



NORTHWEST TERRITORIES LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

2nd Session

Day %\$

12th Assembly

HANSARD

H 9G85M) FEBRUARY &), 1992

Pages %&' -%& &
Pagination reflects print edition

The Honourable Michael Ballantyne, Speaker

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1992

Pages 123 -142

MEMBERS PRESENT

Hon. Titus Alooloo, Mr. Antoine, Mr. Arnnga'naaq, Mr. Arvaluk, Hon. Michael Ballantyne, Mr. Bernhardt, Hon. Nellie Cournoyea, Mr. Dent, Mr. Gargan, Hon. Stephen Kakfwi, Mr. Koe, Mr. Lewis, Mrs. Marie-Jewell, Ms. Mike, Hon. Don Morin, Mr. Nerysoo, Hon. John Ningark, Hon. Dennis Patterson, Hon. John Pollard, Mr. Pudlat, Mr. Pudluk, Mr. Todd, Hon. Tony Whitford, Mr. Zoe

ITEM 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

SPEAKER (Hon. Michael Ballantyne): Good afternoon. Orders of the day for Tuesday, February 25, 1992. Item 2, Ministers' statements. Mr. Patterson.

ITEM 2: MINISTERS' STATEMENTS

Ministers' Statement 16-12(2): Investigation Of Workers' Compensation Board

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, an internal review at the Workers' Compensation Board has identified serious irregularities involving possible misappropriation of funds from the board by one of its employees. As a result, the RCMP have been asked to investigate the matter. In addition, an employee of the board has been suspended, with pay, pending the results of an internal investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I am not able to comment any further on this matter while it is under investigation. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministers' statements. Ministers' statements. Item 3, Members' statements. Members' statements. Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

ITEM 3: MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Member's Statement On Inconsiderate Comments By Member For Iqaluit

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak on an issue of how a Member, particularly a Minister, spoke yesterday in this House. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Iqaluit conducted himself in a manner that I do not believe is

acceptable to myself and to Members of this House. Mr. Speaker, I quote from Hansard, the comment said: "If it is skewed to the West, it should be called the western special committee on social..."

The concern that I want to address, Mr. Speaker, is the point that when we have a Minister who is responsible to look after the interests of all NWT residents with an open mind of fairness, and when we have a Minister that we place our trust in to develop policies, regulations and legislation for the future of our Territories, I am concerned that this particular Minister has the mentality of an East/West concept when developing responses to issues.

With these comments, Mr. Speaker, due to the attitude and the conduct he displayed toward Members, if the Minister wants to maintain any credibility in this House I would suggest that he consider apologizing for his inconsiderate comments. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Members' statements. Mr. Patterson.

Member's Statement Of Apology

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for my ill-considered comments yesterday.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Mr. Gargan.

Member's Statement On Advice From Status Of Women Council

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and dismayed yesterday with a response I received from the Minister responsible for the Status of Women Council during question period.

I am sure honourable Members will recall that I asked the honourable Member for Natilikmiot what action he had taken to seek the advice of the Status of Women Council on the shameful decision of our territorial court to grant Paul Quassa an absolute discharge. The Minister did not answer my question. He did not refer to the council or its executive director. His only comment was, "Since the decision has been made, on a number of occasions I have talked about this with my wife."

Mr. Speaker, this response is clearly unacceptable. The people of the Northwest Territories commit over a

quarter of a million dollars yearly to support the council. The members of the council, and their staff, invest even more in terms of time, energy and devotion they bring to the cause. For the Minister to seriously suggest that he would not actively seek the opinions of this group of skilled and thoughtful Northerners because he had chosen to talk to his wife instead shows little respect for the members of the council or the work that they do. It also shows disrespect for women in general because it suggests that, unless you are married and have a husband who listens, your views will not be considered by this government. It is possible that the Minister may have been trying to make a joke with his answer. Mr. Speaker, this is not acceptable, either.

Throughout the Northwest Territories women, and men too, have taken note of the Quassa affair and what it says about both the justice system and our current constitutional political process. This is not a joking matter, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister should know that. We should take a serious position on the issue and should begin to rely on the advisory resources that exist within the Status of Women Council and our community organizations across the Northwest Territories. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Members will join me in welcoming Mr. Gary Bohnet to our Assembly. As we know, Mr. Bohnet is the president of the Metis Nation. Members' statements. Mr. Antoine.

Member's Statement On Allegations About HAP Delivery

MR. ANTOINE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, allegations about the 1990/1991 delivery of HAP houses for

Page 124

three Nahendeh communities by the Liidli Koe Construction Association have caused discouragement and resentment within my constituency. I believe that the actions and statements of a disgruntled former Housing Corporation employee, and the highly selective and poorly researched coverage which aired on CBC's Focus North -- I call it the "Unfocused North" -- program, have directed a lot of negative attention on the Fort Simpson Dene band and the Liidli Koe Construction Association, and upon good people who have given their time and energy to assist their community.

I had originally decided not to dignify these inaccuracies and falsehoods with a response, but I would like to set the record straight. Mr. Speaker, the Dene band to which I belong has been involved in providing houses for the people of Fort Simpson for over 15 years. Our partnership with the public government -- first the federal government and later the government of the Northwest Territories -- has been in part based on what I believe are our rights and responsibilities set out in a treaty, Treaty No. 11, which was signed by our forefathers in 1921. Mr. Speaker, we made a decision to proceed with block funding arrangements several years ago because we believed the greater autonomy they represented were in keeping with the partnership and with our tradition of community self-sufficiency. When I became chief of the Fort Simpson Dene Band in July 1990, however, I inherited a number of problems within the housing infrastructure of our community. The Liidli Koe Construction Association, which is managed by the housing committee of the Fort Simpson Band Council, was struggling with a surplus of capital assets and a very severe cash shortage. Late block funding payments, received in July from the territorial Housing Corporation, had disrupted project schedules which were supposed to begin as soon as the snow melted in the spring. There were problems with some local contractors' attitudes toward meeting our project deadlines when they knew they were dealing with public funding.

Interpersonal strife and suspicion within the bureaucracy of the Housing Corporation was interfering with our ability to get answers and commitments we needed to do a good job. I think my time is coming to an end, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It has come to an end, Mr. Antoine. The honourable Member is seeking unanimous consent to conclude his statement. Are there any nays? There are no nays. Continue, Mr. Antoine.

MR. ANTOINE: Mahsi Cho. Because of the success the association had achieved over the past years, we faced the unique situation of having two other communities, Wrigley and Jean Marie River, ask Fort Simpson to take responsibility for the delivery of their HAP units there, as well. As a chief, the most useful contribution I could make was to have the best people in my community work on the band council's housing committee. We were fortunate that band councillors Andy Norwegian, Rita Cli and Ron Hardisty accepted the challenge of being on the housing committee. And I was fortunate to recruit Rene Lamothe to work for the housing committee as a project manager. In

my role as chief, I asked this group to keep a tight financial rein on the matters and to use a common sense approach to meeting people's basic needs for housing.

Mr. Speaker, the housing committee made a lot of difficult decisions. I supported their decisions then, and I do now. I would like to commend these people for their contribution and to indicate to this House that it is truly regrettable to see the sort of misinformation and finger-pointing that has surrounded this issue.

But what matters, Mr. Speaker, is the bottom line; and the bottom line here is that Liidli Koe Construction succeeded in meeting its goal for 1990-91. It built and delivered 11 houses for families in three Nahendeh communities -- seven in Fort Simpson, three in Wrigley and one in Jean Marie River -- and people were able to move into their homes. And it delivered these homes at a lower average per unit cost than the previous year.

There has been some talk locally of a formal investigation into this matter. Personally, I would welcome any sort of investigation. We have nothing to hide, but it would not accomplish anything. I agree with the Minister responsible for the Housing Corporation, Hon. Don Morin, when he says that our job now is to build houses.

Mr. Speaker, as a final comment, I would like to register my concern over the fact that internal Housing Corporation documents were turned over to the media, and that this government has appeared helpless to do anything about this abuse of confidence. I will have more to say about that issue in my statements later this session. Mahsi cho.

MR. SPEAKER: Members' statements. Mr. Pudlat.

Member's Statement On Female Mayor Of Lake Harbour

MR. PUDLAT: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to tell my fellow colleagues that in the Baffin I am surprised to see that there is a female mayor in our community, and I am very happy to see that. There was an election to elect a mayor, and I am proud to say that the female who was running for mayor was elected. You can see that women are becoming leaders, and I would just like to say that I am very happy to see a female in our community who is a mayor. I am welcoming the new mayor of Lake Harbour, and I will be working with her. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Members' statements. Mr. Lewis.

Member's Statement On Concern Re Responses Made By Government Leader

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Like Mr. Gargan and Mrs. Marie-Jewell, I am also concerned about the way in which questions were answered yesterday. I am particularly concerned about the response made by our respected Government Leader on the involvement of ordinary Members in the implementation group for the Beatty report.

I will not quote, but I looked carefully through the unedited transcript of Hansard and listened carefully to her responses yesterday, but the implication is that the work that has gone to date is of such a highly technical nature that poor peons like us could not be involved because it was so technical and so complicated that we would not be able to get our minds around it. That is the implication from the statements that she made yesterday.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker...

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Ms. Cournoyea.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, the Member is imputing motives to my answers to questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Is this a point of order, Ms. Cournoyea?

Point Of Order

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member is imputing motives to my statements. I have total

Page 125

respect for every Member in this Legislative Assembly. The technical nature that I referred to is that we are talking about the make-up and the process of setting up the implementation. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: On your point of order, Ms. Cournoyea, I will review Hansard and give a ruling on the point of order as soon as possible. I would just ask Members to be cautious when they are making Members' statements, as to the interpretation of their

Members' statements, just to keep respect here in the Assembly. Mr. Lewis.

MR. LEWIS: I will go on to describe then, my feelings about the response to questions that were asked yesterday. We had understood, as ordinary Members, that having received the Beatty report, we would be involved at that stage in doing something to implement whatever kinds of changes in programs needed to be implemented in order to achieve overall efficiency and to bring government closer to the people we serve. It was quite clear from the statement that was made yesterday that it was thought that the kind of work that needed to be done was of a highly technical nature.

The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that we want to be involved at the level when decisions have to be made. We are not talking about technical stuff; we are talking about policy, programs, changes, and we do not want to be involved at the end when all the decisions have been made and they are at the stage where they are so irreversible that we then would be at the stage of trying to do the work that civil servants are employed to do, which is to implement things and go around and make sure that things are working properly. What we want is to be involved at the decision-making level about what we are going to do, not how it is going to be done. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Members' statements. Members' statements. Ms. Mike.

Member's Statement On Pangnirtung Tapestry Art

MS. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my congratulations to the Pangnirtung Tapestry Studio as it celebrates 20 years of Inuit tapestry weaving. On March 28, 1972, Inuit hand-woven tapestries were introduced to the art-buying public at the Canadian Guild of Crafts in Montreal. Since that day, Pangnirtung tapestries have been exhibited and sold at art galleries throughout Canada and the United States.

The studio marked this historic occasion with a special exhibition of works from February 9 to February 22 at the art gallery at the Ottawa School of Art. The exhibition and sale featured new works by Pangnirtung tapestry weavers Olassie Akulukjuk, Igah Etoangat, Leesee Kakee and Kawtysie Kakee. The tapestries are interpretations of images by several Pangnirtung artists, including Malaya Akulukjuk,

Annie Kilabuk, Lypa Pitsiulak and Ekidluak Komoartok.

The exhibition and sale was produced by the Uqqurmiut Inuit Artists' Association of Pangnirtung, with the assistance of Sinaaq Enterprises Inc., the development subsidiary of the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Members' statements. Members' statements. Item 4, returns to oral questions. Mr. Ningark.

ITEM 4: RETURNS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Further Return To Question O135-12(2): Departmental Advisor Re Lac La Martre Office/Warehouse Complex

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a return to Question O135-12(2), asked by the honourable Member, Henry Zoe. Further to my response to Question O135-12(2), I would like to provide the honourable Member with more information.

Yesterday I informed Mr. Zoe that the chief of Lac la Martre had received a letter advising the community that the construction of an office/warehouse complex was under review. This information was incorrect. The chief has been advised verbally by Mr. Bob McLeod, the assistant deputy minister, and also Mr. Len Hedberg, the district superintendent for the department. The chief has not been advised in writing, and therefore I cannot provide Mr. Zoe with a copy of any correspondence.

MR. SPEAKER: Returns to oral questions. Mr. Alloo.oo.

Further Return To Question O66-12(2): Use Of Chemicals On Access Road To Fort Providence

HON. TITUS ALLOOLOO: Mahsi, Mr. Speaker. I have a return to Question O66-12(2) asked by Mr. Gargan on February 18, 1992 with respect to the use of common road salt, or sodium chloride, on the Fort Providence access road. The Member wished to know why the Department of Transportation would apply salt on the road on a relatively warm February day.

In 1987 and 1988 the Department of Transportation spent \$1.5 million giving the Fort Providence access

road a chip seal asphaltic surface. This road improvement has the advantage of giving a smooth, dust-free and safer driving surface. The ice blades which motor graders use to remove ice from gravel surface roads would destroy the chip seal surface. The only practical way to remove ice from an asphaltic surface is to apply road salt.

As the Member reported, Tuesday, February 4, 1992, was a mild day and rain was falling in the Fort Providence area. Although the rain was liquid at the time it fell, the rain water on the road was sure to freeze later in the day and evening when the temperature dropped. The department's road maintenance crew in Fort Providence took the appropriate action in applying salt to prevent the rain from freezing and making the road a dangerously slippery surface.

The Fort Providence maintenance crew did exactly as they are expected to do. The Department of Transportation does not wait for complaints from the public or for injury or fatality accidents before taking steps to keep the roads in a safe driving condition.

I wish to correct the Member's suggestion that the Department of Transportation spent \$218,000 applying salt on the Fort Providence access road. That figure is the amount the department spent in 1990-91 on salt applications for the entire highway system. In the year 1990-91, the Department of Transportation spent \$28,300 for labour, equipment and salt keeping the Fort Providence access road safe for the public's use.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Returns to oral questions. Mr. Patterson.

Page 126

Return To Question O4-12(2): Problems With Water Reservoir, Chesterfield Inlet

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a return to a question asked by Mr. Arvaluk on February 12th about the problems with the water reservoir in Chesterfield Inlet. I received the letter from Mayor Titi Kadluk on February 4, 1992 and have sent a response to the mayor today. I have also provided the Member with a copy of my response. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Returns to oral questions. Returns to oral questions. Oral questions. Mr. Gargan.

ITEM 5: ORAL QUESTIONS

Question O152-12(2): Chloride On Fort Providence Access Road

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Transportation. In his response with regard to the calcium or sodium chloride that has been spread on the road, the Minister did say that the department does not wait for complaints before they do that. They are looking after the public safety, and that is more important than the complaints that are being made. Mr. Speaker, the department has been putting the chloride on the road while it was raining so that it does not freeze. Mr. Speaker, this morning on the radio there is a forecast that rain is going to be falling again in Fort Providence. Can I get the Minister's assurance that they are now putting that salt on the road?

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of Transportation, Mr. Alloo.oo.

Return To Question O152-12(2): Chloride On Fort Providence Access Road

HON. TITUS ALLOOLOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure if my department is putting salt on the road currently. As I stated earlier, last week, before we begin to put salt on the road we would communicate what we are doing to the community. In the event that we will put salt on the roads at Fort Providence, I will consult with the community prior to commencing putting the salt on the road. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mr. Gargan.

Supplementary To Question O152-12(2): Chloride On Fort Providence Access Road

MR. GARGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister indicated that last year \$218,000 was spent putting salt, or chloride, on the roads, and 10 per cent of that was designated for Fort Providence. I would like to ask the Minister in which other areas this chloride has been applied.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Alloo.oo.

HON. TITUS ALLOOLOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will get the figures for the Member, and I will take the question as notice. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister has taken the question as notice. Oral questions. Mr. Arvaluk.

Question O153-12(2): Consultation With Women's Groups Re Recent Court Decision

MR. ARVALUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct this question to the Minister responsible for the Status of Women Council. As the Minister knows, the women started their association so they can have equal status in the workplace as well as in legal matters. I know that people make fun of women and that is part of their culture, but in the Inuit language there are words also that can intimidate women; it is possible to intimidate women by making light of them. If it is not just making fun of women, and if it is intimidating women, then it is possible to be charged for that intimidation, and it can be legally possible to follow through with it through legal means.

MR. SPEAKER: Minister responsible for the Status of Women, Mr. Ningark.

Return To Question O153-12(2): Consultation With Women's Groups Re Recent Court Decision

HON. JOHN NINGARK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since the time that Pauktuutit was formed -- I will be contacting the chairperson on the phone to discuss this matter with her. I will be contacting the Status of Women Council tomorrow and also the NWT Native Women's Association about the court cases we were discussing the other day.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mr. Arvaluk.

Supplementary To Question O153-12(2): Consultation With Women's Groups Re Recent Court Decision

MR. ARVALUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister then report to this House the government's absolute decision on the matter after the consultation with the groups?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ningark.

Further Return To Question O153-12(2): Consultation With Women's Groups Re Recent Court Decision

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is one of the reasons why I would like to communicate and have meetings with the Status of Women Council; with Pauktuutit, which is the Inuit Women's Association; and with the NWT Native Women's Association, and then I will make the report to this House. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mr. Arvaluk.

Supplementary To Question O153-12(2): Consultation With Women's Groups Re Recent Court Decision

MR. ARVALUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question has not been answered. I would appreciate an answer. Will the Minister report to this House an absolute decision -- I do not want just a report; I want a report on the decision of the government, to this House, after the consultation with these groups.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ningark.

Further Return To Question O153-12(2): Consultation With Women's Groups Re Recent Court Decision

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Mr. Todd.

Question O154-12(2): Department Of Education's Five-Year Plan

MR. TODD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Education. Last week I asked the Minister if the Department of Education had a five-year plan. He answered, "Yes." I asked him if he could provide me with a copy of the plan. He answered, "Yes." My question is: When?

Page 127

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of Education, Mr. Allooooloo.

Return To Question O154-12(2): Department Of Education's Five-Year Plan

HON. TITUS ALLOOLOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will try to have the plan given to the Member this week. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Mr. Gargan.

Question O155-12(2): Advice From Status Of Women Council Of The NWT

MR. GARGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have not always agreed with every decision about funding arrangements and appointments to the Status of Women Council, but in recent months I have come to value the council's role as an advisory body. I would like to direct my question to the Minister responsible

for the Status of Women Council of the NWT in response to Mr. Arvaluk, and that is whether or not the Minister has decided to seek advice from the Status of Women Council.

MR. SPEAKER: Minister responsible for the Status of Women, Mr. Ningark.

Return To Question O155-12(2): Advice From Status Of Women Council Of The NWT

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After I reviewed my response to the honourable Member's question yesterday, I realized I must have misunderstood the question. Yes, I am going to be seeking advice from the Status of Women Council.

MR. SPEAKER: Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

Question O156-12(2): Status Of Family Law Review Committee

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice, what is the status of the family law review committee?

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of Justice, Mr. Patterson.

Return To Question O156-12(2): Status Of Family Law Review Committee

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the special advisor on gender equality, Katherine Peterson, has been working hard, with some assistance from staff, to do a public consultation process. I understand that she has now held community workshops in at least two communities in every region of the Northwest Territories. The final report and recommendations of the special advisor are due by the end of March 1992. I understand that she will meet that deadline. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

Supplementary To Question O156-12(2): Status Of Family Law Review Committee

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, obviously the Minister was not listening. I did not ask for the status of the special advisor on gender equality; I asked for the status of the family law review committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson.

Further Return To Question O156-12(2): Status Of Family Law Review Committee

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I apologize to the honourable Member. Mr. Speaker, the current status of the family law review is that a person who had been chairing the working group since its inception has left the Department of Justice to work in the Department of Social Services. That person has been carrying on with the family law review duties while, at the same time, undertaking new responsibilities for the Department of Social Services, so there has been a little difficulty in getting the report completed. The status today, Mr. Speaker, is that the report is now being edited. It has been put together, and it will then be distributed to members of the working group on family law, which includes the Advisory Council on the Status of Women, the Departments of Social Services and Justice, representatives from aboriginal organizations, and the legal profession. Once those comments are received, then it will be submitted back to the government for action. It is hoped that all of this will take place, Mr. Speaker, before the end of this fiscal year. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Supplementary, Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

Supplementary To Question O156-12(2): Status Of Family Law Review Committee

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister did indicate in December that the individual who was the chairperson was an employee of the Department of Justice and is now working with the Department of Social Services. In December, the Minister indicated that the bulk of the work was near completion. He now states that he will be able to present this report to the House toward the end of the fiscal year. I would like to ask the Minister, when will the report be sent to the House? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: I will take the question as notice and get back as soon as I can, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is being taken as notice. Oral questions. Mr. Gargan.

Question O157-12(2): Effect Of Crown Office Staff Turnover On Appeal Of Paul Quassa Case

MR. GARGAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Justice. Mr. Speaker, I will

be careful with this question not to discuss the specific details of any matters which have been before the courts and may be subject to appeal.

My question to the Minister of Justice is: I understand that the chief counsel for the Northwest Territories will be leaving his post soon and that there will be a significant turnover of personnel within the Crown office. Is the Minister able to assure this House that the staff shortage and turnover within the Crown office will not influence the decision on whether or not to appeal the territorial court's ruling on the Paul Quassa absolute discharge?

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of Justice, Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member will appreciate that the Crown office does not report to me and therefore I am not briefed on the situation. However, I will, through my department, attempt to find out the situation, and I will report back to the House, as quickly as I can, the answer to the Member's question.

Page 128

MR. SPEAKER: Did you take the question as notice, Mr. Patterson? The question was taken as notice. Oral questions. Mr. Nerysoo.

Question O158-12(2): Additional Documents Used In Developing Government Position On "Strength At Two Levels"

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Government Leader. In responding to a number of questions regarding the matter of Strength at Two Levels, you indicated that there were a number of additional documents and reports considered in developing the position that was put forward by the government. I am asking if the Government Leader could make available those particular documents to the Members of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Ms. Cournoyea, Madam Government Leader.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, I will take that as notice and try to find out how much I can bring forward to the Member for his consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is taken as notice. Oral questions. Mr. Gargan.

Question O159-12(2): Chief Crown Counsel In The NWT

MR. GARGAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Justice with regard to Personnel. I understand that the chief crown counsel is going to be leaving his post here in the NWT to take on a post in Ottawa regarding aboriginal justice. Is this correct?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson. This is not within the Minister's direct responsibility, but if the Minister would like to respond to the best of his ability.

Return To Question O159-12(2): Chief Crown Counsel In The NWT

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I know that it is true that the chief crown counsel in the NWT will be leaving his present position next month. I am not precisely sure of the new responsibilities, but I think the Member is generally correct.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

Question O160-12(2): Report On Status Of Family Law Review Committee

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Justice. In December I asked the Minister of Justice the status of the family law review committee, and he indicated that once this report was compiled, that it would be presented to him and the Minister of Social Services. Can he indicate to this House whether this report has been presented to the Minister of Social Services and himself?

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of Justice, Mr. Patterson.

Return To Question O160-12(2): Report On Status Of Family Law Review Committee

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, as I said, I understand the report is being edited at this moment. Neither I nor the Minister of Social Services has seen it as of this day.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Supplementary, Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

Supplementary To Question O160-12(2): Report On Status Of Family Law Review Committee

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to also advise the Minister that I had asked a written

question in regard to it, and in the same reply in December he stated to me that he would provide me with a response to the written question. So when will the Minister provide the House with the response to the written question?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson.

Further Return To Question O160-12(2): Report On Status Of Family Law Review Committee

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, you will correct me if my interpretation of the rules is wrong, but I understood that when a written question is responded to after the session is concluded, that the procedure is to send the response directly to the Member and it would not necessarily go to the House. Mr. Speaker, my best recollection is that I did a written response to that written question directly to the Member, in care of the Clerk. So if she has not received it, it is not because it was not sent.

MR. SPEAKER: My understanding of how we deal with written questions is that after a session has prorogued essentially the issue is dead and the Minister, as a courtesy, sends the response to the Member. Oral questions. Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

Supplementary To Question O160-12(2): Report On Status Of Family Law Review Committee

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if he would consider providing this House with a reply to the written question given to him December 9th. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson.

Further Return To Question O160-12(2): Report On Status Of Family Law Review Committee

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Yes, I will do that, Mr. Speaker. It has been prepared, and it will be no problem to provide it to Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Mr. Zoe.

Question O161-12(2): Decision To Defer Construction Of Office/Warehouse Complex, Lac La Martre

MR. ZOE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question will be directed to the Minister of Renewable Resources. On February 18th the Minister provided a response to my question I asked about the construction of an office complex in Lac la Martre. Essentially the

Minister stated that this project had been deferred because of an expenditure management program that was implemented by the government. However, the decision to defer the project was not made by the department until November 29th and not confirmed by FMB until late December, about the 20th or 24th. Since that appropriation was approved last spring, it was anticipated that the project would have gone ahead last summer. Perhaps the Minister could explain to me why the tender for this project was not let and construction not completed before the decision to defer this project was made.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ningark.

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will take the question as notice and review the matter with the Minister of Finance. Thank you.

Page 129

MR. SPEAKER: The question is taken as notice. Mr. Koe.

MR. KOE: Mahsi, Mr. Speaker. Today is budget day in the House of Commons, and the federal Minister of Finance is scheduled to make a budget speech at 2:30 p.m. our time. This budget may have implications for our government's finances. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would seek unanimous consent to waive the rules to recess the House to the call of the Chair to hear the federal budget speech.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member is seeking unanimous consent to waive the rules. Are there any nays? There are no nays. I will take one more oral question and then we will recess the House. Oral questions. Mr. Antoine.

Question O162-12(2): Cost Of Food In Trout Lake

MR. ANTOINE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As many Members of this House are aware, the cost of food in the North is quite high. I just want to identify the community of Trout Lake as, I believe, one of the highest in the Northwest Territories, and according to the latest food price index published by the Bureau of Statistics, the cost of food in Trout Lake is 68 per cent higher than Yellowknife, and 68 per cent higher than what a lot of people in Yellowknife complain about. Mr. Speaker, the people of Trout Lake live a traditional lifestyle and do not have high income levels. People simply cannot afford to pay such prices for food.

My question is for the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism and deals with the store in Trout Lake that his department runs. Would the Minister commit his department to look at finding innovative ways to better manage food supplies in Trout Lake to lower the cost of food in this community?

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of Economic Development and Tourism, Mr. Pollard.

Return To Question O162-12(2): Cost Of Food In Trout Lake

HON. JOHN POLLARD: Yes, I would be glad to, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: We will now recess the House. Supplementary, Mr. Antoine.

Supplementary To Question O162-12(2): Cost Of Food In Trout Lake

MR. ANTOINE: Mahsi. Supplementary. One possible strategy is to truck food supplies into the community over winter roads and store it either at the store or another facility. This would lessen the amount of food supplies transported into the community by air. Would the Minister take this suggestion into account when he looks at the serious problem?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Pollard.

Further Return To Question O162-12(2): Cost Of Food In Trout Lake

HON. JOHN POLLARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. We will now recess the House until the call of the Chair, and we will freeze the question period clock like a football game.

---SHORT RECESS

I would like to call the House back to order. We are in question period, with 33 minutes and 12 seconds remaining.

Oral questions. Oral questions. One more time, oral questions. Item 6, written questions. Written questions. Mr. Zoe.

MR. ZOE: Mr. Speaker, can we return to oral questions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Member has asked for unanimous consent to return to Item 5, oral questions. Are there any nays? There are no nays. Proceed, Mr. Zoe.

Question O163-12(2): Response To Question On Busing Policy

MR. ZOE: Mr. Speaker, I asked a question which the Minister took as notice yesterday. I wonder if he is able to respond to me today, with regard to a busing policy. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Zoe, would you please clarify, for the record, which Minister.

MR. ZOE: The Minister of Education, regarding the busing policy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Education, Mr. Alloo.oo.

Return To Question O163-12(2): Response To Question On Busing Policy

HON. TITUS ALLOOLOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have instructed my officials to review the busing guidelines to ensure that the busing is consistent throughout the Northwest Territories. I anticipate that the student transportation assistance policy guideline will be reviewed with the local education authorities and the divisional boards in time for the 1993-94 school year.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Education was never funded to provide students with transportation. The funding for student busing has been provided for individual requests -- the school bus funding has been justified because of distance and severe safety hazards.

In 1990-91, the department provided \$1.5 million to the boards for busing. The department carried out a survey in 1989 analyzing housing patterns in the communities and their distance from the schools, as well as safety hazards and transportation needs of students. As a result, the student transportation assistance policy guidelines were approved in principle in 1989 by the cabinet, but no additional funding was approved to implement the guidelines.

The two main principles guiding the student busing are that all students should have access to school programs, and student age and the distance from their homes should be considered the main criteria for funding of busing services. Mr. Speaker, the criteria

for busing, approved in principle as I said earlier, says that the boards will provide for students who are the age of five and six if they live half a kilometre away from the school; students the age of seven to 10 years old if they live one kilometre away from the school; and students the age of 11 and over if they live one and a half kilometres away from the school. However, this criteria is used now only as contracts. Additional funding is required to implement the policy guidelines if they are to be stated. In some cases where there are no private contractors we have assisted the divisional boards in purchasing the buses through our capital process. Those places are: Fort Rae, Edzo and Pangnirtung. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: If I could suggest to Members that because

Page 130

time is at such a premium during question period, if Members want to pose a question to Ministers that will take a detailed response it would probably be better handled in written questions. Oral questions. Mr. Nerysoo.

Question O164-12(2): Tabling Report Of Constitutional Development Commission

MR. NERYSOO: If I might, Mr. Speaker, ask the Minister responsible for Aboriginal Rights and Constitutional Development: Does he intend to table the report of the commission for constitutional development?

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of Intergovernmental and Aboriginal Affairs, Mr. Kakfwi.

Return To Question O164-12(2): Tabling Report Of Constitutional Development Commission

HON. STEPHEN KAKFWI: Yes, Mr. Speaker, whenever the translation is completed.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Mr. Zoe.

Question O165-12(2): Lac La Martre Office/Warehouse Complex Deferred

MR. ZOE: Mr. Speaker, my question would be directed to the Minister for Renewable Resources. Mr. Speaker, the Minister has told me that the project for Lac la Martre on the office/warehouse complex has been deferred, but I have not been able to find it in the proposed capital estimates for 1992-93. Will the Minister confirm that this project has not been

deferred as stated on February 18, but has in effect been cancelled?

MR. SPEAKER: Minister for Renewable Resources, Mr. Ningark.

Return To Question O165-12(2): Lac La Martre Office/Warehouse Complex Deferred

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to the government restraint budget, and in response to the extremely hard times of financial management, the project is deferred, and we hope that we will be able to put it in this year's budget. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Supplementary, Mr. Zoe.

Supplementary To Question O165-12(2): Lac La Martre Office/Warehouse Complex Deferred

MR. ZOE: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the same Minister. On February 12, the Minister of Finance told this House that decisions on capital projects were guided by four principles, including honouring prior commitments to communities. Well, Mr. Speaker, a commitment was made to the community of Lac la Martre for the Department of Renewable Resources to build an office complex. Would the Minister confirm that this commitment has been indeed broken?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ningark.

Further Return To Question O165-12(2): Lac La Martre Office/Warehouse Complex Deferred

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the commitment was made by the previous government. Mr. Speaker, the project, as I said a number of times, was deferred until such a time when we can find the money. Hopefully, we will be able to find money to fund the project in the next fiscal year. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Mr. Zoe.

Supplementary To Question O165-12(2): Lac La Martre Office/Warehouse Complex Deferred

MR. ZOE: My second supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand, or maybe the Minister does not understand, that the money was already committed from this particular year's budget, \$420,000 I believe, to build the thing. I do not understand what he means, that there was not any

money there. It has been deferred, so the money has to come back out of this year's budget. I do not quite understand. I would like to ask the Minister again. There was a commitment made, and he has already told me it has been deferred, and I would like to know, is it going to be deferred until next year, this proposed upcoming budget? I cannot find it in there. That is why I am asking him: Is it going to be put into the proposed 1992-93 budget?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ningark.

Further Return To Question O165-12(2): Lac La Martre Office/Warehouse Complex Deferred

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I have mentioned a number of times, we are going through hard times, and as each and every Member of the House knows, they were told the bad news that some of their projects were being deferred. Mr. Speaker, I will do everything within my power as the Minister responsible for Renewable Resources to see that project goes on in the next fiscal year. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. New question, Mr. Zoe.

Question O166-12(2): Assurance From Minister Of Finance To Live Up To Commitments

MR. ZOE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question will be directed to the Minister of Finance. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has heard the response from my colleague, the Minister of Renewable Resources, regarding the office complex that was committed to Lac la Martre. The Minister has stated, quite bluntly, that the government is committed to honouring the commitments that were already made to communities; however, this certainty does not seem to have happened in this case. Would the Minister give me assurance that he will review this project to ensure that this government lives up to the commitment it has made?

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of Finance, Mr. Pollard.

Return To Question O166-12(2): Assurance From Minister Of Finance To Live Up To Commitments

HON. JOHN POLLARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of issues here. One is that in the 1991-92 fiscal year there was \$400,000 budgeted and approved by this House for this particular project. The project did not go ahead this year and, consequently, the \$400,000, as the Member

knows, will lapse. The project has not been included in the capital estimates that are before this House at the present time, before committee of the whole, and the Minister who is sitting immediately to my right, Mr. Ningark, has said that he will do everything that he can to ensure that project will appear in the next budget brought into this House, for capital, which will be in the fall of this year, Mr. Speaker, designed for 1993-94.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Renewable Resources is committed to this project, and they intend to bring it forward to FMB in next year's budget. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Oral questions. Item 6, written questions. Mr. Bernhardt.

Page 131

ITEM 6: WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Question W9-12(2): Absolute Discharges And Training For Judges Re Sexual Assault Cases

MR. BERNHARDT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a written question for the Minister of Justice. Would the Minister please provide this House with: a) a list of all cases in which an absolute discharge has been granted for sexual offenders by territorial court judges within the past five years; and b) a listing showing participants and dates of all training initiatives undertaken by any and all judges of the territorial court within the past five years, dealing with topics related to gender issues, sexual assault, or the sentencing of sex offenders? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Written questions. Written questions.

Item 7, returns to written questions. Returns to written questions.

Item 8, replies to Opening Address. Replies to Opening Address. Item 9, petitions. Petitions. Mr. Koe.

ITEM 9: PETITIONS

MR. KOE: Mahsi, Mr. Speaker. I have Petition 2-12(2), signed by employees of the Inuvik Regional Hospital, requesting that positive changes be made in the operation of the facility as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: Petitions. Petitions.

Item 10, reports of standing and special committees. Reports of standing and special committees.

Item 11, reports of committees on the review of bills. Reports of committees on the review of bills. Item 12, tabling of documents. Mr. Bernhardt.

ITEM 12: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

MR. BERNHARDT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to table Tabled Document 15-12(2), if you would permit me to read it first.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Bernhardt, the process is that you just tell us what the document is.

MR. BERNHARDT: Pardon my ignorance. I would like to table Tabled Document 15-12(2), a transcript of the territorial court judgment rendered in February, 1990, which includes a summary of sentencing patterns and sexual assault cases in the Northwest Territories and elsewhere. I would like honourable Members to know...

MR. SPEAKER: Excuse me, Mr. Bernhardt, the normal practice is just to give the title of the document. If you would like to refer to it in a Member's statement tomorrow, you are more than welcome.

MR. BERNHARDT: I will give it to the Page here and you can have it.

---Laughter

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Bernhardt. Tabling of documents. Tabling of documents.

Item 13, notices of motions. Notices of motions.

Item 14, notices of motions for first reading of bills. Notices of motions for first reading of bills.

Item 15, motions. Motions.

Item 16, first reading of bills.

Item 17, second reading of bills. Item 18, consideration in committee of the whole of bills and other matters: Tabled Document 9-12(2), Strength at Two Levels; Tabled Document 10-12(2), Reshaping Northern Government; Tabled Document 12-12(2), Plebiscite Direction; and Bill 14, Appropriation Act, No. 1, 1992-93, with Mr. Pudluk in the chair.

ITEM 18: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS AND OTHER MATTERS

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): I would like the committee to come to order. Does this committee wish to deal with Tabled Document 9-12(2), Tabled Document 10-12(2), Tabled Document 12-12(2), or Bill 14? I need direction from this committee. Member for Thebacha.

Tabled Document 9-12(2): "Strength At Two Levels"

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to look at Tabled Document 9-12(2), Strength at Two Levels. As Members of the committee, we would like to go through it page by page.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Does the committee agree?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. I will allow any Member who wishes to make general comments to do so before we go into it page by page. That is what I am going to do. General comments before page by page. Member for Thebacha.

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The intent to go through Strength at Two Levels was to bring back to the forum of this House an opportunity for ordinary Members to be able to advise government as to some of their concerns that are put forth in this report; and as a result of the questioning in the House yesterday, it appears that there has been no process to date where ordinary Members of the Legislative Assembly are given opportunity to indicate to government what we think of the report and what we think of some of the direction that this report is recommending. The overall report, we want to stress, is a government document; it was formulated by the government, initiated by the government, and given to the government to look at. Some of the decisions, I believe, they are intending to concur with and find out ways to implement some of the recommendations. The concern that I have heard in respect to Strength at Two Levels is -- when the report was being formulated there was a concern expressed to me a number of times at the lack of consultation in respect to formulating the recommendations of this report.

The Beatty report, the Beatty team, or the team that formulated this report, did not consult enough with the communities or the groups that are being affected by

some of the significant recommended changes that are being proposed, and that has been a concern expressed, particularly in areas that affect not only community government but many of the people in the smaller communities that will be proposing changes as a result of this report. There has been basically no opportunity, or very little opportunity, besides the MLAs taking this report back to their communities and seeing ways that they can get

Page 132

this report discussed among the communities, and then coming back to see whether the communities recommend the recommendations. What has happened, Mr. Chairman, is that these recommendations have been looked at, and it appears that there is a reply or a strategy to address these recommendations, and there has been no time that the ordinary Members have been given any type of opportunity to state publicly whether we concur with these recommendations. This has been a concern to many Members in this House.

When this report was tabled in December, there was an understanding and agreement by the government and the ordinary Members that we would retable this report, and as a result of retabling we would formulate discussions on the report and hopefully some type of strategy would be developed. But as it appears, and I want to emphasize that the appearance is the fact that there has been a strategy developed, an implementation being considered for the strategy that has been developed, without consultation from the ordinary Members. I cannot emphasize the concern in respect to this. This government has made a commitment to work with all Members of this House, and it appears that that commitment has been overlooked.

Mr. Chairman, the report in itself -- and that is why we propose to go through the report page by page -- there have been comments in this House, and I refer to some of the replies given to ordinary Members such as myself by the Government Leader, stating that this report has been too technical and that absorbing some of the comments written in the report would be difficult for Members like myself.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Point of order.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Point of order, Ms. Cournoyea.

Point Of Order

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I did not at any time stress that it was too technical and imply that the ordinary Members would not be able to understand. This is the second time this was brought up. The statement that I made was the technicality of setting up the process. It had nothing to do with the intelligence of any Member.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Madam Government Leader, was that a point of order or a point of clarification to the other Member?

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I believe it is a point of order, mainly because it is imputing that there is a statement said by myself that questions the intelligence of ordinary Members. That was never my intention when I was discussing the technical nature of setting up the process. It had nothing to do with the motives being imputed. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): In that case I will have to review the transcript and report back on that. Mr. Nerysoo, you have a point of order too?

MR. NERYSOO: No, Mr. Chairman, I was going to challenge the point of order that was raised, that it was not a point of order. A point of order deals with procedure and not with regard to a concern that is raised on the comments made by another Member.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): I will review that matter and report back to the committee. Proceed, Member for Thebacha.

Little Input From Ordinary Members On "Strength At Two Levels"

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I had said earlier, Members have been expressing grave concern with respect to the point that there has been no opportunity for them to be able to indicate to government, no forum of any type for public discussion, to be able to indicate to government the report in totality. There has never been one session during our sessions here that we have even discussed one page of this report; and the government, as a result, has developed the report, Reshaping Northern Government, and from that document come different types of concepts to be further discussed in this session.

Mr. Chairman, I guess the point that I would like to stress to the government is that everything seems to be going ahead with Strength at Two Levels, with the

recommendations, with very little input from the Members on this side of the House. There are many Members that object to that. Not all Members have taken the opportunity to talk to the government about some of the recommendations, and as a result they feel isolated from government and government formulating their decisions on the different recommendations that came forth in Strength at Two Levels.

Mr. Chairman, because of the fact that this document being formulated, Reshaping Northern Government, has basically been developed by the government as a result of Strength at Two Levels, we would propose to go through the Beatty report and that the government listen to some of the concerns we have with respect to the Strength at Two Levels report, as Members, and we would like to proceed to go through it page by page. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. General comments. Mr. Lewis.

Beatty Report A Product Of The 11th Assembly

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to prolong this business of making introductory comments to a report that we have had for some time now. What seems to have happened is that we have never really sat down in committee to deal with something that really was a product of the 11th Assembly, and it is quite clear that that was the origin of it. What bothers me a lot is that during the 11th Assembly the Executive started -- it is fully explained in the Beatty report how the 11th Assembly got its agenda.

Not long after the election, the Executive Council went out to Snare Rapids and began developing a kind of agenda, unusual in the sense that you have an agenda for government after the election rather than before it. But in our system that is the way it is. You decide after the election what the people are going to get, and the cabinet goes off into the wilderness.

It was outlined at the beginning of this report what kind of government the people were going to get. They outlined five areas: economic growth; improving education; shaping public government; supporting aboriginal initiatives; and also taking our place in Canada as a territory and also a place in the world. Two other ones were added at a later stage: The social issues became a major topic of discussion during the 11th Assembly, and we spent quite a bit of

time, including a mid-term session of the caucus in Baker Lake, in which social

Page 133

issues were supposed to have been dealt with in some depth. Then in June 1987 a seventh priority was set -- it is pretty late in the mandate of the committee, half way through -- the improvement of government administration.

So really the last Assembly did have a kind of a platform or an agenda. What bothers me a little about this report is that it has somehow assumed the status of being the government's agenda. This is what this government is all about. The danger is that we are going to spend all our time navel-gazing and looking at the machine and oiling the machine, and you know, shining the machine, and looking at the machine, and admiring the machine. The point is that governments do things, you know, and it is very, very difficult for me, having sat now in this House -- it is the second session -- to know what this government is all about, because it has been dominated by this government's obsession with the famous Beatty report, and we therefore have come to the conclusion that since so much of the energy of the government is going to look at the machinery, that we had better spend some time at it, because it is our government. It is not just the Executive Council's government; it belongs to everybody. If we are going to spend our time in an obsession, if you like, with the structure, then it makes sense that everybody, in fact, would become involved.

The concern most people have is that despite all the good will indicated publicly that we were going to have a different kind of government now -- it would be an open government and there would be a real attempt this time to involve people -- the understanding, I suppose, was not clearly enough set down at the beginning when we listened to these overtures to involve people.

Really, what we had in mind as ordinary Members was to say, "Fine," you know, "It is wonderful to do something like this, because a lot of it I agree with personally. There is an awful lot I can agree with." The problem that we have is that when we agree to do something, there is always some kind of gap in understanding on what we have agreed on. I know from talking to people that I meet every day that our understanding was that, having got this document Strength at Two Levels, what would happen was that there would be an involvement of people to look at this piece of work and then decide what to do with it,

and since that has not happened people now feel like outsiders. They say, "Well, what is going to happen is that the government will involve us when they have already taken the bike or the truck down the track so far that you are never going to take it anywhere else," because they have decided where they want to take it, and there is that feeling among Members that they really are only going to get involved when they can do no damage, when they can make no significant changes to anything.

Momentum For Change Must Be Built Early

I appreciate what the Government Leader is trying to do, because there are all kinds of evidence that unless you move and get something done, and get it done early on and build some momentum and some energy, and so on, it is very, very difficult to accomplish change. But if you will accept that, will accept that is what you have to do -- you have to move on something; you cannot wait forever -- but what has happened now is that people have been given an understanding that they would be involved in a significant exercise, and the fear among the ordinary Members I have talked to is that this is just tokenism in the sense that, yes, we will agree, you know. We will go along with it, but we cannot involve people at the stage that is so critical that they may slow down the process. But I would argue that by not following through on the commitment, on the same understanding that the rest of us, had the government is in fact slowing up the process itself. We cannot be blamed for slowing the process up if the commitment is not made that from this document here we would be fully involved in determining the direction it should take. It has taken a life of its own, and now whatever we do will be seen as an afterthought.

In my opinion it was a mistake not to get all of the three people that were chosen by other Members right at the beginning so that they could examine this report, because once you have agreed on what you are going to do, then people who have a little bit of pride are not going to be satisfied with saying, "Well, you guys have decided, anyway, and all you want us to do is to go along now on the ride. The bus has left months ago, but you can come along and enjoy the scenery."

I am afraid a lot of people will not be satisfied with that, because once you have decided what you are going to do, how you are going to do it, and so on, then that really becomes an administration job. As politicians we are interested in policy. What is the

policy? What is the program? What is the direction? What is the shape?

You have already developed a second document dealing with the shape. You are going to reshape something, and you are going to decide what the shape is going to be without any input from any Member on this side. There were some very willing people here who would have been quite happy to have helped to take a document like this and to put it into a form where we know what the shape is going to look like. Then you would have some willing, co-operative people who would have been part of the process, would have a sense of ownership, and would want to go with you for the rest of the ride. But they do not have any sense of ownership in the program, the process, the reshaping, or anything, and the fear is that you are going to bring them in too late and there is going to be a loss of dignity among those people who feel that they are an afterthought. Those are my opening comments, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. General comments. Mr. Nerysoo.

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have had an opportunity to read the presentations that have been made and listen to the questions and answers that have been asked by Members, and answers given by the Members of cabinet and our Government Leader.

I want to say that while I might accept some of the remarks that have been made, that there is an interest in seeking the views of Members of this Assembly and the general public about the direction that we wish to take in reshaping northern government, the fact is that the documents and the answers really do not coincide with one another. There have been continuing suggestions that there is no implementation plan; yet your own statement indicates that there is an implementation plan. I am not going to argue about that. I just want to make some additional comments. Maybe that is where the confusion lies for me.

Preoccupation With Beatty Report

I think that I have to agree with Mr. Lewis that there seems to be a continuous preoccupation with the matter of the Beatty report and its recommendations without clearly indicating to the public, generally, what the policies of our government are going to be over the next four years, or what direction you wish to take.

Implementing The 1969 White Paper

The other aspect that I want to point out is -- suffice it to say that despite all our best efforts, and recognizing that we have

Page 134

some significant financial problems, we have to be awfully careful about what it is we dismantle and how we dismantle it, in terms of our government. It is quite clear that even in the areas of health, the Beatty group pointed out quite clearly that we had some very serious problems about how we were, as a government, implementing policies as they applied to status Indians and status Inuit, and that we were, in fact, implementing a policy that was not occurring even in the provinces. We were, in fact, applying, I guess, in many respects, the 1969 White Paper of trying to associate all status people into a program similar to that of all other non-status people. It was the federal government's and, in many respects, our own fault that we were not taking advantage of the financial situation that the Government of Canada had offered to us, and we were doing that to ourselves internally. Maybe there is an attempt on our part to slowly work into implementing the 1969 White Paper here in the North, but at least we should be up front and honest about it and say that status Indians or status Inuit will no longer be treated according to federal government policy. Then let us say it. That is my feeling. If that is the policy of this government and that is the policy of our Assembly, then we should say that to the people of the North.

In terms of some of the questions that had to do with transferring responsibilities to communities, and I do not think that there is anyone here that would argue against the direction in which people want to take this government in improving the ability of people in the communities to take on more responsibilities for themselves. But there is no advantage for communities to take on responsibilities if it means they are going to be, in future, in the financial straight-jacket that this government is in right now with federal moneys that have been transferred to us. It makes no sense for people in the communities. I think that we should not be placing communities in the situation where we give them the impression that our financial situation is such that we can afford to allow people to take on more and more responsibilities with no consideration for the financial situations that they could find themselves in.

I can tell you right now, with the very little authorities and responsibilities that most people in the communities take on, that we do have communities right now where they have simple municipal services that have significant financial deficits. We have to be clear that the efforts that we are going to make in program transfers, service transfers, are going to carry with them all the financial resources that are available to them. We cannot say that it is an excuse for getting away from the financial obligations that we should be transferring. But I do think that we must be prepared to accept that that is what is going to happen.

Amalgamating Of Departments

On the matter of the points of dealing with such things as amalgamating departments -- and I made this point during our presentation and our view of reshaping government when the Government Leader kindly allowed us to have a presentation made by those individuals involved in government and her staff to at least update us on what was occurring. But I do want to say that on the matter -- I will be very specific -- of petroleum, oils and lubricants going to the Power Corporation I can tell you right now that I am not certain whether or not that is really in the interest of the economy of the North or the people of the North or the business community of the North, if the idea of placing that responsibility in the Power Corporation could create a monopoly. We do not know, but it is possible. We need to get a better understanding and an interpretation and explanation from our government on that responsibility and how that is intended, so as not to challenge the ability of private enterprise to get into that particular business.

The other point, in terms of even Government Services -- I was not certain how the matter of computers associated themselves with Public Works responsibilities. Maybe again the Government Leader is going to have to clarify that for me or those people who are associated with that particular discussion.

I just wanted to be certain that these things were being co-ordinated so that if that decision is finally made, that it is clear what divisions of responsibilities are to take place and whether or not there is a reduction in the kinds of programs that are going to be transferred, one program to the next program or next department.

Language And Education Separate Issues

I can say to you that on the matter of the super Education department -- at least it seems that way anyhow, where you are dealing with education, employment and culture -- I was not really sure how the matter of language is really associated with education. I thought that particular matter was a separate issue. Now maybe there is a responsibility on the part of education to deliver education programs on behalf of students or as part of an educational program. But I think that the matter of culture and language is far broader than just the question of education. So I was not clear how that was going to fit.

I was also not certain of how employment was to fit, whether there was a change in the mandate of the department and whether or not we were going to take on a labour force responsibility -- I guess the CEIC, Canada Employment and Immigration Commission, responsibility -- or whether there was a different interpretation to be given to the employment section.

So those had to be explained, and those have to be clarified. I do not think that we, as a government, should be trying to take over a responsibility presently in the hands of the federal government and funded by the federal government, at our expense. I do have many other comments to make and will make them as we go through the document and each section. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Mr. Arvaluk.

Health Care Efficiency Versus Doing Everything In NWT

MR. ARVALUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On the health section on page 151 of Strength at Two Levels, there is a concern in the Keewatin, especially, which has no hospital except in Churchill. Like my friend who just talked about the petroleum, oil and lubricants and NWT Power Corporation integration, I would say it sounds good on paper and for administration but it may have a very negative economic impact. Likewise with health services. Just because we want to have a baby in the NWT, we ship pregnant women and others to a hospital in Yellowknife from Sanikiluaq and Repulse Bay rather than to Churchill, Manitoba, because it looks good to have all the facilities in the NWT; maybe even cheaper in the long run because of transportation costs in Keewatin, or otherwise it would be cheaper and more efficient to continue to send patients to Churchill, Manitoba. If you would bear with

me a little bit, Mr Chairman, there are several questions in that section that should be dealt with -- the impact, the cost, benefits or lack of benefits -- with the whole idea of having everything within the NWT rather than looking at what is efficient. The Beatty report wanted to make the government more efficient and cost-effective, and this proposal or recommendation in the Beatty report will not do that. So that is one of the general comments I wanted to make. Thank you.

Page 135

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Are there any further general comments? Ms. Cournoyea.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, I am listening attentively to what is being said, particularly to the more detailed comments. Mr. Chairman, the comments that were made by the last two speakers are the work of the committee. This is the kind of work that is going to be taking place when we get into the implementation, and these are the recommendations that are here, our recommendations, and this is the work that will have to take place. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Are there any further general comments? Mr. Koe.

Incorrect Data Relative To Inuvik

MR. KOE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a few comments before we get into page by page on the information and data that is presented in the Strength at Two Levels report. Much of the data or information which refers to activities or tasks in Inuvik in many cases is not correct, and in discussing why with representatives of the organizations and groups in Inuvik, there seemed to be a lack of consultation by whoever was on this task group with the organization representatives in Inuvik, and as such, much of the data is skewed or misrepresented. Also, when we were in the ABC committee talking about some of the aspects that the committee was looking at -- the health boards and Arctic College -- in both cases representatives of these groups in Inuvik stated point-blank that they were not consulted and that the information in the reports was wrong. My point, I guess, is that I have a little bit of a problem taking the information that is presented in this report at face value, and seemingly every time I refer to something, I have to question myself whether it is true or not. In many cases where information was misrepresented, I have been able to get true facts; we will talk to those

when we go into the detail. That is basically my point: that the credibility of some of the information in these reports may not be there. Mahsi.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Are there any further general comments? Mr. Gargan.

Health And Legal Aid Concerns

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. About three weeks ago, Mr. Chairman, we met in Fort Simpson, and one of the things that was a concern in the region, at the regional council and tribal council meeting, was with regard to their report and, I guess, the delivery of health services. Another one that was conveyed to me was with regard to Mr. Alan Regel, who gave me a report responding to Strength at Two Levels with regard to legal aid in the Northwest Territories.

I also have a motion, Mr. Chairman, to see if perhaps the government could try to halt the current procedures that will implement recommendations and proposals in the Strength at Two Levels report, and further, that the regional council want to reserve their support of it until they have reviewed the whole document. I keep hearing, Mr. Chairman, in this House, statements like, "Whatever happened in the previous government does not necessarily have to be followed by this government." I think that was the response Mr. Zoe had this morning, anyway, and the report itself was done in 1987, or was worked on and put together, perhaps, by a consultant that used to work for the government.

Since 1987 there have been two things that happened that were of significance, or three things. One of them was that there was a final ratification of the Gwich'in claim; the other is that there was an agreement between the federal government and the aboriginal organizations to have a parallel accord with regard to the shaping of governments for aboriginal people; and the third, of course, is the royal commission. One of the things that the regional council does not want to get into, at least in the Deh Cho region, is they are not at this point in time even considering negotiating a land claim. They are not interested at this point in time, and one of the reasons for that is that they would hope that instead of looking at extinguishing their rights, they would go on what the national forum has to offer them. Most of the agreements that are being implemented now do extinguish certain rights. Also, any kind of self-government that is going to be implemented has got to be reflected in the form of public government.

So I support regional councils that wish to implement that under their regional claims, but I would hope at the same time that perhaps this document is also outdated. It is from the 11th Assembly, and it looked at things before these new developments occurred, and naturally there was also an election at that time, and one of the things that we allowed to happen was that we allowed the Western Constitutional Commission to be created to look at the views through the North, and they have come with an interim report, too, on that.

But what I see, from the last Assembly to this Assembly, is that I still see the difficulties as a Member, Mr. Chairman. For eight years I still see the difficulties of having the government come up with a good strategy plan that does not involve us at all. I do not know how the new Members or the Executive felt about this report itself, but my feeling is that it was a report that was good at the time it was made, but it should no longer apply to this new government. We should be looking at a new vision.

I think that the Minister of Aboriginal Rights and Constitutional Development and the government have also suggested that they will recognize the inherent right to self-government and have made that presentation to the Dobbie Commission.

We have a situation in which we could be offering the communities programs that they could control, but the dollars for the delivery of those programs are there but the resources are not there. What I am getting at, Mr. Chairman, is that we could be offering programs to the communities -- we are asking the communities to get into contribution agreements for the delivery of certain programs. At the same time, we are looking at communities -- there are different scenarios; we have claimant areas and we do not have claimant areas.

For the claimant areas I believe the section on self-government has to be in with the public government process. Where there is not, I am afraid that if communities start accepting programs under that direction, as if it was a claimant area, we might find a situation in which those communities have accepted it and the federal government could view that as taking the principle in the form of public government, as opposed to aboriginal government and self-government.

The federal government could also take the view, "We could have given you the inherent right to self-government and those programs could have gone directly to you, but since you accepted the concept of

the territorial government's focus on public government, we are sorry, we cannot offer you that under the inherent right to self-government," in whatever shape or form it will take eventually. This is why the Deh Cho Regional Tribal Council has requested the halt to the implementation of Strength at Two Levels until they have looked at it; as I would like to see it, before any kind of implementation is done. I am aware that there are communities where negotiations are going on with this government with regard to the responsibility for programs; I am aware of that in the Deh Cho region. I certainly do not want to stop them from doing that, but I would also like to ask other communities if they have not started the process that they should not start at all.

Page 136

Political Future Of North Unclear

We have a situation where the political future of the North is unclear. We have areas where political process has already been agreed to through the claims process, but we also have communities where there is no consideration for a form of self-government through the claims process. I do not wish to see communities, if they are looking at delivering those programs --that government should be pressuring communities to do that, or even suggesting that they take on programs.

Mr. Chairman, we do have a situation where municipal governments are in a deficit position. We also have a situation where, if we deliver those programs to the communities, they are going to be getting those programs in a deficit situation too. I find it very difficult that we would be giving them a program that is modelled to fail. We could give them the social assistance program, but if you limit the amount of money that is going to be going to communities with regard to social assistance, the community governments are the ones who are going to look bad. If we say, "The government did not give us enough money. We know that we are supposed to give you \$400, but \$200 is all we can offer you," this would make the community government look pretty bad and the territorial government would look good at that time when the transfer occurred.

At the same time, we are also sending a message with regard to plebiscite questions, for example. We are going to attain the same level of civil servants, and how in the hell are you going to do that and deliver community governments if you are going to deliver responsibility? I would think that if you deliver

the responsibilities more to the communities, the level of civil service would go down.

I do not have any answers, Mr. Chairman, but I see all these different scenarios, and some of them are good and some of them are not good. We have a situation where the political future of the North is going to be questioned within the next two months. At the same time, we are fighting a report that -- I do not know whether it has been implemented or not, but it seems like it has been implemented. Also, we do not know if this applies to the East or for Nunavut or not. I would think that the intent of the report is for a more efficient delivery of programs to the communities. We are already \$50 million in debt, and I do not know how much more it is going to be before the programs are actually delivered to the communities. If we are looking at a year, perhaps the program would be reduced substantially by the time it gets to the communities.

I do not know whether we should also be looking at maybe reducing our deficit even before we consider giving some self-government to the people. If you do not have 100 per cent self-government, then I do not see it working at all. I think it would have a negative impact on the communities if we give them poor programs. I think the government has to sit down and really look at that seriously. If the communities are going to take on programs, they should be healthy programs. The situation that we are in right now, I have doubts that it will work. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Government Leader.

Status Quo Not Acceptable

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: I fully agree that communities should not be taking programs unless we thoroughly involve the community to make sure that those programs can be delivered.

I do not believe -- and I hope I am not hearing -- that people want things status quo right now. I seem to be hearing, "Do not do anything." But, I think that if a series of communities just do not want to move with this, they can pass motions in their communities saying they do not want to do this, or they may take a period of time.

Different regions do different things. This is all going to take time to do. If Deh Cho does not want to receive or talk about taking over more programs, we

are not going to force feed people to do this. However, we have a very large Northwest Territories. There are different regions wanting to approach things differently. As I said, if people want to move, and one region does not, we cannot do anything about that. If the honourable Member was feeling that his communities do not want to be involved, that should not be viewed as something that is negative, because some people feel they have other mandates or want other ways of dealing with things. We have to look at each community and what they are able to do as well as what they want to do. This is the work that is going to be done with a community so that it does not get short-changed in the delivery.

One thing I will tell you for sure is that if we do not do something about this government and reshaping it in a manner so that people want to take over responsibilities, it will be more than \$50 million in debt. Right now, we know what it is going to cost as we go along. I am concerned that the people that are taking the programs over should be fully involved with this discussion at the community level because they are the ones that have to run it; they have to know what resources they require, and the support they need to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the honourable Member that if Deh Cho wants to pass a motion that they do not want to be involved with the process for a number of years, so be it. They will be given respect accordingly. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Mr. Kakfwi.

HON. STEPHEN KAKFWI: Mr. Chairman, I think that if we get on with this report page by page, a lot of the comments, concerns and perceptions can either be substantiated or unsubstantiated. We had this discussion in 1991, and I think we should get on with it. People should remember that the report, Strength at Two Levels, is titled this way for a very particular reason. We know there is going to be a deficit. One of the first tasks identified is dealing with this deficit. There is the perception that there is, in effect, strength at one level. We have to develop real strength at the community level. We also have to consolidate, simplify and streamline strength at the territorial level as well.

I think we should get into the report so that we can get on to identifying which jobs will be done and what will not be done. From there, once we decide what the jobs are, we can talk about what should be done, when, and by whom. Once we get into this, we

should have the development of a real implementation plan. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): I would like to move to the report as quickly as possible. I am allowed to ask Members for general comments. Let us go page by page. Right now, I would like general comments. Mr. Gargan.

MR. GARGAN: Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to stop communities from taking on programs. I am not letting it happen. The concern addressed, Mr. Chairman, is that we say we are going to give programs to the communities and that we are not going to short-change them. But, what does this mean for other people that are not taking on these programs? Are we short-changing them if they do not have these programs? The more we spend on giving money to communities that have control, the less we have for the government to deliver to other communities.

Page 137

I do not know what the Deputy Government Leader is referring to when he suggests that when we deliver those programs, we are not going to short-change them. Are we then looking at an increase in our deficit in order to maintain those programs?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. General comments. Mr. Todd.

MR. TODD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me that there is an old saying where you put the cart before the horse. I think what we really need to do is to quickly move toward putting the three ordinary Members who were elected into the process of developing an implementation strategy. That has to be done quickly to give this side of the House the confidence that their input is being acknowledged and accepted on an ongoing basis. That is one.

System Needed For Resolving Disputes

Two, it is fine to say, "Let us get on with it," but as there are, in any document, imperfections, and according to everyone's statements, there are things in this document that some of us are not satisfied with, there needs to be a system set in place for debate, and for the resolve of disputes or differences. To me, this could go on for days. It seems to me that what we have is a feeling of lack of confidence. I think the easiest way to bring about this confidence is to move quickly to move the three Members on this

side of the House into the development of the implementation strategy, and then debate the report on an ongoing basis. Until we solve this, I think there is still going to be a feeling of neglect.

My feeling is that no matter how well-intentioned the objectives are in the period of time between when the report was tabled and where we are today, perhaps, in hindsight, we should have involved the ordinary Members in the development of implementation.

Given that, I think this is what we need to do now: Bring forward the ordinary Members into the implementation process, and then the document and the implementation strategy will reflect not only cabinet's concerns, which are understandable, but will also reflect, to some extent, the concerns of ordinary Members. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mr. Todd. General comments. Mr. Dent.

MR. DENT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At the risk of belabouring the point, I think it is important to make sure cabinet understands that most of us on this side of the House do feel much the way Mr. Todd has described. There was a real opportunity here for the government to show its commitment to openness, to the consultative process we said we were going to engage in, by opening it up and allowing the three Members we had nominated to participate in the activity of putting together an implementation strategy. We keep hearing that this is not an implementation strategy that is there now, but when you take a look at the document, Reshaping Northern Government, there is considerable thought that has gone into that. There has been a lot of work, and some adoption of principle and policy in order to make the document come together the way it has.

Ordinary Members' Involvement In Policy-Setting

What we are saying is that ordinary Members should have had some involvement in the policy-setting. It should have, and could have, come from the grassroots. You had the opportunity to get us on side, if you will, right from the bottom up -- at least to hear our views about areas where we support the Beatty report, or areas where we do not support the report, and look for some way to find a consensus. Unfortunately, when we were presented with a fait accompli and now invited to have three ordinary Members participate in the so-called implementation strategy, it looks as if we are being co-opted or being brought in after the fact in order to get us on side.

This is going to lead to resentment and distrust. It is unfortunate because there is no way that Reshaping Northern Government happened without a large number of people working a lot of time to examine whether or not there was any possibility of the government, being able to achieve some of the goals that are set out in that report. Before spending all that time, it may have been wise to involve ordinary Members in a discussion as to whether or not certain areas were acceptable in terms of policy and government direction. Now, we have to go back and do that very thing before we are going to be willing to accept the direction given in Reshaping Northern Government.

I think this is going to slow down the entire process, Mr. Chairman, but I hope the government will now be willing to recognize that we have to start again. We have to make sure the grassroots is involved. There has to be a consultative process to include all of us here if you want to get the broad base of support to achieve the goals set out in Reshaping Northern Government, especially in the manner required in order to save a lot of money. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mr. Dent. Mr. Nerysoo.

MR. NERYSOO: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one particular question of one of the Ministers. Could Mr. Kakfwi clarify for me whether or not the government has developed a proposal of the process and the items to be considered for negotiation with the communities that are interested in the process? Could he table the document so that all Members may review it?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Mr. Kakfwi.

Options To Be Laid Out For Communities

HON. STEPHEN KAKFWI: Mr. Chairman, the approach we have indicated to the communities we have communicated and met with is that we are going to try to lay out everything that the government does in terms of programs and services for communities to consider. Whether or not they are practical for communities to take on or whether it is possible for them to have the capability to take these on would be decided through the course of their looking at it. We are not trying to set the stage in deciding what communities can or cannot do. What we have indicated is that we will lay it all out, and the communities can make these decisions. The

communities will decide what they are interested in, and under which terms and conditions they will be willing to assume any work that the territorial government does now, as well as the type of agreements they may want.

It is very clear in this report that the idea is to give more support to the communities so that they can develop the capability and strength to assume much more responsibility and authority. It is not to transfer and reduce resources and costs. I want Members to know that we have said we are willing to start meeting with communities now to discuss the general intent and give them some examples of what they can assume. We can talk with them about how aboriginal self-government may be seen as part of this scenario. The process will slowly develop from there. Communities will let us know what it is they want, and how they want to get this process under way.

We have set certain target dates. We have said that

Page 138

We hope the first transfer agreements come into effect by March 1994. Other than that, we do not have a document that lays out the process and items in detail. We indicated to the communities that we are working on this. As soon as this document is available, we will commence in-depth discussions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Any further general comments? Mr. Nerysoo.

MR. NERYSOO: I would like to make one point before we move on to more specific issues. I think there is a view that -- and it was expressed a few minutes ago by Mr. Kakfwi -- aboriginal government may fit into this scenario. The fact is that we had better be open to the idea of how this government may possibly fit into the scenario of aboriginal self-government rather than the reverse. We may find ourselves in a situation where we may not have as much jurisdiction as most aboriginal governments in a few years from now. We have to be careful about these kinds of things.

The other aspect I want to mention with regard to this is that I believe the Minister pointed out that staff have, in fact, conducted discussions with various groups and communities. Has he any documentation on the matters that have been discussed and whether or not there are any specifics which have been discussed with various communities and regions?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Mr. Kakfwi.

Presentation Made To Gwich'in Tribal Council

HON. STEPHEN KAKFWI: I was in Inuvik about a month ago meeting with the Gwich'in Tribal Council. I had a draft presentation which my staff prepared for me. It was one of those drafts that I never used. There is a real problem. The Member picked it up, but I was kind of late in trying to change my wording when I said this thing about how we fit into each other, the sort of phrasing. It was unfortunate, and I am glad the Member picked it up because I am quite aware of what he is raising, and I think everybody else on this side, in cabinet, is aware of it as well. The problem is in trying to finesse a presentation. We are doing it on the fly, so to speak, and it is difficult to come out with a definite presentation that we use all the time, because we are just sort of going at it and it changes, you know, my own particular style of making presentations. I think the many words of advice and caution that the staff and other people give us about how we should say things, what we should not say, is there.

Anyway, that presentation was made, and we had some discussion with the tribal council about how to basically make the presentation that it is done for a lot of reasons, some of them being that this is what the Dene and Metis communities have asked for starting as far back as 1975, that we think whether or not aboriginal self-government is the constitutional right, the inherent right, and whether it is put into the Canadian constitution or not, that we are talking about giving communities real power, real resources, real responsibility to do things themselves, and that is going to be the way to get stronger people, stronger communities, healthier communities, where we can begin to see a better return for our dollars in the areas of education, where we would get a lesser drain on the resources we have.

Going into social problems, we believe that we have to do things immediately in terms of addressing our deficit; that we cannot wait until next year; that we have to begin right now; that we have to reduce the cost of running government. It means looking at consolidating departments. It means looking at reducing the levels of bureaucracy, and it means streamlining and reorganizing government, reshaping government so that we can put more support, more dollars into communities so they can get on with assuming the responsibility they should have had in the first place.

These talks should not alarm people. We are offering to give to communities those things that they can handle. We are offering to help communities get ready to get into meaningful discussions by making sure that they have adequate resources in terms of staff, in terms of administrative and financial support systems, so that they can get on to doing some of these things and not just talking about it and not being afraid about it. If communities are afraid they do not have the human resources available to do some of these things, then that is part of the discussions.

Everything To Be On The Table

As far as I am concerned, we are going to put everything on the table. Some things we know cannot be readily done at the community level, but we are willing to discuss everything that the territorial government does so that there are no hidden agendas. We try to do things as above board as possible. That was generally the approach that I took to the presentation in Inuvik, and the response was generally good. There were a couple of jaundiced members in the audience that said we were not sincere, but other than that I think the presentation went over well. There was interest from places like Aklavik and McPherson and Arctic Red and Inuvik to look at setting up some further meetings where we can have more in-depth, longer sessions to continue the discussions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Are there any further general comments? Mr. Nerysoo.

MR. NERYSOO: Maybe if I could get additional clarification, Mr. Chairman. While I can appreciate the position that Mr. Kakfwi has put on the floor, or at least has made known to us, I just want to ask the honourable Member whether or not the matter of legislative authority is a matter that is on the table for discussion with the regions or with the communities, because there are certain things you can do that cannot really be done without any, what you might say, legislative responsibility, and I do not necessarily mean the ability to pass the laws here, but to be able to pass appropriate legislative instruments, I guess, that will implement overall legislation or restrict certain things. By-laws, for instance, are one good example. Regulation is another, because those instruments give certain powers to groups or communities that ordinarily do not exist at the moment. So I just want to know if that particular matter has even been discussed, or is it going to be a matter of discussion at some time in cabinet so that we somehow resolve that matter? Whether or not you like it, it is a matter

that can be discussed with the Gwich'in through their agreement, so it has to be dealt with at some time. My assumption is that it is not going to be only that region, but other regions as well, so I just wanted to find out if the matter has been discussed or whether or not it is going to be dealt with at some future time with regard to cabinet and with regard to your position on the table.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. General comments. If not, does this committee wish to go page by page? Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Page By Page Review Of Report

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. We start on page five of the report. Mr. Nerysoo.

Page 139

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I might ask a simple question at some time here. I notice that today, or at least the last couple of days, we have been told that we should not ask questions with regard to this particular matter as it relates to the former cabinet and former government, and yet this particular document has been signed by the former Minister; so I am kind of curious as to who is really the body of authority that is to, in fact, deal with this document. Maybe at some time we may wish to ask the author or the signatory of this document to explain some of the details.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Mr. Pollard.

HON. JOHN POLLARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, when I became the Minister of Finance, one of the earliest documents that I received was this particular document, and it was, I think, released to the House the day after I got it. Early on cabinet decided that this was of such importance that the Government Leader would be the lead Minister in this particular document. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Page five. Any comment on page five? Page six. Mr. Nerysoo.

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today, if the honourable Member, the Government Leader, recalls, I asked for specific documentation. You will notice on pages six and seven that there were specific groups that developed particular reports. I

am wondering if the interim reports from these committees could be made available if possible, depending on your review and consideration as you indicated earlier.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Government Leader.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I did not mean to be hesitant about providing the information. I do not know where they all are or how many there are. The only report that was delivered to us was this, and I undertook to find out where the other documentation or reports that were used in this process are. I will do that; I just have not had time to do that yet.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Page seven. Mr. Gargan.

MR. GARGAN: In designing this report, there were some private citizens and government employees who provided opinions that were critical to the project. I would like to ask who the private citizens and government employees are on this.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Madam Government Leader.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Starting at the bottom of page five, it lists all the people on there as well as the different team leaders. There is a management organization as well as service and program delivery. The names are on there. For example, under management and organization, Jim Antoine, Knute Hansen and Liz Apak Rose are on this list.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Mr. Gargan.

MR. GARGAN: I thought these were resource people. When I was referring to this section, my impression was that there were public meetings where private citizens and government employees made presentations. I guess that is not the case.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Madam Government Leader.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: These were the team organizers. They met with several people by going to the various regions. I do not have a list of who talked to them or how many people met with them making presentations. It is not listed in the book. However, I am sure the information may be obtained.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Page seven.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Page eight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Page nine. Mr. Nerysoo.

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask if the Direction for the 1990s is still the basis by which this government is operating, or whether or not there will be an indication at some time of either a renewal of those directions or a reassessment and indication by this cabinet of the direction they wish to take over the next four years.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Madam Government Leader.

Lack Of Financial Resources For New Programs

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The general problem we had in trying to set a direction is our lack of ability to find the financial resources to take on new programs or deliver new initiatives. What we have found is that if we do something about the government, to reorganize and redirect, we would be able to do that. At this point in time I am not planning to go into another Snare Lake and say we are going to set these brave objectives that cost money, because we cannot afford them. Basically, we are staying the course and trying to reshape and redirect funding to take on programs, even the present programs that we have. I think that there is a lot of anxiety that our financial position would not allow us to fund the programs that exist today. Hopefully, when we are going through this process, a clearer direction can be pulled out of this exercise.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Mr. Nerysoo.

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Government Leader for responding; however, I must say that the matter of, for instance, dealing with additional provincial-like powers and responsibilities does cause me some concern. I agree that if the case is that those transfers are going to cost us more money, then it is really not in our interest. I do want to caution government about even dealing with the matter of northern control of Northwest Territories'

energy resources if that particular matter is going to, in future, cause us financial problems. I know that some may say it is an advantage because we are going to get resource revenues, but our problem still lies in that we have to assume the responsibility for paying for the overall administration of managing those resources within terms of mineral and energy resources.

I am cautious about it, and maybe even more so I am concerned that aboriginal people are still not secure in their involvement in that process. I just want to raise that concern with you and maybe you can address it some other time, but I just wanted to point that out to you. I know that you have consulted some organizations with regard to legislation, and those kinds of things, but there are still problems with significant changes that are required, and maybe that

Page 140

Is one reason that you are seeking the advice of the various groups.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Madam Government Leader.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I would like to restate that we are still committed, particularly to the Northern Accord negotiations. I would also like to say that one of the prime reasons that we have come to a stalemate here is because of the financial arrangements. I fully agree that we have to be sure that those transfers are of a net benefit to us, rather than a net loss. So yes, we are very cautious of that and as we go along we still have a commitment that a Northern Accord has to complement the claims process as we proceed. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Page nine. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Page 10

---Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Page 11. Mr. Gargan.

Growth In Person Years

MR. GARGAN: Mr. Chairman, there seemed to be an indication by the previous government that there were going to be some financial difficulties ahead unless it allowed only a one per cent growth, or less than one per cent growth, with regard to person years. The government must also be aware that in 1988 I made a motion with regard to a reduction in the person years of 2.5 per cent with another 2.5 per cent the following year. I do not know what the discussions were with regard to the motion I made. I do not know whether or not it was ever discussed. I would like to tell the Government Leader, on the Executive at that time, that it was a reasonable motion.

In 1988, there were approximately 340 vacant positions open. Implementing something like this could have avoided the situation we were in. How did you come up with this? Is it a one per cent person year growth during the four years of our term of office? During the first year that I was in office, I thought there was an eight per cent growth in person years. My motion in 1988 was to reduce it by 2.5 per cent for the first year and 2.5 per cent for the second or last year of our term. I guess this did not happen.

What is the less than one per cent person year growth? Was this during the last year of our term?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Madam Government Leader.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That was for a one-year period. I think the Member would be pleased to note that the reduction by the motion was well received. This has been an ongoing, broad situation which people have asked us to address. In order to accomplish the savings in person years, one of the things is that it is very difficult the way we are structured right now is to go in and say we will take this person year out of this department or that department. This is how we are attempting to do it, by reshaping and putting departments together so that we can accomplish that and more. The concern that the general public has, which is that we have far too many civil servants serving the number of people that we have, and the concern that much of the money is being spent in looking after the administrators, is the fundamental concern that we tried to address in this document. We are attempting to gather together how we are going to do that. I hope we can accomplish that and

much more, particularly with the vacancy factors that we do have.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Mr. Lewis. Page 11

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I did not catch your eye when we were still on page 10. But it is very brief, if I could. I know we have problems when we refer to what happened in the past government because that is history now. It does not matter much. We do not have a party system here. We have an ongoing, flowing system, and a lot of the same people are still around. We have the same kinds of problems as we had a year ago, and yet a year ago we had identified that it was very important for us to set up a new department of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources. In the Northern Energy Accord we had umpteen briefings on it. We identified transportation as being a key thing for the development of our economy, and in order to give it significance and to give it focus we had to not just state it as a priority but in fact, create a new department to look after developing transportation infrastructure. Also at that time, if you recall, Mr. Chairman, because of the tremendous interest in the last year -- and the Member for Thebacha would recall this very, very clearly -- that safety and the concern for mine safety was such a huge issue that it was felt that we should set up a department for this, to look after safety, the safety of people throughout the Northwest Territories, not only in mines but just safety of our people was so important that we had to set up a department for it. So we in fact created all this government infrastructure in order to meet the program of the government. This is the program. So in order to help the program and to highlight the priorities, this is how we are going to set ourselves up.

Government Lacking In Focus And Vision

So now just a year later we have got a document in front of us just simply to provide a restructuring of transfers of programs, and I wonder really the degree to which we are committed, still, to economic development. We spent four years saying, you know, economic development or privatization or whatever, creating jobs, creating wealth, all these different ploys you could have to create wealth and to reduce the dependency of individuals on government, and we suddenly find that the only thing that matters is government. This government, the way I have seen it over the last few months -- we are completely preoccupied with government, and one of the main recommendations in this report is the reduction of

people's reliance and dependence on government. That is the main story of this report: Reduce people's dependence on government. Yet the complete preoccupation of it is with government and the government's service, and so on, and yet with no idea of focus. What is the focus? At least the examples I gave you were attempts to give some sense of priority, to say, "Okay, this is the stuff that people worry about so therefore we will do this." I fail to see that in the documents that we have. The sense of vision, of focus and so on, is just simply, well, it is government but we are going to do government in a different way.

So the fear I have, Mr. Chairman, is that when I look through this page, which is a kind of introduction that gives you a bit of background, the transitional period leading to this report, it bothers me that, right or wrong, at least there was some sense of direction, of focus and so on. What we have got left, it seems to me, does not have that. We do not have a sense of where we are going. In what kinds of ways are we going to create employment opportunities? How are we going to handle a lot of these things, which are ongoing problems for us?

Page 141

I think it is the wrong solution. We did this in education in 1981-82; we said, "Well, we do not know what the hell we are doing, really, but let us let the communities decide." You know, we just handed it to somebody else. Maybe they would do a better job than we did. And it is no solution just simply to say, "Well, you know, the solution is to give people control over their lives, and so on," and maybe give them an instrument that is no good to them. It is no good handing a program over that is of no use to somebody. Maybe they want something completely different.

So what I am worried about and concerned about is that as we go through this document, we are simply talking about government again, reshaping government. We are not talking, really, about where we are going. What is the vision? How are we going to solve all these problems that, in fact, have been plaguing us for so long, if we do not at least begin to look at more than just structure and form and everything else? It seems to me that is just doing what we did in the past, saying we do not know what to do so we will give it to somebody else to do, and anyway things are rough now. We do not have enough money, so we will let them worry about that too. That is the kind of accusation that may be made

unless we can come up with some kind of sense of vision of the kinds of things we could be doing.

I am not talking about huge, expensive programs because so many things can be done which do not necessarily have to cost a lot of money. There are all kinds of things you can do. I do not get that sense after reading the document. I am sure we will have an opportunity to discuss it later on as we go through it page by page so that we can have some sense of vision as to where the government is going in terms of services. I hope we can get some sense of vision as far as the future of our territory is concerned, beyond this basic structural issue. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Madam Government Leader.

Process For Redirection Of Control And Responsibility

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, the document is a document that provides the process and some idea on how to get some of the funding so that we can do some of the things the honourable Member is speaking about. It seems to me that we are taking a lot of time on a document that is trying to reshape the government. It is really a process to provide redirection of some of the control and responsibility to the people that are affected by our programs and delivery system. I believe we are attempting to do that by answering the question that a lot of people have in front of them; that is, it is difficult to get access to the government. I believe it can be fixed very quickly and nicely. We can bring the decision-making to where people want it to be made and, at the same time, provide consolidation so that we can save some dollars and redirect these dollars to economic development and other methods. If we keep on going the way we are and do nothing, we can keep spending on exactly what we have with no changes. We can go out and run around in the community, but our resources are limited as to how we can direct that. That is all we are trying to do. There is a preoccupation on government because Members want to talk about it, and I do not think this should be disallowed as a negative thing.

The honourable Member seems to be telling us that people want to discuss this document because we are preoccupied with government. Right now, we have to understand -- and we all know -- that we are too heavily dependent on government. People's concern is that the government does not do the job they want

to be done for them. How do we correct this? This is really what we are trying to do.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Are there any further comments on Page 10? Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Agreed? Page 11

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Agreed? Page 12

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Agreed? Member for Thebacha. Page 13

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With respect to page 13, some of the recommendations are on separate appendices to the report. I do not know if it is the intent of the committee to go to the appendices, or just go through them. There are some significant recommendations as a result of the appendices to the report, and I am sure they are of concern to Members, in particular, the review of program and program delivery of legal aid and the Departments of Health and Social Services, and advanced education. The chapter and the appendix include numerous recommendations. Even though I recognize that we stated we would go page by page, some of the appendices are somewhat integrated so I would like to state, for the record, that I, as a Member, have concerns with respect to programs and program delivery areas as well as support services delivery.

Mr. Chairman, recognizing the new rules in place and that the House concludes at six o'clock, I would like to report progress.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Is that a motion?

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Yes, I move to report progress.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. The motion is not debatable. All those in favour? Those opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

I will rise and report progress.

ITEM 19: REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. SPEAKER: Item 19, report of committee of the whole. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been considering Tabled Document 9-12(2), Strength at Two Levels, and wishes to report progress. Mr. Speaker, I move that the report of the chairman of committee of the whole be concurred with. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder to the motion? Mr. Dent. The motion is in order. All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

Page 142

---Carried

Item 21, orders of the day. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Mr. Speaker, meetings for this evening, at 6:00 p.m. of the Nunavut caucus. At 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning, a meeting of the standing committee on finance, and at 10:30 a.m., a meeting of the ordinary Members' caucus.

ITEM 21: ORDERS OF THE DAY

Orders of the day for Wednesday, February 26, 1992.

1. Prayer
2. Ministers' Statements
3. Members' Statements
4. Returns to Oral Questions
5. Oral Questions
6. Written Questions
7. Returns to Written Questions
8. Replies to Opening Address
9. Petitions
10. Reports of Standing and Special Committees

11. Reports of Committees on the Review of Bills
12. Tabling of Documents
13. Notices of Motions
14. Notices of Motions for First Reading of Bills
15. Motions
16. First Reading of Bills
17. Second Reading of Bills
18. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills and Other Matters: Tabled Document 9-12(2); Tabled Document 10-12(2); Tabled Document 12-12(2); and Bill 14
19. Report of Committee of the Whole
20. Third Reading of Bills
21. Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. This House stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m., Wednesday, February 26, 1992.

---ADJOURNMENT