take off and you go to somebody's private accommodation and you spend a hundred dollars, you just saved the Government whatever the amount of money is that you're staying there throughout the whole time. So in fact, you are saving money and you're not going over budget.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Just again, I mean, just to reiterate, I'm not disagreeing what I'm hearing around the table. I agree with certain components of that. But even if we enact a policy change right now, that has implications for the budget. We have appropriated and the Assembly has approved spending for the Government for fiscal year 2011, 2012. We have no right at this point and time to fetter that but, I mean, as the Deputy Minister of Finance has reiterated, there is nothing to preclude Finance from taking a look at this and preparing and making some recommendations and changes in next year's budgets to accommodate what people are saying. We just don't have the authority to do that. If we did that, then the public is going to come back and say the Assembly is now changing in mid-term and we're benefitting from that. That's a direct conflict of interest as per our Conflict of Interest Guidelines. We can't be seen to be benefitting in any way, shape, or form outside of what's allocated for and appropriated through the Budget Bill. That's all I'm saying is we can't do it midway through a year without making an amendment to the Budget Bill. I would assume, and I stand to be corrected on that, but that's the only way I can see it going ahead.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** I think what we'd have to look at is the two parts; one is look at what other rates are paying now versus and even policy changes looking at versus a private accommodation rate plus a meal allowance where your meal allowance rate does it make, what is, makes sense, and then does it still fall in with the amounts that were appropriated for travel under everybody's department in the House of Assembly or the Nunatsiavut Assembly and as long as we can live in the amounts that were budgeted and we don't go over, it may be possible, but what we communicated to Member Services Committee from the department was what was being proposed for Member Services Committee would have an impact over the whole Government because once you change a rate for an elected official on meal allowances and business expenses it would be setting two different standards and we want it from our perspective that would have financial implications far greater than what was budgeted at the time. So that's what we communicated back to Member Services Committee.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honorable President.

**MR. LYALL:** It's not clear to me, you're not changing your rates, you're not changing accommodation rates, that's not what I'm asking. Your meal rates are the same as mine. If I go to a restaurant and then I have my dinner and my supper and breakfast, I get rate for breakfast, rate for lunch and rate for supper. I'm saying, please, can I claim that if I go out in a restaurant and have my

meals, if I can't go home to private accommodations, get those meals? Why do I have to pay for meals can't get, claim for it because I'm not staying at a hotel? That's all I'm asking.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Honorable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** And I guess there are exceptions to every rule and I would hope in a situation like the President has just explained that there would be some consideration given to that. For the information of the Assembly, maybe I've stepped outside of my authority, but when we had the Uranium Policy Workshop in Goose Bay, the President was affected by just that. I mean, his flight was delayed. He got to his accommodations, nobody was home. He had to go elsewhere for his supper so I approved the \$26 for his supper outside of what was allocated for him for private accommodation. So I think it needs to be looked at on a case-by-case basis and there should be some exceptions to each rule to that, if that helps.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Thank you, Madame Chair. And I guess the comment I'm hearing from the Minister of Finance, from the President, from the Minister of Education and from the AngajukKak for Hopedale, I mean, this is an issue that Member Services Committee had beat to death. We have beat it to death, but we're hearing loud and clear from other Assembly members. And I guess our bureaucracy has to hear the message that we're putting out there.

**MR. POTTLE:** Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak from Nain.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** The important stuff that is food. , that's probably not a good idea for the Minister of Finance to say that at this table that he broke his own rules and approved a meal for the President. By jingles, you can't do that, boy. You've got to stick to the policy that governs your department and whether it's the President or me. Yes, I'm sure that you wouldn't do it for me, but you did it for him, and that's breaking the rules, Dan, but that's not my point. Now, that's fair enough, you know, and it's good to know that you did it, but I hope that applies to all. The one that I wanted to speak to was something that you mentioned as well that I had it in my mind before that is that if there's meal rates will not be paid for any meals provided or included in the function attended by the elected official, and sometimes that stuff can go on for three days, and sometimes those meals are not very good. Sometimes you can't even eat it, but, you know. That's like my mother was, she's from the old school, and you don't you eat what's on the table or eat nothing at all. And why can't we go out and have something that we like, you know. Hey. And I felt sorry but, of course, it doesn't apply for some members from the Civil Service. They couldn't collect their meal money because they didn't know that you had to eat that meal, at the Uranium Workshop was one occasion but, you know, there are different times when we shouldn't have to eat what they're serving. Sometimes it's only like French fries and onion rings and things like that, you know, but they may want to go out somewhere else. So I think that Member Services should look at that one, that 1(c) as well.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Yes. Go ahead.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** I just want to speak to an example of the Uranium Workshop which was the most recent function that all of the Assembly attended. We and the Assembly budgeted a certain amount of money for the workshop. The contract that was awarded included meals for the workshop. So I understand and I sympathize that and at times at any function you are attending there are meals that may not be suitable or appetizing, however, then we're paying double for a meal. So because we have incorporated into the budget, we paid \$500 to the Friendship Centre for that lunch and meal and then everybody went out and had to buy another meal, I think then we're double paying then, and that's where the reasoning was coming behind, you know, I think that clause too is that you want to make sure people understand that if you're breakfasts are provided at a function, then we should be availing of that meal and not us double paying two pay cycles.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honorable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** For the record, Madame Speaker, in relation to the comment that was made partly in jest, but I know the AngajukKak for Nain was serious, and again, I mean, you know, in the absence-, there are rules and regulations, but are we not human enough to make an exception in extenuating circumstances, which I did for the President. I certainly would consider that for any Assembly member, if any Assembly member was faced with that and, I mean, I go on record to the public of the Labrador Inuit and say, I mean, you know, I did make an exception for that \$26, and if that puts my position in jeopardy then so be it. I had to live with that. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak from Nain.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** But I don't know that if it puts your position in jeopardy, Dan, but certainly I could say a word that, you know, that you use quite frequently as Finance Minister and that you just set precedent, you know. And if the President can come to you and ask to get a meal paid for, what stops any of us from doing the same? Whether we got to phone you or text you or whatever, you know. But that's the danger of what you did and by saying it at the table, you know. Like we didn't know didn't hurt us, I suppose but, hey.

**MR. POTTLE:** We are about openness and transparency and I know it's \$26, I know, though, know that this is not the point, but again the point that I want to stress is, I mean, I think we've got to be human enough to entertain a request such as that and, if in consultation with, the Department of Finance or the Speaker of the House of Assembly, which budgets this came out of, then, I mean, I consulted and I thought I did the right thing. So if I never-, you can take \$26 out of my pay cheque.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak for Rigolet.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Just with reference to number 1(c) there about the meals, well, that you can't claim meals when you went to a function and that meals would be provided, I think we should know up front that the meals are going to be provided because when I did out my travel claim at that time, I didn't even know that the meals were going to be provided. Perhaps if I would have read the agenda better because it said lunch is served or something or other, like that, but I think that we should be notified that meals are going to be provided and that your travel claims should reflect that. And I think

at one point, though, with that, to that meeting, though, that I thought that I heard someone say, and I thought it was Danny, but I could be wrong, I thought that he said if you eat here you can't claim your meal, and I didn't eat. I ate breakfast somewhere else one morning, but breakfast was there, but I ended up not be able, which is nothing, I don't mind. But I'm just saying let us know up front that that's the case; meals are going to be provided and then we won't put in for it on our travel advance and stuff like that so.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** We'll go to page 11, any comments or questions for page 11? Page 12?  
Ordinary Member for Nain, Minister Barbour.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Okay. Number 6 and I go back to the question that the AngajukKak from Makkovik raised earlier. And if you look at it now under number 6, that is what is allowed under legal opinion. That is what we're allowed to do and spelled out what we're allowed to do. Donations, we're recommending to the Assembly that donations, as we knew them, to be taken out based on legal opinion.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak from Makkovik.

**MR. JACQUE:** Okay. Just again for clarification purposes, this still stands, does it? So our constituency allowance is still in to effect, am I correct? We were told different. Actually, okay, the reason why I asked that is because I submitted a claim and never did reimbursed.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** You were talking about the claim for a telephone, for your telephone in...

**MR. JACQUE:** For supplies etcetera.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** I think the issue came down to and looking at are you using your telephone and office supplies for discharging your duties as an AngajukKak of Makkovik, or are you using them as discharging your duties as a member of the Assembly? And some of the budget items are, for a telephone, administrative support, office supplies. For example, the Ordinary Members for the Canadian constituency have administrative support. There is no administrative support in the office that they are in currently.

**MR. JACQUE:** For the eligible expenditures here it says that and I'm using it for both.

**MR. POTTLE:** I don't know what the intent of the Member Services Committee is with respect to constituency allowance expenditures, but I believe and I stand to be corrected by the Member Services Committee in a legal opinion that was provided, and I qualify this by saying I was a member of the Member Services Committee at one point in time and, like Mr. Barbour, sometimes you just don't take things in consideration because we're learning. I'm not making excuses, but one of the things that the legal opinion provided and as per the Labrador Inuit Constitution there are seven constituencies; Canada. Upper Lake Melville, Nain, Hopedale, Postville, Makkovik, Rigolet. Legal opinion states that Ordinary Members are elected to serve and represent the constituents AngajukKaat and Community Chairs. They are not elected to a constituency per se. You're elected to represent the interest of your community Government and your community corporation in the Assembly, and that's all I can say on

the matter and it's not for me to put forth this recommendation. That's for the Member Services Committee, I think, to look at the legal opinion that was provided and looking at our legislation laying out that if we were ever, I guess, brought to task, it's now come to the attention that we could be held liable because some of the things that we've set out previously by the Member Services Committee for constituency allowances are invalid because our current legislation do not make allowances for that. That's all I have to say, if that's any help to the table or to the Member Services Committee. That's my understanding of the legal opinion that was provided.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak from Makkovik.

**MR. JACQUE:** Okay. I understand where you're coming from, Mr. Pottle, but this is the first year we've ever had a problem and, you know, for the last five years, so I don't know what the hold-up is as though what the problem is now. Thank you.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** I guess, in Finance there is a lot of debate and discussion on the Inuit Community Governments get an operating grant for operating your community Government, and part of is, for administration, for your Government, which would include, I would assume, a telephone bill, our telephones for, I know we get our telephone bill for, say, our Nain administrative building. We've got however many lines and we pay for that and we can break down long distance charges per bill, but overall we pay a bill for that building and that's budgeted under our operating budget. So the issue for us from Finance is trying to determine when it is being used to discharge your duties as a member of the Assembly and when it is used for conducting business related to your Inuit Community, and that is where Finance is coming from and trying to determine the difference in regards to that determination. That's where the decision was coming from.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak for Rigolet.

**MS .WOLFREY:** I'm trying to figure this out because before the Nunatsiavut Government, before Nunatsiavut came into being, as a Mayor of our Community wouldn't sit in our office seven hours a day and be a paid-, the forming of Nunatsiavut made this happen, which is a good thing in some extent, but it shouldn't come with a bill to the Rigolet Inuit Community Government or to the other Inuit Community Governments without providing for some support to operate because in the years before this our Mayor came to a meeting once a month and if we had to call a special meeting, they came to the special meeting when the Town Manager or Town Clerk or whatever needed something to happen. So the eight hours a day in your office discharging duties that- and we weren't allowed to make laws before, for example. We had the Municipalities Act, and we didn't have to go and look at the Constitution to try to find out. We could phone up Bob McCauley or whoever it was and get the opinions about the Municipalities Act and way to go. So I'm saying is that part of this was created when Nunatsiavut was created and is good, but there should come some money with it to operate, I think, and it shouldn't be on the Rigolet Inuit Community Government or any of the other Inuit Community Governments to support all of that, and I know our pay comes from the Nunatsiavut Assembly, or the, from the payroll, anyway, but I still think that some of the operational charges like for public meetings and travel and travel to different meetings and stuff like that, some of that should be allowed and for

telephone and office supplies and things like that. We were only put there because Nunatsiavut was formed. Otherwise, there wouldn't be some Mayor sitting in our office seven hours a day. We'd be doing our other work or whatever.

**MR. POTTLE:** I guess related to some of the discussions that we're having here, going back to the report and the Appendixes to the report that was given by the Committee on Rules and Procedures for the Standing Orders, one of the things that will happen, if the Assembly consents to that is a review of this Assembly Act. And maybe what needs to be done is that review needs to take into consideration some of the things and points that are being raised around this table this evening. Even though legal opinion has come back and stated that because we're providing each Assembly members with constituency allowances, in particular, elected officials who are not elected to represent a constituency, there must be some consideration, or there should be some consideration given to Part XI of the Assembly Act, which looks at expenses. So I don't know if that would be something that would be looked at in a review instead of speaking, as opposed to constituency allowances, maybe the terminology that we should be looking for and moving to change is related to expense allowances as opposed to a constituency allowance, if that makes any sense because that was the problem that I had with the legal opinion and then coming in mid-budget year to try and change what the Assembly had approved creates a certain level of discomfort for me as Minister but, I mean, you know, if we are in contradiction of our laws and we could be held liable for that, then it has to be valid, I guess, I mean, you know, in order for it to be approved and, if not, then it's going to have to be taking a different look at, I think.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Just in response to the question that's being raised is in regards to certain costs that were submitted to be off set against the constituency allowance being telephone, office supply. Most, if not all, our Ordinary Members sit in a Government, have offices in a Government office whereby their telephone, their office supplies and all those are covered by the operations of the Nunatsiavut Government. So there is no charges against their constituency allowances for their telephone use or, or office supplies. Whatever the direction is that we're giving here today, I guess, we need to be very, giving clear direction from the Assembly from the Department of Finance as to if it relates to telephone going offset against a telephone line, to again offset against your constituency allowance, does that apply to everyone here and then at this case do we then go through if you're in a Government office and take your phone bill and offset against your constituency allowance, and that's the direction the Finance Department's going to need, coming from this to let us know what we should and should not offset against our, the constituency allowance allocation.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Go ahead, Patricia. Sorry, Tony.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** I was going to say not something different than what the Deputy Minister said, and perhaps it's the AngajukKaat who need support allowance more, because as Deputy Minister said, all of these Ordinary Members, they work out of Government offices, not their own constituency office, with the exception of Canada, I suppose, who has the only true constituency office and has to support themselves. But, you know, they don't, William Barbour, Denise, down at the end, they work out of Nunatsiavut Government offices. What Charlotte said was that because we now sit in offices, we have created more expense for the Inuit Community Governments and probably we need to support more



than the Ordinary Members or just as much. Don't take away our chance. You know, I hope that's not the case and I hope that Member Services Committee will consider that.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Just so I understand what's being recommended, or what's being put here, is that the constituency allowance is not going to include any allowance for the AngajukKak anymore, and is that what I understand from this?

**MS. SILLETT:** No, if this constituency or an expense allowance, who's going to get it, and I guess, one of the things that you said is, you know, when it's a cost, when the AngajukKak incur cost in discharging their duties as an exofficio member of the Assembly, then it should be, it should rightly come from here. That's, that's what you said, right?

**MS. SILLETT:** But the question is, this, whatever you call it, if you call constituency allowance, or if you call it expense allowance, who is eligible in the elected officials to get it and when?

**MR. JACQUE:** Okay, for further clarification, will the MSC revisit this and eliminate or delete what we're not entitled to?

**MS. SILLETT:** The Assembly has to provide direction to the MSC as to what you want.

**MS. KEMUKSIGAK:** I just wanted to speak from our perspective in our constituent, well, we call it constituency, but maybe it's separate. But, anyway, for instance, if we're going to have community public meetings, say, myself, Ed, and the other Ordinary Member would cost share the costs of the public meetings, or myself and Max and the Ordinary Member. So like it I'll pay for something, he'll pay for something, the other one will pay for something, because we come together to have a public meeting. We don't do it separately. Like we had a meeting last time what happened at the Assembly, so we updated the members. And also I know we all put out newsletters, like Ed's and Max's might have a different focus than mine, but they're still newsletters informing our beneficiaries of certain things. So I wouldn't want the AngajukKaat and the Inuit Community Corporation Chairs not to have an expense allowance because, like we're all supposed to work as a team. I'm just using an example. Maybe Denise and Herb might have public meetings together. I don't know if I'm making sense.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Go ahead, Honorable President.

**MR. LYALL:** Yes. A little bit off the topic of constituency allowance. It was on the same page. Number 3, elected officials are not encouraged to work from home, but if this is necessary, it should be used sparingly. Could you please advise me when it's necessary for an elected official to work out of home, other than the when weather's bad?

**MS. SILLETT:** I think that the example that I remember being given was, like, for example, let's just say that they had to have their plumbing done and there is no other time to get that done, and there's an appointment there, so they had no one else to be except themselves, and we're talking about a scenario on the city, but that was one example that came by.

**MR. LYALL:** Okay. Could I suggest that if they have an appointment at home for plumbing or anything else, that they take time off to do it.

**MS. SILLETT:** I'll give you another example, and it's happened down there is that the water lines break or the heat is off, and that happens in a lot of the Nunatsiavut communities. I see it on line.

**MR. LYALL:** Yes. I understand if you had the water problems or heating systems or power breakdown, and in that case I guess just about everyone else would be off also at, at home from work.

**MR. WINTERS:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. The constituency allowance eligible expenses, is it being, I don't know, I'm confused because we keep going back and forth to different things. All these expenses that's listed here; public meetings, including room rental, whatever, administration, board taxes, newsletters, is this being taken away from us or are they still there? Thank you.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Yes. I'll try to keep it as simple and understanding as I can make it, okay? What the Member Services Committee has done is recommend taking out of the constituency allowance eligible expenditures, what we can do. What we are recommending, based on legal opinion, and Denise was clear on it earlier, is that we are recommending taking out the donations portion of the constituency allowance. That's all we're recommending. Why? There's a reason why. Based on legal opinion, it's against the Assembly Act; the donation portion was contrary to the Assembly Act. There potentially, potentially could be questions raised of misappropriation of funds as the Minister of Finance pointed out earlier. We could be accused of buying votes by giving donation. In effect, that's what it amounts to, where it seems to be buying votes. That's the portion that the Member Services Committee was strongly, strongly recommend that you have to understand that. And how and where this discussion for the last half an hour is taking place, we've not changed direction. It's spelled out what we can do. Thank you.

**MS. NOCHASAK:** Thank you. I would just like to comment on what you have just mentioned. I do understand that it is looked at as a misappropriation of funds and that yes, it is. It has been decided to take the donation portion out of the constituency allowance. But I'm just wondering where it was mentioned. If this can be changed to expense allowance and get away from the constituency allowance and maybe do another allowance separate where the Government can maybe look at putting an allowance for donations or an allowance for bereavement, or because I, personally, I get a lot of requests to help people out in really bad situations, and now it's, even this week, I've had requests to help families and I had to say no. All I'm asking is that if we, as an Assembly, or you, as the Member Services Committee, can come up with a different allowance or constituency allowance to come back and help our people again.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak for Rigolet.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Well, if we done that wouldn't we just be doing what we were told not to do? No matter where the money is coming from is the same thing; we'd be doing what we were told we shouldn't be doing. No matter where the money is coming from, it's coming from the constituency, or

expense allowance, or whatever it is we're going to be doing what the lawyer said we shouldn't do. That's my opinion, anyway.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Okay. To the point made by the Minister of Education, I think that brief discussion at Member Services Committee at the last conference call. Potentially, if the Member Services Committee is directed to go looking for other avenues, to be able to do what you just suggested, Susan, I'm prepared to go look and if it can be done, if it can be done, but I'm telling you based on the legal opinion, under the constituency allowance, donations are just not-, we have to inform you that donations are not, are contrary to the Assembly Act, but I, I'm prepared to go looking.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak for Hopedale.

**MR. PIERCY:** We're supposed to be accountable for the constituency allowance that we receive. Wouldn't it be fair to say that if you had a receipt for everything that you bought and it's not buying votes or nothing, the receipts is there, wouldn't you be able to say that it's acceptable because the receipt that you put forth to get reimbursed for, is fair, I would say? And how do you explain the difference from putting something in. If you passed in the receipts, you're accountable for the money that you spent, and you look at the other side of the story, it was fair, you never used it to go either way, and it was used for something reasonable. So why is there such a big fuss over, if I spent so much on this and so much on that, and I give you the receipts and we used it and it was used for purposes of benefitting the people of my community, so where do you draw the line to say that, like with Herb's? So we need clarification on what we can use it for, and we're here at the Assembly, but then now when everybody leaves I go back to my office. How do I break down if we're there for seven hours a day, how do I break down the difference between what I use for Hopedale and what I use for the Assembly, if I'm using both avenues to get the information to come back to the Assembly?

**MR. LYALL:** Wayne, I'm not sure, but I, I think it's listed there on page 12 there, what you can spend your constituency allowances on.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** Thank you. I hate to use Minister Pottle's statement he made earlier about being human and making a special consideration for people in our community. Sometimes some of our beneficiaries do not have the means to have to travel for the death of a family member to parts of Canada and I think this is something and, and we've discussed this before, about a bereavement travel subsidy or some type of thing. I think something like that should be, like extenuating circumstances, should be part of the expenditures for this.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Mr. Barbour.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Yes. Okay and again, for the Member Services, first to, Ed, my first response, this has been emotional debate with among the Member Services Committee. We feel, you know, until I received the legal opinion, and now as a member of Member Services Committee, I've not touched my, not one penny out of my constituency allowance. But I'm just like you, if I feel like I'm helping my community out, I don't see myself as doing something wrong, but I go back to Wayne's point, and the point that I made earlier in my response to the Minister of Education. I'll use an example of where I can

seem to be very biased in using my constituency allowance. I'm a hockey fan. I used to play hockey, but let's just say, for the sake of arguments, out of my donations I supported the hockey team and then in my community, and then a volleyball team comes up to me and I say, no, I've used up my constituency allowance, well, that volleyball team can come at me very quickly. How come you can support a hockey team, but not a volleyball team? Can be said very quickly, very quickly, and I think that's where the legal opinion was careful in its wording that, hey, the wording that was used, this is donations are contrary to Nunatsiavut Assembly Act. I can't say it any simpler than that.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honorable President.

**MR. LYALL:** I would just like to add this to what William had just said. I remember three years ago when the constituent allowances were basically used for donations. I made donations to a family that was in bereavement, two members of his family. My constituency allowance was used up. It's just about the end of the year. The following week you had a suicide in Nain. I had this family come to me and said they wanted some money to help them. I said, I'm sorry, I don't have any money. I was accused immediately, how can you help them, but not me? And but I think it goes further than that. When we're saying buying votes, it, I think it's quite easily done. I mean, it's, say, if Herb, for instance, Makkovik, was able to help his constituents or someone in his family or someone in his community to funeral costs or any other cost, he's not really buying votes. But people remember what you've done. The next guy that's running against Herb in the election the next time around, say, no, sorry, I'm not supporting you, Herb gave me money. It's only because he was able to do it. I think that money should not be used for donations in that way because it'll be looked at as buying votes. It might not be intentional, but that's what it looks like to the rest of the community.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honorable Minister of Finance.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** After this, we'll take a break.

**MR. POTTLE:** I don't mean to confuse the issue, and I'm sorry if I did, but there was a lot of, I guess, and I didn't see it clearly, laid out here when I referenced the Constitution and the Assembly Act regarding constituencies, and I'm sorry if I caused some confusion around that, and I thank William Barbour for clarifying after 35 or 45 minutes of discussion that the only intent at this point in time for the Member Services Committee was to strike out the portion of your constituency allowance for donations. So I apologize to the Assembly through some of my commentary, if I made some confusion and that around that, but I was just trying to reiterate, and I guess when this Assembly Act may be reviewed, this will certainly come to the floor again because we need to take a closer look at, I believe, moving forward on what is a constituency, who is eligible for constituency allowance, and in what categories are you going to approve that moving forward so I just leave it at that. Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** We're going to take a 15-minute break.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** We're still in a Committee of a Whole here. We're going to continue where we left off on break. There are just a few more pages to go through here on the, this package, to get comments. You know, the Member Services Committee has a lot of work to do, so we'll just go through

the last few pages and get any more comments and recommendations, and then the Member Services will take it back for another look at. So I'd like to recognize the Honourable Susan Nochasak, Minister of Education.

**MS. NOCHASAK:** Thank you. I apologize for belaboring this topic that we've been discussing for the last half hour, but I, I didn't really get much of an answer. I know that you told me that you would take it into consideration, and I do understand that there are causes for this, the donation, especially the bereavement travel taken off of this constituency allowance. I do understand that. But I still don't believe that it should be dead in the water. I do believe-, maybe this isn't the right place, but maybe somewhere in our Government, maybe in departmental level, that it still should be looked at in some form to help some of these families that are looking for travel. I do understand the President's point by saying that it might be taken as buying votes. I do understand that the funds were in issue in regards of helping one, as opposed to not helping the other. That, why I'm asking if, as a department, or as a Government, can take this on in regards of a committee to have funds to be able to help these families, I'd be satisfied, rather than just having it dead in the water. Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Herb.

**MR. JACQUE:** Thank you. Likewise, I agree with Minister Nochasak and I just had to say, like, today and yesterday I had to help people, but I had to go to other sources, right? I go to the Community Government and different departments or organizations in the community, but we still have to help those individuals. Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Mr. Barbour.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Okay. And as the Chair of the Committee of the Whole right now has pointed out, we've just got a couple more items. I still hear your points, Susan and Herb. I do hear your points. We just touched on it very, very briefly on our last conference call on the issue of donation. If the Member Services Committee is directed by the Assembly to look at other avenues, as you pointed out, Susan, other avenues, away from the constituency allowance, away from that, I'm sure we're prepared to look at it, at least look at, but I make it clear now, and you, each and every one of you Assembly members have the legal opinion, and it's quite clear, it is quite clear that if you're using and after having seen the legal opinion, you're still using the constituency allowance for donations for bereavement, for house fires, for sporting events, for cultural events, I'm sorry, but if somebody starts looking at your finances, you're on your own. We can't help. We, we've informed you now, but you've also got copies of that legal opinion. It had to be clear on that.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honorable Minister of Health.

**MS. KEMUKSIGAK:** I'd like to suggest number 6 be changed to expense allowance for elected officials, and call it an expense allowance under number 1, so that it's not perceived to be only Ordinary Members are people who run constituencies. Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more comments to make on page 12? Then we'll go to page 13. If anybody has any comments or questions there? Page 14, any comments or questions? AngajukKak for Nain.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** I guess these are new proposals, but all elected officials will be provided with office supplies and materials needed to conduct their business, including a computer and a cell phone. I suppose some of that duplicates, like, the office supplies and materials that was covered off under the expense allowance but it's almost saying the same thing over again. It's covered under the expense allowance, but because there is no limit on this, looks like. We'll be provided office supplies and materials needed to conduct our business, including a computer and a cell phone. But perhaps someone from the committee can expand on that a little. I certainly do understand what a computer is and cell phone, but you know the office supplies and materials, a little bit vague. Is that like papers and pens and printers and things like that, or what? So we can request those kind of things, I suppose. But that's going to be, okay, not to be asked now, is it? What does that include? Maybe I should make it more-, what does that include office supplies and materials needed to conduct their business, what does that mean?

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Well, I just have the same comment from Tony is that when the budget was done up by the Member Services Committee for the fiscal year 2011, 2012, there was no office supplies or materials budgeted under the budget for each elected official. What was budgeted was the operating cost for the clerk of the Assemblies Office, operating the Assembly meetings and the allowance and salaries for each Assembly member. So I just have a comment on what the budget is right now for the Assembly.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Now, that's not quite my question, though.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** Oh, I know what your question is, but this...

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Okay.

**MS. CRAWFORD:** ...that's just my comment on the budget.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Your question on that, AngajukKak for Nain, that will be reviewed when we go through this again...

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** ...when the Member Services Committee goes through it. AngajukKak from Hopedale.

**MR. PIERCY:** The same thing with the cell phone too?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** It will be reviewed at the next Member Services Committee meeting. Any questions or comments on the forms that are made there? Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Thank you, Madame Chair. I'm just wondering, we have been to date working with, I believe, it's three other forms for constituency allowance spending.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Yes.

**MR. POTTLE:** One is an application for a donation which, of course, now would be most likely struck out. The other one was, again, a summary form to that so, I guess, that would be struck out and that's why that's not included in here, I think.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** That's right. AngajukKak for Hopedale.

**MR. PIERCY:** Are we entitled to mileage here in Hopedale?

**MR. BARBOUR:** When we say mileage for, we didn't exclude anybody, Wayne. We didn't. What we did think about, though, when it comes to mileage for someone like Dan Pottle or Pat Ford in St. John's, Patricia, in Happy Valley Goose Bay and whoever, Keith Russell, at present time, who is on leave of absence. It may be Max who's gone out, a fair good amount of driving around Happy Valley Goose Bay, but we didn't exclude anybody.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more comments to make before we close up on this? Okay. Then we will end this. The Member Services Committee will take the whole package back for review and then after listening to all your concerns, comments, and we will get back to you at a later date. We will now break the Committee of the Whole and get back into the Assembly. Is everyone in agreement with that?

**ASSEMBLY:** Aye.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The next item is number 12, Notice of Motions. The Honourable Minister of Lands.

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I'd like to make notice that I will be presenting two motions tonight. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. We provided you with notice, but for the sake of the Assembly, I wish to give notice that I will be moving a resolution that the Assembly adopt a report from the Committee on Rules and Procedures. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more Notices of Motions? The Honourable Susan Nochasak.

**MS. NOCHASAK:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I'd also like to give notice of a motion to appoint two trustees to the LICST, trustee nominees. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Thank you. There's no more Notices of Motions. We're moving to the next item on the agenda, which would be motions. Order, please. We're now moving to number 13 on our Orders of the Day, which are motions, and I'd now like to recognize the Honourable Minister of Lands.

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. Madame Speaker, our resolution to put forward a plan to review the provisions of the Labrador Inuit Lands Act that imposed a moratorium on uranium mining. I move, seconded by Dan Pottle, the Minister of Finance, Human Resources and Information Technology that the Nunatsiavut Assembly adopt the following resolution to review the provisions of the Labrador

Inuit Lands Act that impose the moratorium on uranium mining. Whereas in April, 2008, the Nunatsiavut Assembly passed an Act amending the Labrador Inuit Lands Act. And whereas that amendment restricted the issuance of a private interest in Labrador Inuit Land, in relation to the working, production, mining, milling, or development of uranium on Labrador Inuit Lands. And whereas subsection 1.9(2) of the Labrador Inuit Lands Act, states that the Nunatsiavut Assembly shall review those provisions of the Act dealing with the moratorium after March 31st, 2011. Madame Speaker, now therefore be it resolved that the Nunatsiavut Assembly hereby establishes a Special Committee of the Nunatsiavut Assembly to be chaired by the Minister of Lands and Natural Resources to hold public consultations on the moratorium issue. The public consultations will include information on the uranium mining and the use cycle and are to be completed before the next session of the Assembly. The Department of Lands and Natural Resources will secure a qualified consultant to assist with the consultation and prepare a report for the Special Committee and the Nunatsiavut Assembly. The Nunatsiavut Assembly budget for the committees of the Assembly will cover the cost of the consultation process. If the Special Committee determined that the result of the review of the Act dealing with the moratorium and public consultations supports that the moratorium should be lifted, the Minister of Lands and Natural Resources will draft an amendment Bill to remove section 1.9 clause (i) of subsection 2.11(i) and subsection 10.7(3) from the Labrador Inuit Lands Act, and a draft Bill will be attached as an appendix to the report. The Minister will include in the amendment Bill a provision that reads, This Act comes into force on the same date that the Nunatsiavut Environmental Protection Act comes into force which shall be no later than March 9th, 2012. Subject to Section 3, above, the Minister will table this draft Bill at the next sitting of the Nunatsiavut Assembly. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The motion is in order. Minister, would you like to make any opening comments to the motion?

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Yes. Thank you, Madame Speaker. No doubt over a period of time this has been an issue that has been, I guess, looming related to our beneficiaries. Not only our beneficiaries, but more importantly, our beneficiaries, also industry. Madame Speaker, it has been, I guess, an issue that has consumed maybe 95, 96 percent of my time in the department as Minister. As it speaks to, as I read out in the resolution, we feel that community consultations in this process to deal with the moratorium review are very important. We also feel that an Environmental Protection Act, that, if when the moratorium become effective, it will not have until the Environmental Protection Act is effective also. This is for the protection of our land. This is for the protection of our people that we represent, and I'm hoping tonight, as we discuss this issue, that serious thoughts is put into the resolution, itself, the thought for our beneficiaries. No doubt, we have people out there that are going to be looking for hours, presently looking four hours and going to be looking for hours, and not solely depending on the moratorium, itself, but it contributes to some of the hardship within Nunatsiavut. So having said that, I thank you, Madame Speaker, for giving me the opportunity to speak.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Thank you, Honorable Minister. Any comments? Honourable Minister of Finance.



**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. As the seconder to this motion, I certainly support the motion put forth by the Minister of Land and Natural Resources. Currently, the Labrador Inuit Lands Act states that there are two aspects to the current Lands Act that this resolution addresses. The first one says that there will be this section, section 1.9(i) of subsection 2.11.1 and subsection 10.3 from the Labrador Inuit Lands Act, states that the Bill will not be repealed until March 31st, and the review will not happen until after March 31st. In keeping with the Labrador Inuit Lands Act, Madame Speaker, I believe that part of the review process must be community consultations. I don't think, Madame Speaker, without public consultations and the review of this Act that we should proceed without doing that because that's what currently is stated in the Labrador Inuit Lands Act as something that the Assembly must do. I support the resolution, Madame Speaker, simply for that fact and to do other would be contrary to our current law. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Nakummek, Honorable Minister. Any more comments? The AngajukKak for Rigolet.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I'm just wondering the date of March the 9th, I'm just wondering, and the other thing that I'm wondering is about the EPA being completed or being assented to before the resolution. If the community consultation calls for the moratorium to be lifted and we're going to go by this date here, I'm a little bit concerned that, and I suppose it's-, I don't want to seem to be pre-judging the outcome at all of the community consultation, and I certainly support that to the fullest because I think our people should have their say, but I'm just concerned that with that date and should there be people that want to lift the moratorium, for example, work still wouldn't be able to happen next summer with that March deadline. That's the only concern that I have.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Go ahead, Minister Sheppard.

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Thank you, Madame Speaker, and also thank you to the AngajukKak from Rigolet for your question of concern there. As it's stated in the resolution, March the 9th, the Act will come, will come into effect no later than March the 9th. However, if the community consultations or the public consultations reflect that the moratorium should be lifted, during our next sitting as it's stated in here, there will be a Bill brought forward by the Minister, which is myself. Having said that, if the moratorium, let's use examples here, if it lifted early December, March the 9th here, 2012, is our deadline. I wouldn't take a second guess at it tonight that if the moratorium lifted, that would put a lot more fuel under our feet to get the EPA effective, maybe sooner, rather than March the 9th. I won't commit to that, but that's my general feeling on it and as for industry coming in, once the, if the EPA is not complete until March the 9th, right now, I presently can't elaborate on that one. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** AngajukKak for Nain.

**MR. ANDERSEN:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I can't, I won't support this resolution as it is. There are far too many unknowns in here and even contradictions within the resolution, itself. In number 1, for instance, we don't know when the next session of the Assembly is. Neither do we know who makes up the Special Committee, and that is key, Madame Speaker, who makes up that Special

Committee, because number 3 reads, If the Special Committee determines that the result of the review of the Act dealing with the moratorium and public consultation supports that the moratorium should be lifted, the Minister of Lands and Natural Resources will draft an amendment Bill to remove section 1.9 clause in brackets, Roman (I) of subsection 2.11(1) and subsection 10.7(3) from the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Act and a draft Bill will be attached as an appendix to the report. Fair enough. But what if the Special Committee determines that the result of the review dealing with the moratorium and public consultations supports that the moratorium should not be lifted, then what? The Minister will then, he won't include an amendment Bill then, because the committee has recommended against it. It ends there, that's the way this resolution reads. It ends right then and there. There's no room. If a Special Committee says the consultation didn't support lifting the moratorium it ends there. There's no room for us, the rest of us in this Assembly, the Committee has all the power. I can't support that. I think that the Assembly should have the power. As well, number 5 is subject to section 3 above. The Minister will table this draft Bill at the next sitting of the Nunatsiavut Assembly. Well, if the Committee doesn't find in favor of lifting the moratorium then, again, section 5 is gone out the window. There'd be no need for him to table the draft Bill amending the Lands Act. All of this depends upon the Special Committee determining that the result of the review dealing with the moratorium and public consultation supports that the moratorium should be lifted. There are people in here that feel that the moratorium should be lifted, Madame Speaker. We don't know the makeup of the Committee. We don't know who will appoint the Committee. I suppose there is something in here that can hint toward that. We don't know for certain who will be on the Committee. We have no idea who the consultant will be at this point in time. And we have no power over that to pass this resolution and for me, there are too many unknowns. I think that, as well, getting a little late in the game for starting community consultations after almost four years having this moratorium in place to finding what I believe is perhaps this again is to stall or, for some reason, that, you know? And you don't have to stall because work is slow. Tell us the truth, you know. For me, the list that I had, anyway, too many unknowns at this point in time. I cannot support the resolution put forward.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Ordinary Member for Nain.

**MR. BARBOUR:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I think I just want to go directly to a question that the AngajukKak for Nain had, not necessarily asked, but kind of made a statement to. Well, I asked the President and not the Minister of Lands and Natural Resource, I asked the President will there be another sitting of the fall sitting of the Assembly in trying to move this file forward.

**MR. LYALL:** Thank you, Ordinary Member of Nain. Yes, I plan to have a fall sitting on the date of the 12th of December to review and accept the consultations that have been carried out by the Special Committee that I hope that'll be appointed and set up tonight. The Committee will be recommending only. They won't make the decision. They will be recommending to the Assembly what we should be doing on the uranium moratorium issue. Thank you very much.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more comments? Chair of Sivunivut.

**MR. TUTTAUK:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. I'm quite conflicted with this resolution. I was under the hope and the intent that we'd come to this sitting and address the moratorium at this sitting, but I was willing to look at this resolution and I'm quite pleased that public consultations will be done. I'm okay with a committee. I am, however, not okay with tying the moratorium to our Environmental Protection Act. We have a date set for March 9th. I could almost live with that, but as the AngajukKak from Nain has said, there are too many, too many issues that need to be addressed first. So and that's where the conflict comes in. Do I support this motion as it stands, or do I not support the motion based on that number 4, and I'm still uncomfortable with tying the moratorium to the Environmental Protection Act, so I can't support this motion as it stands. Nakummek.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The AngajukKak for Makkovik.

**MR. JACQUE:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. Likewise. First of all, I'd like to just say that I'm happy to see that there are public consultations in this motion, but we would like to know how it's going to be conducted, who is going to conduct the consultations, how it will be done, will it be door-to-door, will it be public meetings will they use our local radio station, etcetera. In my community when we have public consultations such as in meetings, we just have a handful of people that show up. No doubt there are people in our community in need of jobs, and this has been brought on to us, like I said earlier, there are mixed feelings. We want to know who the public Special Committee will be. Will all communities be represented? And I don't think that this date, like same as the other guys, is relevant. And one more thing I'd like to add is that we need to get out there. I've conducted 65 interviews in Makkovik but feel that it's not sufficient, and we need more time. Maybe we need more help. Maybe all this information is not good enough. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honorable First Minister.

**MR. SHIWAK:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I stand here tonight to support the Minister's resolution. I think that it's important that the moratorium be associated or tied to the EPA. The EPA is very important. It's our control. It's our protection. It's going to ensure that as it says in the EPA when the regulations are done that Inuit have the last say of any project on Labrador Inuit Lands. I also believe in the public consultations when they're done the right way and when they're done meaningfully within our communities. When you go into a community and you ask for the opinions and you listen to the people, you don't tell them what you're going to do, but you go in and listen. And from that you take those comments and put them into a report and ensure the Special Committee will and you bring it back to the Assembly as a recommendation. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Thank you, Honorable First Minister. The AngajukKak from Hopedale.

**MR. PIERCY:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. The point I need to bring up is coming from number 2, Department of Lands and Natural Resources will secure a qualified consultant. As everybody knows we were out to Goose Bay for the workshop with Golder & Associates. After reading a little bit of material on Golder & Associates, I come to a conclusion that with Golder & Associates their main purpose is to live within the mining industry. So I think we only heard the facts that they wanted us to hear and we never heard the whole story. So whoever it is that's going to be qualified, I think they need to go around

to each, like Herb said, from Makkovik, when you do your consultations you only get a handful of people that show up because there's so much on the go, even though the communities is small, right? You still only get the same handful to each, each sitting that's going on with any given meeting, unless there was door prizes and stuff involved. Then you get a few more out. So whoever is going to be qualified need to ensure that they get to go and see almost everybody that's going to be able to put something forward so that we can have a better understanding of what we're going to be dealing with? And to tie it in with the March 9th, with the EPA, I think our EPA should have their strictness to it so we can follow what's in there. Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honorable Susan Nochasak.

**MS. NOCHASAK:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I do, I also support this resolution tabled by our Minister of Lands and Natural Resources for the fact that we do have a timeline here. I do understand that it's been four years in the works, but there is a date hereof March 9th, 2012. With the stipulation that the Nunatsiavut Environmental Protection Act comes into force. I say that again because as Minister Shiwak had mentioned, it gives us, the Inuit control over what the Environmental Protection Act is going to say. It gives us the control and power to make sure our environment is protected to line and dot to what we want it to be. In regards of the AngajukKak from Nain of mentioning that there are a lot of unknowns and that the Special Committee, he's not sure how the Special Committee is, is going to reiterate the public consultations. I would just like to say that I'm sure as professional people in this Government and appointing the Special Committee, they will just give the concerns of the public through consultations. They're not recommending that they go separate ways. They are just giving the information back to this Assembly on what those public consultations and what our beneficiaries are asking to look at. Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Nakummek, Honorable Minister. Any more comments? The Honourable President.

**MR. LYALL:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I do support this resolution. I think it's something that we were all aware for the last three and a half years that this date was coming, that March 31st was coming, but we all had to be clear that March 31st, to me, is an artificial deadline. I said we, we shall review it after March 31st. It doesn't say we're going to review it in the 1st of April, or 2011, or 2012 or 2013. There's no timeline. I think we should take as much time as possible to do the right thing, to do the right thing for our people, do the right thing for our environment. Make sure everything is in place so that when we do have, if the uranium mine does goes ahead, that we're all covered, that we are healthy people that we're vibrant people. Are we going to open a mine without any consultations, without talking to our people? I mean what are we talking about? I think it's absolutely urgent we consult our people. I promise you that I will have another Assembly on the 12th of December of this year to review the recommendations that come out in the consultation, as I said earlier. It's only recommendations. It's up to the Assembly to make the decision whether they want to follow those recommendations or not. I've had some lengthy discussions within Department of Lands and Resources. They promised me that all the stuff from the environmental legislation will be ready by sometime in February, maybe early or late February. If it's early February, we can have the Assembly for the March

sitting moved up to earlier, to an earlier date, if possible. But it all depends on getting the environmental legislation completed and done. But I'm saying let's not shove ourselves down the drain just because we're, it's going to be March instead of January, or March instead of April, or whatever the dates is. I think we do the right thing for our people. Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Thank you. Any more comments? The AngajukKak from Postville.

**MS. GEAR:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. My question, I guess, is how soon do you plan to put this committee in place? I come down here and my people expect me to go back and have an answer for them. Although before I left home I did tell them that there was going to be a resolution put forward. You know, as well as I know, that there's absolutely nothing in our community. I'm not saying that we should have uranium going ahead at all costs, but I am saying that we need to look at something for the whole Nunatsiavut. You look at all our communities, what's there? There's nothing. There's absolutely nothing in our communities, and I think this is something we need to look at. I'm undecided right now whether I'm going to support this or not, but I guess when the times comes to vote, I'll have my mind made up then. Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honorable Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

**MR. LAMPE:** Nakummek Madam Speaker. I also support this resolution. This issue will not go away. It's a serious element, a serious mineral and a serious issue. But the Executive Council has worked really hard with the Minister and his staff trying to find best ways of moving forward on the issue of uranium. And so we are putting this forward to the Assembly to see what we can do to let the public know, the beneficiaries, and to look at what we can hopefully get out of talking about uranium, and certainly having learned from Voisey's Bay, I believe that we can use that experience, and at the same time I believe we can look at using this as a channel to get what the communities need, what the beneficiaries need, and I do believe that we can together find solutions. Nakummek Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Nakummek, Johannes. Any more comments? The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MS. KEMUKSIGAK:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I support the resolution tying in the lifting of the moratorium to the Environmental Protection Act is very important, as people had stated so the Inuit have control over if an environmental assessment should happen, we have environment, we'll have environmental protection for our land and our people. Consultations are very important, and we will have the draft Bill, or the department will have the draft Bill ready so that there's no further delay in the case the communities say to lift it. If they say not to lift it, well, that's another story, but at least it'll be ready so it's not a further delay. It will speed things up. The Assembly will get to vote on who's on the Special Committee and I believe it will be set up tonight, so it wouldn't be any further delays. There was a lot of thought gone into it, and we believe this is the best thing, and I believe it's the best thing to help all our communities and our beneficiaries. Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Thank you, Honorable Minister. I'd like to recognize the Honourable President.

**MR. LYALL:** Well, thank you, Madame Speaker. I think Minister of Health brought up the point that I was going to make that we're hoping to have the committee formed or set tonight, if the resolution passes. Thank you very much.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Chair of NunaKatiget.

**MR. WINTERS:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I like many support the public consultations, but there are quite a few things there that I'm uncertain with. So right now I have to do quite a bit of thinking on this before I can have any more comments. Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Thank you. Anymore? AngajukKak from Rigolet.

**MS. WOLFREY:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. I guess I got a question. Can I ask a question?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Yes. Okay.

**MS. WOLFREY:** I remember when this moratorium was first put in place and there were discussions around Nunatsiavut anyway, around my community about how Nunatsiavut didn't need to have that moratorium. They already had the power from; I don't know if it was the Lands Act. I can't remember, but they already had some power to not let a mine go ahead. So and our environmental protection, to the best of my knowledge, was already passed. I know it hasn't been assented to, but it was already passed, so we've got a passed Environmental Act and we, and I mean, unless I heard wrong, that we already had some protection as Labrador Inuit to not let a mine go ahead, if we didn't want it to. So the reason that I was talking about making sure of the timing, I don't think that from between the time that if this moratorium is lifted until the EPA is put in place that they've got time to make a mine. So we could still have the environmental protection passed before there are any environmental assessments, stuff like that. I don't think everybody is ready to go ahead just like that, but I'd like the question asked, is do we already somewhere else in some of our laws, have some authority to say, no, you're not putting a mine there because I thought we had that already?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Honorable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. Yes, we do have the environmental protection legislation approved by the Nunatsiavut Assembly. The President will, and has committed to the Assembly that he will assent to the EPA once the regulations are developed by the Department of Land and Natural Resources. Without regulations, Madame Speaker, to guide us and to give us some direction and assurances that Labrador Inuit concerns are heard and are validated through this process, those regulations must be developed. If and when the moratorium is lifted, there's no guarantee that there is going to be a mine tomorrow, or next week, or the day after. There is a process that has to be followed here. Once the work has been done and the Assembly is satisfied and is comfortable enough with proceeding with respect to finding from our people what they want on this issue. I think it's important we were all elected to this Assembly to hear the views of our people, and I don't think, without doing what's set out in this resolution that we're doing due diligence for our people. It's incumbent upon us as Assembly members to ensure that our communities and our beneficiaries are

consulted throughout this process. Once again and if the moratorium is lifted, and we're saying, if, there's no guarantees here, the Special Committee, if this resolution is passed, the Committee on Rules and Procedures will be bringing forth names for members of this Special Committee tonight to be hopefully approved by the Assembly and, again, without our environmental protection legislation and regulations to accompany that, I think we're going down a dangerous road of lifting a moratorium without those regulations put in place. The moment that the Nunatsiavut Government consents to lifting the moratorium, proponents, such as Aurora Energy, have the right and authority to register their plan for development. With that registration will come environmental assessment through the three processes that's set out in the Nunatsiavut Environmental Protection Act that says that we must do our best measures to harmonize with the Newfoundland and Labrador Environmental Assessment Act and The Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. Without that and without assurances that Labrador Inuit are ready, we will be sitting on the sidelines again and we will be letting the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador dictate what's best for Labrador Inuit. It's up to the Labrador Inuit to decide what's best for Labrador Inuit, and without this we're going down a dangerous road, if we don't put in place the regulations to accompany the Environmental Protection legislation before we consent to letting something go to an environmental assessment without full Labrador Inuit participation. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Honorable Minister of Lands, would you have, do you have any closing remarks?

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Yes. Thank you, Madame Speaker. I think I've heard from all direction of the table and there was mixed feelings, some in support of the resolution and some not. I respect all decisions of all elected people, however, I has to, I guess, reiterate what the resolution states and that I would be the first one to be very uncomfortable in lifting the moratorium without an Environmental Protection Act in place, which is the laws of our land, the dos and the don'ts. It's in our hands. This is in our hands right now. We are, around this table tonight, we are the eyes of the world. The eyes of the world is focused on us tonight. So the decision we make has to be for the betterment of our people. Not out in western Canada, not over in other countries, we have to make a decision that's right for our people. I heard internally, when, you know, I see people going around unemployed, but I seriously give, thought this through. If we lifted the moratorium today, a week later, would I look back and say we made the wrong decision? It's too late. We can't go back and undo it. We don't have our Environmental Protection Act in place. In the 1970's, my grandfather joined forces with a few other people from Makkovik and a couple from Postville, and he fought for what he believed in. At the time was a living off of the land. And in his case he won the case, along with the downfall of the uranium prices. Today, 2011, we are discussing the same thing. Only we have right now control. We have the say here. So let us make this decision in the best interest of our people and for the betterment of the environment and for generations to come. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Thank you, Honorable Member. We'll now take a vote on this resolution. All in favor, please raise your hands? Nine

**MADAM SPEAKER:** All against? All against, could you please raise your hands again? Seven.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The resolution has passed, nine to seven. We're going to take a break for five minutes.

**MS. LANE:** I just read in the Constitution that it says, it states 50 years.

**MR. JACQUE:** It's to my understanding that we could go up to 50 years.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** We're going to break for two minutes. Are there any more comments on this resolution? Then we'll ask the Honourable Minister of Lands.

**MR. SHEPPARD:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. Sorry for the delay there, Mr. AngajukKak for Makkovik, but we're issuing indefinite Inuit free hold title that the land, we're issuing to you. Also, under your Inuit Community Government Bylaws that I think some of the questions there, or a couple of comments there, could be answered through your own Inuit Community Government Bylaw, and also, I guess, in relation to a couple more comments there, you have that, we would have to discuss this more internally with legal and also in conjunction with yourselves as Inuit Community Government. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Any more comments on this resolution? Honourable Minister of Lands, do you have any closing remarks?

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

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Then we'll take a vote on it. All in favor, please raise your hand? Everybody. This resolution has passed. I would now like now like to recognize the Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable First Minister, the Ordinary Member for Rigolet, the Honourable Darryl Shiwak that the Assembly adopt the report and recommendations of the Standing Committee on Rules and Procedures, including the amendments to the Standing Orders as amended in the Committee of the Whole. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The motion is in order. Would the mover like to speak to the motion?

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. I don't have much to say, other than I think we've exhausted and we had a lot of discussion and debate on the motion in the Committee of the Whole, and I believe there was consensus at the Committee of the Whole to move this resolution forward. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Thank you. Does anyone else have any comments to make? Then we'll go into a vote. Everyone in favor of this resolution please raise your hand? This resolution has passed. I'd now like to recognize the Honourable Susan Nochasak, Minister of Education.

**MS. NOCHASAK:** Thank you, Madame Speaker. The LICST Trust Deed sets out the process to be followed when filling vacant positions on the Trust. Two trustee positions must be filled; one non-Nunatsiavut Government employee trustee and one Nunatsiavut Government employee trustee. The current trustees have spent a lot of time considering the skill sets that we currently do not have and



which we believe will be important as we move forward. We have also considered and are recommending only Nunatsiavut beneficiaries. We have been proudly making note of the fact that we are an all-Inuit Trust, and we think it is important to retain this description. The LICST trustees are requesting the appointment of James Igloliorte and Kristy Sheppard as trustees to the LICST. Non-government, non-Nunatsiavut Government trustee nominee, James Igloliorte. Madame Speaker, Dr. James Igloliorte a Nunatsiavut beneficiary, originally from Hopedale, graduated from Memorial University with a Bachelor's Degree in Science and Education in 1972. In 1980 his legal career began when he took up duties as a lay Magistrate. He became a Provincial Court Judge a year later. Madame Speaker, in 1985 he received his Bachelor of Law degree from Dalhousie University in Halifax and returned to take up his duties in Happy Valley Goose Bay as a Circuit Court Judge. In 1999, he was awarded a National Aboriginal Achievement Award in the field of law. He recently taught a preliminary course in legal process with the Inuit only, Akitsiraq Law School, affiliated with the University of Victoria in Iqaluit, Nunavut. He has been a Deputy Judge of the Territorial Court of the Nunatsiavut Territories and was honorary Colonial of the Five Wing Goose Bay for a year. Dr. Igloliorte has been a Labrador Director with the Innu Healing Foundation and was a commissioner on a number of commissions including the Royal Commission on renewing and strengthening our place in Canada and Qikiqtani Truth Commission. He completed a two-month stint at the Province's Child Youth Advocate and was employed with the Labrador Inuit Development Corporation as an officer manager in St. John's. Most recently, Dr. Igloliorte was a panel member on the Lower Churchill Environmental Assessment Panel. Madame Speaker, Nunatsiavut Government trustee nominee, Kristy Sheppard. Kristy Sheppard is a Nunatsiavut Government Director of Tourism. She has been in this position since 2007. Part of her current role is to research and implement industry programming and policies and to provide marketing and the travel trade representation. Kristy also worked for I2K as project coordinator. Social and Economic Development. In this role she was responsible for developing strategic and working plans and managing projects. Kristy has a Bachelor of Arts, major in sociology, minor in psychology, and she will be completing her Master of Arts in Tourism Management in September, 2011 from the Royal Roads University, Victoria, British Columbia. Her research thesis focused on practical model for tourism for Rigolet. Kristy is a Nunatsiavut beneficiary who has the skills that are going to be essential as the Trust moves forward in the terms of the tourism industry. Kristy's resume is also attached. Madame Speaker, I have a special resolution for the Nunatsiavut Assembly, whereas the Labrador Inuit Capital Strategy Trust, ICST, was, was created pursuant to the Settlement and Trust Indenture made effective March 20th, 2006, between Chesley Andersen Wyman Jacque and Tim McNeill as trustees and the Labrador Inuit Association as settlor. The Trust Indenture was amended and re-instated with effect from April 18th, 2007. Section 5.3 of the Trust Indenture provides for the election of successor trustees and reserves the capacity to elect the successor trustees to Nunatsiavut Assembly as approved by special resolution of the Nunatsiavut Assembly. Section 5.2 of the Trust Indenture sets forth the qualifications and the criteria of the successor trustees, and the Nunatsiavut Assembly has considered the foregoing provisions of the Trust Indenture and reviewed several candidates for the election and desires to approve the election of the following persons as successor trustees of the ICST. And now therefore be it resolved that pursuant to section 5.3 of the Labrador Inuit Capital Strategy Trust Indenture, the following persons can be elected by the Nunatsiavut Assembly for election as successor trustees of the Labrador Inuit Capital Strategy Trust effective upon the latter of the date hereof and the date of such

successor trustee executing and delivering of the Labrador Inuit Capital Strategy Trust in acceptance, sustainability, as set forth in section 5.3 of Labrador Inuit Capital Strategy Trust Indenture, James Igloliorte and Kristy Sheppard. Thank you, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Thank you, Honorable Minister. The motion is in order. Does anyone have any comments? Then we'll go into a vote. All those in favor? The motion is passed. I'd like to now recognize the Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. POTTLE:** Nakummek, Madame Speaker. As per the resolution that was passed by the Assembly a while ago on the Special Committee to hold public consultations and review the legislation for the Labrador Inuit Lands Act, the Committee on Rules and Procedures is recommending to the Assembly that the members of the Special Committee be as per the resolution chaired by Glen Sheppard, the Minister of Land and Natural Resources, the Ordinary Member for Makkovik, Denise Lane, the Ordinary Member for Nain, William Barbour, and a non-Assembly member, the Deputy Minister of Land and Natural Resources, Carl McLean. Nakummek, Madame Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Is the Assembly in agreement?

ASSEMBLY: Aye.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** This concludes our session. We will now adjourn.

\*\*\*\*\*