



**NORTHWEST TERRITORIES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

2nd Session

Day %1

12th Assembly

HANSARD

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY &6, 1992

Pages %43-162
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

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1992

Pages 143 -162

MEMBERS PRESENT

Hon. Titus Allooloo, Mr. Antoine, Mr. Arngha'naaq, Mr. Arvaluk, Hon. Michael Ballantyne, 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's Ruling

SPEAKER (Hon. Michael Ballantyne): Good afternoon. Before we commence with the orders of the day, I would like to respond to the point of order raised by Ms. Cournoyea, February 25, 1992. Ms. Cournoyea raised her point of order during the item, Members' statements. The point of order raised by Ms. Cournoyea was that comments made by the honourable Member for Yellowknife Centre during his Member's statement were contrary to Rule 35(i) which states: "In debate a Member will be called to order by the Speaker if he: (i) imputes false or unavowed motives to another Member."

In reviewing the matter, I had to refer to the unedited Hansard of February 24th as that contained the remarks where Mr. Lewis indicated the Government Leader had made certain comments concerning the capabilities of Ordinary Members. In reviewing the unedited Hansard of February 24th, I could not find where the Government Leader had made any disparaging comments along the lines indicated by Mr. Lewis on February 25th during his Member's statement.

In ruling that the Government Leader does have a point of order, I would like to point out the difficulty for all Members in achieving the exact measure of precision in their comments to prevent misunderstanding. The Government Leader was perhaps not as precise as she could have been, and perhaps Mr. Lewis had a more negative interpretation of her words than was intended by the Government Leader. However, the free exchange of ideas is always a difficult area, and I would ask Members to

be as precise as possible and to give each other the benefit of the doubt where possible. Thank you.

Orders of the day for Wednesday, February 26, 1992. Item 2, Ministers' statements. Mr. Patterson.

ITEM 2: MINISTERS' STATEMENTS

Ministers' Statement 17-12(2): Mining Safety Bill Committee

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that I have appointed the following individuals to the mining safety bill committee: Mr. Terence Vaughan-Thomas, a retired professional mining engineer, who will serve as chairperson; Mr. Norman Pottinger, an underground shift supervisor at Nerco Con Mine, nominated by the Union of Northern Workers to represent organized labour; Mr. Jim Bacon, a millwright at Echo Bay Mines Limited, nominated by that mine's occupational health and safety committee to represent unorganized labour; Mr. Bob Jacko, mine superintendent of Polaris Mine; and Mr. Brian J. Hagan, safety and training superintendent of Royal Oak Mines, nominated by the Chamber of Mines to represent management.

Mr. Speaker, in appointing Mr. Vaughan-Thomas I have chosen an individual with over 43 years' experience in the mining industry, who was involved in the redrafting of British Columbia's new Mines Act. He will be arriving in Yellowknife next week, and I anticipate that he will bring the committee together very quickly to commence its very important work.

Even though the United Steelworkers of America and the Canadian Association of Smelter and Allied Workers have chosen not to participate on this committee, they will have ample opportunity to have input on the proposed new act when it is reviewed by a standing committee of this House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministers' statements. Ministers' statements. Item 3, Members' statements. Mr. Todd.

ITEM 3: MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Member's Statement On Specific Areas Of "Strength At Two Levels" Report

MR. TODD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to make a few brief comments on the Strength at Two Levels report. My remarks will deal quickly with some content areas, but also with the process which must

be used for implementing any changes which come out of the report.

This document, which has consumed so much of our time and attention, is useful, but it is not perfect in my view, Mr. Speaker. There is, for instance, very little content which deals specifically with the models for privatization of government services. As well, much of the government restructuring proposed in the report does not seem to have considered the long-range needs related to the creation of Nunavut.

I am also concerned about the impact of the Strength at Two Levels framework on our regional government, both in terms of what it means for regional councils and also for representation on government-created boards and agencies.

These are the larger issues which I believe we should be debating on the floor of the House. However, there has been, at the very least, an appearance that ordinary Members are locked out of the early decision-making on how this report should proceed. For that reason, I am strongly in favour of reviewing the complete Strength at Two Levels report and its Appendices, where necessary, when we meet in committee of the whole.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time I am reminded that there are dangers involved in the reduction process where we focus more on the trees than the forest. Sometimes we pay so much attention to the bends in the road that we lose track of where we are going.

I believe that this House can work concurrently to deal with the specific proposals on each page of the Beatty report while addressing the big picture of where our government is heading. It is important for all of us to maintain both of these perspectives. Thank you

Page 144

---Applause

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

**Member's Statement On Lack Of Consultation
With Ordinary Members Re Implementation Of
Beatty Report Recommendations**

MR. DENT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today, I also rise to express my disappointment and dismay over the government's apparent decision not to involve ordinary Members when they were developing the strategy for implementing many of the

recommendations of the Beatty report. I, too, feel that there are many sections in this report that are well worth considering very favourably, but I think the fact that the ordinary Members were not involved leaves us in a difficult situation right now.

We have often heard this government promise a new process of more open government in which ordinary Members will have a greater voice. Despite this promise, Mr. Speaker, and despite the fact that there has been no consultation with the public nor with ordinary Members, the government seems to be using the Beatty report as the basis for the proposed changes in government structure contained in the Government Leader's document, Reshaping Northern Government.

Although we have heard that Reshaping Northern Government is a working document and only a starting point, a detailed report such as this must have required considerable discussion and could not have been formulated without making some policy decisions. Only now that the planning has been completed, the government is seeking the involvement of ordinary Members. This is not consultation. Consultation starts at the beginning.

Mr. Speaker, the government had an opportunity with the Beatty report to demonstrate its commitment to the promise of a new and open approach to government. But, I am afraid they have chosen to waste this opportunity. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

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

**Member's Statement On Lack Of Participation By
Ordinary Members In Preparation Of "Reshaping
Northern Government"**

MR. ARVALUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise today to express concern over the government's decision not to allow ordinary Members and, by extension, the voters of the Northwest Territories to participate in the Strength At Two Levels report.

Despite promises of more open government and promises of greater participation by ordinary Members, Mr. Speaker, this government is only now asking for our involvement after all the planning has been completed. The government had an opportunity, with the Strength At Two Levels report, to break with the past and demonstrate its commitment to more open government and greater participation by

ordinary Members. Instead, they have chosen to continue to work behind closed doors. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because the government appears to be using the Strength At Two Levels report as the basis for changes to the government as proposed in the Government Leader's document, Reshaping Northern Government.

I have been told that Reshaping Northern Government is a working document and only a starting point. But, it is obvious that a detailed report such as this must have required considerable discussion and could not have been formulated without making some policy decisions. Now that all of the decisions have been made, the government wants ordinary Members to rubber-stamp its recommendations. Thank you.

---Applause

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

Member's Statement On "Reshaping Northern Government"

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be more careful with my words today, Mr. Speaker, than I was yesterday. I appreciate your wise words about the care we must take when we address each other.

I would like to reiterate that we have had so much experience now with what we call consensus government. It is very, very easy to simply say it is a wonderful idea to agree with something, and not to follow through with it. I am not implying the government did not intend to follow through, but the reality is that nothing happened. They appointed three people who were not given the opportunity to participate in what was considered by this government as being a priority and something that we should get on with. That is, to reshape government in order to live within reduced resources and to give people the power to control those things in their lives which matter most to them. What concerns me most, Mr. Speaker, is that when we examine this report Strength at Two Levels, all we are really doing is examining the concept of strength, and there is no vision in this document. It concerns me that those people from communities -- they do not live in Yellowknife; they live elsewhere, that is where they make their home -- those people from those places, who could help to create this vision of what that strength should be at those two levels, were not involved. I think it is a shame that this did not happen, for whatever reason. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Members' statements. Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

Member's Statement On Lack Of Involvement Of Ordinary Members In Review Of "Strength At Two Levels"

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I today would also like to express my concern over the government's decision not to allow ordinary Members to participate in the implementation of Strength at Two Levels. Despite the intention of more open government and agreement to greater participation and involvement of the ordinary Members, I am disappointed that the government is now only asking for our involvement after all the planning appears to have been completed.

Mr. Speaker, it is our intention, as I had indicated to this House yesterday, that it is necessary to go page by page through the Strength at Two Levels report because of the fact that we were never asked in public discussion for our opinion on Strength at Two Levels, and the remarks of "300 more pages to go" is a reality, and it is not appreciated by the Members. It just reflects your attitude on wanting to listen to us.

Mr. Speaker, the government appears to be using the Strength at Two Levels report as the basis for changes to government. We feel we are part of the Legislative Assembly, which should be giving direction to government, and we do not appreciate that the proposed changes in the document Reshaping Northern Government does not allow our involvement. It appears that decisions have been made, significant decisions, that my constituents have to live with and many territorial residents have to live with, in isolation. If this government feels they want these decisions to be made with rubber-stamping from MLAs, I will let them know that I have never

Page 145

been a politician to rubber-stamp anything that has been proposed by bureaucrats. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Members' statements. Mr. Arngna'naaq.

Member's Statement On Lack Of Involvement In Beatty Report Implementation

MR. ARNGNA'NAAQ: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, stand up about the government's

decision on the Beatty report. We, as ordinary MLAs, have not had enough involvement in the implementation process. Although the government had told us that we would be involved with them through all the stages, and although the government said we had the strength to take part in this process, to this day we have not been involved at all as ordinary MLAs. Government Ministers and cabinet, are probably just putting together their constituents' thoughts and not taking into consideration our constituents' thoughts. I am just standing up to comment on my disappointment on the government's part. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Members will join me in welcoming to the Legislative Assembly Elsie Marykuca and six students from the St. Pat's High School "Stay in School" program.

---Applause

Members' statements. Mr. Antoine.

Member's Statement On Elections In Nahanni Butte And Wrigley

MR. ANTOINE: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make some comments in regard to my constituents. I am speaking for the six communities that I represent. Recently the chief and councillors had elections. (Translation ends) Last Friday they had elections in Nahanni Butte and Wrigley. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the newly-elected chief and council of Nahanni Butte and Wrigley.

On Friday, February 21st, the residents of Wrigley elected Charlie Tale as their chief. Also elected Friday in Wrigley were councillors Gabe Hardisty, Martha Drake, Mike Canadian, James Hardisty, Tim Lennie and Lloyd Moses.

In Nahanni Butte the people elected Jayne Konisenta as their chief, and Chief Konisenta joins the previously-elected council of Sam Ekotla, William Konisenta, David Konisenta, Lena Marcellais, and Laura Vital.

I hope that this government recognizes and will work with these new community governments. For Chief Konisenta and Chief Tale, it is their first time as leaders. So I would like to congratulate them. Mahsi cho.

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

Member's Statement On "Strength At Two Levels" Report

MR. PUDLAT: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to comment on the Strength at Two Levels report. We have to be influenced in our communities. I am trying to see what kind of set-up they have here. I have great concerns about the Strength at Two Levels report. I represent three communities, and they are very far apart from each other. One is very far from the other constituents. If I am just going to be sitting here and not take part in events going on, I am just rubber-stamping these ideas without consulting my constituents.

I told my people about the important things going on here. I told them I would keep them informed. Because of that, I stand here today to say I will not be rubber-stamping ideas from the government without informing my constituents because it will be of no use to us. I just wanted to tell you my concerns about the Strength at Two Levels report. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Member's Statement On Representation On Beatty Report Implementation Team

MR. KOE: Mahsi, Mr. Speaker. I, too, stand up in this House to express my concern over the ordinary MLAs' lack of participation in the process that my colleagues have talked about. I was one of the Members chosen by my colleagues to represent them on the implementation team, to look at development of a process and strategy for implementing the report, Strength at Two Levels. To this day I have not yet been invited to any meetings, or any consultation, to do the work that I was picked to do. I am very, very concerned as to when we will be involved, and I am finding now that I am in a situation where I think it is too late and I have to reconsider my position. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Members' statements. Members' statements. Item 4, returns to oral questions. Mr. Allooloo.

ITEM 4: RETURNS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Return To Question O59-12(2): Highway Patrol Restricted To Certain Areas

HON. TITUS ALLOOLOO: Mahsi cho, Mr. Speaker. I have a return to an oral question asked by Mr. Gargan on February 18, 1992, with respect to distribution of highway transport officers. On February 18, 1992, the Member for Deh Cho asked why the Department of Transportation's highway transport officers restricted their patrol operations to the public highways in his constituency.

The transportation safety section of the Department of Transportation has its headquarters in Hay River. From Hay River the transportation safety section monitors commercial truck traffic for compliance with transport legislation throughout the Northwest Territories.

At present there are six highway transport officers stationed in Hay River, two in Inuvik and one in Yellowknife. The primary duties of the officers stationed in Hay River and Inuvik are to operate the Enterprise and Inuvik weigh scales. At the weigh scales the officers control the axle loadings of commercial transports, conduct safety inspections and issue licences and permits. The officers are on patrol duties for one eight-hour shift a week.

Highways No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3 are the main land transportation corridors in the Northwest Territories. Highways No. 1 and No. 3 carry 73 per cent of all highway traffic in the Northwest Territories. It is along these routes where 75 per cent of all highway accidents occur. The Enterprise weigh scale, at the junction of Highways No. 1 and No. 2, is the best location for inspecting truck traffic and for sending out patrols along the highway system. The transportation safety section is responsible for commercial transport safety over the entire highway system. Its operations are not restricted to the Member's constituency. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Returns to oral questions. Mr. Whitford.

Page 146

**Further Return To Question O99-12(2):
Consultation With Elders In Elective Surgery**

HON. TONY WHITFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a return to a question asked by Mr. Gargan on February 20, 1992, regarding consultation with elders in the area of elective surgery. Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure the honourable Member for Deh Cho that there is a process for obtaining informed consent from patients.

Consultation normally takes place between the patient, members of the family, as appropriate, the nurse, doctor, and, depending on the community, either the clerk-interpreter or the community health representative. All health staff are aware of the consultation process and the need to ensure that patients and relatives are well informed.

It would be inappropriate for me to discuss the medical history of the deceased elder in question, but I can assure the honourable Member that the patient's condition was such that surgery was warranted and considered critical. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Returns to oral questions. Mr. Ningark.

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

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a return to an oral question which was asked by Mr. Zoe on February 25, 1992, regarding the decision to defer the construction of office/warehouse complex in Lac la Martre. The only work that had been planned in this fiscal year, 1991-92, for the office/warehouse complex was to purchase and move building material to the community. The materials were to be transported on the winter road to Lac la Martre, which usually does not open until mid to end of January.

A tender for the materials was issued in the fall. Bids had been received; however, the tendering process was interrupted in December when the department had to change its 1991-92 capital project plans due to fiscal restraint measures. Thank you.

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

**Return To Question O131-12(2): Minister Of
Justice Expressing Public Concerns
To The Judiciary**

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have return to a question asked by Mrs. Marie-Jewell on Monday, February 24th. A question was asked as to whether there is a process by which the Minister of Justice of the Northwest Territories can express public concern to the judiciary. The honourable Member recognized the principle of independence of the judiciary and expressed concern

regarding a specific decision which was recently rendered.

It is the role of our Legislature and of Parliament to enact the laws which judges apply. Parliament is responsible for enacting laws regarding criminal offences.

The independence of the judiciary is a fundamental imperative of our constitution and our system of justice. Judges individually shall be free, and it is their duty to decide matters before them impartially, in accordance with their assessment of the facts and their understanding of the law without any restrictions, influences or pressures, direct or indirect, for any reason. The single most important remedy for judicial decisions which are inappropriate is appeal. In the Northwest Territories, the Attorney General of Canada, who is accountable to Parliament, is responsible for criminal prosecutions and has a role in deciding whether or not to appeal a decision.

With the above in mind, Mr. Speaker, I can forward to the Chief Judge, for his information, excerpts of Hansard which refer to a decision, but it will be for his information only and not for the purpose of interfering with the independence of the judiciary. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Returns to oral questions. Mr. Allooloo.

Return To Question O27-12(2): Funding For Teachers' Conferences

HON. TITUS ALLOOLOO: I have a return to a question asked by Mr. Gargan on February 14, 1992 regarding funding for teachers' conferences at a time of restraint. On February 13th and 14th, 1992 a teachers' conference was held in Yellowknife. Teachers from all divisional boards of education except the Kitikmeot board attended the conference, along with teachers from Yellowknife Districts No. 1 and No. 2 as well as the Board of Secondary Education for Sir John Franklin Territorial High School.

This conference, Mr. Speaker, was funded through the professional development fund provided for by the collective agreement for the Northwest Territories Teachers' Association. The professional development fund consists of two and a quarter per cent of the gross basic salary of teachers. The Department of Education and participating boards did not contribute any additional funding for teachers to attend this conference. Funding for travel and accommodation

for individual teachers to attend the conference was provided by a combination of professional development funding as well as funding provided by each participant. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Returns to oral questions. Mr. Allooloo.

Return To Question O90-12(2): Reduction In Student Allowances

HON. TITUS ALLOOLOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a return to an oral question asked by Ms. Mike on February 19, 1992 regarding reduction in student allowances. The Member for Baffin Central questioned why the funding one student received had been reduced from \$531.43 to \$522.86. There has been no reduction in the total allowance paid to the students; however, in the 1991-92 school year, the Department of Education changed the monthly allowances payment from an amount which fluctuated somewhat from month to month to an average amount.

In previous years, the monthly cheques paid to the students fluctuated depending upon whether the month had 30 days or 31 days. For example, a single student received \$514.29 for a 30-day month and \$531.43 for a 31-day month. Students raised concern over the fluctuating rates, as they caused budgeting problems. As a result, the department implemented a new schedule to provide students with a consistent monthly cheque rate of \$522.86 based upon the average of two previous months' rates. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Returns to oral questions. Mr. Ningark.

Return To Question O141-12(2): Peel River Watershed

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a return to an oral question asked by Mr. Nerysoo on February 24, 1992, regarding the Peel River watershed. The government of the Northwest Territories is a member of the Mackenzie River Basin committee. The committee is involved in the preparation of a co-operative water management agreement for the entire Mackenzie River Basin. The agreement will consist of two parts: an overall agreement for the entire Mackenzie River Basin and agreements between each of the jurisdictions within the basin.

The Peel River is part of the Mackenzie River Basin. It will be included in the overall agreement and the agreement between the Northwest Territories and Yukon. The Department of Renewable Resources has contacted their counterparts in the Yukon to begin negotiations with the intention of completing the agreement in 1992. Thank you.

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

ITEM 5: ORAL QUESTIONS

Question O167-12(2): Involvement Of Communities Affected By Peel River Basin Agreement

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you. If I could ask, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Renewable Resources, has the department contacted anyone in the communities affected by the Peel River Basin Agreement to consider participating with the Government of the Northwest Territories?

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

Return To Question O167-12(2): Involvement Of Communities Affected By Peel River Basin Agreement

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Mr. Speaker, that is one of the elements, that we would like to have the communities affected by the agreement between jurisdictions involved, and I will inform the communities.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Mr. Koe.

Question O168-12(2): Status Of Dispute Between Inuvik Teachers And Department Of Education

MR. KOE: Mahsi, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Education. Will the Minister please advise this House of the status of his or his officials' investigations into the dispute between the teachers in Inuvik schools and the department?

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

Return To Question O168-12(2): Status Of Dispute Between Inuvik Teachers And Department Of Education

HON. TITUS ALLOOLOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My officials met yesterday at breakfast time with the

NWTTA officials, and both sides are confident that the problem we are experiencing up in Inuvik could be resolved as a result of the NWTTA officials' agreeing that they will go up to Inuvik to talk to the teachers, to see if the offer that was given to the teachers, which unfortunately was rejected by teachers, could be reviewed by the NWTTA and the teachers.

As to the result, I have not heard what the resolution is. I am confident that we can resolve this issue very soon. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Mr. Pudlat.

Question O169-12(2): Allocation Of Staff Houses In Communities

MR. PUDLAT: (Translation) Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of DPW. Further to my previous question, O114-12(2), regarding lack of staff houses for the government, I understand we are in a deficit and because of that there is no further housing for 1992-93; the Department of Public Works or the government did not allocate funding for 1992-93. I would like further housing allocation for 1992-93.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Minister of staff housing, Mr. Kakfwi.

HON. STEPHEN KAKFWI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it might be more appropriate if we deferred this question until we get into the estimates of the budget.

MR. SPEAKER: I have not heard anything put as a point of order. There is not anywhere in the rules where we talk about appropriateness. Mr. Kakfwi.

HON. STEPHEN KAKFWI: I will take the question as notice.

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

Question O170-12(2): Funding Provided For High School Students In The South

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Education. We have had quite a bit of discussion over the last while of high school and high school programs and the fact that we have unused capacity in the 13 schools that offer high school programs in the Eastern Arctic and the six that offer high school programs in the West. Do we have students attending high schools in southern Canada who are paid for by the territorial government?

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

Return To Question O170-12(2): Funding Provided For High School Students In The South

HON. TITUS ALLOOLOO: Mr. Speaker, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mr. Lewis.

Supplementary To Question O170-12(2): Funding Provided For High School Students In The South

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister, under what circumstances do we provide the funds or fees for students to attend high schools in southern jurisdictions?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Allooloo.

Further Return To Question O170-12(2): Funding Provided For High School Students In The South

HON. TITUS ALLOOLOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In some cases there are students who are attending universities in southern Canada. There are some residential schools where parents have requested to send high school students and in some cases that has been approved by the department. I am told there are other cases where a student requires a program that is not provided in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. Speaker, if you wish, I could come back with more detailed information if the Member so desires. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mr. Lewis.

Supplementary To Question O170-12(2): Funding Provided For High School Students In The South

MR. LEWIS: I will take the Minister up on that, but I will also ask the Minister to indicate under which policy of government we fund programs for students to go to high school in the South.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Allooloo.

Page 148

HON. TITUS ALLOOLOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I provide the Member with more detailed information, I will provide the policy used for students who go south.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Mr. Todd.

Question O171-12(2): Details Of Students Attending High School In South

MR. TODD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Education. In keeping with what Mr. Lewis has said, could the Minister provide us with details of who is attending high school in the South, where they are attending high school in the South, and why they are attending high school in the South?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Todd, you asked three questions. Mr. Allooloo, please respond to the first question.

HON. TITUS ALLOOLOO: Mr. Speaker, I will look into the Member's request to answer all three questions. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Allooloo. Oral questions.

Item 6, written questions.

Item 7, returns to written questions.

Item 8, replies to Opening Address. Item 9, petitions. Mr. Arngna'naaq.

ITEM 9: PETITIONS

MR. ARNGNA'NAAQ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to present Petition 3-12(2), signed by 193 residents of the community of Baker Lake. The petition, Mr. Speaker, is sponsored by the Hunters and Trappers Association of Baker Lake to request that the Minister of Renewable Resources make changes to the wildlife regulations in order to permit dogs to be fed caribou meat within the community. I suggest that all people who have dog teams, especially those who use the teams for hunting in the Northwest Territories, would agree with this request. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Arngna'naaq, as I said yesterday, try to keep to the title. Item 9, petitions.

Item 10, reports of standing and special committees.

Item 11, reports of committees on the review of bills.

Item 12, tabling of documents.

Item 13, notices of motions.

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

Item 15, 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; Bill 14, Appropriation Act, No. 1, 1992-93, with Mr. Nerysoo in the chair.

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

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

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): I call the committee to order. I believe we were dealing with the matter of Tabled Document 9-12(2), Strength at Two Levels. There was a matter on a point of order that was raised by Ms. Cournoyea. I believe a ruling was made earlier by the Speaker. However, I would like to read the ruling to the point of order raised by the honourable Member for Nunakput, Ms. Cournoyea, on February 25, 1992, while we were in committee of the whole discussing Tabled Document 9-12(2), Strength at Two Levels.

Chairman's Ruling

The point of order raised by Ms. Cournoyea was concerning an allegation made by the Member for Thebacha, Mrs. Marie-Jewell, on the capabilities of ordinary Members in understanding the tabled document.

This is the same point of order raised in formal session yesterday by Ms. Cournoyea, which the Speaker ruled on today. I also rule that the Member for Nunakput does have a point of order, and I would trust that Members show respect for the opinions of each other and provide the benefit of the doubt.

We are on page 13 of Strength at Two Levels. Are there any other comments? Mr. Lewis.

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since we are going through this document in some detail, I would like to make a comment on the business of efficiency. The report does deal in some detail with the difference between efficiency and effectiveness, and how effectiveness is measured in the relationship between cost and what you are getting out of the money being spent. What I would like to ask the

Government Leader is, since this is a focus of the report -- it is a crucial issue -- I refer to a middle paragraph on page 13, where it says, "For the purposes of this project, the term 'efficiency' was defined as the ratio of effectiveness to cost, and the project group was concerned with the many ways this ratio, or relationship, can be improved. For example, if ways could be found to increase effectiveness for the same cost, the result is greater efficiency."

There are lots of phrases in here which talk about many ways, different methods and so on. The project group identified this as an issue, and that all kinds of efficiencies could be gained if we really attempted to get far more benefits at a reduced cost, because we are faced with a decrease in the amount of money that we would have available to us in the future. I wonder if I can get a response to this. What are the many ways? I see this phrase being reiterated throughout the report: many this, many ways, many methods, and so on. It is very difficult to know exactly what the project group had in mind.

For most of us, although we can conceive that you can do things with a little bit less money, how can you get better results with less cost? This is what I gather from the report; that we could tighten up, spend less money, and yet we can get better results and that, then, is called "efficiency." The smaller amount of money you spend for a good quality result is, in fact, the measure of efficiency. Could we have some idea about the many ways in which this could be improved? I have looked through the report to find examples of how you can get better results for less money, but it is not very clear to me how you can do that.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): Madam Government Leader.

Page 149

Beatty Report Not Adopted By Cabinet

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member is asking me to defend a reading document which is a document that has really no legal status, as I understand. It has not been adopted by cabinet and it has not been adopted here. Some of the ideas in there are good ideas. Probably every one of us will disagree here and there that it is the best approach to take. The only thing that we can agree on is that the general public out there has thrown a great deal of criticism at this government in terms of how we are operating and where we are

spending our money, and I believe that once we move in past the process and begin looking at the various areas, then we can identify where those costs and benefits would be.

That work has not been done at this point in time. At this stage this is a document that has good points and bad points, and I do not believe that I want to sit here and defend and come to conclusions on certain matters, because the implementation has not begun yet. There are some ideas on areas where it makes a lot of sense to explore. However, the work has not been done yet, and I feel as though I am defending something that we have not even concluded or begun work on. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): Thank you. Page 13. Mr. Lewis.

MR. LEWIS: The intent of my question is to get a further understanding of what the document means, Mr. Chairman. I did not talk to any of the people that put the document together, and I did not talk to any of the people who advised the government. I did not talk to any person within the bureaucracy who was trying to make sense of it. The only intent in my asking this question, since the government has had several months to study the document -- they did commission it -- is that my assumption always is that when something is as important as this to the government, they would have studied it; they would have had expert advice on it; and they would have an understanding of it that I do not have. It is not because I am incapable, but because I do not know what thinking has gone into it.

My simple question is, what is the government's understanding of what that means? That you can, in fact, get an increase of effectiveness and there are many ways in which this ratio could be improved. In other words, you can get improved service but still not spend more money; in fact, you could spend less money. What I am trying to get at is, what is the government's understanding of how you do that? I have tried to think -- in fact, I thought a week ago about how you would do this. How would you get a better service but spend less on doing it? I went through a whole list of things to figure out if there was one example I could come up with in my own mind as to how you would do that. Presumably the government would have gone through the same exercise that I went through. How do you get increased effectiveness, if you like, or efficiency of government, with fewer resources and yet not lower the level of service but improve it?

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

Inefficiencies Of Duplication

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: I suppose, to give an example, if that is what the Member wants, the Department of Social Services and the Department of Health are run as two separate departments at this point in time. The inefficiencies that people have complained about is that when they want to access the Department of Health, it has one set of rules, policies and guidelines. They will go so far, and then it stops, and then they have to begin the process all over in accessing Social Services. The feeling of people all throughout the Northwest Territories is, why are not the Departments of Health and Social Services combined? Some of them have functions that are somewhat in duplication of each department. It is very difficult for an average person to move in and access the departments because of the duplication. As well, the functions are similar, so in collapsing Health and Social Services together, obviously the savings would be increased, presumably.

Once we go through the exercise, it appears from the outset that they would be somewhat reduced because of the administrative factor; rather than running two duplicate administrative factors to support Health and Social Services, you would have one. I am talking from some of the discussions that we have had, and once we go into the implementation I think that will flesh out a little bit more. Certainly, from the people's point of view, this has been an ongoing issue for some time, so in putting these two departments together you would probably have a better way of dealing with the duplication, and there would be administrative support and easier access by the clientele. That is one area, as an example, that would, at the outset, be more cost-effective and also provide easier access and eliminate some of the duplication. I do not know if that is what the Member is asking for, as an example.

For example, when you look at the Power Corporation and petroleum products delivery, each agency in the communities has a tankage system, and from time to time, in the last while, the issue has been how much of a tankage system is required at the community level since they are very expensive commodities. In putting the two together I would presume that we would have, collectively, much more capacity for storage for all the needs of the communities. Thank you.

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

MR. LEWIS: Thank you. I appreciate the Government Leader's identifying an area in which she has some familiarity as the former Minister of Health, but I would like to narrow it down even further, using the example that the Minister has used. I can see that there is an inconvenience to a person who has to go to two different places for the same services. It is not clear to me what it is that is duplicated in Health and Social Services. What is the precise thing that you have to go to two different places to get? That is not quite clear. What is duplicated in those two places?

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

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: An example is for removal and travel when you are accessing health services. This is one area where there has been a continued complaint, that once you leave the Department of Health and if, you are indigent, and go to another department, such as the Department of Social Services, oftentimes both departments are not working collectively in how we are going to support people who have to have medical assistance. Social Services does have a program that people can access after a certain point under certain guidelines.

Those two things often cause a great deal of anxiety and apprehension at the community level when people are not well and they really do need medical treatment. So those two have been causing a lot of concern, and if we can put those two functions together you would have a one-window approach when a person comes and it gets dealt with, so it is not going from one department and starting over in another department.

Page 150

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

MR. LEWIS: Is that not just a simple policy question? If I know my circumstance and what it is that I need, the government is there to provide policy; this is a policy issue; this is how we handle it. So does this mean that the government has failed to have policy so that it is clear where you get a particular service in our government, and it has nothing to do with amalgamation at all but a lack of clarity of policy?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): Government Leader.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: No, Mr. Chairman, that is not the case. If you are living in a larger area, a regional centre, probably we would have more access to having people move around, although the complaint is right here in Yellowknife as well. There may be a grey area in how you deal with a person, a person's financial ability to pay. But when you go to a small community, for example a community of 500 or less, you would have the social service worker, and you would have the health centre station. The health centre would have a certain criterion that they deal with and that is their job.

Basically this government is departmentalized, and it has been trying to meet the criticisms we have in Health and Social Services. When a person goes to access a service at a smaller community -- and I did not hear any fewer complaints in Yellowknife, Inuvik or Hay River -- they go into the health centre. The health centre can do so much, and then after that point in time they have to contact the social service worker. If the social service worker is not clear on the details, they would go either to a regional level or to the Yellowknife level. It depends on what the area of request is.

So it is not as simple as just policies. It is how those two departments dovetail into each other. There are all kinds of circumstances, and I am sure while we are moving through the implementation stage, when we are putting those departments together, we will deal with what those issues are and the concerns that are there, so that when we finally come to a conclusion we would do an adequate job on meeting those guidelines. I do not believe we will totally get rid of guidelines, because those have to exist. But it is an easy movement from one department to another for a person's social or medical needs. That is just an example. There are a lot of other things as well. Thank you.

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

"Northwest Territories Way"

MR. TODD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I could get clarification. On page 19 it says, "The Department of Health must be given every possible encouragement to continue with implementation of its 'Northwest Territories Way' model for health delivery and rationalization of hospital facilities." Let us say hypothetically that I disagree with that particular recommendation and cabinet agrees with that recommendation. What process is there in this discussion, in the review of this, for me to express my

position in a vote? I know I have spoken on a number of occasions on the "Northwest Territories Way" because my constituents have asked me to. I am not convinced that reducing the level of service of health is the answer. I do, however, recognize that it is the largest financial commitment of the budget. However, I am not prepared to support the Northwest Territories model if it is going to jeopardize the health of the constituents that I represent. What I am wondering is, where is the process for me to express to this government, with this document, that I wish this government not to proceed with the "Northwest Territories Way"? I am using it hypothetically; Is there a process?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): You noted page 19 and we are only on page 13 at the moment. Despite that, I will allow the honourable Minister to answer if she chooses to.

MR. TODD: I was only using it as an example. There may be other contentious areas; there are also other areas we can support, obviously. It is in terms of process that I am asking here. Where there is a dispute, how do we determine the process for ordinary Members' participation in expressing their concerns? Rather than using "Northwest Territories Way," we will just talk to the principle of the thing.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): Government Leader.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I did send a letter today to the MLAs who had their names put forward, setting out a process of how we are going to be dealing with implementation. If they are still willing, at the earliest convenience, we will sit down. The Members working with them would be Mr. Pollard, myself and Mr. Kakwi. We will form the working team on the implementation. That was the intent from the beginning.

As well, I would also like to indicate that we have not implemented anything in the document. We have not set one policy. We have not made one decision. I want to assure the Members that we have not done that. The process has been set up, and some of the suggestions have been put forward for implementation and the work to be done from here on.

In terms of the "Northwest Territories Way," I know there are a number of issues in there, but I want to read you three or four broader areas that are known as the "Northwest Territories Way."

"A broad approach to health which includes the improvements to health which come from outside the health care system, such as housing and sanitation; emphasis on health promotion and disease prevention and delivery of health services; delegation of responsibility for providing care from medical specialist to family physicians, from family physician to nurses, and from nurses to other providers of care; and involvement of the people in the planning and management of the health care system."

Mr. Chairman, this is the general idea on those issues. What is in this Strength at Two Levels -- we have not drawn anything out of it, we have not made any decisions on what we are going to do with it and we have not set one policy. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): Mr. Todd.

Priorities Of Government

MR. TODD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Where I am having some difficulty is that I am not sure what the priorities are of this government. First of all, I do recognize the need for restraint. Secondly, I recognize the need for change. I want to say that up front. There is no question, and I have said on a number of occasions, we have to cut where it is fattest to protect where it is leanest.

MR. LEWIS: There is no fat.

MR. TODD: The thing is, what I am having difficulty with is that when we look at some of these recommendations that are coming forward, I still have not got a clear understanding of what the priorities of this government are. Are our three priorities to ensure that people have food, shelter and employment? If these are the basic principles, then the changes have to reflect these principles. I had some real difficulty when I looked at the capital budget, for example, and

Page 151

some of the things that came forward, because I think they are all inter-related. You cannot look at one without looking at the other. I could not quite get a feel for where the priorities of this government were. Is it more important to put parks into communities or to build houses for people who need shelter? Is it more important to look after people's health or to build legislative assembly buildings? So I personally have a real struggle here trying to determine what the priorities are of this government. To me, the priorities

should be making sure people have got shelter and food in their mouths and making the best effort to find people employment, and I have to view this document in that light; so I am a little confused as to how I would approach some of these recommendations and how I would support some of these recommendations if they do not relate to the principles of what I see as priorities. Do you understand what I am trying to say, or am I jumping all over the place?

You know, if I may, we talk about Arctic College. Education is an important subject to many. We talk about Arctic College and some of the changes we want to make there, yet we still have not solved the problem of getting kids out of school with a decent education. To me, the priority is education, so I view this document with respect to, how can it best serve the interests of the kids in school? It may be a little philosophical, but that is the dilemma I am in right now. I have to view the document as I view the basic needs of Northerners. I am not sure, in a number of situations, that they necessarily reflect the basic needs of some of the Northerners, and that is why I was asking the question. I want to be able to stand up in areas which I have got some serious concerns with and be able to voice my opinion and opposition to that particular part of the report and also, at the same time, my support for the parts of the report that I can support. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): Thank you. The Government Leader.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: I think that there has been, and not on our part here, but in the Strength at Two Levels report -- as cabinet or as a government we are not bound to implement every recommendation. I agree with the Member that there should be some guiding principles, but one of the problems we have had in the past is exactly what he mentioned -- education, health. He did not mention education -- those are the areas where we have an automatic request or obligation to support. We have to support that. What we have been finding is that with the fiscal arrangement we have and with the resources we have, we are not going to be able to meet those basic areas that were just mentioned, and I do not think there will be any question that there is no support for those basic principles, none whatsoever. However, in trying to meet those basic principles on where we are going to finance them from, we have got into a problem. Where do we make some cost savings so we can continue to just take care of those basic needs, and that is a problem we faced right from the beginning. I believe that in

looking at that in the past, what we have been told is that there are funds available but it is being burnt up in areas that are really not necessary. I think that is a very strong statement from many areas. We are burning up money in the wrong areas, and I believe that this document, which we have not adopted in cabinet, is a reference document, and I think that opportunity, as we are going into the implementation, will have that course. If we make any changes to the consolidation or whatever in the process it would have to come to this Legislative Assembly, which would say "yea" or "nay." We would appear before standing committees giving a program of activities that can be expressed at that level as well. So I do not want to belabour a long statement, but to say yes, the basic principles -- we stand by them. And right now, in order to support those basic principles we have to find the resources to support them, and that is all we are attempting to do, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. TODD: You know, Madam Leader, I want to be assured and I need to feel comfortable that we are not going to balance the budget on the backs of the communities. We are not going to balance the budget on the people who have least. That is my fear here, and this document is part of balancing the budget and is an integrated document. I need to be assured, and I need some level of comfort that when we look at these things we are not looking at things from purely a monetary point of view. Other considerations have to come into the argument. I recognize the difficulties, do not misunderstand me, and I know things are not being run as well. There is no stronger advocate for change than I have been, but our job, and my job -- after waiting 20 years to get this job -- is to make sure that the little guy in Arviat, Whale Cove and Rankin Inlet is protected in a sense, and he is represented in a responsible manner. And I need some assurances that when we look at the changes that are necessary, other arguments besides only monetary ones, and other considerations have to be taken into place. It seems to me that in some of this document, which I will talk to later, there is a preoccupation, if you want, with the need to save money, which is understandable. It is a bit of a contradiction, what I am going to say, but not necessarily taking into consideration the impact it is going to have on the people at the community level. Now, last weekend I got a call, for example, if I may -- and I realize that they perhaps over-reacted -- but the community of Whale Cove absolutely panicked because for some reason they had got some indication that the

Northwest Territories --- we were going to close the nursing station and the nurse was going to go bye-bye. Now I do realize it is an over-reaction, but it is symptomatic of the kinds of concerns I have, and it is my responsibility as the MLA for that region to ensure that the interests of the ones who cannot represent themselves are represented. And again I reiterate, my concern here is, recognizing the difficulties we are in, knowing there is a need for change and being supportive of it. And I want to say that today, being supportive of the need for change, other factors have to be taken into consideration.

We have got to ensure that if we are going to amalgamate Health and Social Services, for example, that it is going to deliver a better level of service to the communities. We have to ensure that if we are going to turn over drug and alcohol and public works responsibilities to municipal government, they have the capabilities, they have the manpower, and they have the financial resources to do it. I mean, if we as a government, with the kind of wealth we have had in the past, were unable to do the job well, I am not so sure that unless we put the resources in behind people, that they will be able to do any better. And that is all I am asking for; a kind of approach of caution with some consideration outside of the monetary component which we seem to be totally preoccupied with lately. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Madam Government Leader.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: The Minister of Finance will speak a little on that, but I just want to assure the Member that I have been trying to say that all week. I have repeated and repeated that intention. This is why we tried to set up a process so that everyone knows what the process is going to be so that when we begin doing the work on it, they know who is doing what and what we are going to do about it.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arvaluk): Mr. Pollard.

HON. JOHN POLLARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that we step back and look at where this document came from. Mr. Lewis can correct me if I am wrong, but I believe -- and you yourself, sir -- were on

Page 152

the standing committee on finance when the recommendation was made to the government that

they do a base review. During the fourth year of the government's term, the then Minister of Finance, Mr. Ballantyne, came to us and said we are going to have to review government. He asked us to participate in the process. I think we refused by saying it is the government's job to get the document done. We told him how we feel about it, and I think Mr. Lewis is on record as reserving the right to criticize the document. I see that he is exercising that right during this session, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, when the document arrived, it arrived from one government to another government. It arrived in my office one day. There was agreement in cabinet to release it immediately, without reading it. There was agreement in cabinet that we should be open and up front. We delivered it to the House the next day. When we delivered it to this House at the last session, Mr. Chairman, we did not know any more about what was in there than the Members who eventually got the document. But it soon became apparent to us as we read through the document and went over it with our staff, that not all the things in the document suited what we as a government or this Legislative Assembly would want to do. I think the number of usable items in here may be as low as 70 per cent. We admit that as much as 30 per cent -- maybe more -- is chaff.

We could have reviewed the document and pulled out the good parts, and written our own story about what we wanted to do. We could have then delivered it to the House and said this is what the government wants to do. But we did not do that. We released the entire thing and said it is the information we have before us. We said this is a document we would like to put into the House and that some of the things are attractive to us. We have said it before, and we will say it again.

I want to make some specific references to Mr. Todd's comments with regard to the transfer of responsibilities and the financial aspect of that. This government has experienced for some time, Mr. Chairman -- and you are well aware of it -- the fact that Ottawa transfers responsibilities to us and does not ultimately give us enough money to operate the program. I do not see where we as a government would be doing that to our own communities. I think that when Mr. Todd refers to the capital budget as being locked into this quest for efficiency that we have in government when he says we should be building parks or houses, it is always the government's responsibility to look after the people it has responsibility for. But Mr. Todd also said he wants

people to get jobs and he wants an economy. Governments have to balance the spending that they do with an area of requirement by people of the Northwest Territories. At the same time, we have to be asking ourselves how the economy can be stimulated to create some jobs. We are constantly wrestling with how we should spend money, where we should spend money, and trying to balance that between the social needs of the people of the Northwest Territories and a future which we hope will have a stronger economy. We worked it back and forth and said we should do certain things because, ultimately, they will create some wealth and it is an investment for jobs down the road. It is difficult. This House has to decide when those budgets pass through the House, whether or not we have placed priorities in the right areas.

Duplication In Government Departments

There is a lot of duplication in government. That occurs for a number of reasons, Mr. Chairman. The fact that responsibilities have come from Ottawa at different times over the last 20 years or more, and when they come you lump them into another department or you just create a new department. I think there is a recognition, not only in the Northwest Territories but across Canada, that there are enough reasons to suspect duplication in departments that it makes sense to examine putting the departments together. I do not think any of us on this side have any idea of the kinds of things we would have to go through to put the Departments of Health and Social Services together. These are some of the things that we would like to explore. We may get into it and find that it might not work. But, I think there is a gut feeling that it would make sense because it deals with many of the same things people in the Northwest Territories are complaining about or have need of.

Certainly, Mr. Todd is complaining about the finances. Certainly, we are being driven like we have never been driven before by the fact that we do not have enough money. We are looking at ways of doing things that, as Mr. Lewis says, cost us less and yet we can deliver an effective program.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate to this committee that the ultimate decision on whether we go ahead with these things rests on the floor of this House. The ultimate decision for proceeding -- if there are legislative changes, it will have to go to the standing committee on legislation; if there are changes to boards and agencies, it has to go to Mr. Koe's committee; if there are financial ramifications to the

legislation or to the boards and agencies, it has to go to the standing committee on finance. We have said from day one that any changes we are going to make structurally to this government, where it affects any one of these three committees, will be delivered to that committee for either ratification or consultation from the committee to the floor of this House. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. TODD: First of all, I would like to thank the Minister of Finance for clarifying where I get my right to voice my opinion in a yes or no. I would, however, like to add that while we say the transfer from the federal government to the Government of the Northwest Territories has, in some cases, not been adequate and that we would do exactly the same, we have done the same in the past. We have transferred responsibility to municipalities. In some cases, municipalities have not had the level of financing or increase in financing that has been necessary over the last eight or nine years. We have transferred drug and alcohol responsibility to some communities, and the level of financing has not been in place. No matter how well intentioned we all are -- and I believe we are all well intentioned in this exercise -- we must ensure that we are not passing along the problems. We must pass along the solutions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arvaluk): Mr. Pollard.

Legislative Assembly Responsible For NWT People

HON. JOHN POLLARD: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate Mr. Todd's comments, and I may be getting into Mr. Kakfwi's area, and if I am, I apologize. When we get into community transfer, I think we said at the very beginning: 1) What are we prepared to transfer? 2) How are we prepared to transfer it? 3) Will those communities be ready to receive that transfer? 4) If they are not, how will we bring them up to speed? 5) What is the point of transferring responsibility to a community if they do not have the funds to operate the program?

I realize that Mr. Todd is saying that it has been done in the past, but I think when we started out with this exercise in this book, those five principles are what we first looked at. There is no point in spinning our wheels and giving something to somebody if they cannot operate it, or they cannot afford it and we eventually get it back. Ultimately, the people of the

Northwest Territories, no matter who is delivering the program to them, are the responsibility of this Legislative Assembly. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arvaluk): Thank you. We are on page 13. Do you want to comment on that, Mr. Lewis?

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to refer to page 13 again, but in light of the comments that have been made by other Members on the whole intention of this report --because on page 13 we are still talking about the report, the terms of reference, the organization, question of efficiency and so on -- I would like to point out, not to correct Mr. Pollard but, in fact, to confirm what he said, that when the standing committee on finance recommended to the Minister of Finance that we undertake a base review, then it was my understanding at that time that it would be a base review; that we would look at levels of service and whether we are, in fact, funding things properly.

Years ago, before we had a formula funding agreement with the federal government, there used to be an annual visit. We used to go down to Ottawa with our caps in our hands, and we were always using the words "base review" because the kinds of resources that we have in order to handle the problems are really not adequate. It is not a good base, it needs to be adjusted, and so on. When we went into the formula funding agreement, there were all kinds of different formulas put in there to really help you to adjust your base as you go along.

The purpose I understood, as Mr. Pollard's deputy on that standing committee on finance, was that we ourselves, at least the government, was, going to look at its base. In other words, what is the base of our operation? What is the level of service that we are providing? Do we have the proper resources to provide it? That is what we were doing.

When we looked at the terms of reference that the government gave the project team, it was somewhat different from a base review. That would be just one element of the total project. I have not gone in detail through the appendices, but this document is really not a base review in the way that we normally use the term "base review."

Criticism Regarding Timing Of Transfer

The concern that I have in looking at this issue of efficiency on page 13 is this, Mr. Chairman: I have heard the criticism many, many times, and it has already been reiterated by Mr. Todd here, that there is always going to be a sense of uncertainty and a sense that the government is choosing the wrong time to be doing these things. Why did this proposal not come forward years ago when there was all kinds of money around, things were great, and people seemed to have all kinds of money to do interesting projects? But now times are tough, really tough. They are so tough, in fact, that we want you to handle it. We give it to you now because we do not have the kind of money that we need to run government. I have heard that criticism already. We have a wonderful example. When things get tough, then suddenly we say, "Well, you guys run it." Or we screw something -- I should not use the word screw, I suppose, Mr. Chairman, but we mess something up or we have not done a very good job of it, so we say, "Okay, we will get somebody else to do it; they can look after it."

You are going to find that this argument here about efficiency, about doing more with less -- we are going to ask somebody else to do that now. We have not been able to do it, and we have been in existence for 20-odd years, but now we are telling people in communities, who have enough struggles, "You guys do more with less. We have done more with more but you guys are going to have to do more with less." That is going to be the challenge that this government is going to have to face if it is going to have any credibility in this transfer process. That is the first point I want to make.

Redesign Of Programs By Communities

The second point, which follows from this, Mr. Chairperson, is that we are assuming that when we are looking at effectiveness and efficiency we are talking about programs that we may have a statutory responsibility for, or we may be running programs which we want to delegate or pass on to another order of government, but it could very well be that the communities will say, "Those are your programs; they never worked for you; how do you think they are going to work for us? We never designed them. You did." In this transfer agreement or the proposal to do things in a different way, to reshape things, you may find that communities are going to say, "Those are your programs; there are all kinds of rules and regulations and everything else, because you set them up to do them the way you want to do them. Is

there going to be any place in here, not just to have us measure against your system or your effectiveness or your ideas of efficiency -- can we have our own programs? Is there any way at all, any flexibility, so we can design the things that matter most to us? Not just give us a menu. 'You can have fish or beef, but you cannot have anything else; that is all we are going to offer you.'

Would it be possible not to just be caught in this whole business of delegating something to somebody else because that is what we would like people to do, but to look at the whole business of having people look at government and say, "This is the way we see things. What you do is not exactly what we ever had in mind, but we would like to do something a bit different." Instead of taking over this and taking over that, could we not -- let me think of an example. Suppose people in some small place said, "Look, this system of sending people away to corrections is not working; that is hopeless for us. We want to handle all that stuff ourselves. We will set up a bush camp, and people can go there, and that is the way we want to handle that problem. You may not have that in your system on any kind of a developed basis, but we would like to do something like that." If we are going to reshape government, if you like, at the local level, how are we going to be simply caught in the web of talking about effectiveness or efficiency, with the way we do things, the way you are going to have to do things according to the same criteria that we do, but with fewer funds? Is that kind of option going to be open to people? I have heard some of my colleagues say that that is likely what communities are going to want to have. They are going to want to have not just simply delegated programs but some room, if you like, to develop some initiatives of their own, which currently they cannot.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arvaluk): Mr. Pollard.

HON. JOHN POLLARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Lewis is correct. This is not a base review, but it was what the government of the day chose to do. I understand Mr. Lewis when he says it should have been done when governments had a lot of money. I would just draw your attention to page five, which says, "Our government is facing lower revenue growth, and increasing expenditure pressures. We must be prepared to make some hard decisions in the near future - decisions about what we expect from government..." and it goes on, and I will let you read it yourself. That was the budget address, February 1991, when Mr. Ballantyne was experiencing the

pressure of running out of money. Maybe that is what triggered this review.

We accept that some communities may not want to

Page 154

take on responsibilities, Mr. Chairman. We also accept the fact that communities may want to say to Mr. Kakfwi, "Well, I am sorry, but I do not want it under your rules." I think Mr. Kakfwi is prepared to be flexible and look at that with the communities.

I would point out, Mr. Chairman, when we are talking about the new capital process where we are going to be consulting more with MLAs and people in communities, there will be some discretion in that capital process for communities to say, "Well, we are going to prioritize items that we want you to do," which I think puts a little more of the decision-making process on the communities. There may even be some instances in these transfers where there may be block funding transfers and communities do what they want. Maybe in housing -- I do not know what Mr. Morin has planned, but I think we would be open to that. And again, I am moving into Mr. Patterson's area but I also know that Mr. Patterson, on the community justice system, is prepared to sit down with communities and talk about the very thing that Mr. Lewis has just raised, which is not sending people off to a corrections facility, which costs us a whole lot of money, and I am not sure how much good it does. So I think in that one, communities would be able to participate in the justice system at their level, take care of people who have run afoul of the system, and it might save Mr. Whitford, who is the present Minister, a lot of money in the corrections system.

So those things and all of those things are open for negotiation and discussion. I think I would have to let you ask Mr. Kakfwi for more specifics in how he intends to go about the negotiations for the transfer, but just in general terms, Mr. Chairman, I would say that all of those things are on the table.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arvaluk): Thank you. Before we go any further on this, I would like to take a 15 minute break.

---SHORT RECESS

The meeting will come to order. Thank you for your promptness in arriving in the House so that we may proceed quickly. On the list, Mr. Pudlat, and for page 13 of the Beatty report.

MR. PUDLAT: (Translation) On page 13 in the centre, in the English translation it is not properly exact; the wording is not the exact same. For instance, it says that social services recipients, the people that are receiving social services, have to have a grade nine level of education, and since the report has been given to us, we now know that. As elders we used to know quite a bit about receiving social assistance. I have not heard in the Northwest Territories an announcement about the guidelines for social assistance to be received by individuals. One thing that we should be getting assistance for is because they have taken our dog-teams away that we used to use quite some time ago.

I think we will have to teach our younger people how to live off the land as well as living off their full-time employment. For this reason, perhaps I could ask the Government Leader, on page 13 there is a paragraph in there that states that if you have never asked for social assistance before the government came, but since the government is here now, we see social assistance and we are used to receiving social assistance now, and I just wondered whether only the people that have reached grade nine can receive social assistance. As I said before, I think you realize now that the reason why we do not know very much about the report is because we were not involved at the beginning.

In regard to the second paragraph, it says that about 80 per cent of NWT residents receive social assistance. The reason why I ask this question is that, because the GNWT is in fiscal restraint, it seems as though they want to do away with social assistance more than ever. I am not teaching my children to provide for themselves off the land. Perhaps you understand my question. If you are not clear on the question I am asking, perhaps I could clarify it further. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arvaluk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Pudlat. We will keep your comments in mind, but we will go over further the concerns you have later on when we get to the appendix. Mr. Pudluk.

Concerns About Transfer Problems

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a few comments. I am not against the report we are talking about, Strength at Two Levels. However, the concerns that we have, especially for the smaller communities regarding the transfer of responsibilities -- I have some doubts if we were to make this report a reality. First, I would like to

say what the MLA for Yellowknife Centre stated very clearly. How come the report is here now? How come this was not done previously? When the government was first being formed in the communities, it was under DIAND, and there were a number of programs introduced. For that reason our tradition has changed.

After those programs were introduced, the Government of the Northwest Territories was introduced. The GNWT found that a number of federal programs were not completed. It costs a lot of money to use those programs and those programs that were not completed -- they lost a great deal of money because of that. After that, most of the communities became hamlets, and the people of the communities were happy when the communities became hamlets because they would have more responsibilities in their communities. It was obvious that the money that was given by the government was not enough, and the people who were working in the communities are now working for the hamlet. When they started working for the community, the hamlet, one of the concerns and hardship they had was that there was no housing available. Also, before, they were allowed holidays twice a year, and when they moved to the hamlet office they were only allowed holidays once a year. The government did not have sufficient money. These are my concerns.

When the responsibilities are transferred, I am afraid that the funding will not be sufficient for the responsibilities and the capital dollars will not be there according to the responsibilities today. I am afraid the government will not give enough money so that they can run the programs. It will be harder for the communities. These are my concerns. I do not want to see the communities not be given enough money to run their programs.

On page 13 it will be run smoothly, but we know that there will be difficulties. The Strength at Two Levels report is lengthy and we would have to read it several times to understand the content. For this reason I wanted to voice my concerns while we are here.

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

HON. JOHN POLLARD: Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier on this afternoon, we share the same concerns about transferring responsibility and not transferring enough money for those programs to be run efficiently and properly and to be delivered in a good fashion to people. We share the same concerns. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arvaluk): Any other comments on page 13? Mr. Nerysoo.

Page 155

Problem Of Enforcing Agreements

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I listened with interest to the comments that have been made by Members and some of the replies that were given, and I believe that one of the problems that we have, even in terms of reorganization or restructuring, is that we tried that before, and that we tried that in the last government. The fact is that we created more departments. We moved certain responsibilities from one department into others. On the medical side, let me remind the Members here, we moved medical transportation in the new board of management areas under the responsibility of Government Services. We are still in a debt situation of \$31 million in medical transportation for status Indians. It has nothing to do, really, with whether or not it is organized -- organized to a point where you are trying to save money by restructuring -- but whether or not our financial agreements are such that the Government of Canada is going to live up to its obligations to us.

The other point I wanted to make to you is that in the Inuvik hospital, for instance, and maybe I can give you an example of this. There is a suggestion that Public Works is responsible for the maintenance of that hospital, yet we have reconstructed the lobby of that hospital four times in the last two years. Now, I do not know what it is that we are supposed to do in terms of those kinds of expenditures. Those are points that, when you talk about saving money or cost savings, you have to reconsider. I want, also, to say to you that when you talk about cost savings -- and right now I can probably say that the Inuvik General Hospital, or the Sahtu Delta/Beaufort board, may have a surplus of money, but the question I have is, well, how many nurses have not been hired to fill positions in that hospital, or even in the nursing stations? The question in reorganizing is, how do you talk about reorganizing if the services are not being provided?

I am not opposed to the ideas and the concerns that have been raised, or the proposals that have been made by our government to reorganize to deliver the service better, in a more co-ordinated manner, but I can tell you from past experiences that that just did not seem to happen. If the intention is to correct those irregularities and those problem areas, then I agree with you; but if those problems are going to

continue to remain, then the whole purpose of considering reorganization is not going to work.

Insecurity About Employment And Government Policies

The other point I want to make to you is, there has been a great deal of discussion over the past few months about how people are all of a sudden going to be losing jobs, and I can tell you that is not very helpful to the morale of the public servants. They themselves understand the matter of cost reduction. They know that at some time some significant decisions are going to be made, but we came into this process in terms of reassessing the organization of our government almost with the view that there will be these massive layoffs in our public service, and I do not think that is very helpful, whether or not it is in McPherson, or whether or not it is in Aklavik, or whether or not it is in Inuvik, or for that matter the Keewatin or the Kitikmeot. The fact is that people are not secure about whether or not they can continue to work for our government.

The other aspect I wanted to point out in reorganizing is that I listened to the comments that were made by Mr. Todd about the points of people in the communities and in the regions wanting to be secure about the policies of our government. I have the same feeling, because if the intention is to downsize government, then how is that downsizing going to affect the whole idea of more northern people, and more aboriginal people specifically, being employed and being given the opportunity to train for positions in government? I think those policies, while they may have been good, have to coincide; otherwise you lose sight of the intention and the good direction that was laid out previously.

I wanted to make one other point, and that was this: I agree in some instances with the Government Leader on dealing with the question of the whole matter of tank farms, and the government requirements and the public or the Power Corporation requirements almost contradicting one another, or at least not having any streamlining, but the fact is that the oil lubricants or petroleum lubricants responsibility is far more than that. It is the purchasing and the selling of those products in communities, and so the question I have is, what does that mean in terms of other businesses, or the co-ops, or individuals, or communities, and their participation and their ability to sell, purchase, or to establish a business that is going to take on that responsibility? Yesterday when I mentioned that, that is the point that I was getting at. I can understand all

of the matters of the duplication of purchasing and the duplication of establishing tank farms. That was the crux of the issue that I was most concerned about. It is that other aspect: not the tank farms but the aspect of purchasing and selling petroleum products.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arvaluk): Thank you, Mr. Nerysoo. Ms. Cournoyea.

Implementation Will Answer Questions

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, first of all I believe that a lot of these questions get answered when you go into an implementation of how we are going to achieve these goals. I believe, to my understanding, there is a very strong desire in communities where it does not take place right now, where the community selling is very well received by co-ops and individuals. I do not see that changing at all. Mainly our concern is the facility for storage. I think the idea is to set up storage facilities in such a way that anyone can draw from them, including the Power Corporation. The actual community gas pumps or petroleum delivery stay the same. The intention is not to take away from the privatization that is there already; it was to make better use of the tank farms because they are, as you know, an expensive commodity.

When we went into this -- certainly from my point of view we always seem to ad hoc it. We would do a little bit here and do a little bit there. We do not grab a hold of the whole problem. This government has never advocated massive layoff but these are generally the fears that have been created because of what we are trying to do; but we have never advocated that.

In looking at the turnover rate, particularly in health professionals and teachers, the turnover rate, particularly in the communities, is very large. I do not think that is going to stop. What is the question there? Why are teachers not aboriginal people? I believe that if we bring this decision closer to home, maybe the people in the community could see where the education system fits into a requirement for people to be involved, in directing how we are going to move people from a grade level to a professional level.

I really understand what is being said. I think any time we try to do something different or try to attack a problem, there are always fears. I think whether we manifest those fears or whether we try to go into it in a positive light and say, "Look, all the concerns and

issues about civil servants -- what they are, how many there are, where they are, bringing our own people into the professional stream -- those things are not going to go away until we address the fundamental issue of how we are going to do it." It is true, we have not been terribly successful in meeting the stated feeling at a

Page 156

community level for people to feel that they want to be a teacher, they want to be a nurse, they want to be a doctor, they want to be a financial wizard within their community, because all those are positions which are available. The difficulty we are going to have is to have the proper climate and environment so that people want to take those responsibilities on and feel that they are just as good as anyone else and they can do it. I think it is an attitude that we have to create.

Why have we not been successful in the past? A lot of it comes down to community support. How does a community find meaning? I guess the more communities that are involved, I think, we will get a better result at the end, I agree. Certainly those comments about whether we are going to take something away from privatization, that is not the intent at all.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arvaluk): Thank you, Ms. Cournoyea. Mr. Gargan.

Cost Reduction By Simplifying

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With regard to the last paragraph with regard to the report itself, it indicates, "Many people will argue that cost and quality of service to the public is an inevitable trade-off. It is the conclusion of the project group that this is not the case. Productivity and organization experts around the world agree that quality improvement which results from simplification and streamlining often leads to large cost reductions. In the GNWT, as restraint/consolidation/ simplification become the required beacons of management, it is important to emphasize improvement in quality of service to the public as you promote cost-containment. Some people will have trouble accepting this..." I would like to ask the Government Leader if she could explain what is meant by that.

My interpretation is that simplifying would mean there would be a reduction in the amount of red tape a person may have to go through. And it would also

lead to a cost reduction. So the intention here is that you deliver a program to the communities and you allow the dollars to go with that program; that means there is going to be someone that is going to be out of a job, maybe in the Finance Department and also the Social Services office, for example. And then the communities would use the Social Assistance Act to administer social assistance. Am I on the right track?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arvaluk): Ms. Cournoyea.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: The Member might be on the right track, but I think it is sort of premature because we have not gone into the implementation. But I think what this paragraph really is stating, and I do not want to defend the project team's analysis, but often in other parts of the country when you try to streamline or put together, the system says you cannot do that because you need all those people. And it is found that in areas where they have done the streamlining before, and consolidated, it works well and sometimes it works better. Because probably people are more driven by a more direct process than by what they have to do.

Say, for example, if two people are handling similar things, maybe one person can handle that job and then the client would not have to go to two people. I guess it is really just the way that we have taken over responsibilities. We have not rationalized that. There generally would be a fear created because a whole lot of different people have different functions that are similar but who would not see that maybe there would be streamlining and maybe one person could do a really super job rather than working half time or whatever.

I think it is just an opinion that is being placed in this report, an analysis, looking at how other people have viewed streamlining in other constituencies. But in the end it was not really found that it was not necessarily true. Maybe one could really do a super job; pay the person more and make the job more oriented to a different function. So I think this is just an opinion from experience from these people.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arvaluk): Any other comments from page 13? Page 14. Mr. Gargan.

MR. GARGAN: Mr. Chairman, we do have three people that were from the communities and three people that were from out of the Territories, two from Winnipeg and one from Ottawa. There are six people from the regional offices. February 27th was when this new initiative was addressed in the budget last

year by Mr. Ballantyne. The working groups got together in February and, I think, dissolved around June. When did this working group dissolve? I know Jim Antoine said he started in February to June and that was it. Who did this actual final analysis of this report? You had an election in there, and I do not know if there was any kind of direction given to this project group with regard to the end result of this report. I need to get that clarified because there are two large documents done and it seems it is more of a government initiative or bureaucratic issue. But the group got together and worked with each other for approximately four months. The end result is this book. Who has done this report? Who has put it together?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arvaluk): Ms. Cournoyea.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: This is a collaborate effort with the team groups. I will not go over the team group again because it is on page six. The idea was to take a number of people -- some people have had experience at community government levels, regional levels and also some system people from the bureaucracy within the territorial government.

The head of the group was Mr. Beatty, but the report was written by all the people who were on as full-time people for that period of time. They were either seconded from their positions or given a contract for that period of time. These people collectively wrote the report, and it was presented and signed in June. Once they concluded the report, the team members went over the report again. This was contracted out. So even though it was a government initiative to try to find ways and means of addressing the criticism of how we run the government, how we can do it better, this was a contract piece of work. The person who was the head of the group had a long-standing reputation in dealing with systems in governments all across Canada and other places. So that was the head of the team. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arvaluk): To keep the very fast pace going, I would ask the Members to try to keep to the page we are discussing. Page 14. Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

North Becoming A Welfare State

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have some comments with respect to page 14, particularly with respect to findings of the review project. If you look through the page, basically what this says is that the North is now becoming a welfare

state, if I can use the term, and the North is becoming totally dependent on government, in particular social assistance, and it is growing and the cost of it to the government, and how the government inherited and how they have to address all the problems of unemployment, drug and alcohol abuse and poor housing.

When you think of it, this government was basically created in the latter part of the 1960s, taking into account, from what I

Page 157

recall, that prior to that people were fairly independent and did not depend on society to address issues in a monetary way. The native way was to basically share what we had and to use the resources we could from the land.

However, government came in in the 1960s and basically indicated that the housing was not adequate. "You do not live in good conditions and we are going to fix all this up for you." And as the years went by, they developed all these programs, such as housing and social assistance. If they felt you did not make enough money, they gave you money to go and buy food, clothing, and at the same time they basically said, "if you do not look after your kids, well, we will take them away," and all these types of things that caused many social problems.

I want to make a few points, because I am concerned that in the North we are becoming a welfare state. I am not saying no other jurisdiction is a welfare state of the government, because I believe every jurisdiction in Canada is a state of the government. They all rely to a great degree on the federal government. However, it is becoming obvious that our jurisdiction is increasing rapidly, to the point where people feel it is a right to take advantage of all these benefits the government gives them. They feel it is a right to go out and get social assistance, not recognizing that they lost the focus on thinking that social assistance is for people only in need, and the system is set up to encourage people to stay home, even though I recognize that in many of the communities there are no jobs. Where there are jobs, many times the system is set up to encourage people to basically consider living off welfare. I guess as an individual I am concerned about that, because all I think is that the more dependent we become on government, the more social problems we are going to face. As a result of it, I think when you become a dependant of government, probably your violence and

crime continually increase, because a person's esteem becomes very, very low; and when a person's self-esteem becomes very low people think in a different mentality and they become discouraged to try to get out of the system.

But I did want to state that it is government's fault in many ways that allowed this dependency. They basically stated to people, "No, you and your children cannot live off the land in an outpost settlement or in a camp. You have to take advantage of our educational system and you have to send your kids to school, so therefore you have to live in the community," not recognizing that to develop a school system that would accommodate their way of life. I find it extremely difficult now that we want to say that we want to...

MR. LEWIS: Point of order. I am a little bit deaf, Mr. Chairperson, and I am trying to use this to listen to the Member speaking, but the conversation to my right is a very interesting one and I find it hard to listen to both of them.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arvaluk): Thank you, Mr. Lewis. I appreciate your comment. Mrs. Marie-Jewell, continue.

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I did want to say that now that we want to transfer the control of many of the programs to the community, some of the communities are not ready and I think it is important, and I am glad that the government has recognized that they have to be very careful in making sure that once they transfer these programs, that not only are the communities ready but they should be capable of delivering these programs. I feel if they are not capable, first of all they will set them up for failure, which is not fair to the communities.

But I did want to point out one thing, and this is one of the questions I did have. In the South, when you think of how people live, take for example the farmers, Mr. Chairman, you know they find that it is very difficult to make a living off farming so they asked the federal government for all these subsidies to be able to live as farmers and to live off their land that they produce their crops on; and recognizing that the fur prices are so low and that we still have an abundance of resources here in the North, when will this government ever decide to formulate a subsidy to address people who still want to live off the land in respect to fur and in respect to trapping? That is one of the questions that I want to ask.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arvaluk): That is all? Anybody want to respond to that? Ms. Cournoyea.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I guess it is somewhat related to page 14. I think the last two paragraphs really are a reiteration of what the Member is talking about, and I would also think that the very last sentence in the last paragraph really relates to the very good efforts that the past Minister of Economic Development went to in terms of the economic strategy, which I think we have done a few things on, but we have a long way to go, and we have a good blueprint there as well.

Support Program Needed For Hunters And Trappers

There are still active discussions on how you would produce a program that would be reflective of what the different regions want in terms of a support program for the hunting and trapping industry. Right now the main thing, when we are looking at that, is that we look at the money that we have. We know that there is a requirement and we should be doing it, and how we do that -- some of the work has already been done by the Member who just finished raising the issue. At the same time, when you calculate what is required, again it is an issue of funding. Where do we get the funding to create that type of support? We are dedicated to trying to carry on the work that she has done already, and try to move it into something actual. Every time we look at that we will say, "How much can we take out of the present expenditure that we have?" We are still facing the same question right now. Hopefully, we can work something into the fall budget and try to get it dealt with.

In terms of the TFN, they are still talking about cost-sharing the program. There are different little approaches that they have thrown in lately about that. We are still in active discussion with them on how they want to put that program together. At one time they had expressed that they were going to put quite a large amount of money on the program, and as time went by it became less. The desire, then, was that perhaps the territorial government could fund that themselves rather than cost-sharing.

All these discussions are going on and, hopefully, we can come to some resolution in the fall when we bring forward our budget and see if we can work it in at that time. I cannot assure the Member that we will be able to have the resources to support the program. I just want to assure the Member that we are not redoing the whole information and proposal that has been put

forward, and I do not think we should. I guess we would have to talk to some of the other regional organizations and what they are willing to put up as well, and how important that is. Everyone seems to be having a different opinion on just how that can be delivered.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arvaluk): Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is somewhat encouraging to hear that it is something in the backs of their minds. Recognizing that even though they are in the fiscal environment that they are, in as much as their intentions of wanting to look at this type of a program, it is difficult because of fiscal problems that we have.

Page 158

What I want to emphasize is that in the event -- the upfront costs would be horrendous, there is no doubt about it, but I think the long-term results would be greatly beneficial to the North. If we look at the long term, it would take us away from the rapid pace that we are now going in in becoming a welfare state jurisdiction, if I may use that. We are getting to that point when we look at social assistance; as a jurisdiction it is rapidly increasing to the point where it is scary. It is going to be coming to the point where generations -- when we think of welfare we think of it coming in only two generations ago -- people now have the mentality to think that it is a right. If we do not do anything about it two generations from now they will feel not only that it is a right, but it is going to be law. It is going to be very, very difficult for us to get out of this. You are going to encourage more social problems than anything, and that is going to be more costly to the government to try to address these social problems. To avoid these types of social problems what I want to say is that you cannot put a price on how much it costs to save people from committing suicide. You cannot put a price on how much it will cost to get people to read and participate in society to the point where when you look at the top paragraph, the very last line, saying, "The government is in a positive position to begin change toward an outstanding 'made in the north' structure staffed by a committed 'home-grown' civil service." You cannot even encourage northern people to be able to take up a higher percentage of our own civil servants because of the way that we are going.

When we look at the success rate in the educational system it was not until the past five years that the increased rate of northern people to participate in the

civil service has been showing results. Prior to that the results were very poor, and there was a need for affirmative action programs and other programs.

I want to stress to the government that I think it is going to be critical, if we are going to get out of this welfare state, as a jurisdiction, we are going to have to make some fairly significant decisions with respect to addressing such things as support programs for the trappers, for the fur industry, or for people who want to live off the land. We are going to have to look at something like a subsidy such as they have for farmers. There should not be anything wrong with that. The farmers take their subsidy and they make Canada know that they need the subsidy to live as farmers. This type of subsidy should be developed for the trappers and the hunters. I think that is very, very critical with respect to trying to get away from this welfare economy that we are quickly moving into. I cannot stress the importance of that when you look at some of the findings of this project, Mr. Chairman.

I find that you cannot place a price on addressing some of the social issues. The up front costs, I recognize, are very high. However, in the long-term results I think you can see significant results with respect to developing people in the Territories. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arvaluk): Mr. Pudlat.

Living Off The Land

MR. PUDLAT: (Translation) Mr. Chairman, I have a comment on page 14 as well, in support of the statement that was just made with regard to social assistance. It is the only source of income today in some places. The source of income that we receive, aside from social assistance, is from the harvesting of animal pelts which can help with the income, but these are very low in price now. The government is not responsible for the low prices, but those who are responsible for the low prices, are the animal rights groups. For that reason people require social assistance when they do not have any source of income. If you are not capable of being employed in the local economy, there should be something in place in order to have a source of income if there is no other way that we can make any money from animals. Not just from social assistance, but also in being able to improve the source of income that they have.

The income that we receive in the North -- we live in a cold climate -- although the resources are there,

people are not buying our materials. When we were younger we did not receive social assistance, but we had to live off the land. Only when the retailers came up North and were buying the pelts were we able to buy other commodities from outside of our area and were able to pay for them. The commodities were not that expensive then, and we were able to afford them. We were able to buy them with pelts and the pelts were needed by others. But today it is very difficult for hunters because of lack of money. Because of the lower price of pelts, there should be something in place to subsidize the hunters. Thank you.

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

No Incentive To Live Off The Land

HON. JOHN NINGARK: I agree with my honourable colleague, Jeannie Marie-Jewell, about retaining our way of life, especially giving financial support to the hunters and trappers who wish to go out camping and live off the land. This occupation, as most Members in this House will agree, is a healthy occupation. It is environmentally healthy; it is environmentally friendly. It is also cost-efficient to the Government of the NWT.

I would like to explain why it is cheaper for this government to have outpost camps within the Territories. One is that when you are living in the outpost camp, then your dependency on welfare is cut drastically, as the honourable Member has mentioned. Secondly, there are virtually no crimes in outpost camps. Thirdly, there is no structured classroom type of school in the outpost camps. The mother or father should get some type of funding from the government for educating their kids in how to survive living off the land.

As the Minister responsible for Renewable Resources, I support the initiative to have people live off the land. The money that we grant from my department, trappers' incentive grants, the harvesters' assistance program and outpost camp grants -- one of the solutions in solving the problem is to encourage people to live off the land. The money under this program is not sufficient to encourage people to live off the land. As a government, I think different departments should get together to try to come up with initiatives to make sure camping and hunting survival is a means of living. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arvaluk): Thank you. Page 14. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arvaluk): Page 15. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Arvaluk): Page 16. Mr. Lewis.

Lack Of Housing Continues To Be A Problem

MR. LEWIS: On page 16 the point is made that in the

Page 159

NWT, outside of the large centres, all we really have is social housing. In any kind of developed economy we found that construction is vital to an economy. It is very often used as an indicator of the strength of your economy. Even this current federal budget that we heard yesterday recognized that something had to be done about the construction industry and especially in relation to housing.

I mentioned earlier the concern I had that this report talks about strength at one level and another level. You have to really decide what you are going to do with the strength. If you decide that what we want to do is have a strong government and the way to do it is this, it is no good just looking at the structure. You have to have some vision and some policies and some programs, and so on. The concern I have is that we may spend an awful lot of time tinkering, as we did in the last Assembly. We spent quite a bit of time preoccupied with making sure our structures reflected our priorities, which did not last long. We spent an awful lot of time and money shifting things all over the place to reflect the priorities that we had, and within months we want to junk it because we want to do something else, except it has to be clear, if we are going to concentrate on this issue of strength at two levels, what it is in fact that you are going to do. What is it you are going to do? What is your vision? So I would hope that many of the things we have identified as priorities over the last while would be somehow reflected. Maybe in the Budget Address in the summer we will have a kind of platform or a program to reaffirm what you are going to do with the strength once you have asserted it.

I just wanted to make that point that housing continues to be a massive problem, and this report recognizes it, and much of the work we did in the past

recognizes it. It is a key element in any kind of economic strategy that we have. There are all kinds of problems with it, and Mr. Morin has an unenviable job in trying to deal with that huge problem of looking at ways in which people can get housing.

However, if we go to page 17, which was the last page you mentioned, Mr. Chairman, in the middle of the last paragraph there is a comment, a sentence if you like, which I have pondered over and I cannot understand it. This is the sentence. Maybe I should read quite a bit in front of it so that it has the complete context. It says: "Accordingly, the work of government should be shared (divided) more evenly with communities, and the territorial government should transfer more responsibility and resources to communities in the area of providing 'services to people.' This is not a question of further decentralization, but of enhancing the capacity of the community level of government."

Now, I read that sentence lots of times over the last little while and really cannot figure out what it means. It says you are not going to decentralize, and yet what I understand is being proposed is transfer from one level to another level. You are going to provide means by which people can do something. Here we are told that we are not going to do that. What we are going to do is to enhance the capacity of the community level of government. Is there any way of getting a better understanding of what is meant by "enhancing the capacity of the community level of government"? If in fact it means something different from providing you with resources and programs and so on, and giving them options as to what they want to do -- if that is not being proposed, then what is being proposed? If we are not talking about two levels, strength here and strength there, and giving communities control over their own programs, then what does it mean? What do we mean, that we are not going to do that, we are not going to decentralize, we are not going to get rid of stuff and put it at another level, but we are going to enhance the capacity of the community level of government? Does it mean that we are going to give it a new title or a new status, if you like? Are we going to change the way we look at what a community is? Are we going to rename them all and at least create some way of demonstrating to people that somehow they are different from what they used to be; that you are going to enhance the capacity of the community level of government? I wonder if that could be explained to us as to what is meant by that.

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

Community Government

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: I am not willing to take away from what the author of the report might say, but in the community we already have existing community government structure. In some communities it is a band council, in other places settlement councils. In each community, as well, a lot of the services are delivered in a departmentalized fashion that has no reportability to the single government system in the community level. For example, education in some instances reports to a divisional board. You have a small community education committee, but it does not report to the hamlet council or the band council. It is not an internal organization of those functions. We have an economic development officer. The economic development officer does not report internally to the community. We have social service committees who report outwardly, and health committees that report outwardly, but not to the community council, and this has been a matter of discussion in a lot of the communities, that everyone can do their little role and you do not have a central collection of who is responsible or who they are responsible to. It is always to someone else, another board, or another department.

A lot of the communities say that if they can take over those functions, by and large the flexibility is there. We might need a little more help to do that, but if you have one reporting function and the accountability is there, then that would enhance their ability to make, if we can allow them the flexibility, decisions on what their priorities are. If there is some money for social services programs that might have a flexibility part of it, who makes that decision? Right now a little social service committee may exist that would deal with a regional office, but it is not centred toward that community.

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

Community Control Of Programs

MR. LEWIS: I had thought that maybe that is what was meant. I know that in the past we have had lists of the number of people in the Northwest Territories that hold elected offices. We have thousands and thousands of committees all over the place. Mr. Chairman, what this is heading for, then, is one community group that looks after the whole works. I asked this question of Mr. Morin the other day when I

asked, does that mean that the local housing corporations are going to go? He was absolutely clear that that is not what is intended at all. I asked it for that reason, because it seemed to me that if we are going to head in the direction of giving local communities control over all of their programs, that the local housing corporations would go; they would disappear; and they would then come directly under community government. Would the Government Leader confirm that there is no intention at all of getting rid of local housing authorities, that they would still be independent and carry on the way they are right now?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): Madam Government Leader.

Problems With Community Control Of Programs

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, the

Page 160

Community, in itself, I would think at the outset would want to keep their housing committee, but at this point the housing committee does not report to the local authority. They report outwardly. There is no intention of doing away with their function, but who do they report to, who are they accountable to, and how do they get into the mix so that those local priorities can be set? In terms of making decisions, sometimes even here we sit and try to take away one function, saying that it is not needed, but that does impact on another department.

The community of Tuk has talked about taking over these responsibilities, and what they find is that we have a lot of disjointed community organizations and they fall apart in the end, because there is not really a strong support group that would ongoingly take into consideration what each is doing, and the function would be hedged into the local authority, whoever that would be. There are some areas where there are bands, and some areas in the far Arctic have communities which do not have as much of a problem because they are hamlet councils.

The communities themselves really have a difficult time because the local municipality will zone and put together some lots that are available and the housing association will do something else; so they deal with the Housing Corporation regional office and really do not know how those houses are going to be planned. In the end, somebody who needs a lot just does not have the lot preparation. There is no community

planning as a total package so that everyone knows what others are doing, and when you put gravel on, what your plans are to go to certain types of housing.

This is not the idea of doing away with the local housing administration facility, although I could see that the administration may be that they want to take on all of the public housing repairs. There are all kinds of things that they could do, but it is just to try to co-ordinate it at a community level so that everyone knows what is going on, and then they can work out co-operatively how they are going to plan their expenditures.

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

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I find that very useful to understand what is meant here. We are not talking about decentralizing programs; we are talking about consolidating. Many of these programs which are now independent of each other would be, somehow, co-ordinated better under one level of government. That is much clearer now, and I appreciate the Minister's response to that issue.

Would this be a condition, then, of transfer? You said we are not really very far along in this -- all these things are ahead of us -- and there has not really been that much planning or thinking, and so on. I would like to ask the Minister, does she see this as a condition of proceeding with transfers? That there would be one consolidated level of government to which things could, in fact, be transferred. Is that a condition?

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

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Yes, we see that happening. What the political make-up of that community body is is another thing. That is being developed on a more highly political time frame. The constitutional part is being discussed at the commission level, but we see the communities coming to some reconciliation on who is going to handle that delivery of service.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): Thank you. Mr. Arngna'naaq.

Level Of benefits In The North

MR. ARNGNA'NAAQ: Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer back to page 16, to the comments that are made in there regarding the social housing situation and the quality and level of these benefits. I just wanted to

point out that in the third and fourth paragraph there are sentences there which I think are not true. They are, in the third paragraph, discussing staff housing, dental and medical benefits: "The quality and level of these benefits have come to be regarded as the northern standard, and many residents who are non-government employees expect to receive precisely the same standard of living through government social programs."

In the fourth paragraph the third sentence reads: "These programs provide a level of benefits to aboriginal residents which tends to be high in comparison to non-natives." I think there are areas that are hidden within the government's spending which by far exceed the amounts that are spent on native people: such things as vacation travel assistance, and the vacation travel assistance handed out to employees. An employee is able to receive funds or be given travel warrants to travel, and those amounts far exceed the amount that is received by an individual who wants to stay in the North and take his vacation time. I think the majority of the people who do stay in the North are native people, because they are at home.

Another example of areas where costs are hidden, is where a person who is travelling from the South and wants to come up north and is weathered out will receive pay for that time that they are stuck down south; whereas an employee who is stuck out on the land, also on vacation, who is not able to come back into the community, will not get paid. I have this tendency to think that when the traders first came up here, they came up and made rules which would suit themselves and not the people who were living here first. Now, that is beside the point, but there are, I think, ways that we could equalize some of the benefits that are received.

In the third paragraph, it states that there are many residents who are non-government employees who expect to receive precisely the same standard of living through a government social program. We were discussing in the page before, page 14, that the social programs we have in the North are a way too high, and the comments that were being made regarding the hunters' and trappers' program, which I think is very good. I think because of the fall in prices of fur, there are more trappers who are staying home, which creates problems in the homes --social problems -- because the people are not able to take in an income which they would have otherwise earned rather than received. I know I have met some people here in the North who are on social assistance who say, referring

to welfare day or social assistance day, "I will be receiving my cheque, my pay cheque, on this day." Now, that shows you how far along we are as far as our social programs go. There is no self-esteem in some people who are on social assistance any more, and we as a government give no incentive whatsoever to try and raise that self-esteem. I think that a program such as a hunters' and trappers' assistance program would give that self-esteem back to the people, who I think deserve it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): Thank you. Do we have a response? Government Leader.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Just on the one part. The statement here really is saying what you are saying. You know, in terms of the collective bargaining, there are many benefits that are accruing to government people, like vacation travel and all these extra benefits -- removal, after so many years a couple of trips out -- you know these are part of the collective agreement, and what this report has said is that

Page 161

because it has been there so long, people who are not employed by government, who are outside working in other areas like maybe even a private garage -- somebody has got a garage -- they do not get this if they are a non-native person, and so there is a feeling that it should be upgraded for them to receive the same benefits.

As well, in terms of the status native people, which are the Inuit and the status Dene, they receive certain benefits that they do not have to pay for, where a Metis person has to pay. So the Metis people and other people who are not involved with government would like to be drawn up to it, because it is just a statement of the fact that when the higher standard is available, people want to move up to it. The thing is that some of them are already in the collective agreement. Other ones are paid for by a medical insurance plan, et cetera, so it is not a criticism but just stating a fact that these different levels of support exist and people tend to feel that everyone should have the same. That is really a statement, and I just want to agree with that.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): Thank you. Mr. Arngna'naaq.

MR. ARNGNA'NAAQ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with the Government Leader in what she is saying, but I would like to add that when I was campaigning, I was asked a question, why is it that we are at home, we have been given assistance to get a home, we have lived in the North for a long time, but the manner in which a person who is hired to the GNWT is given a house which he is, of course, paying for, but the other benefit that the employee receives is furniture, something that is, I think, to some people a luxury item. I have been to homes where people are sleeping with mattresses on the floor. Their houses are so rundown that there is no proper heating, the house is not level, and yet we have employees whose houses are renovated every three or four years. The level of service that is given to our employees, I think, is much more luxurious than what is received by just ordinary people on the street. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): Thank you. Are there any other comments? General comments or comments? Page 16. Page 17. Any comments? Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Mr. Chairman, prior to going to page 18, I would like to request the Chair to give us a 10 minute break.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): Yes. We will take a 10 minute break and start at 5:25.

---SHORT RECESS

I call the committee back to order. Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

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

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): Thank you. The motion to report progress is non-debatable. To the motion. All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

I will rise and report progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we return to the orders of the day, I would like to clarify a ruling I made under Item 9, petitions. Mr. Arngna'naaq was explaining his petition. I ruled at the time that only the title was allowed.

I will read Rule 57(2): "A Member may present a petition from his place in the House during the daily

routine under the item 'Petitions.' He shall endorse his name thereon and confine himself to a statement of the petition, the number of signatures and the material allegations. In no case shall such a Member occupy more than five minutes in so doing, unless by permission of the Assembly upon question put."

I was in error, and I apologize to Mr. Arngna'naaq. At the next opportunity when Item 9 comes up in the order paper, Mr. Arngna'naaq will have an opportunity to complete his statement.

---Applause

ITEM 19: REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Item 19, report of committee of the whole. Mr. Chairman.

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, your committee has been considering Tabled Documents 9-12(2), 10-12(2) and 12-12(2) and Bill 14, and wishes to report progress. Mr. Speaker, I move that the report of the chairman of committee of the whole be concurred with.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder to that motion? Mr. Arngna'naaq. The motion is in order. All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Item 20, third reading of bills. Item 21, orders of the day. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Mr. Speaker, announcements. There will be a meeting of the ordinary Members' caucus immediately after adjournment this evening, followed at 6:00 p.m. by a meeting of the Nunavut caucus. Meetings for tomorrow morning: at 8:30 a.m. of the standing committee on legislation; at 10:30 of the ordinary Members' caucus in the committee room; and at 12:00 noon of the full caucus.

ITEM 21: ORDERS OF THE DAY

Orders of the day for Thursday, February 27, 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
- Page 162
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 Documents 9-12(2), 110-12(2) and 12-12(2); 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., Thursday, February 27, 1992.

---ADJOURNMENT