



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

2nd Session

11th Assembly

HANSARD
Official Report
Day 24

THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 1988

Pages 900 - 943

Speaker: The Hon. Red Pedersen, M.L.A.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Speaker

The Hon. Red Pedersen, M.L.A.
General Delivery
Coppermine, N.W.T.
XOE OEO
(403) 873-7629 (Office)
(403) 873-5788 (Home) (Yellowknife)
(403) 982-5788 (Coppermine)
(Kitikmeot West)

Allooloo, The Hon. Titus, M.L.A.
5024 - 57th Street
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 1Y6
(403) 873-7113 (Office)
(403) 873-4813 (Home)
(Amittuq)
Minister of Culture & Communications
and Renewable Resources

Angottitauruq, Mr. Michael, M.L.A.
General Delivery
Gjoa Haven, N.W.T.
XOE 1J0
(403) 360-6600 (Office)
(403) 360-6704 (Home)
(Natilikmiot)
Deputy Chairman
Committee of the Whole

Arlooktoo, Mr. Joe, M.L.A.
General Delivery
Lake Harbour, N.W.T.
XOA ONO
(819) 939-2363 (Home)
(Baffin South)

Ballantyne, The Hon. Michael, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1091
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2N8
(403) 873-7658 (Office)
(403) 920-2963 (Home)
(Yellowknife North)
Minister of Finance and Justice

Butters, Mr. Tom, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1069
Inuvik, N.W.T.
XOE OTO
(403) 979-2373 (Office)
(403) 979-2373 (Home)
(Inuvik)

Cournoyea, The Hon. Nellie, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1184
Inuvik, N.W.T.
XOE OTO
(403) 873-7128 (Office)
(403) 977-2405 (Tuktoyaktuk)
(403) 979-2737 (Inuvik)
(Nunakput)
Minister of Health

Crow, Mr. Charlie, M.L.A.
General Delivery
Sanikiluaq, N.W.T.
XOA OWO
(819) 266-8940 (Home)
(Hudson Bay)

Ernerk, Mr. Peter, M.L.A.
Box 182
Rankin Inlet, N.W.T.
XOC OGO
(819) 645-2800
(819) 645-2500
(Aivilik)

Gargan, Mr. Samuel, M.L.A.
General Delivery
Fort Providence, N.W.T.
XOE OLO
(403) 873-7999 (Office)
(403) 699-3171 (Home)
(Deh Cho)
Deputy Speaker and Chairman,
Committee of the Whole

Kakfwi, The Hon. Stephen, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1320
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2L9
(403) 873-7139 (Office)
(403) 873-8215 (Home)
(Sahtu)
Minister of Government Services
and Housing

Kilabuk, Mr. Ipeelee, M.L.A.
General Delivery
Pangnirtung, N.W.T.
XOA ORO
(819) 437-8827 (Home)
(Baffin Central)

Lewis, Mr. Brian, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1320
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2L9
(403) 873-7999 (Office)
(403) 873-5549 (Home)
(Yellowknife Centre)

Marie-Jewell, The Hon. Jeannie, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1051
Fort Smith, N.W.T.
XOE OPO
(403) 873-7959 (Office)
(403) 872-2940 (Home)
(Slave River)
Minister of Social Services

McLaughlin, Mr. Bruce, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 2637
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2P9
(403) 393-2939 (Office)
(403) 393-2226 (Home)
(403) 920-3166 (Office)
(403) 873-6220 (Home)
(Pine Point)

Morin, Mr. Don, M.L.A.
General Delivery
Fort Resolution, N.W.T.
XOE OMO
(403) 394-3471
(Tu Nede)

Nerysoo, Mr. Richard, M.L.A.
Fort McPherson, N.W.T.
XOE OJO
(403) 979-2668 (Home) (Inuvik)
(Mackenzie Delta)

Patterson, The Hon. Dennis
P.O. Box 310
Iqaluit, N.W.T.
XOA OHO
(403) 873-7112 (Office)
(819) 979-5993 (Office)
(403) 873-2802 (Home)
(Iqaluit)
Government Leader,
Chairman of Executive Council,
Minister of Executive and Education

Pollard, Mr. John D., M.L.A.
Box 1095
Hay River, N.W.T.
XOE ORO
(403) 874-2345 (Office)
(403) 874-2600 (Home)
(Hay River)

Pudluk, Mr. Ludy, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 240
Resolute Bay, N.W.T.
XOA OVO
(819) 252-3719 (Home)
(High Arctic)

Richard, Mr. Ted, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1320
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2L9
(403) 873-7920 (Office)
(403) 873-3667 (Home)
(Yellowknife South)

Sibbeston, The Hon. Nick, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 560
Fort Simpson, N.W.T.
XOE ONO
(403) 873-7123 (Office)
(403) 873-6215 (Home)
(Nahendeh)
Minister of Economic Development
& Tourism

Wray, The Hon. Gordon, M.L.A.
Baker Lake, N.W.T.
XOC OAO
(403) 873-7962 (Office)
(819) 793-2700 (Home)
(Kivallivik)
Minister of Municipal & Community
Affairs, Personnel and
Public Works & Highways

Zoe, Mr. Henry, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1320
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2L9
(403) 873-7999 (Office)
(403) 873-4136 (Home)
(Rae - Lac la Martre)
Deputy Chairman,
Committee of the Whole

Officers

Clerk
Mr. David Hamilton
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

Clerk Assistant
Mrs. Rhoda Perkison
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

Law Clerk
Mr. Joel Fournier
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

Editor of Hansard
Ms Marie J. Coe
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

Sergeant-at-Arms
Mr. Raymond Mercer
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 1988

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	900
Ministers' Statements	
- 48-88(1) Long-Standing Services Provided by Housing Associations and Authorities	900
Returns to Oral Questions	901
Oral Questions	902
Replies to Opening Address	
- Mr. Richard's Reply	905
Tabling of Documents	914
Notices of Motion	915
Notices of Motion for First Reading of Bills:	
- Bill 6-88(1) Loan Authorization Act, 1988-89	915
- Bill 11-88(1) Borrowing Authorization Act, 1988-89	915
- Bill 29-88(1) Interim Appropriation Act, 1988-89	915
Second Reading of Bills:	
- Bill 7-88(1) Student Financial Assistance Act	916
- Bill 25-88(1) Supplementary Appropriation Act, No. 4, 1987-88	915
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Bill 1-88(1) Appropriation Act, 1988-89 - Department of Social Services	916
Report of Committee of the Whole of:	
- Bill 1-88(1) Appropriation Act, 1988-89	942
Orders of the Day	942

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 1988

MEMBERS PRESENT

Hon. Titus Allooooloo, Mr. Angottitauruq, Mr. Arlooktoo, Hon. Michael Ballantyne, Mr. Butters, Hon. Nellie Cournoyea, Mr. Crow, Mr. Ernerk, Hon. Stephen Kakfwi, Mr. Kilabuk, Mr. Gargan, Mr. Lewis, Hon. Jeannie Marie-Jewell, Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Morin, Hon. Dennis Patterson, Hon. Red Pedersen, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Richard, Hon. Nick Sibbeston, Hon. Gordon Wray, Mr. Zoe

ITEM 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

SPEAKER (Hon. Red Pedersen): Orders of the day for Thursday, March 24th. Item 2, Ministers' statements. Mr. Kakfwi.

ITEM 2: MINISTERS' STATEMENTS

Ministers' Statement 48-88(1): Long-Standing Services Provided By Housing Associations And Authorities

HON. STEPHEN KAKFWI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On July 20 of this year the Pond Inlet Housing Association will have been incorporated for 20 years. This makes the association, along with the other associations in the Baffin, among the oldest community-run organizations in the NWT.

In this, their 20th year, the Pond Inlet Housing Association, in conjunction with the other Baffin housing associations, hosted a tenant relations workshop, February 9 to 11. The workshop was highly successful, covering tenant/association/community relationships and involved staff from every Baffin community. Much of the success of the workshop can be attributed to the warm welcome given to participants by the hamlet of Pond Inlet, the Aarqissyijit Hunters and Trappers Association and the Toonoonik Sahoonek Co-op. These organizations sponsored a country food feast and dance to welcome the visitors and introduce them to the residents of Pond Inlet.

However, the Baffin is not unique as all districts have housing associations or authorities that have been continually operating for more than 15 years. These organizations have for many years provided a very valuable and essential service to the communities and residents of the NWT, often under trying and difficult circumstances.

Formal recognition by the government in respect to the services provided by housing associations and authorities is long overdue. To provide appropriate recognition, I will be implementing a system of long service plaques and pins to housing associations, their board members and employees. Housing associations will receive appropriate plaques for 10, 15 and 20 years of continuous service.

Many housing association board members have been involved with housing for many years. Special housing association/authority board of directors pins will be designed and presented to board members who have served the community for over five years, and plaques will be presented to members with over 10 years' service.

Housing association employees are valuable community assets and long service will be recognized by a system similar to that provided to employees of the Government of the Northwest Territories. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Ministers' statements.

Item 3, Members' statements. Item 4, returns to oral questions. Mr. Alloofoo.

ITEM 4: RETURNS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Return To Question 0261-88(1): Effect Of Wolves On Mackenzie Wood Bison Herd

HON. TITUS ALLOOFOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a return to oral Question 0261-88(1), asked by Mr. Gargan on March 9 and requested in Question 0281-88(1) on March 23, 1988. It is referring to the transmission of diseases by wolves between the bison herds.

The bison herd in the Mackenzie Bison Sanctuary is free from the diseases brucellosis and tuberculosis. Transmission of diseases between wolves and buffalo is highly unlikely and there have been no cases reported in the North. Studies with cattle and dogs, which are similar to bison and wolves, have shown that dogs with these diseases did not infect cattle.

Recent studies in the Mackenzie sanctuary by my department show that the wolf population is not causing problems to the bison herd and that the herd is continuing to grow. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Returns to oral questions. Mr. Sibbeston.

Further Return To Question 0171-88(1): Economic Development Officer For Clyde River And Broughton Island

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, my return is to Question 0171-88(1), asked by Mr. Pollard on February 26, 1988, concerning an economic development officer in Clyde River and Broughton Island.

After having my regional staff look into the matter further, I maintain that there is not enough demand within Clyde River and Broughton Island to justify the placement of a full-time economic development officer in one of these communities.

A review of the economy of these communities indicates the following: There is limited arts and crafts activity, and significant expansion is not likely to occur due to the lack of local soapstone. The development of commercial fishing is restricted as no resource assessments have been undertaken. There is a small number of commercial caribou tags available. However, hunters would have to travel a great distance in order to hunt. This makes it less attractive than other locations within the region.

There is a minor amount of tourism activity in these communities, but again businesses in this sector are at a significant competitive disadvantage with other more attractive and accessible tourism opportunities within the region. The retail component of the service sector is well represented in Clyde River and Broughton Island. There is a Bay and a privately owned confectionery store in Clyde River and a Bay and a co-op in Broughton Island.

The most potential for short-term development in these communities relates to establishing businesses which would secure contracts which are currently awarded to outside companies. These contracts relate to capital projects; for example, site preparation, gravel hauling and general labour requirements.

Since my earlier response to this question, departmental officials have contacted community representatives and they are working together to prepare a submission to EDA for an economic planner. I anticipate that the application will be reviewed before the end of this month. As I stated earlier, the planner would assist the communities to identify and prioritize business opportunities. Once this has been completed, the communities could then apply to EDA for an implementer who would assist in the establishment of businesses.

I will continue to monitor the situation and in time, if there is a sufficient level of activity, the department will certainly consider the placement of a full-time economic development officer to serve Clyde River and Broughton Island. In the interim, I can give assurance that the economic development officer stationed in Pangnirtung will be making more frequent visits into these communities. Mahsi.

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

Return To Question 0270-88(1): Responsibility For Services To Band Councils And Status Indians

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a return to Question 0270-88(1), asked by Mr. Gargan on March 9, 1988, concerning responsibility for delivery of services to band councils.

There has been a great deal of confusion and controversy as to whether the GNWT or the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is financially responsible for the delivery of services to native people in the Northwest Territories. In order to delineate responsibilities and develop a solution, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and I have set up a federal-territorial working group. Participating in this group are: from the Government of the Northwest Territories, the president of the NWT Housing Corporation and the assistant deputy minister of the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs; and from DIAND, the executive director of Indian services, the NWT regional director of Indian and Inuit affairs and the director of special projects for the northern program. The purpose of this group is to define the services involved and to determine the cost of providing these services.

The expected date of completion for this project is December, 1988 so that the information may be finalized for inclusion in the new formula financing agreement, when it comes into effect. Some of the major issues to be dealt with are: capital assistance for Indian bands; primary, secondary and post-secondary education for native people; health and medical services; core funding for Indian bands; economic support programs. Because of the complexity of this issue, it will take some time to develop a viable solution; however, all MLAs shall be kept informed of any major developments. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Returns to oral questions. Item 5, oral questions. Mr. Richard.

ITEM 5: ORAL QUESTIONS

Question 0286-88(1): Tabling Of Principles Of NCPC Transfer Agreement

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister responsible for the energy portfolio. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the session, the Opening Address given by Commissioner Parker referred to the NCPC matter and the agreement signed by the two Ministers. It was stated in the Opening Address that once these principles had been agreed to by the cabinets of both governments, it will be made available for review by the Members of the Legislative Assembly. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the second cabinet, being the federal cabinet, did approve those principles sometime in the last two weeks. I appreciate that the Minister has given notice of a bill she is going to bring in for first reading, I believe tomorrow, but is it the Minister's intention to also table with the Assembly the principles that are referred to, of some three or four weeks ago?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Richard. Ms Cournoyea.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, my commitment was to make those available to the Members and I am still waiting for Mr. McKnight to get back to me. I do not know where he is. He is somewhere in the federal bureaucracy and I had hoped to speak to him this morning. I cannot find him so I will take this under advisement and I will get back to you tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Madam Minister. Oral questions. Mr. Butters.

Question 0287-88(1): Canadian Institute Of International Affairs, Working Group Report

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, on the report, The North and Canada's International Relations, by a working group of the national capital branch of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, published March, 1988. To the Government Leader. Has the Executive Council considered this report and if it has, will it be making any comments in the near future on the report?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Butters. Mr. Government Leader.

Return To Question 0287-88(1): Canadian Institute Of International Affairs, Working Group Report

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, the report was received two days ago and I can tell the honourable Member that it has been discussed by the Executive Council. We have not taken an official position on the report, which contains a total of 37 recommendations, as the honourable Member knows. The Executive Council has not taken a position on the report and I might note that the working group, chaired by Mr. Gordon Robertson, enjoys no official status with the Government of Canada, so I am not sure whether we will be taking an official position on the report. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Supplementary, Mr. Butters.

Supplementary To Question 0287-88(1): Canadian Institute Of International Affairs, Working Group Report

MR. BUTTERS: I wonder if the Government Leader would agree with me that while the members of the working group seem to have considerable northern experience, that experience would have been garnered some years ago.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson.

Further Return To Question 0287-88(1): Canadian Institute Of International Affairs, Working Group Report

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly have noticed that the working group is composed of non-natives and non-residents of the Northwest Territories and, in fact, includes 10 present or former federal civil servants. I might also note, Mr. Speaker, that the working group did not see fit to consult the Government of the Northwest Territories or this Legislature on a report which makes significant comments on aboriginal people and on the Arctic, and on political development in the NWT. So I agree with the honourable Member that while there is some limited northern experience on the part of the working group, most of it was accumulated several decades ago. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Government Leader. Oral questions. Mr. Gargan.

Question 0288-88(1): Diseases In Wood Buffalo Herd, Fort Smith

MR. GARGAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Renewable Resources with regard to the return that he has given me to Question 0261-88(1). In his reply, the Minister did indicate that transmission of disease between wolves and bison is highly unlikely. I would like to ask the Minister, then, how the herd in the Fort Smith area got infected by tuberculosis and brucellosis.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

HON. TITUS ALLOOLLOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My information is that the diseases the wood bison have, and the caribou, have been in the population for quite some time. And regarding the transmission of diseases between animals, those that are infected, that transmit disease to other animals -- to the Member's question as to when the Fort Smith herd got the diseases, I would have to get back to the Member at a later date on this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. You are taking the question as notice. Oral questions. Mr. Gargan.

Question 0289-88(1): Report Of Task Force On Aboriginal Languages

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to ask the Minister another question with regard to the final report of the task force on aboriginal languages. On the 21st of this month the Minister did indicate that the recommendations of this report were done on the basis of transcripts from the community hearings, and the Minister did indicate that he was going to provide me with the transcripts of these community hearings. I would like to ask the Minister, how soon would I be able to get those actual transcripts? He did say that he had them, in order to come up with this report.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister of Culture and Communications.

Return To Question 0289-88(1): Report Of Task Force On Aboriginal Languages

HON. TITUS ALLOOLOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I recall rightly, I did not say to the Member that I would provide transcripts to the Member, but I did say that I would provide him with information that is available on the community hearings of the task force. Mr. Speaker, for your information, there are no transcripts of community hearings, but there are tapes and some bits of information, the notes that were taken. I could provide the Member with tapes on these community hearings. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Supplementary, Mr. Gargan.

Supplementary To Question 0289-88(1): Report Of Task Force On Aboriginal Languages

MR. GARGAN: Mr. Speaker, just to refresh the Minister's mind, when I asked the question he did say that the task force report was taken from transcripts of the community hearings. I then asked the question whether the Minister did indicate that the recommendation was based on transcripts, and I asked the Minister if he could provide me with the transcripts. The Minister's reply was, yes. Now I am hearing the Minister say that they do not have transcripts. I would like to ask the Minister, how did they come up with the final report of the task force in about six different languages? Did they use all six translation people as well as resource people to come up with this final report? I do not know the results of this and I cannot say for sure that what was said is what is in this book. So I would like to ask the Minister, what process was used to come up with the final result of this report?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Further Return To Question 0289-88(1): Report Of Task Force On Aboriginal Languages

HON. TITUS ALLOOLOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Basically the report was written by the task force, by listening to the tapes and the available written information that was taken at the community hearings. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. You will take it as notice. Oral questions. Mr. Gargan.

Supplementary To Question 0289-88(1): Report Of Task Force On Aboriginal Languages

MR. GARGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite satisfied with the answer the Minister is giving me. I would like to ask the Minister whether or not he intends, within the Department of Culture and Communications, to transcribe the community hearings for the Members here. I am not satisfied with just having a report done as a result of listening to tapes.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Further Return To Question 0289-88(1): Report Of Task Force On Aboriginal Languages

HON. TITUS ALLOOLOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At this time I do not have plans to transcribe the information that was taken from community hearings. This Member had mentioned before that we are dealing with a lot of different languages and it would cost quite a bit of money to transcribe the information. It would be up to the Legislature if the information is to be transcribed. At this point I do not have sufficient funds to cover this. I would have to go back to the Legislative Assembly for more funds if my department were to do that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Item 6, written questions.

Item 7, returns to written questions. Item 8, replies to Opening Address. Mr. Richard.

ITEM 8: REPLIES TO OPENING ADDRESS

Mr. Richard's Reply

MR. RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity this afternoon to make my reply to the Opening Address made by Commissioner John Parker on the first day of this session. I wish, Mr. Speaker, to refer to a number of items in the Opening Address delivered by the Commissioner on behalf of the Executive, very briefly and then reply to one item, in particular, at length; that being the budget referred to in the Opening Address and the reference to the "tough choices" that the government has made in a difficult fiscal environment and to the Appropriation Bill that the Commissioner recommended that we in this Assembly pass during this session.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I was rather concerned with a reference in the Commissioner's Opening Address, when he was listing on behalf of the Executive the accomplishments, I suppose, of the government in the past year or so. There was a reference, under the Department of Social Services, to the fact that in the last year there was a new senior citizens facility opened in the city of Yellowknife, the implication being that it was the Department of Social Services that had provided that facility. That, of course, is untrue. A group of very dedicated volunteer citizens in this community built that facility. I was pleased, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Minister of Social Services correct and clarify that issue immediately after it was brought to her attention in this Assembly.

In the Opening Address the Commissioner stated that one of our government's key objectives is to support the private sector and encourage the viability of northern business. He indicated, Mr. Speaker, that they would be reviewing all of the grants, contributions and loan programs with a view to achieving a more coherent or overall approach to business support. That particular item, Mr. Speaker, I personally welcome and applaud. That kind of review is long overdue.

There were references in the Opening Address to education issues, particularly the statement that the government believes that efforts are needed to better prepare students. That efforts will be made throughout the coming year to improve literacy. The statement was made that the Department of Education will continue to increase public involvement in the delivery of education. In that context, Mr. Speaker, I trust that the government has been listening in the past two or three weeks to what the public is saying about the proposed cutbacks.

Request For Delay In Federal Transfers

Also in the Opening Address, Mr. Speaker, were references to impending and major federal transfers, those being NCPC and a large portion of the federal health presence in the North. On those two issues alone, Mr. Speaker, there is much, much work to be done. They are not simple issues; they are very complex issues. I personally have a concern that we are rushing too fast on both of those issues. As it happens there is one and the same lead Minister on both of those issues and, although that Minister is as hardworking as any, each of those tasks is very onerous and I know that the staff of public servants in Health, in Finance, in Personnel and in Energy have been working many, many long hours on those two issues. I believe, Mr. Speaker -- and we can get into it later this week or next week -- but I personally believe we should consider delaying each of those projects, rather than rush into completion on some arbitrary calendar date.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to the budget item in the Opening Address made by Commissioner Parker, when he stated that the main business before this Assembly at this session will be consideration of the 1988-89 budget. The statement that I refer to, which leads into the balance of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by way of reply is, "The budget will reflect some tough choices your government has made in a difficult fiscal environment. The territorial accumulated surplus has almost been exhausted, thus restraining our spending choices for the year ahead."

Mr. Speaker, and fellow colleagues, I wish to take this opportunity to comment at some length on a decision of the Executive Council, an ill-advised decision, in my view, to reverse an earlier decision on the location of a correctional facility. That decision we are being asked to confirm. I have a grave concern about the precedent that we would be setting for this 11th Assembly as to what practices are okay and what are not. Some of my colleagues on the Executive Council and in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, may ask why is this such an issue or what is the issue...

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Why is it such an issue?

MR. RICHARD: I would like to speak to that. Firstly, what is the issue? The issue, sir, for me is not the location of the facility. I wish, sir, on this issue, that there was a facility being moved in these circumstances from Inuvik to Fort Smith, or from Hay River to Fort Smith...

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame, shame!

MR. RICHARD: ...so that I could make my point on the principle without being accused of protecting my own riding.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: The same applies to the Minister.

MR. RICHARD: The issue, Mr. Speaker, is the decision-making process of the Executive arm of government; how and why those decisions are made. I wish to put this decision of the Executive Council in context, in fact in several contexts. I will of necessity, Mr. Speaker, have to use that awful word "pork barrelling". I have never hesitated at being blunt and frank. For me, the issue is a new Minister changing an earlier decision made by a previous cabinet which resulted in a government appropriated facility being put into her own riding. If that is pork barrelling, the issue is pork barrelling...

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Different standards for the Minister than for yourself, eh?

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Speaker, I took the trouble, because for me, I guess, when we ask what is pork barrelling, to me it is the blatant use of ministerial power to benefit one's...

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Careful!

MR. RICHARD: ...area, one's riding, one's constituents. But I have sought and have found in a dictionary that there is a definition, to my surprise. "Pork barrel, a term used to describe government appropriations for projects that may not be needed but are likely to appeal to certain constituents."

I think the label fits, Mr. Speaker. I have many, many questions, Mr. Speaker...

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson, you feel you have a point of privilege?

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable Member is out of order, in that he is imputing motives to the Minister of Social Services for which there is no evidence. I think there is a rule on that subject. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson, you certainly do not have a point of privilege. A point of privilege is -- on your point of order I will rule shortly.

Speaker's Ruling

Mr. Patterson, on your point of order, under rules of debate you would indeed have a point of order. However, the replies to the Opening Address do not fall under the rules of debate as they normally do not have an opportunity for a return to them. So unless the Member would blatantly accuse another Member of false or unavowed motives, there would, in my opinion, not be a point of order. Bearing that in mind, Mr. Richard, would you proceed?

MR. RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, on this issue I still have many, many questions and concerns, specific questions in particular, that I wish to ask the Members of the Executive Council when we resume debate on Mr. Ballantyne's motion in committee of the whole. I wish to raise some of these concerns now during my reply, sir.

It has been about two months since I first learned of this decision. I am not on the standing committee on finance but I heard that it had been discussed during those meetings in January. When it was first stated to me, I thought, that appears unusual, that such a decision would be reversed at this particular stage, but surely, thought I, surely the Executive Council will provide some justification for the reversal of the decision at this stage. I waited, and I waited, and I waited for such a justification. I received phone calls, some anonymous phone calls, some others, about the impropriety that was being alleged. I ignored these telephone calls. I waited for word from

the Executive, from the Minister of Social Services, from the Government Leader, from the Minister of Finance -- nothing initially. This session opened on February 10. I looked in the main estimates documents, in the capital estimates -- nothing, nothing. It showed the correctional facility in question being placed in the original location in Yellowknife. I heard some mention of this change in the media after we opened the session, on the radio, in the newspaper, in the Fort Smith newspaper, news about this change that was going to happen. And still nothing stated in this Assembly; no statement by the Minister.

First Mention Of Change Of Location

The Government Leader finally rose in his seat on March 1 and made mention of it, in defence of his Minister concerning a certain media report. And later, Mr. Speaker, I would like to return to Mr. Patterson's statement at that time on conflict of interest. Finally, Mr. Speaker, finally, on Tuesday of this week, two days ago, the very day that we are about to start debate on the Social Services budget, finally the Leader again rose in his seat and read out a statement that amounted, with all respect to my colleagues on the Executive Council, amounted to pulling themselves up by their boot straps. This decision, Mr. Speaker, has not yet been justified in my view, and I doubt, sir, that it ever will be.

Mr. Speaker, let me look at this decision in the context of the return to my written question. I asked a written question asking what were the reasons why this facility was to be placed in Yellowknife in the first place. I asked that question on February 25, Mr. Speaker, you will recall. I have learned, Mr. Speaker, in my very short time in this Assembly that there are a few little signals when I am on a track, when I think there is something amiss in the government. I now know that there are a few signals to confirm my suspicions. One of them is that when you ask a simple question, and there is a delay and a further delay in getting the answer, that is a signal that you are on track. Another signal I have learned about, Mr. Speaker, is that when you ask for a document and there is a resistance to get a document, there is another signal that you are on the right track.

In any event, to a written question, a simple question, what the justification was for a decision that was made many months ago, 10 days later I got a response. And let us look at the response. Why was the facility originally to be placed in Yellowknife? I asked, was there a study done? That is a simple question. If so, will the Minister table a copy? Another simple question. Two days ago, we finally got the study. I have now asked, what are the costs of that study? A fairly comprehensive review of the various scenarios and options open to the government. What was the cost of that study that has now just been thrown in the garbage? I think the public is entitled to know what the cost was of the study that is now being ignored by the Executive.

I asked also, in the context of delivery of programs, what was the justification of establishing this facility in Yellowknife? The answer to that question: "Program delivery factors which justified the original location of the facility in Yellowknife included: a) availability of psychological and related services..." Now what does that mean? Does that mean that the services were more available in Yellowknife? I presume it does. Now is this still the case? What has changed in January, 1988?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible comment)

MR. RICHARD: Well, I do not normally respond to interjections, Mr. Speaker, but I was going to come to that anyway. The main estimates document that I picked up not only has the reference to the facility going into the city of Yellowknife, it has reference to the mobile team. We were going to have the mobile team anyway. We did not think of the mobile team argument the day that FMB approved the change of the facility to Fort Smith. So much for the mobile team.

Responses To Written Question On Economic Factors

I also asked, Mr. Speaker, in the written question, in the context of economic factors, what was the justification for establishing this facility in Yellowknife? The Minister responded, "Economic factors considered at the time which provided justification for the facility to be placed in Yellowknife included: a) readily available land..." Now what does that mean? Does that mean that land was more readily available in Yellowknife than in some other community? Is this still the case? What has changed? Another economic factor that was given in the response, economic factors which provided justification, shared kitchen services at YCC, shared laundry services at YCC. What

is the extra cost for an unshared kitchen and laundry facility in Fort Smith? Also listed as an economic factor, "recreational facilities already on site". Will recreational facilities be added to the Fort Smith design? At what cost? Finally, in this response to the written question, another economic factor that justified putting the facility in Yellowknife in the first place, "Yellowknife is central in terms of travel." I have to ask the question: What was the cost analysis regarding travel? What is the cost analysis now regarding travel? Has one been done?

I also, Mr. Speaker, in my written question asked for details of the expenditures that had already been made in Yellowknife, in terms of architect's fees and everything else. Perhaps we can get into those specifics when we return to committee of the whole.

Another context. Let me put this decision in the context of the study. The young offenders secure custody facilities study done at a cost of, I do not know what. How many thousands of dollars to the government? This, sir, is a document which I have had a chance to quickly review in the last day or two, prepared by two groups of consultants. In the last page or two there is a list of the consulting team; a list of the planning committee that these proposals were run past before the report was prepared; contributors to the document. Pretty impressive list of people, from the deputy minister of the Department of Social Services, the chief of the social service programs, the director of young offenders program, another program officer in the young offenders program, the co-ordinator of the young offenders information systems, superintendent of the YCC, planning officer with the Department of Social Services, regional superintendents from Kitikmeot, Keewatin, Inuvik Regions, manager of the children's facilities in Inuvik, a judge of the territorial court, an administrator with the territorial court, staff sergeant from the RCMP, a manager from the Department of Public Works, and other public servants.

The objectives of the study, Mr. Speaker, are set out in the document. They include such things as determining the need in each region. Another objective was to define the most appropriate size, type and location of facilities to meet these needs. Another objective was to provide a comparative cost analysis. The document further states that in developing the plan the consultants were to have regard to certain planning principles. These philosophical and operational principles were established, and they are set out on page three of the document. Four alternate scenarios were examined for service delivery and after review by the planning committee some of the people or positions that I referred to, one scenario was preferred over the other three.

Scenario Was Not Discussed In Study

Mr. Speaker, putting this recent decision of the Executive Council into context of this study, my point, sir, simply is that the scenario now being developed by the Executive was not even one of the four that was discussed and compared in this study. So we in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, being asked to confirm this Executive decision, have no idea from the consultant study which government has paid for, or we have no idea from this planning committee, whether proper planning principles have been followed; whether it is the most appropriate type or location of facility and we certainly have no comparative cost analysis.

Next, Mr. Speaker, let me put this decision, this ill-advised decision in the context of the Minister's statement made by the Government Leader two days ago -- three days ago, whenever. At the risk of the Government Leader popping up again, Mr. Speaker, this document is so much hogwash. Tuesday of this week the Government Leader rose and said, "I believe it is important to make clear to Members all of the factors surrounding the decision", and I hoped when he said that to hear some new factors. He stated that the original decision to place the facility in Yellowknife was based on costs. I was glad to hear that. Next he says, "However, in light of new factors...", I ask Members to remember that, new factors "which emerged during the new cabinet's review of the capital budget, the cabinet decided that other alternatives should be considered."

I ask all of my colleagues in this room if they are prepared to accept that. Do each of you believe that the new cabinet sat around a table where a whole bunch of new factors emerged, just emerged, and then and only then they decided to consider other alternatives? Yesterday following that statement, I asked the Government Leader if there were other changes resulting from emerging new factors, and I have yet to receive a response to that. I guess my concern there is that I fear there are other changes that we do not know about, because of emerging factors or new Ministers. So then the statement goes on, Mr. Speaker. Hopefully we are going to find out what these new factors are, also described by the Government Leader as several new and significant factors.

Demands On Yellowknife's Infrastructure

All right, the next paragraph goes on, "The growth of the territorial government is already putting intolerable demands on Yellowknife's infrastructure." Now is that new? I do not know when the previous decision was made but I am going to assume the summer of 1987. Did something like that happen between the summer of 1987 and December, 1987 or January, 1988?

Then he goes on to describe, for example, the changes being made to the receiving home in Yellowknife. "This new facility will require 20 new positions." Now I had another one of these anonymous phone calls since then. Someone whispered into my phone, "It is 11, not 20." But I do not know what it is. "It will put further pressures on an already overloaded housing market." We had an overloaded housing market in the summer of 1987 and we still have one. That is not new.

The next, supposedly new and significant, factor is this mobile team that the Government Leader just interjected in an earlier part of my reply. "In 1988-89," he says, "the psychological assessment and treatment team will be expanded to provide increased support services to field and institutional staff." This was the case when the previous decision was made. This was in the works then, so that is not a new factor.

Young Offenders On Remand

Now here is a new one. The Government Leader stated, "In addition, the department is planning to house remanded young offenders in secure facilities in communities instead of bringing them all to Yellowknife." Now that is a gem, because I am going to have to ask, when we go back to the detail, where those are. I suspect they are RCMP police detachments. I have been in those facilities, not as an inmate, sir, I have been visiting, and I am concerned about that new factor. But let us say we are going to put those kids who are on remand in police cells where adults are. That is what this says, unless someone can explain that we are going to build secure facilities in each of these communities for remanded young offenders. Well, my question there is, at what cost? At what cost is this change being made? Do the RCMP agree? Is their budget going up because of the cost of guards, the cost of housing the remanded young offenders in the communities? And I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, on that new factor, when was that decision made? This statement was given on Tuesday. Was that decision made over the weekend by the department? The department is planning to house remanded young offenders in secure facilities in communities instead of bringing them all to Yellowknife. When was that decision made? It is definitely a new factor.

The final supposedly new factor, "The economic decline south of the lake is a significant factor to this government." Is that new? How long in this Assembly, how many years have MLAs from south of the lake been reminding the government of that factor?

The importance of separating young offenders from adults in jail is not a new consideration. That is in the study that we paid for. If that was not brought to the attention of the Executive Council, we should fire some of the public servants in Social Services. That is not a new consideration. "It was...felt important to consider other alternatives which would keep the young people completely separate from the adult correctional centre grounds and facilities." Well, I take it you are going to take steps to do that in Iqaluit as well.

Next it says, "The cabinet review revealed that psychological, legal, educational and medical services are available to Fort Smith. Emergency backup in the form of RCMP is also available. The facility in Fort Smith...", and I presume they mean River Ridge, "...already has an ice rink and ball diamond on site, as well as a summer garden. Community facilities are available on a supervised basis. We have also learned...", this Executive has also learned, "...that very few young offenders are visited by families. Most of their contact is by telephone -- that obviously will not change." All of these factors, Mr. Speaker, I have to ask, how or why was all of this missed last summer when the other decision was made, when the options were reviewed?

Then there is the reference to this red herring about the existing River Ridge building; it will once again be used as a child care building. "This will permit the government to recognize a \$1.2 million future savings." Now, that is a real gem. We are talking about a comparative cost analysis as to where a building should go, and this government is coming in here, through their Government Leader, and telling us, and the Minister said so yesterday, do not worry, there is going to be an overall cost savings of \$1.2 million. Now, I shake my head, sir, to think of some of the people we have on the Executive with their arithmetic.

Position Of Departmental Officials

Let me, Mr. Speaker, next put this ill-advised decision in the context of our departmental officials. Although I would not want to put departmental officials in the uncomfortable position of trying to justify a decision made by elected politicians, of trying to justify this about-face, because I am aware, I am satisfied, that this was a strictly political decision and perhaps, Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of fairness, I will use political decision as the buzz word, rather than pork barrelling. Public servants should not have to justify political decisions made by elected politicians. But what if I were to ask the departmental officials in Social Services or the Financial Management Secretariat or the Priorities and Planning Secretariat, what if I were to ask them this question while the Ministers were present: "What new information do you, the departmental officials, have now that convinces you that the facility should be located in Fort Smith, that was not available to you, the departmental officials, last year when you were convinced that the facility should be put into Yellowknife?" Would not that be nice now, to put the departmental officials in that position?

Policy For Changes In Government Organization

Mr. Speaker, next I would like to put this ill-advised decision in the context of a few government policies. The first one I would like to refer to is called "Government Organization, Policy", tabled in the first session, last fall, approved in May, 1987. This document, I understand, although I am not great at reading the bureaucratic language in these policies -- I try to understand them -- I understand it is the ground rules for making changes in government organization. Now, those who are better at interpreting bureaucratic language than I am may disagree with me that this decision is not one of these changes. I think it is. They talk about major and minor changes in here. At a minimum it is a minor organizational change. This policy is stated to be based on a number of principles. I note that one of them, principle three, states: "The structure of government departments should be designed to allow programs and services to be delivered as close as practicable to the people being served." That is an interesting one. Principle four: "The organizational design of government departments shall be standardized where practical and adhere to the basic principles of organization design to ensure: a) pooling of specialized support and administrative services at the location closest to where programs are delivered and where they will be fully utilized." And "c) best use of existing and any planned increases in personnel and physical infrastructure to balance efficiency with diversifying benefits to communities."

The directive attached to this policy goes on to describe the difference between a major change and a minor change. At page three of the directive it states the various parts of the government who have responsibilities in this area. It states that the priorities and planning committee is to make recommendations to the Executive Council on all proposals for major changes. Now, I have to ask: Was this done in this case? If they do not see it as a major change, I guess the priorities and planning committee did not have to do that.

On page four there is a reference to a role of the Priorities and Planning Secretariat. They have the responsibility for identifying issues arising out of major organizational changes. I have to ask: Did that secretariat perform their job before this decision was made? Next there is a reference to the job of the Financial Management Secretariat. This is pertinent, because this applies to any change. The FMS is accountable to the chairman of the Financial Management Board for providing an independent assessment of the financial implications of organizational change. I will have to ask later: Was that done by FMS; that is, any organizational change?

Further in this government organization document, Mr. Speaker, on page five it is stated that proposals to create changes in the organization may be the result of a number of factors. There are four listed, and they make sense: An Executive decision to realize a GNWT priority; a change in the government's objectives; addition of a new function; and the requirement to improve effectiveness and efficiency. It does not say that it may result from a change in the cabinet make-up.

Change Within Or Outside Directive Provisions

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in this document, I wish to refer, as always, to the last paragraph: "Nothing in this directive shall in any way be construed to limit the prerogative of the Executive Council to make decisions to take action respecting the organization of the GNWT, outside the

provisions of this directive." So, of course, I have to ask a question on that: Was this correctional facility change done pursuant to this government policy or was it done outside of this policy?

Mr. Speaker, next I would like to look at this ill-advised decision in the context of the health transfer debate. There I am referring to another government policy called the "transfer policy". Now Members may not see the relevance, but let me try and explain. The health transfer is a current topical issue. Some of my colleagues on this side of the House and in that corner over there want to oppose the health transfer. I understand one of their reasons is that they feel that this Executive Council is renegeing on a commitment made by the previous Executive Council that promised local autonomy for regional health boards. I have listened carefully and closely to the Government Leader, in particular, to the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Personnel, when they attempt to justify why the Executive will insist that regional boards of health use government service departments, such as Personnel and DPW, for the reason of cost efficiency in the delivery of health services. I must say in all frankness that I was predisposed, having heard Mr. Patterson and the others, to agree with him, Mr. Ballantyne, and Mr. Wray on this point. But now, Mr. Speaker, I find that they are talking out of the other side of their mouths. Cost efficiency does not count. It is politicking that counts.

If the Government Leader and the Executive Council and each Member of the Executive Council have no difficulty in supporting the Minister from Fort Smith on this issue, I hope they agree that I should support Mr. Nerysoo, Mr. Zoe, Mr. Ernerk, in their insistence on local authority, local autonomy for regional boards of health, regardless of cost efficiency. If they can do that, I hope they will not frown at me when I support my colleagues who want to do some politicking to local autonomy, regardless of cost efficiency.

1986 Report Of Auditor General On Federal Cabinet Decision

Mr. Speaker, next let me look at this decision in the context of a recent 1986 report of the Auditor General of Canada. Members in the public will well recall the infamous prison that was moved from Drummondville to the home riding of the Prime Minister of Canada in Northern Quebec, Port-Cartier. The Auditor General of Canada, after the fact, thought on review that he should report to the public on that federal cabinet decision. Because I see a similarity, I took the trouble to look up that chapter of the Auditor General's report in 1986, about the move of that institution from Drummondville to Port-Cartier in the Prime Minister's riding. I would like to share with my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, some of the terminology that was used, and ask Members if any of these statements sound familiar or relevant.

The Auditor General said about the decision to move the prison, "This decision was not made with due regard to economy." He also stated about that decision, "Cost benefit considerations were not the deciding factor." He stated, "The decision could not be justified on the basis of need." He stated, "It was based on non-program related considerations." He stated that from a program effectiveness point of view, the decision was much criticized by professionals in the corrections field. He stated that by switching the location, the Government of Canada incurred an extra capital cost of at least \$11 million. He stated that by switching the location, the Government of Canada incurred an extra O and M cost over the life cycle of the building of over \$30 million. He stated about the Treasury Board that because of a lack of information, the Treasury Board was not able to make an informed decision, paying due regard to program needs and economy. He stated, Mr. Speaker, that the department -- that is, the corrections department, federal -- should disclose to the Treasury Board and to Parliament the additional costs incurred for meeting purposes other than program related purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I briefly would also like to put this decision in the context of my friend Mr. Ballantyne's Budget Address. On page 23, it is a short quote when he was concluding: "This restraint budget is achieved through an across-the-board control of new program initiatives and efforts by all departments to identify expenditure savings." Put this decision in that context.

Direction for the 1990s. I found a real gem in here in the context of this decision. A real gem. Because, Mr. Speaker, I am determined that we must set the right ground rules for this 11th Assembly. The Minister of Social Services has very frankly stated to us that there have been too many jobs lost in her community already. Why were the jobs lost in the past? Did previous Ministers move jobs around the Territories? I do not know. If that is true, we have to stop it or we are going to compound it by saying yes, once more, to these political decisions.

Achieving Goals Through Restraint

The Direction for the 1990s, coming out of the Snare Rapids meeting. Again on the last page the government is talking about its goals and its limited resources. Government, and this is the Executive Council, "To achieve our goals, we will restrain spending, cut back programs, restructure organizations and reallocate resources. We are ready to make tough decisions: where we might have said 'yes' in the past, we are prepared to say 'no' now."

An Abuse Of Principle

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to put this decision in the context of the role of the Executive Council. Mr. Speaker, let me say how disappointed I am at the eight people that we elected to the Executive. I am disappointed that they would allow the Executive Council to fall into disrepute by a decision like this. I voted for most of those people on the Executive Council. I feel responsible for putting them there. I feel a sense of betrayal because, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, although there may be those in this room who disagree with me, I think if we allow this kind of decision to continue, this Assembly becomes a laughing stock of the citizenry. I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, if the vote were tomorrow, that I would support any of them again as they cannot see, or refuse to see, the principle that is being abused here. I am disappointed particularly at those four Members of the Executive who were also on the last Executive just a few months earlier, when the first decision was made, after an outside study was done and a review done by a planning committee of senior departmental officials and other public servants. How those four individuals can come to this Assembly supporting this change is beyond me.

Mr. Speaker, in my initial informal conversations with some Ministers and with some other MLAs after January, when I learned of this decision, when this decision was discussed, it was passed off in a jocular fashion in my presence. The implication being, "What did you expect, Richard? It is politics." Mr. Speaker, that is not politics as we should want it in the NWT. It is not a laughing matter. But unfortunately, sir, as I state, I fear that we in the Assembly, this institution and we in it are being laughed at by the public that we serve or purport to serve, that we allow this decision of the Executive to stand and set a precedent for our 11th Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, we have all spoken in eloquent words in recent months on national issues such as the Meech Lake Accord and Bill C-72, telling Ottawa and the rest of the country that we have grown up, we have matured and we are entitled to some respect. If we support this ill-advised decision of the Minister and her Executive colleagues to stand, I believe we are giving a different kind of message; a message that we have grown up so much that our Ministers can pork barrel with the best of them in the South. Brian Mulroney can move a prison to Port-Cartier; we can match that.

Now some may say that that is growing up. But it certainly does not entitle us to more respect as a Legislature. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed in my Executive Council and I hope -- I know I have spoken at length -- I hope they understand why. It is because of the principle at issue here. And I, as I started out saying, just wish in my heart, sir, that it had been a move from Inuvik to Fort Smith, or Hay River to Fort Smith so I could make my point, and why I feel strongly about it, in the absence of any criticism of myself for protecting my own constituency. Yellowknife does not need the jobs. I agree with you.

---Applause

Mr. Speaker, I say that without reservation. I hope to emphatically make my point. It is not the God damn jobs -- sorry, sir, I withdraw that. The issue is the decision-making process and whether we are going to allow it to continue. To try and make the points further, in the absence of the personalities or the locations of the ridings, let me pose a scenario. What if, for whatever reason, eight of us on this side of the House tomorrow became the Executive and those of you over there became ordinary Members. And what if Mr. Butters became our Government Leader, and what if he appointed Mr. Ernerk to be his Minister of Social Services tomorrow, March 25. And what if, in the first month that Mr. Ernerk was in office as Minister of Social Services, he directed his department to cancel the young offenders custody unit to be built in Iqaluit and said, "I want you to develop a plan for putting that in Rankin Inlet, my riding, where some of my relatives are employed in the Department of Social Services."

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame, shame, shame!

MR. RICHARD: What if, Mr. Speaker...

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson.

Point Of Order

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, Rule 35 requires that in debate a Member will be called to order by the Speaker if he imputes false or unavowed motives to another Member, if he speaks disrespectfully of Her Majesty, if he uses abusive or insulting language of a nature likely to create disorder, or if he charges another Member with uttering a deliberate falsehood. Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that you have ruled earlier that Rule 35 shall not apply because replies to the Opening Address may not be debated. But with the greatest respect, Mr. Speaker, are you suggesting that a Member can charge another Member with lies, can impute...

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson, you are not to ask questions of the Speaker.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: I was asking on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Not in the form of a question.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: The Member, Mr. Speaker, is again imputing a motive to the Member, Mr. Speaker, of not only pork barrelling, but now nepotism, and I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the rules should not allow those kinds of charges to be made in this Legislature without the Member being named. There must be some rules of decorum in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. I will review your point of order with Hansard and deliver a definitive ruling on it tomorrow.

MR. RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Continuing with my hypothetical -- what if that happened? What would be the initial reaction over here among these eight, if you can picture that, that you are an ordinary Member again, there are eight Ministers over here and in the first month that happened? You heard about it. What would be your initial reaction? Mr. Speaker, what would the public think, initially, about that decision by the hypothetical Minister Ernerk? And upon ordinary Members questioning hypothetical Minister Ernerk about the justification for reversing the earlier decision, when he replied, "You cannot have the young offenders in Iqaluit beside the adult offenders in Iqaluit. That is why. And besides that, Rankin Inlet needs the jobs more than Iqaluit." How would they feel about that kind of response, Mr. Speaker?

Veteran Ministers Disappointing

Mr. Speaker, it is the veterans on the Executive Council that I am most disappointed in. I can understand, in all seriousness, a new Minister, a new MLA, being zealous, or overzealous, having, like all of us, promised her constituents the world during the recent election, wanting to deliver something for her home community. But the others, Mr. Speaker, my point is the others should have said, "No, the decision has been made. It was a well thought out decision based on sound factors for good reasons." They should have said no, as the document coming out of Snare Rapids said they would.

If this decision goes through and is confirmed by this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, what expectations do we ever have of changing that kind of practice? What if Henry Zoe, the Member for Rae-Lac la Martre, becomes a Minister for whatever reason, in the next few years, what expectations does Minister Zoe have? Worse still, what expectations do Minister Zoe's constituents have? "Oh well, he is on the Executive now, we can expect something momentarily." And I say this with no disrespect to Henry. Let us pick another one from that corner, Sam Gargan. What if he became a Minister...

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, your button went off just now.

MR. RICHARD: I say again, Sam.

---Laughter

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to make the point about the precedent. What about the next new Minister, and the next new Minister after that? What sort of expectations are we building up for potential Ministers and their constituents?

Practice May Become A Guideline

There was a suspicion, Mr. Speaker, while I was in attendance during the last Assembly, that with our system of Executive and ordinary Members that the Executive was able to go and make promises individually to individual MLAs and sort of keep enough votes on side that they were able to continue as a group in office. I know there is a give and take there in the system that we have, where there are no party or team allegiances, but I ask Members to keep these points in mind when addressing this principle of whether we are going to allow this kind of practice to be the guideline for the next four years. And I ask Members to keep these things in mind regardless of what you might be concerned about in your own constituency.

I may, Mr. Speaker, and I apologize if I have offended anyone this afternoon, but I have enough -- disappointed as I am -- I have enough trust in my colleagues on the Executive Council, and I have enough courage to speak my mind on this issue and vote as my conscience dictates on this issue, as we come to the vote later today or tomorrow. And I hope other Members have that kind of conviction as well, sir.

I had intended to conclude my reply, sir, but I see from my notes that I neglected to return to an issue, and perhaps it is unfortunate that I finish on this issue of conflict of interest. But I want to, Mr. Speaker, indicate perhaps by some notice to the Government Leader, that I want eventually, as we are discussing this issue, to go back to his statement in this Assembly, when he reacted to the media reports about some allegation that the CBC or some radio station had made about the Minister of Social Services. I believe he, in his statement in the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, made it clear that when he assigned the portfolios he was well aware that Mrs. Marie-Jewell had relatives or a sister working in the department that he was about to assign to her by way of portfolio. That is fine. I am glad he made that clear for the record. And also he stated that with respect to this specific decision as it came to Executive Council, he, and I presume the rest of the Executive, were well aware of that situation as it related directly to this decision of reversing an earlier cabinet decision. But my question will have to be later, Mr. Speaker, with that knowledge what did the Government Leader do on those two occasions? If there was a conflict of interest that he was aware of, what did he do, being aware of the conflict? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Richard. Item 8, replies to Opening Address.

Item 9, petitions.

Item 10, reports of standing and special committees. Item 11, tabling of documents. Mr. Crow.

ITEM 11: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

MR. CROW: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table Tabled Document 105-88(1), Nuiyak School Newsletter, Problems with New Budget, dated March 11, 1988. This document I would like to table is coming from my community. I was invited to come to the community education council meeting so that they could inform me about this and I was given this document. It is a concern of the residents of Sanikiluaq concerning the Education budget and the effect it will have on the school. The cultural inclusion curriculum that was previously taught may not be taught again in school starting April 1, 1988. This document I am tabling is concerning this explanation I have just given.

Also, regarding cultural teaching in our community, cultural inclusion, at the time before the Europeans arrived our ancestors had their own equipment that they used for their survival, the artifacts, and these are taught in school in Sanikiluaq to the students to give them an idea of how our ancestors survived before the Europeans arrived. I just wanted to show these. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Crow. Tabling of documents. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I wish to table Tabled Document 106-88(1), a letter from the Inuvik Regional Education Committee to the Minister of Education, Mr. Patterson, asking him to re-examine the cutbacks in the Education budget.

I also wish to table Tabled Document 107-88(1), a letter from the Inuvik Regional Council to the Minister of Education, Mr. Patterson, stating a motion of that council. Signatures to the letter are Eddie Dillon, Grace Blake, Lucy Jackson, Bessie Hagen, Elizabeth Kunnizzi, John Kendo, Michael Neyelle, Florence Barnaby, Eddie Wright, Sr. Celeste Goulet, Jeff Gardiner, Terry Buist, Pat Ruben, Sheila Nasogaluak.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Butters. Tabling of documents. Item 12, notices of motion. Mr. Gargan.

ITEM 12: NOTICES OF MOTION

Notice Of Motion 17-88(1): Tabling Of Transcript Of Public Hearing On Preparation Of Report Of The Task Force On Aboriginal Languages

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on Monday, March 28, 1988, I will move that the Legislative Assembly request the Government of the Northwest Territories to prepare and table in this Assembly the verbatim transcript of the public hearing in the Northwest Territories that resulted in the preparation and final report of the task force on aboriginal languages. Further, that the government consider having this transcript prepared by an independent body such as the regional council or a native organization.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of motion. Item 13, notices of motion for first reading of bills. Mr. Ballantyne.

ITEM 13: NOTICES OF MOTION FOR FIRST READING OF BILLS

Notice Of Motion For First Reading Of Bill 6-88(1): Loan Authorization Act, 1988-89

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on Monday, March 28, 1988, I shall move that Bill 6-88(1), An Act to Authorize the Making of Loans During the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1989, be read for the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. Notices of motion for first reading of bills. Mr. Ballantyne.

Notice Of Motion For First Reading Of Bill 11-88(1): Borrowing Authorization Act, 1988-89

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on Monday, March 28, 1988, I shall move that Bill 11-88(1), An Act to Authorize the Commissioner to Borrow Funds During the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1989, be read for the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, notices of motion for first reading of bills. Mr. Ballantyne.

Notice Of Motion For First Reading Of Bill 29-88(1): Interim Appropriation Act, 1988-89

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on Monday, March 28, 1988, I shall move that Bill 29-88(1), An Act Respecting Interim Appropriations for the Government of the Northwest Territories for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1989, be read for the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, notices of motion for first reading of bills.

Item 14, motions.

Item 15, first reading of bills. Item 16, second reading of bills. Mr. Ballantyne.

ITEM 16: SECOND READING OF BILLS

Second Reading Of Bill 25-88(1): Supplementary Appropriation Act, No. 4, 1987-88

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Iqaluit, that Bill 25-88(1), An Act Respecting Supplementary Appropriations for the Government of the Northwest Territories for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1988, be read for the second time. The purpose of this bill is to make supplementary appropriations for the Government of the Northwest Territories for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1988.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. The motion is in order. To the principle of the bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question is being called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? Bill 25-88(1) has had second reading.

---Carried

Second reading of bills. Mr. Patterson.

Second Reading Of Bill 7-88(1): Student Financial Assistance Act

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Amittuq, that Bill 7-88(1), An Act to Amend the Student Financial Assistance Act, be read for the second time. The purpose of this bill is to amend the schedule to the Student Financial Assistance Act to provide for the maximum aggregate of principal amounts outstanding in respect of all loans for the fiscal year 1988-89 and subsequent years.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. The motion is in order. To the principle of the bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question is being called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? Bill 7-88(1) has had second reading.

---Carried

Second reading of bills. Mr. Clerk, Bill 25-88(1), Supplementary Appropriation Act, No. 4, 1987-88, and Bill 7-88(1), Student Financial Assistance Act, have had second reading and are ordered into committee of the whole for today. Item 17, consideration in committee of the whole of bills and other matters: Report of Standing Committee on Finance on the 1988-89 Main Estimates; Bill 1-88(1), Appropriation Act, 1988-89; Ministers' Statement 13-88(1); Tabled Document 71-88(1), Direction for the 1990s; Tabled Document 80-88(1), Task Force on the Meech Lake Accord; Ministers' Statement 43-88(1); Tabled Document 101-88(1), Development Plan, Young Offender Secure Custody Facilities; Bill 25-88(1), Supplementary Appropriation Act, No. 4, 1987-88; and Bill 7-88(1), Student Financial Assistance Act, with Mr. Gargan in the chair.

ITEM 17: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS AND OTHER MATTERS

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE ON THE 1988-89 MAIN ESTIMATES; BILL 1-88(1), APPROPRIATION ACT, 1988-89; MINISTERS' STATEMENT 43-88(1), WESTERN ARCTIC MAXIMUM SECURE FACILITY FOR YOUNG OFFENDERS; TABLED DOCUMENT 101-88(1), DEVELOPMENT PLAN, YOUNG OFFENDER SECURE CUSTODY FACILITIES

Department Of Social Services

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): The committee will come to order. We are dealing with the Department of Social Services. We have a motion on the floor by Mr. Ballantyne. What is the wish of the committee? Does the committee wish to deal with the motion or does the Minister wish to bring in her witnesses? Does the committee agree then, that the Minister brings in her witnesses? Madam Minister, for the record would the Minister introduce her witnesses.

HON. JEANNIE MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the record, my witnesses are the deputy minister of Social Services, Mr. Bob Cowcill and the director of finance, Mrs. Phyllis Sartor.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated yesterday due to the fact that there is a motion on the floor I did want to exercise my right in voting and therefore would wish to remain at my seat until the motion has come to a conclusion. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Madam Minister. Mr. Butters. To the motion.

MR. BUTTERS: No. Just on the process which the Minister indicated. I do not think that anybody wishes to see her divorced from her experts here. I would like to ask her a question and if she cannot answer, is it her intention to refer it to the experts at the chairs or does she wish to be with them? If a vote is called, you will have lots of time to get to your seat and make your vote from your seat.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Butters. This is the Minister's discretion. Madam Minister.

HON. JEANNIE MARIE-JEWELL: As I had stated, I feel comfortable sitting here, Mr. Chairman. It is not with the idea of divorcing myself from my departmental officials. In the event there are questions regarding this tabled document or whatever, because of the fact that that document was commissioned before my becoming Minister, the information may be available through my officials. I think if the information also in fact pertains to the motion, this is the purpose of retaining my witnesses at the witness table but also wanting to be at my seat in the event a vote comes up. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Madam Minister. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: I understand from the Minister's comment that questions will be able to be put to her witnesses on matters on which she has no personal knowledge.

Further Discussion On Motion To Amend Detail Of Capital, Correction Services, Department Of Social Services

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Butters. To the motion. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: The Minister I wish to direct the question to is not in his chair. I wonder if you would ask the Minister responsible for the Financial Management Board to return to his seat.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mrs. Marie-Jewell on Friday, January 22, indicated in a special meeting of the standing committee on finance that the decision to approve the relocation of the planned facility from Yellowknife to Fort Smith occurred, I believe it was, on Monday morning January 18. Is that correct? Could the Minister confirm that?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Minister.

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: I think that is the date but I will check it.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Marie-Jewell indicated that they had met in cabinet. Now, was the decision made in the FMB or was it made in the Executive Council? Who was in the chair when the decision was approved?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Ballantyne.

Executive Decision, Ratified By FMB

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: I feel like a witness at a murder trial. The decision was discussed obviously in the Executive Council and an agreement in principle was reached. Mr. Patterson was in the chair. The decision was ratified by the FMB with me in the chair.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: The decision made by the Executive Council. Was that also made on the Monday morning? Or is that a decision that was made very much earlier as referred to in the Government Leader's statement where he says that "the cabinet decided other alternatives should be considered"?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Ballantyne.

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: I will let the Government Leader answer that since he made the statement.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Patterson. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: What I am trying to find out, I am having difficulty and maybe the questioning is obtuse but I would like to know whether the decision was made by the FMB. The Minister for the FMB has just said they ratified the decision of the Executive Council. If they did that -- and I think that many Members were in the chambers when Mr. Richard spoke a few moments ago, when he indicated the role and responsibility of the FMS -- one of the responsibilities of that secretariat is to look at the costs associated with the move and other financial matters and to determine objectively, relative to the decision. That is what I want to know. Whether or not the Minister responsible for the FMB had the secretariat examine this decision.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Ballantyne.

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Yes.

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

MR. BUTTERS: Before or after the Executive Council had determined that the decision was to be made?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Ballantyne.

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: It was discussed as I recall, and I unfortunately do not have the information right in front of me. There was a fairly lengthy discussion in both Executive Council and in FMB on this particular subject.

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

Consideration Of Other Alternatives

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to the Government Leader based on his statement earlier this week. He said in the second paragraph of his Ministers' statement, "...during the new cabinet's review of the capital budget, the cabinet decided other alternatives should be considered." That is, other alternatives to the original decision to put the facility in Yellowknife. I wonder if the Government Leader could tell me when the cabinet decided other alternatives should be considered.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Patterson. Mr. Ballantyne, your point of order.

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: I thought this was a debate. This is a very unusual way to carry on a debate. As I said yesterday, if this were put in its proper context and debated when the page came up, the questions would be asked to the Minister and to us. Normally a debate does not take place in the form of this sort of questioning. I am interested, Mr. Chairman, on exactly what basis this debate is taking place.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Ballantyne, with your point of order. Yesterday I did say that the Members are entitled to ask questions of the Ministers. But if the Ministers do not wish to respond, then that is up to them. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, that is why I am directing my questions to the Minister of the FMB who moved the motion. The Government Leader's statement was moved into the committee of the whole so we could ask questions of the Government Leader. That is what I am doing. I think I am pursuing my right as a Member. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Government Leader would answer my question if his colleague would stop whispering in his ear.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, I do not have detailed notes of the extensive meetings of cabinet since November but my best recollection is that the first review of the capital budget by the new Executive Council took place in early December. It was at that time that the Minister of

Social Services suggested that she had some doubts about the wisdom of the previous government's decision and that cabinet should consider alternatives based on new factors, including an analysis of the economic implications, including factors such as the availability of mobile treatment facilities, including factors such as the analysis of the employment implications, including analysis of the experience and cultural implications of staffing decisions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: The Government Leader, Mr. Chairman, indicated that cabinet decided other alternatives should be considered. What were those alternatives?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, moving the centre to Fort Smith. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Well, the Minister should correct his statement to put "alternative" in the singular then. It should read, "Cabinet decided one other alternative should be considered." I just would like to indicate that his statement is wrong. Other alternatives were being considered.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, my colleagues have reminded me that Hay River was also an option that was considered in the review. I apologize for not mentioning that in my first answer.

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

MR. BUTTERS: In determining those alternatives, was there any other documentation looked at? Were any other reports examined or was this the result of an oral discussion?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Patterson.

Decision Based On Cabinet Document

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, the document on which the decision was based is a cabinet document which would have addressed a number of factors. No other documents were considered by the cabinet in making that decision, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: I understand that cabinet documents are not available to the committee and no other documents, the Government Leader said, were considered. So that this document was obviously not considered, Development Plan, Young Offender Secure Custody Facilities. Would you confirm that? Would the Government Leader confirm that?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, my recollection is that the only document that the cabinet worked from was a cabinet decision paper. The study that the Member refers to was undoubtedly available to the Minister and examined by the department. But my recollection is that it was not considered by the cabinet. The cabinet worked from a decision paper which summarized a number of factors and considerations. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: I understand there were two alternatives considered. One, the Fort Smith option and the other, the Hay River alternative. I wonder why Inuvik or Cambridge Bay were not considered in view of the fact that so many of the people that are treated in these institutions come from those particular regions.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, the cabinet acted on the recommendations of the Minister of Social Services and I would like to refer that question to the Minister. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Butters, your point of order.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I am questioning the Government Leader on his statement to the House and if I depart from that then I can ask the Minister a question myself. I am referring to the Government Leader's statement.

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: This is not question period, this is a debate. Read the rules.

MR. BUTTERS: I do not need instruction from you.

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Well, I think you do.

MR. RICHARD: The chairman already told you that you are wrong on that, item.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Does the Minister wish to respond? Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I find the Member's questions to be going into a detail that I do not think it is fair to expect me to be able to answer without all the documents and all the factors that were considered at the cabinet meeting before me. So, since this is becoming sort of a question period, I would have to take that question under notice, review the minutes, review the studies and documents available to the Minister and to the department, and provide a proper detailed answer at another time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Mr. Butters.

New And Significant Factors Considered

MR. BUTTERS: I do not require a detailed answer. The Minister has already indicated that Cambridge Bay and the Inuvik area were not considered alternatives when the cabinet discussed the document. Again examining the Government Leader's paper, I would like to look at the new and significant factors that were introduced into the equation. I will summarize them: 1) Yellowknife's growth, 2) the treatment team can travel, 3) remands would be kept in the communities and 4), and this is "a significant factor to this government", the Government Leader said, the economic decline south of the lake. Is that a fair summary of the "new and significant factors", Mr. Chairman? I wonder if the Government Leader would confirm that.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member for Inuvik and the honourable Member for Yellowknife South seem to ignore the penultimate point of the statement which is jobs -- the fact that moving the centre to Yellowknife would require the elimination of some 20 jobs in the community of Fort Smith, jobs which happen to be held by native people who happen to be of the same cultural background as most of the young offenders, and the fact that the analysis of the staffing requirements and experience in Yellowknife indicate that experience and the cultural experience of employees in the existing facility in Yellowknife would not be as relevant or as useful to the young offenders. So I would like to add the point of jobs to the Member's summary. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Well, that is what I thought he meant by the economic decline south of the lake and jobs. I would take his answer a little more to heart if I had not known that last year he moved the main management pod of Arctic College to Yellowknife. I do not know why the Minister of Education could not have left it in Fort Smith where it belonged.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Patterson, your point of order.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: The Member should be asked to confine his remarks to points relevant to the motion. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Yes, I would like to remind the Members to please talk to the motion. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: I am sorry, sir, I thought I was talking about jobs being moved from Fort Smith.

MR. RICHARD: Agreed.

MR. BUTTERS: But I guess I was not. Is the Government Leader aware that there has been a significant economic decline in the Mackenzie Delta? And if he is aware of that fact, is that not a significant factor to his government?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, yes, I am aware of the significant decline due to reduced oil activity in the Beaufort region and that is why I was very pleased to have, at great difficulty, found the capital and operating money to establish a college campus in the Inuvik Region last year. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: A college campus that has been asked for by that region for the last 25 years -- long before the Member ever arrived in the Territories, and the Member will recall too that when I was Minister of Education I laid the first steps for the college in Iqaluit...

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

---Applause

MR. BUTTERS: But I am very serious about the fact that, and the Minister recognizes that, there has been an economic decline in the Mackenzie Delta. I am very pleased to hear him say that it is a significant factor to his government. But in view of that fact, why then was not one of the alternatives considered by cabinet, the Western Arctic?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Patterson.

Significant Program Advantages

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, in examining other alternatives, I think one of the factors that was important to the cabinet in considering Fort Smith and Hay River, was the fact that there are existing institutions in those communities that can be used or can be used to offset the requirements for new young offenders facilities. I think it is also important to consider that we looked at the program of the proposed young offenders facility as well. Program factors were of considerable importance and there are significant advantages available in those communities that were not present in Inuvik. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. We will take a 15 minute coffee break.

---SHORT RECESS

The committee will now come to order. Just to remind the Members regarding the motion. You can debate the motion or ask questions about the motion. The Ministers do not have to answer the questions if they do not want to. It is a debate or question period. It still has to go back and forth. To the motion. Mr. McLaughlin.

Intention Was To Keep Fort Smith Facility Open

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to restate a couple of things that seem to have been blown out of proportion -- the fact that there will be 20 jobs lost in Fort Smith. The original intention was that there would be a medium secure custody facility built in Iqaluit to serve the Eastern Arctic and the present facility which is already in existence in Fort Smith where these people are working, would remain open as the medium secure custody facility for the Western Arctic; and the maximum secure custody facility, to serve the whole NWT, would be located in

Yellowknife. So to say that the people in Fort Smith are going to lose their jobs and have to move to Yellowknife and put pressure on the job, is not right. It was always the intention to keep the Fort Smith facility open and to close the one in Hay River which was opened only temporarily for one or two years. People were originally hired there with that understanding.

When I was the Minister, the Department of Public Works advised us that if we were going to use that facility for more than a year then we would have to construct something new in Hay River. So it always was the intention, the officials told me and I told the Executive; it was under my understanding that once we got the money to build two new facilities, the facility in Hay River would be closed because it was a temporary building anyway. So there was never any intention to close down the already existing medium secure custody facility in Fort Smith and move it to Yellowknife. The intention was to keep it open, close the one in Hay River and run the one that served the whole Territories out of Yellowknife.

Having secure custody facilities in all the regions if possible, which other Members talked about, was considered, but the negotiations with the federal government while fairly successful, certainly did not give us the luxury of being able to operate secure custody facilities in every region and every area of the territory. So we basically have enough money to run three facilities: One medium secure to serve the Eastern Arctic; one medium secure to serve the Western Arctic; and one maximum secure to serve the whole Territories.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. McLaughlin. Madam Minister.

HON. JEANNIE MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess that just confirmed what I had told the Assembly yesterday, of the effect that the economic impact south of the lake would have on either community. They would lose 20 jobs. Whether it was in Fort Smith or Hay River, those jobs were going to be lost and more jobs would be placed in Yellowknife. This is one of the factors that was brought to cabinet when the new decision was made, to try to maintain those jobs south of the lake because of the decline south of the lake. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Madam Minister. To the motion. Mr. Richard.

Iqaluit Facility Eliminates Jobs South Of The Lake

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, just on that point and going back to when Mr. Butters and Mr. Patterson were speaking to the issue. I appreciate just now that the Minister of Social Services did not put it in these terms, but she did yesterday and the Government Leader did today as well. Building the centre in Yellowknife would eliminate 20 jobs in Fort Smith. I do not think that is a fair statement, now that I have had the opportunity to read this report, and I know that the Minister is saying that under the current plan, unless it is changed, either Fort Smith or Hay River would lose some positions because the current plan says we have to have a medium secure facility in the Eastern Arctic. There are three of them in the Western Arctic now, three temporary facilities let us call them. But it is because there is one being built in Iqaluit that one of the three in the Western Arctic, one of the two south of the lake under the current plan, has to be shut down. So when it says building the centre in Yellowknife would eliminate 20 jobs in Fort Smith or Hay River, that is not true. It is building the new centre in Iqaluit, as it should be, that is what would eliminate 20 jobs south of the lake under the current plan, unless changed. So I just wanted to make that clarification, Mr. Chairman, but I think with the three explanations that have been given now, people understand it.

Remanding Young Offenders In Communities

I would like, Mr. Chairman, since I have the mike, to turn to another matter in the Government Leader's statement of two days ago and refer to a different so-called "new" factor and direct the question, even though you say, Mr. Chairman, that Ministers do not have to answer them, to the Government Leader or to the Minister of Justice, and that is this reference to the department "planning to house remanded young offenders in secure facilities in communities instead of bringing them all to Yellowknife." I would like to know when this decision was made, what communities are being referred to, where are the secure facilities in these communities, and at what costs are you going to hold remanded young offenders in the communities. Before I finish, the Minister did give Mr. McLaughlin some information recently, I believe yesterday, on the breakdown of the total client days at the facility in Yellowknife, a breakdown between sentences and remands, and remands was a significant amount if I recall, about half. So we are talking about a significant number of remand days. But this new factor, I would like to know when was that decided and what is the cost? What is the plan?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Richard. Madam Minister.

HON. JEANNIE MARIE-JEWELL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Assembly to allow my departmental officials to clarify this misunderstanding regarding remands and clarify this issue for the Assembly, if they would so allow.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Cowcill.

MR. COWCILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The department's plan, Mr. Chairman, and it is laid out in one of the principles of the planning study that you have referred to today, is to house remanded offenders in all secure facilities. This plan is now possible, and by the way once Iqaluit is open, this plan is possible because youth court judges are now available on a decentralized basis. As you know, there has previously been a resident judge in the Fort Smith Region, in Hay River. There is now a resident judge in the Baffin Region, in Iqaluit, and so we feel, and as I say it was laid out in the consultants' report, that it is more logical to deal with these remand cases, where possible, close to their home region. We anticipate that this particular move, particularly in the case of Iqaluit, will also save a considerable amount of money that our government is now expending bringing remands across to Yellowknife.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Cowcill. Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that clarification because it makes my point initially when I was addressing the Assembly with my reaction to the statement made by Government Leader Patterson two days ago. None of these, then, are new factors. That one is not. The deputy minister has indicated that that factor is included in the study that was available in 1987 when the previous cabinet made the decision, and certainly the youth court judges who are in the regions were in the regions in 1987, so that is not a new factor at all. It was available to those who made the decisions in the summer of 1987. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Richard. Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the statement says, "This decision was made by cabinet based on sound reasons and additional factors which had not been considered previously." I think it is important for the Member to understand, Mr. Chairman, that generally the decisions that are taken by cabinet are based on the recommendation of a Minister. The previous Minister recommended the facility be built in Yellowknife with supporting reasons, documentations and factors. Another Minister and another cabinet recommended that that decision should be reviewed based on additional factors which had not been considered in the previous decision. We are not implying that all of the factors are entirely new. What I am suggesting, however, is that the cabinet based its decision on a recommendation which was supported by factors that had not been considered or emphasized previously. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Patterson, for that clarification. Mr. McLaughlin.

Factors All Discussed By Previous Executive Council

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have some problems with what seems to be going on here and it is becoming more and more apparent now to me, listening to what happened in some of the other standing committee meetings that have looked at the budget. I find out that in December sometime the Executive made a decision to review other considerations because of new factors. Well, I have not heard any new factors being discussed that I did not discuss at Executive Council meetings some of which were as late as July, August and September on this. In fact, at one Executive Council meeting I even brought up that we should probably make the decision to close one of those two places so these are not new factors that were not discussed at the Executive as late as September. To impute otherwise is not right. I happened to be here during the election. I did not go to my constituency in June and not come back until November. I was in Yellowknife at Executive Council meetings.

I had one Member tell me a whole bunch of new factors came up while the election campaign was on and I obviously did not know about it. He was the one who was not in Yellowknife. I was here. These factors were discussed. This topic came to the Executive Council several times over the last year and a half as to whether there should be small secure custody facilities everywhere. Whether something should go in the Keewatin or not. Why should it go in Iqaluit instead of the Keewatin?

Should the Kitikmeot people go there? None of these are new factors. They might have been new to the new Ministers but they certainly were not new to the old Ministers. There is no bloody way that that is a fact. So it might have been new to a "new cabinet" but it is certainly not new to the previous Ministers who served with me. And to say otherwise is just not right.

Information Not Given To Standing Committee

The other thing I find really difficult is that we are being told here and we have been told over and over that in December they decided to look at new alternatives. Fine. Then they are saying that in January they made a decision to move the facility to Fort Smith. Then immediately after that decision was made by FMB and the Executive Council, the Minister appears before the standing committee on finance of this House and does not disclose that to that standing committee. Only when officials in the Department of Social Services phoned me and other Members of the standing committee and then we talked to CBC and found out it had been discussed in Fort Smith, only then does the Minister when she is called back by the standing committee, only then is she willing to divulge this has happened. If this was such a firm decision that was made, why was not the standing committee on finance told about it, because the decision had already been made? Why was it hidden?

These are the things that make me think there is something more than just an economic and common-sense decision to serve all the residents. It should have been divulged then and it was not. So that is the first clue that this is not a straightforward issue.

Secondly, we have been told, and it was said today and other days, that the Executive Council decision was to move it to Fort Smith. When the Minister appeared before the standing committee on finance she said the decision had been to move it to Fort Smith or Hay River. So what was the Executive Council decision? What decision did you make? Did you decide to move it to the south side of the lake or to move it to a particular community, because you have told us two different things now. If you had not even made up your mind which community it would go to, what factors between then and now, and at what subsequent meeting did the new facts come to decide whether it was going to be Fort Smith or Hay River?

No Consistency In Argument

So there is no consistency here in the argument. There is no new information that I have heard that makes me believe that there have been any significant changes. You look at the statistics that show where the young offenders are coming from; they are basically still coming, in the same proportion, from the same regions. There is the same number of young offenders, there are remands from all over the Territories. And I just cannot conceive how you can convince us in this Assembly that you are going to have two medium secure custody facilities, one in Iqaluit to serve the East and one on the south side of the lake to serve the West, where only about 15 or 20 per cent of the young offenders are coming from to start with. Then you are also going to take the maximum secure custody facility to serve the whole NWT and put it on the south side of the lake as well. It just does not make sense. We have had all the figures to deal with before. I am just afraid that the officials have been told to come up with manufactured new ideas and reasons to justify a political decision. So the more you talk, the more I do not believe. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. McLaughlin. Mr. Pollard.

MR. POLLARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It would appear that people are getting dug into positions and are thrashing around looking for all kinds of reasons not to allow this motion to go through or to be in favour of the motion. But surely at issue here is the actual people who are going to be in that facility.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Hear, hear!

---Applause

MR. BUTTERS: Jobs, jobs, jobs.

MR. RICHARD: He's missed the point, he's missed the point, he's missed the point.

MR. BUTTERS: He missed it, yes.

MR. POLLARD: So having said that, Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could get back on track and start discussing the efficiency of this facility. As we are doing the discussion by talking to the motion, perhaps we should discuss the efficiency of putting that facility in Fort Smith or Yellowknife. First of all, I would like to clear up a point that Mr. McLaughlin made and that was that the standing committee on finance was not advised by CBC. The standing committee on finance was not advised by the department officials. The standing committee on finance was advised by the Minister of Finance by way of letter, on the morning of the 22nd of January. That is when we found out about the change. So there was no leak from any officials or any calls from CBC. That is my recollection of that event.

So before we get to the efficiency of this particular facility in whatever location, I would like to ask point-blank to the Minister and try and clear up this pork-barrelling issue. I am going to ask the Minister, in all conscience, she can answer my question: Does she regard this as patronage to her constituency? Does she regard this as pork barrelling in the terms that Mr. Richard referred to earlier?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Madam Minister.

Decision To Be Made On Merit

HON. JEANNIE MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you to the honourable Member for allowing me to clarify. I, in all honesty, do not feel this decision was ever made with the intention of pork barrelling or patronage. Things that I have been looking at for years being a northerner and a native northerner for years. When the initial decision was to be looked at, I always asked for it to be made on its merits.

As I had stated to the honourable Members yesterday, the first question that I had asked the officials when they reviewed the decision was to ensure that the quality of program was maintained; to ensure that those youths were looked after in proper perspective; to ensure that those youths were not labelled as apprentices next to the YCC, to go into the YCC in future years. This is where I wanted to make sure of principles that I strongly believe in and further that I wanted to ensure that the quality of program was maintained. When the decision was reviewed my officials did advise me that the quality of program can be maintained. I had never at any point looked at pork barrelling. In fact, I did not even know what pork barrelling was until I heard an accusation made by Mr. Lewis. I still wondered until clarification came today about pork barrelling.

I have always felt decisions in my department -- I have always emphasized sincerity to my department. I have always felt myself to be a sincere person and in my opinion, it was always the idea of principle, economics, avoiding centralization and to ensure number one, the quality of program being maintained to those youths who are going to be in that facility.

Decision Not Concealed Intentionally

As I had stated in my budget speech, it was always my intention to tell the standing committee on finance. I got out of the cabinet meeting and went to the standing committee on finance. I really did want to tell them. I kept asking my official if I could tell them. I was advised by my officials that departmental staff, with all due respect, should have the first choice to be told of such a decision that had an effect on them. With due respect to my departmental staff and to my department, I did not advise the standing committee on finance although as soon as I went back to my office a letter was initiated to be sent to the chairman of the standing committee on finance. It was sent to the Minister of Finance. With the process that had taken place, it took three days to reach the chairman. It was not something that I hid intentionally.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Madam Minister. Mr. Pollard.

MR. POLLARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would now like to direct a question to the Government Leader because the Minister has assured the House that she does not believe this is pork barrelling and did not do that with that intention. So my question to the Government Leader is, and I am asking the Government Leader on behalf of the other seven Members of the Executive: When the Minister brought this proposal before the Executive Council, and there are a number of experienced MLAs on that Executive Council, did the thought cross their minds or did they discuss the fact that it may look bad, a Minister moving something from one constituency to her own constituency? Was that considered? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain to the honourable Member that from the point of view of a Minister who serves all of the Northwest Territories, these questions are always extremely difficult. I suppose ideally one would hope that, as a Minister, there would never be any situation arise in which a capital project could be fairly considered for one's constituency. One would hope that the Minister of Education would never need a new school in his or her constituency, for example. However, Mr. Chairman, almost as a matter of routine, capital projects big and small must affect the constituencies of one third of the MLAs who happen to be on the Executive Council.

Mr. Chairman, I can tell the Member that, of course, the cabinet considered that the decision and the change of the decision could be criticized. Of course we were aware that the Minister of Social Services represents a constituency that was being considered, for a number of reasons, as a location for this facility. I would not be candid if I did not answer the question very directly, that of course that was in our minds. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Mr. Pollard.

Reasons Outweighed Possible Criticism

MR. POLLARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. From the Government Leader's remarks then, with the knowledge that this could be criticized and construed as pork barrelling, can I ask the Government Leader if the practicality of the move outweighed the chances of the criticism that might come later? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. Mr. Ballantyne. Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think it is fair to say that the matter was given thoughtful consideration by the cabinet on more than one occasion. I can assure the Member that we were well aware that there might well be, in some quarters, charges of this kind. However, Mr. Chairman, the cabinet determined that there were a number of good reasons for making this decision that would outweigh the possible criticisms based on the location of the facility in the Minister's constituency.

Perhaps I can add, since Mr. Richard has raised this totally unfair accusation, in my view, that the Minister did inform me when I was discussing with her the portfolio of Social Services, which I was delighted to find she was interested in taking on, that I should know that relatives of hers, particularly her sister, worked in a child care young offender facility, just as other relatives of the Minister work for the Department of Education and other departments of this government, I am sure.

No Conflict Of Interest In Minister's Situation

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it very clear that the conflict of interest legislation of this Assembly clearly does not apply to the Minister's situation. Section 16(2) which discusses the interests of relatives, "dependant, spouse, son, daughter or other relative...who shares the same accommodation", clearly does not apply to the honourable Minister, and there is no way, in my view, and I have been advised by our legal adviser, that the Minister was in conflict by virtue of her relations. Nor does she have a direct or indirect pecuniary interest in the decision. So I would like to make it clear that that was not a consideration in the cabinet and that particular accusation is not based on law. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Mr. Pollard.

MR. POLLARD: Mr. Chairman, we operate under consensus government. And I have been assured by the Government Leader and the Minister herself that they do not believe this is pork barrelling, that they made the decision in an economic and practical sense, and I accept that. So having set that issue aside, as far as I am concerned anyway, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know now from the Minister of Social Services if she feels that she can provide to those people who will be inmates of that institution, the same kind of service in Fort Smith as in Yellowknife, or vice versa. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Madam Minister.

Staff Well Qualified To Deliver Program

HON. JEANNIE MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to assure the honourable Member that when I did ask my department to review this decision, with the other factors involved, they did advise me that the same program service could be delivered to the youth in custody in that facility. I would also at this time advise Members -- and this is one of my points in believing that the delivery of service could be maintained -- that in looking at the staffing complement in the three facilities, and in reality recognizing that the majority of those youth offenders are native people, I strongly believe that the percentage of native staff content in these facilities, and their having the depth of understanding of these young offenders, are very important to program delivery.

In my reply to Mr. McLaughlin, I have outlined the training that the staff has taken, I have outlined the education, and one other thing that I have outlined is the length of service. I have always felt that this government, to quite a degree, should have a moral obligation to those employees who have given years of service. Taking into consideration the complement of one of the facilities having, I believe, 70 per cent native staff, and the other facility having 46 per cent, and the current facility in Yellowknife having approximately 20 per cent, they have the knowledge to be able to deal with these youths, and I am led to believe by my department that this program can be delivered by the existing staff. It has been assured to me by my department that it can be.

I would also like to point out to those honourable Members wondering whether or not education is a great qualification, with all due respect, no doubt it is. I sort of sit here and look across to the ordinary Members and to Mr. Richard, the honourable Member, with the profession that he has been able to achieve. With all due respect, I respect Mr. Richard. No doubt my education qualifications do not come near Mr. Richard's but I believe that when it comes to dealing with northern people, in particular native people, I have a better understanding. Mainly because of the fact that I was born and raised in the North. I understand people in the North. And in years to come I probably will be in the North. I have always echoed this to the Assembly Members, that, as a native northerner, I am tired of these people coming into the North and making decisions for us, for example, like my last Assembly MLA who is now living in the South, and these decisions my children have to live by. When my department advised me that the staff would be able to deliver the program, I am today convinced that that program could be delivered by the existing staff in both facilities. I hope this would answer the questions the Members have in mind on staff qualifications. Thank you.

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

Access To Professional Services

MR. POLLARD: Mr. Chairman, thank you. Another question to the Minister. What about professional services? Counselling? Legal services? Will those services be available to the inmates of that particular institution if it were in Fort Smith, on a comparable basis to Yellowknife? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Madam Minister.

HON. JEANNIE MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As we are all aware, the communities south of the lake are not as fortunate as Yellowknife to have as many lawyers, although we were advised that there are legal and judicial services available in both of the communities south of the lake; counselling services, medical facilities and in fact, as we had stated, these services are available. The expansion of the mobile treatment and assessment team would make it available to these communities. That is the purpose of this mobile team, mainly for the available mobility of the team which involves psychologists, social work specialists and child care specialists. So therefore I believe that the services are available to the communities south of the lake. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Madam Minister. Mr. Pollard.

Cost Comparison, Yellowknife And Fort Smith

MR. POLLARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A question if I might, directly to the motion, to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Chairman. Is this project going to cost any more to this year's budget by having it in Fort Smith or by having it in Yellowknife? I see from the numbers it is a direct transfer. Can the Minister of Finance confirm that, please?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Ballantyne.

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: My understanding is that this year there will not be an increase in costs but that next year there will be an increase of some \$350,000 in costs. Depending on -- we have had this discussion before -- the overall change in plans, the closing down of some facilities and the opening up of others, in one configuration there is possibly some savings. But in fact, there will be an increase next year of probably something in the magnitude of \$350,000 at this point in time.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. Mr. Pollard.

MR. POLLARD: I asked specifically in this fiscal year, Mr. Chairman. I would like that confirmed, that all that is being done is moving a dollar amount from a Yellowknife page to a Fort Smith page. Is that correct? In this fiscal year.

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. Mr. Pollard.

MR. POLLARD: Now perhaps if we could deal with some of the other costs. With regard to operations and maintenance costs in years to come, which is always a concern of mine, Mr. Chairman, you build something and it looks great but is the money going to be there down the road to operate it? So has there been a cost comparison in O and M done between the two proposed locations? Or I should say the one proposed location and Yellowknife. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Ballantyne.

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Originally when Mr. Butters asked me what was the involvement of the Financial Management Secretariat in this particular equation, I was not given the opportunity at the time to probably flesh out what the involvement was. Unfortunately in this process -- and I can see that it is partly our fault; there have been questions asked, we have answered them and they lead to more questions. I think Mr. Pollard is right in the way of issues becoming lost. We are lost in a paper trail right now. If I can in this debate, I will answer your question but I want to make a couple of other comments in the process of doing that and clarify some things that have been said and hopefully try to put them in their proper perspective.

First of all, I was a little bit disappointed in some of the statements and accusations made by both Mr. McLaughlin and Mr. Richard. I respect both those individuals very, very much and in the past I have always found them both to be fair and reasonable.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Pollard, your point of order.

MR. POLLARD: I am the person who likes to ask direct questions, Mr. Chairman, and I want an answer on O and M. I am not asking for any other speeches. I just want an answer on O and M. Is it going to be cheaper in Fort Smith or cheaper in Yellowknife? That is the question. I do not want a speech. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Ballantyne.

Lower O And M Costs

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: After I answer this question, I will make my speech. There were a number of factors that obviously were considered. The major factors were obviously jobs, number one. Two, the cost of housing in Yellowknife is more than the cost of housing in Fort Smith. In Fort Smith, people were already housed. In Yellowknife they were not, so it means finding new accommodation. And the cost of municipal services in Fort Smith is cheaper than in Yellowknife. So there were three major reasons why the decision was made. We think that in the long term the O and M in Fort Smith will be less than the O and M costs in Yellowknife. Yes.

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

MR. POLLARD: Okay. Was there a cost analysis done, Mr. Chairman? That is what I am trying to arrive at. I know it is cheaper in Fort Smith than it is in Yellowknife. I know houses are cheaper in Fort Smith than they are in Yellowknife. Houses are cheaper in Toronto than they are in

Yellowknife. The point is, was there a study done? Was there an O and M comparison done between the two proposed locations in order that we might see the costs in O and M farther down the road, Mr. Chairman? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Ballantyne.

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Thank you. In the documentation that we looked at there was not a detailed comparison of those O and M costs. Correct. The major component was a loss of jobs. However, I think the reality is in comparing it, I, as a former mayor of Yellowknife, know all too well the costs so there is no doubt whatsoever that the costs would be cheaper in Fort Smith than in Yellowknife. But as to whether there was a specific study done, no.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Pollard.

Geographical Area Served

MR. POLLARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to refresh my memory, a question for the Minister of Social Services: What area will this particular facility service, the geographical area in the Territories?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Madam Minister.

HON. JEANNIE MARIE-JEWELL: The facility will serve the Western Arctic area.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): I believe the question was, what geographical area? Madam Minister.

HON. JEANNIE MARIE-JEWELL: I apologize. I was not quite listening to Mr. Pollard when he asked the question. I was under the assumption that he was directing the question to the Minister of Finance. The maximum secure facility will serve the Territories in general, as a whole.

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

MR. POLLARD: So people will be coming from across this territory to this facility. Has there been a survey done on the increased costs, presumably increased costs, of channelling those people on to Fort Smith? Has that been taken into consideration? This is to the Minister of Social Services, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Madam Minister.

HON. JEANNIE MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know the department did look at these in their review. I would like the deputy minister to reply to this question when we get into consideration.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Cowcill.

MR. COWCILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The department did examine a number of the cost factors related to the move. We have already mentioned that on the capital side there will be a net increase to build the stand-alone facility in Fort Smith. The facility O and M, we have been advised by DPW, will be equal to or lower than Yellowknife.

Additional Transportation Costs

There will be some costs associated with the additional transportation of sentenced offenders. I believe for our department, anyway, it is an extra \$115, for example, for a child coming up from the Inuvik area. With respect to remands, at this point we are not positive how that will impact because, as I mentioned earlier, we are going to be changing our approach to dealing with remands by, for example, keeping remands over that are currently coming across from the Eastern Arctic. In Iqaluit when the new facility opens, in fact, we are anticipating with the Iqaluit facility that there will be considerable savings over what is currently expended on travel, with the new arrangement. But on a net basis, over Yellowknife, there will be some extra transportation costs. We have not done an analysis of the infrastructure costs which Mr. Ballantyne has referred to, within the department. Obviously the Financial Management Secretariat has a better beat on what those cost differences might be between Yellowknife and Fort Smith.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Cowcill. Mr. Kilabuk.

MR. KILABUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like further clarification as well, in this area of the motion. I have some concerns that I plan on letting you know. First of all I have a question which deals with the relationship of the family and how the family life will be affected when the transfer is made to Fort Smith. Have you looked at whether the young offenders will have easier access to their families by relocating in Fort Smith? Was this also considered in those factors?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Madam Minister.

HON. JEANNIE MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The question Mr. Kilabuk has posed was looked at. The family relation aspect of the facility was looked at. When it was reviewed, also, it was noted that the majority of visits or family contacts were done by telephone here in Yellowknife. Very few of those young offenders get family visits. This was taken into account when the decision was being reviewed. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Kilabuk.

MR. KILABUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I suspect that this has not been considered thoroughly because Yellowknife is such a central location. It is the main access for transportation to and from different regions. I believe this has not been thoroughly reviewed. The way I see it is, there is access into Fort Smith but it is not as readily accessible, compared to Yellowknife. I do not see how families would be more able to communicate or visit with the young offenders, unless you thought of providing transportation funding for these families to be able to visit their children. Yellowknife is so central and we often meet in this city. I believe you have not thoroughly reviewed this aspect and I urge you to reconsider that aspect for the future.

How Location Would Affect Nunavut

Also, there is another aspect that I believe you really have not looked at, which is the formation of self-government and Nunavut. Because Yellowknife is such a central location, have you also considered the formation of Nunavut coming into existence and how it would affect Nunavut, being located in Fort Smith as compared to Yellowknife? If Nunavut should come into existence, there would have to be plans made to transfer ownership of facilities such as that. Have you considered things like that as well? May I have an answer please?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Madam Minister.

HON. JEANNIE MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, the aspect of family visits has been looked at by the department and it was determined that very few families visit the young offenders in those facilities. The majority of their contacts with these young offenders are done by telephone. In regard to placing a maximum secure facility in the Eastern Arctic, in the event Nunavut ever became a reality, this is obviously something the department will have to look at when the division takes place, in placing the services that we have in the West in the East. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Madam Minister. Mr. Kilabuk.

MR. KILABUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I was aware that this was carefully looked at, the idea of Nunavut coming into existence. This is part of the concern that I felt. I would like to look into my future and see what we can expect and I look forward to a good future. Maybe we should look more closely at the relocation of this facility. People who are qualified can travel to different regions to obtain employment, and I would not want to see job opportunities being open and being taken only by people from within Fort Smith if it is to serve the NWT, which consists of so many different regions. I do not believe in the loss of job opportunities to begin with. Job opportunities are made available wherever, and this was one of my main concerns. Mr. Chairman, I urge the others to reconsider and to plan for our future because we still have a bit of time. We have three years. These were my concerns, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Kilabuk. Mr. Alloo.

Counselling And Rehabilitating Offenders

HON. TITUS ALLOOLOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, when the decision was being debated regarding the location of the young offenders facility, the experts, or the consultants, professionals, did a review and stated that the facilities are put into existence with the idea of counselling and rehabilitating the young offenders, and to be able to put them back into society once they reach their community. That is our priority with regard to the young offenders. What was also stated is that Inuit and Metis, or aboriginal people, form a majority of the population of these offenders. There is a larger number of aborigines who are still able to be rehabilitated and so if the facility should be located in Yellowknife we are all aware that 20 per cent of the staff would consist of aboriginal people and in Fort Smith it would be a percentage of 80 per cent. (Translation ends)

The young people who have committed offences -- and the primary purpose of getting these is to get these young people back to the society where they could be useful to their own communities and to their own people, so they could contribute to the communities and to the whole Northwest Territories. It is a known fact by the professionals who have studied in this area, that the utilization and enforcement of traditional and cultural values are very important in rehabilitating these young people, since the young people who are in these facilities are mostly aboriginal people. It is also known by the professionals that alienating these young people from their environment is detrimental to some degree, and this is quite well documented.

Inability To Cope With Different Environment

One case that I know was sent from Baffin Region for a six month period to Yellowknife. Because he could not cope with the people and the environment, he ended up serving two and a half years instead of the initial six months, and he was considered dangerous and a troublemaker by the authorities. He was offered by the Yellowknife Correctional Centre -- because he served two and a half years; he was a young offender when he got there, and after two and a half years he became an adult -- he was offered to go back to the Baffin Correctional Centre. The Baffin Correctional Centre said, "No, we do not want him. He is a troublemaker and he will make trouble in our centre." He stayed in Yellowknife until the opportunity for him to go back to the region and the Mingtuo centre opened. My understanding is that when he went back to his own environment, to his own people, he changed. Today he is helping out, even though he is serving; he is helping out with the young offenders, talking to them in some way; he is helpful to the staff, and he changed. It goes to show that when the people are removed from their environment, in a lot of cases they cannot cope. I do not have the statistics here now, but I will get them tomorrow.

It is well known by the authorities that the young offenders who have come to Yellowknife have gone back to Baffin Region and have tried to commit suicide. They are introduced to a foreign environment, foreign values and when they go back they cannot cope. And therefore they have tried to end their lives. My feeling is that the best counselling, the best assistance these young people will have in the centres, will be from their own people. And most of them are native people. My understanding is that if the centre stays in Yellowknife then 20 per cent of the staff will be native people and if it is in Fort Smith it will be close to 80 per cent. Aside from the money matters and the need to move facilities, the very important part of it is that these facilities exist because we are there to rehabilitate the young people. We should put that into consideration. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Allooloo. Mr. Wray.

Certain Information Provided Affects Decision

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There has been a lot of rhetoric today and emotions run high and we hear a lot of charges and countercharges, and a lot of peripheral and really irrelevant issues are brought into the whole argument. The bottom line is, is it a good decision or not? I think it is a good decision, being one of the so-called veteran Members of the cabinet who supposedly should know better. In fact, I do know better and when the decision was reconsidered I wholeheartedly supported the Minister of Social Services, because when she brought it to the table, she brought it in a different perspective than had been brought before. There was additional information made available to us that had not been made available before, or was highlighted for us. I think that what people have to understand is that when a department, and sometimes a Minister, wants a certain decision made, then there are times when only certain information is provided so that only a certain decision can be made.

Now in Mr. Richard's comments, and Mr. Butters has alluded to it, mention is made of the study which has been tabled and I object to it being tabled. I will illustrate for you in a minute why it is dangerous to table reports commissioned for government departments. This study was not an objective study, to study where the facility should go. This study was undertaken after it had been predetermined that the facility was to go to Yellowknife. The study was undertaken to confirm that decision. And if you read the study it only talks about the maximum secure facility being in Yellowknife. They do not talk about anything else. So the study is not an objective feasibility study of where this facility should go. That, first of all, has to be understood.

Errors In Document Re Keewatin Region

Secondly, if I had been the Minister of Social Services at the time, I would have fired somebody for this study and I would have refused to have paid for it, because among other things, I would have read it. In reading this study, which is being highlighted by Mr. Richard and Mr. Butters as an objective study with all these experts that put information into it, from pages 50 to 62 which concern my region, the Keewatin Region, there are 14 errors, major errors and four potential errors because I have not had time to check the other four out; 18 mistakes in two pages. And major mistakes. Not minor errors, major errors. Now if I had the time or the expertise I could probably get somebody to go over this entire document and find a helluva lot more than 18 errors on two pages. So that is why documents like this should not be tabled in this Assembly, because they are erroneous documents containing erroneous information and the reports have never been accepted by the government as comprehensive and complete reports. And to try and use them to justify any kind of decision is doing a disservice to this Assembly and to the government. I made it clear when this report was made available to me -- and this report, by the way, was not made available to me when the original decision was made. It was the new Minister of Social Services who made that report available to me. I did not even know that such a report existed.

One other thing I would like to say -- I would like to say for the benefit of some of the Eastern Arctic Members. I have sat in this House for five years and I wished to hell that this House would pay as much attention to issues when the concern is in Rae-Edzo or Baker Lake or Pangnirtung, as we do every time there is an issue that concerns Yellowknife or Fort Smith or Inuvik. I am getting a little bit tired of every time we make a decision about this city, it has to become a major point of debate in this House.

When they closed the mine down in Eskimo Point, was there a major debate in this House? It was not even talked about. When we cancelled the Grise Fiord school, a major decision that this new cabinet made within the last month, was it the subject of a major debate in the House? When Pangnirtung did not get its airstrip extension, which is going to cost severe economic hardship for that community, was there a major debate in this House? No, but every time we do something in this damn town there is a major debate in this House and we take days to debate it. Why? If that facility had been moved from Baker Lake to Cambridge Bay, would there have been a three day debate in this House? No, there would not have been. You know it and we all know it. This only became an issue because it happened to be Yellowknife and because the media is centered here and the media made it an issue. That is why we are debating it. That is why we are spending so much time on this issue. We make lots of controversial decisions but we sure as hell do not take three or four days of the House's time to discuss them.

Decisions By Ministers

So I hope that people realize what is going on here and forget all the red herrings that are being thrown up. Forget the charges of nepotism, forget the charges of pork barrelling, because they are not relevant and they are not appropriate. If we were going to accuse a Minister of pork barrelling every time that a particular decision was made to put something into their own constituency, the bloody Member for Yellowknife would be accused of pork barrelling every second day because we are pouring so much money in facilities into this town that it looks like permanent pork barrelling going on. But we do not. Do the other two Members for Yellowknife stand up and accuse the Member for Yellowknife North of pork barrelling every week? They do not do that either.

---Applause

When I made a decision about Keewatin last year -- two weeks it was debated in this Assembly because I made a controversial decision about my constituency. We are Ministers and MLAs, and we represent half the bloody population of the NWT, and our constituencies are going to get facilities just like everybody else's and just because we are a Minister, it does not mean a damn thing.

The Member from Pangnirtung said it is easier for transportation because Yellowknife is central. Well, if that is the thinking that is going on in this House, let us close up Pangnirtung and we will close up Baker Lake and we will close up Eskimo Point and we will close up Pond Inlet and we will move everybody to bloody Yellowknife, because it is easier to travel there. When cost and when availability of services are considered, it is only one of the determining factors in making a decision. We were accused -- and I cannot believe this -- the Member for Yellowknife South accused the Executive of making a political decision. Well, what the hell do you expect us to do? We are politicians.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Zoe, your point of order.

MR. ZOE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The honourable Member is using unparliamentary gestures. If I could ask the Chair if he would retract all the unparliamentary words that he has been using. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): I believe there was only one. Mr. Wray.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Certainly I will retract them, Mr. Chairman. My point is, if you do not want your Ministers to make political decisions, then go out and hire bureaucrats and put them in the Executive and let them make bureaucratic decisions. If you want politicians to make political decisions then put politicians in charge of the government. It would be nice and neat to say that every decision has to be based on cost and availability of services and determination of this and that. What it means is that those that have, are going to continue to have, and those that have not, will never have. That is what it means.

You say that there are legal services available in Yellowknife and judicial services available in Yellowknife. Well, how in the name of God are the communities like Rae-Edzo and Baker Lake and Fort Smith ever going to get those services if we do not put the facilities in those communities that need those services? Nobody is going to put those services in there just for the hell of it. How did Yellowknife get all its services? Because we put facilities in this community. So there is a lot bigger issue here than just whether we move the facility from Yellowknife to Fort Smith, and there was a lot more that went into the decision-making of whether we moved it from Yellowknife to Fort Smith.

I could not care less whether the Minister of Social Services comes from Fort Smith or not, and it was not a determination in the decision that I made. The principle that I was trying to get at is that it is about time we started putting facilities in other communities, or it ends up we are going to have one big community in the North. Or we are going to have 55 small communities, and we are all going to live in Yellowknife and we are all going to send everything that we have to Yellowknife, and Yellowknife is going to have it all. So that is all I wanted to caution the Members who represent small communities. Just remember, the decision you make today is going to have an impact when you want the same thing in your communities in the future. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Wray.

---Applause

Mr. Ballantyne, to your motion. Are you going to make your final remarks to your own motion or are you going to give opportunities to other Members to speak to your motion first? Mr. Lewis.

Issue Is The Way Government Does Business

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, as the very quiet Member for Yellowknife Centre, I would like to at least say a few words on this subject, if I may. And it relates to the fact, not that we are doing something which people feel is inappropriate by moving something that was planned for the capital city and is now going to go to another regional centre, it has to do with the kind of government that we have and the way decisions are made. I refer, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that the publishers, not of the Yellowknife press, but of the press in Fort Smith, were aware of this decision in December, before Christmas. Not as a final decision, but as a decision that was in the making. On the weekend of January 16 and 17, the day before we discussed the Social Services budget -- and I disagree with Mr. Pollard about whether we knew or did not know that this was in the planning stage -- we were told that this was going to happen, and when we discussed that budget on January 18 I was a bit surprised that what we saw in this document was a facility still in Yellowknife -- it had not been moved.

Now according to the Minister, on the following day, or just after discussion of her main estimates, a period of three days elapsed and then on Friday, the 22nd, on the very last day of the standing committee on finance meetings, Mr. Pollard informed us that a letter had been received from the Minister of Finance about this proposed change. We were rather upset, to put it mildly, that on the Monday when we discussed this budget, it had not been an issue; we were not told about it. We went through all the departmental estimates and there was not one word about a proposal to move this facility, even though it had been talked about in Fort Smith in 1987, in December, and continued to be discussed in the first two weeks of January, and when we were told verbally, both Mr. Pollard and myself, following the weekend of the 16th and 17th of January.

So the issue here, Mr. Chairman, is not just simply a decision that may have been a bad decision, that is now being changed. It is about the way in which our government does business. Because we in good conscience were sitting down with the Minister, who already knew, who had a plan in her head which she was not prepared to share with us at that time, even though she knew it. And this has nothing to do with non-native and native; that is not the issue at all. It is the fact that we were being businesslike with each other and we were not told that that was a plan that was in the works and that there was going to be a revision. On the Friday we were told by letter, that we should be aware of this, and we insisted, because we wanted to be professional in our job, that that Minister appear before us before 5:00 p.m. on Friday, January 22. And she did appear with her staff and then explained to us the various reasons for these changes.

Good Thinking Was Assumed

What bothers me, Mr. Chairman, is that, having been given that notice that these changes would be made, we then found when we got the printed copy of the budget that there had been no change, that what we had in front of us was a facility which was still going to be built in Yellowknife, so we were confused and perplexed as to what was going on here. I am talking about what I read in black and white in front of me, Mr. Chairman, and what I had in front of me was a budget document which, we were told, was going to be changed and what we had was the same facility in place in this community. To me, to be quite frank, the only thing I am concerned about is that when a decision is made to do something, that you would expect all kinds of good thinking would have gone into that process. And we can assume, when we went through this budget, that all that had taken place, and that all that good work had been done, and therefore when the changes were made we felt that, okay, all kinds of new evidence would be given to us about why this was being done.

What bothers me now today, Mr. Chairman, is this. And I am going to get into the very simple motion now, a piece of paper that I was not here to look at yesterday. And before I get into this piece of paper, Mr. Chairman, I should say the reason why I was not here to look at this piece of paper yesterday was because I was in Rankin Inlet, and the reason I was there was because last December I made a promise to be there, which I intended to keep, and which I kept, because I felt that by this time this House would have finished its business, if we had not been involved in all kinds of other stuff. So I followed through on my commitment. Last night at our banquet in Rankin Inlet it was explained to me that the reason why this is such a big issue today and why the Leader is not here, and why Mr. Sibbeston is not here, is because it is a big issue being dealt with in this House that requires that they be here because they worry about the life of this government. I am quoting the words that went on in this House, so it is not this group that is making this into a big issue, it is the government itself that is making it into a big issue, not just us. It has been made into a big issue because of the way it was handled -- well, I am coming on, just give me a few more minutes.

--Laughter

Not Dealing With Technical Problem

I am going to deal just with the piece of paper explaining why I was not here yesterday, Mr. Chairman. Imagine people from Europe, where I come from, Mr. Chairman -- I never used it before, Mr. Chairman. I have lots of others. If we in fact support this motion, Mr. Chairman, if this group and anybody else wants to support it, we are not dealing with a technical problem of saying, okay, let us put that figure now in a different way in this document. What we are doing is acting like a whole government in power, all 24 of us, who have agreed that what we should do is to put it in the budget as it is, showing this facility in Fort Smith. That is what we will be doing. Not simply agreeing to change the figure as a technical issue, but what we are doing is to support a

decision by asking that this budget document be changed to show figures in another community. And when we get to that item and into the debate tomorrow on that item, we will have no choice but to say yes, we agreed yesterday to put that money into another place. Therefore, we have no choice but to support this particular decision that we make. So when we make our vote, what we are doing is saying yes, as a big government we are in fact operating by consensus. What I have seen happen, Mr. Chairman, is not consensus government.

This government was designed to avoid the kinds of things that exist in southern Canada, where a party comes into power and says, "Okay, with impunity I will put this right in my backyard because we are the party in power and damn it, that is where it is going to go." That is what Mr. Mulroney did. Because he had a huge majority, he was the government and that was where it was going to be. We do not operate that way in this part of the world. What we try to do is operate by consensus and what happened here was that an attempt was made to slip something through very quietly; to find ways of exercising the will of eight people against the 24.

Biggest Political Issue Faced By 11th Assembly

That is what happened here and that is why it is the biggest political issue that this 11th Assembly will have to face. It is a huge political issue. We have set aside NCPC. That is a huge multimillion dollar operation. Health services is a big issue. But politically and the way this House operates, this is the biggest decision, because it has to do with the way we do our business. What we have, and I avoided, Mr. Chairman, I avoided accusing the Minister of pork barrelling. In fact, I avoided it because I wanted to hear all the facts to see if, in fact, this had not taken place, that what we were getting was a reassessment of a decision. And I give credit to the eight people that they have come to the rescue of a Minister. That shows some kind of conscience. I also recognize the courage of Mr. Ballantyne, in fact, in proposing this motion. He is from Yellowknife and he is quite prepared to see it go somewhere else. I think that that is the kind of statesmanship that we need. I agree with that. That is fine. I think it took a lot of courage to do that. So he will operate on a principle. But the general principle, the big principle is that the way this was done was devious. It is not acceptable to me. When we come to vote on this particular amendment whereby we put the money into Fort Smith, I shall vote against it. Because if I were to vote for it, in good conscience what I would have to do is say, "Yes, I have agreed it should go in there and now I am going to have to support it the rest of the way." I could go on and give you another lesson, Mr. Ballantyne, through you, Mr. Chairman, but I will leave that until tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Lewis. Mr. Angottitauruq.

Regional Centres In Future Planning

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I call for question but before voting on this motion, I guess we have to state our little piece of mind to the people of the NWT. I am looking at the figures here on page 30 of Tabled Document 101-88(1). Figure 23 and figure 24, NWT regions and possible NWT division. Now, I am going to vote in favour of the motion for simple reasons. I support the idea of Yellowknife getting the centre but in planning in the future we have to consider the regions. The centre we are talking about is going to be used by all the people of the NWT but I support the idea of getting other facilities outside Yellowknife, looking at the regions. Sometimes people in the regions are similar and their crimes are similar and if we put one in Yellowknife, there would be no room for the regions to get theirs because it is a centre. I do not go by the word that they would see their families more often. As the debate goes on, I was planning to oppose the motion, but simply just talking about the regions I am going to vote in favour of the motion. It is as simple as that because I want the other regions in the future to have facilities.

I do not want to repeat what I said. I think I have said enough. With the talk going to the division of the NWT, whether it is a possibility or not, if we put one here in Yellowknife, then the other side would not have any. But the plan is to equalize the NWT. So I will support the motion as I make my few comments. I think enough has been said and there is nothing that is going to be really new that is going to be said again. So I request to call for question. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Angottitauruq. There are still other Members who have not spoken. I will give them that opportunity. Mr. Arlooktoo.

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will not necessarily have to agree with my colleague. I have my own opinion concerning this motion. Also hearing from the MLAs, I am getting new ideas. I will be supporting the motion for the reason that last year or the year before it was agreed upon that the smaller communities should be getting more programs. I will continue to support this, that the smaller centres should be given more programs. I may want to have the facility transferred to our area in Iqaluit. Maybe we will have to move it to Lake Harbour one day. Also, the young offenders do not always have to be visited by their families. I do not believe that they should be in a centre where they are easily accessed by their families. The reason why they are in the facility is because they have to be rehabilitated.

I wanted to indicate why I will support this motion. I am not just trying to support the Executive side or the ajauqtit's but I also have to decide on the basis that I have been elected. I have an area that I represent and there has been a lot said that varies. I would like to conclude this debate. We have come a long way from Baffin. Sometimes it is not very comforting to know when we are not going anywhere with the business that we should be achieving. So I would like to see this motion concluded. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. McLaughlin.

Central Facility For All Three Cultures

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Once again I think what has to be considered here are the young offenders who are going to be in the facility. I want to repeat, because I still think there are a couple of Members who do not fully grasp what is going on here, that what we are trying to do is to put a medium secure custody facility in the East which will be staffed primarily by Inuit people to take care of the offenders from the East, and in the West we are going to have a medium secure custody facility staffed like the one right now in Fort Smith -- 80 per cent by Dene/Metis people -- to take care of the Dene/Metis young offenders from the West. The facility that we are talking about in this debate here is the central facility, the maximum secure custody facility, that is going to be used for all residents of the NWT no matter what their culture is, and it should be centred so that it is accessible to all three of those cultures and regions. There is going to be in Iqaluit a facility for the treatment of young offenders from the East. In the West, there is a facility existing right now in Fort Smith and very well run and staffed by a majority of native people to take care of young offenders of Dene/Metis cultural background. But we have young offenders who are in remand, who are put in remand because they are dangerous to themselves and others. They have extreme emotional and psychological problems. We also have some sentenced young offenders from all over the NWT who have extreme psychological problems that have to be treated and this has to be a facility that is not just staffed by 80 per cent Dene/Metis people from the West but has to be staffed by people from all three cultures. It is a maximum facility and it is supposed to serve the whole program.

Mr. Wray gave a bunch of examples of schools and airports and stuff in people's ridings, that people should have all those things. They should all have those things but those are all specific things, schools and airports, for the use of those people in those communities only. This facility is supposed to serve the whole NWT equally and be accessible to all but if we put the medium secure custody facility for the West and a maximum secure custody facility for the whole NWT on the south side of the lake, we are not going to be doing that. It is not going to be in the best interests of the young offenders from all over the NWT. It is going to be in the interests of a certain community, to have jobs. All they are talking about is jobs. If we build a facility in Yellowknife, the 20 jobs in Fort Smith will remain in Fort Smith because those people are there right now running the medium secure custody facility that was intended all along to remain in the West.

Facility Not Being Built For The West

This facility is not being built for the people in the West. It is being built for all the NWT and if you put it in Fort Smith you are not going to be serving them as well as if it would be in Yellowknife. I had to be convinced to put it in Yellowknife. If you are not going to put this facility in Yellowknife, then you should be putting it in Inuvik or you should be putting it in Cambridge Bay, where there are no services at all, and do not put anything in Yellowknife. I could go along with something like that. If you are going to have three facilities, all medium secure and no maximum secure facility, fine. But if you are going to have a maximum secure facility to

serve the whole Territories to put it down right next to the other facility to serve the West just does not make sense. You are not serving all the regions and you are certainly not serving young offenders by moving this facility to Fort Smith.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. McLaughlin. Mr. Ballantyne.

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will try to be fairly brief and concise for the last words that I have to say on this particular subject. It has been interesting listening to the debate over the last couple of days and, as always, there have been eloquent and impassioned points made. Some of the points are good, and some of them I think miss the real situation. If I could just very briefly explain, in my humble opinion, the way I perceive a few of these statements that have been made over the last little while.

First, if I could lay to rest Mr. Lewis's comment about the timing of the information during standing committee on finance. I will try to lay it to rest once and for all. There was no trick; there was nobody trying to do anything behind anybody's back. The decision was made on a Monday morning. I wrote a letter on a Tuesday or Wednesday. It took three days to get to the chairman. In fact, for government, the process worked very quickly. I am surprised it happened that quickly, in three days. As soon as the chairman had it he invited, on the Friday, the Minister to appear in front of the committee. The process was a little bit delayed. I apologize for that but there was no attempt to fool anybody. I can assure the Member of that. It would be fairly counter-productive to try to approach it that way.

Cabinet Decision Making

If I could get back to a few of the comments that Mr. McLaughlin made earlier about his recollection of cabinet discussions. I am not sure of the propriety of talking about what happened in cabinet after someone leaves it. Suffice it to say that my recollection was not quite the same as Mr. McLaughlin's. But to try to put into context as to how decisions are made when we sit as a cabinet. Mr. Butters who chaired the FMB meetings knows when we are deciding the budget, the \$800 million that we are talking about, and we are making hundreds of decisions. As a small government we have to depend a lot on each other, on the ability and the advice of other Ministers, so we depended very much on Mr. McLaughlin's advice at the time. All of us had many, many other responsibilities and we depended upon Mrs. Marie-Jewell's advice with more recent decisions.

Mr. Richard talked about pork barrelling and I said I was a little bit surprised by both Mr. McLaughlin and Mr. Richard because I found them both to be very logical and very reasonable individuals and I thought it a little bit unfair for Mr. Richard to make these sorts of accusations against all of us as though we collectively had done something wrong. To put it into perspective, this was the decision on \$1.7 million out of an \$800 million budget and actually it is not a bad budget. This very small percentage of the budget has caused this much controversy. We obviously have done a few things right because there has not been too much discussion about some of the other decisions.

But if I could, when Mr. Pollard asked about costs and during the exchange and the flurry of information asked for and given, and then the counter-examination and the examination of the examination, I guess the way that I looked at it -- and when I was chairing FMB and sitting as an Executive Council Member -- is that you look at the costs. There probably will be an extra cost of \$350,000 next year. There might be some long-term savings because of the configuration of all the different facilities that we are talking about. O and M costs are probably going to be less in Hay River because of the cost of living. But let us say, for the sake of the argument, that it balances out. We will say it balances out and arguments can be made either way, but for the sake of this argument it balances out.

Human Element In Decentralization

The context that we were looking at after the first decision was, as we recall, the trauma of decentralization of the Fort Smith Region. There were a lot of problems, and again it was another report that we as a cabinet decided not to accept because it was far too brutal on the Fort Smith Region. There is the human element that sometimes is forgotten in all these equations of cost effectiveness, cost saving, etc., etc. I think that as far as providing services to the clients, we think that the services will be adequate. If they are not, then we will have to put in more services. That will not be a bad thing, to have those sorts of services in a community other than

Yellowknife. I think that can only help the NWT. We will find out. But there is also a commitment of this government to make sure that those clients ultimately will be well served. We think that the resources are there now, but if they have to be improved at all, they will be improved.

There is another factor, and it is a factor that I perhaps am too sensitive about, coming from Yellowknife. Mr. Lewis is right; I am agreeing to moving something that was going to come to my constituency somewhere else. There are going to be people in my constituency in this town who will not agree with my decision but the Fort Smith experience taught me something very valuable, that I hope everybody will consider when we talk about decentralization. Whether it is decentralization from Yellowknife to other communities, or from regional centres to smaller communities, one of the most important factors are those people we talk about when we talk about decentralization. You do not decentralize an institution or a department or a board. What you are talking about is moving real people with wives, husbands, children, houses, careers, lives -- all of these things are what you are talking about. I think that whenever we are discussing decentralization, that is going to be a major factor. I hope that in future in communities where there are existing departments, government facilities, etc., etc., that we will try to keep those there -- we will try. And I hope that we will not be ripping departments out of any community, including Yellowknife. I hope that will not happen.

Nothing Lost To Yellowknife

For me, a prime consideration in this is the fact that, if not in Fort Smith, then in Hay River, but definitely south of the lake, 20 jobs are going to be lost, in Fort Smith or Hay River, one or the other in the configuration. In Yellowknife there was nothing lost because there was nothing here. There were not 20 people displaced, 20 people moved out; that did not happen. So to me that was the consideration, and I hope for everybody in the future, when we talk about decentralization, that should be a major consideration. If we can do things coming into the Territories, fine. We can look at placing them reasonably and efficiently around the Territories, but I think we have always to remember that human element when we are talking about decentralization.

So I was part of the cabinet that agreed to the first decision, and in a different context, with a different Minister, I support the move to Fort Smith of the correctional institute. I am on record as doing that, and I think that in this whole debate we have lost the essence of what has happened. If this had happened four months ago, there would not have been a problem. If it had been a different Minister, there would probably not have been a problem. If it had gone to Inuvik, there would probably not be a problem. So all there is, it seems to me, is a perception of a problem -- nothing more than that. People are imputing motives that do not exist and I, for one, resent that, because I have agreed that something that was coming to my city would go to another city. If anyone can say to me that I am supporting pork barrelling of another Minister, to take something from my city to somewhere else, they are crazy. I would never support that. I thought the reasons for the decision were valid, and that is why I support the decision. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

---Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. I would like to remind the audience in the gallery that they cannot clap while they are in this House. This is only for Members in the chamber.

---Laughter

Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One of the key questions I have been asking in the last few days has not been asked yet, and that is the issue of cost. Mr. Chairman, I referred earlier today to an awareness I have by certain signals to know I am on the right track. One of the clear signals always that I am on the right track, and it confirms to me with 100 per cent certainty that I am right, is when my colleague, the MLA for Kivallivik, Mr. Wray, brings out his speech No. 37 about big bad Yellowknife. This is not a Yellowknife issue at all. I have been saying that for two or three days. So when I hear Mr. Wray bring out that speech about big bad Yellowknife I know then with more certainty that I am on the right track. It is also, Mr. Chairman, not an issue

about how much education Ted Richard has, or Jeannie Marie-Jewell has; it is not an issue about where Ted Richard was born, or where he might die; or where Arnold McCallum was born, or where he might die. These are not the issues, but the fact that they are spoken, I guess confirms to me that there is something to what I have been trying to say.

Cost Analysis

Mr. Chairman, I have been asking for a few days about cost analysis. My colleague, Mr. Butters, asked specifically of the Minister of Finance, the man charged with the Financial Management Board mandate, a man who has the FMS people working for him, that secretariat that was to do an independent assessment pursuant to government policy, and when my colleague, Mr. Butters, asked the Minister of Finance this afternoon "Was such an independent assessment done?", the Minister of Finance responded with a one word answer. "Yes," he said. I would like to know what in the name of all that is good that independent assessment consisted of? The Minister of Finance was subsequently asked, "Then what is the cost analysis? What is the comparison on O and M costs for the life cycle of the building?" My colleague, Mr. Pollard from Hay River, having asked a series of what we call leading questions, let us say "friendly" questions, of the Ministers opposite finally reached one that the Ministers opposite were not prepared for. They were prepared for all of the others. They had all of the answers that he wanted to hear, but when he asked Mr. Ballantyne "Tell me, Mr. Ballantyne, Mr. Minister of Finance, what is the cost comparison between the two?", the Minister of Finance did not answer that question and has not yet.

There is a reference to its going to cost \$350,000 more next year. I assume that is capital moneys. I had heard earlier, I believe in a communication from one of the Ministers to the standing committee on finance, that the increased cost, because they are going to have to build a kitchen and build a laundry, is \$500,000. Now today it is \$350,000, and when I hear a Minister of Finance use words this afternoon like, "Let us say it about balances out", I fear for the financial management of our \$800 million.

---Laughter

The point, Mr. Chairman, is we have been asking for the cost analysis and there has been no cost analysis done. Those of you who are declaring already in support of the motion are doing so with no idea whatsoever of the future final cost of this decision, the same lack of knowledge that the Executive Council was plagued with when they said yes to this request from a new Minister. Now, if before this vote is taken, Mr. Chairman, somebody can answer the cost analysis question I may have an inkling of supporting the change but I am at the position where I was in January when I heard the rumour. Surely they are going to justify this.

Minister Patterson has explained on that great day when it came forward that everything is above board. We know all about Ministers and their ridings. They need schools, they need this, they need that. I am looking for the justification. I have not heard one word in the last two months as to why this change was made. I am like Mr. McLaughlin. The more they speak, Mr. Chairman, the deeper the hole they are digging, the more and more convinced I am. For an MLA to vote on moving an expenditure of this size, of \$1.7 million, with no knowledge of the impact on the budget this year, next year and in the future, is not doing his job. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Richard. Mr. Lewis.

Reversing The Decline Of Fort Smith

MR. LEWIS: For the second and last time, Mr. Chairman, what I would like to do is to remind people about the context in which this change has taken place. If Members will recall, last year there was considerable concern because the last Assembly and the government that worked on its behalf had done so much to help destroy Fort Smith. In fact, I cannot quote verbatim but I can recall many occasions when I was told we must do something about providing facilities outside of Fort Smith for people to go to school from outside of the Territories. In fact the present Government Leader is on record as having said that it was an entirely inappropriate place for Inuit to be going to school to further their education. It was for that reason that we developed an Arctic College system whereby people could go to school in Inuvik and in Iqaluit. I am talking about what used to be called AVTC which eventually became Thebacha College and which was the centre of higher education in the NWT. There was land set aside in Fort Smith to provide that place with some kind of economic future because it was felt that all the advantages that are now being proposed to put a correctional facility of this kind there prevailed at that time.

I also note that over the last couple of years there has been real concern about decentralizing from Fort Smith. The same people, the same decision-makers decided that Fort Smith was an inappropriate place to have this kind of infrastructure to serve people of such a diverse nature because, and again I cannot quote verbatim, but words like "Fort Smith is not a typical Dene community. There are many places served out of Fort Smith that are Slavey, that are not Chipewyan and Cree and we should be taking staff out of Fort Smith to serve those people better." So it came somewhat as a shock and a surprise.

Not A Basis For A New Growth Industry

Well, I find that a proposal is being made to now make Smith the centre of a new growth industry. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that this I hope will not be a growth industry. If Fort Smith had remained an educational centre that would have been a growth industry. My hope would be that we could develop a kind of facility such as this and wherever we do it we would not have to use it. That would be my hope, that instead of having it grow and grow, it would be my hope that eventually it would be empty. So I do not see this as providing much economic future for Fort Smith if this government does its job right and does something about preventing people getting into conflict with the law over the next 20 or 30 years. These arguments may seem a little bit far-fetched, Mr. Chairman, but I think this is one desperate attempt to try to undo some of the things that were done before by the same decision-makers, who decided that Fort Smith had no future, and a courageous person new to this kind of politics said, "I am going to change that." And when she decided she was going to run in Fort Smith, she said, "Enough is enough."

Let me recreate a scene for you. Recall, Mr. Chairman, the time when the heavy duty equipment programs were being withdrawn from Fort Smith by the Government Leader, in his capacity as the Minister of Education. I can imagine Mrs. Marie-Jewell getting into a cabinet meeting saying, "This has to stop. You are ruining this place." I would not want to speculate as to how the final decision was made about moving a facility from place A to place B. But I would suggest that it is in the context of a very, very tough-minded person who had seen Fort Smith suffer enough. And then was forced into the position and forced the rest of her cabinet colleagues into a position of having to defend a position that is no longer defensible.

It has been a rough time for the eight people who have to deal with this issue. But we did not create it. It was not these 15 or 16 people that created the problem. It was the eight people who knew they had a tough person on their hands, who was going to fight for her constituency. Then they had to make compromises which resulted in this House spending all this time over one issue.

Even if we lose this vote, Mr. Chairman, even if we lose it, I think it would be one object lesson to the government that we have selected, that this is not the way to do business. It is not the way this House should run. What should happen is that we operate by consensus, since it is the wish that we all agree. There are enough people, when the vote is taken, that there will be a warning to the other side of the House. Although we want to operate as a team, as a group around the table with one group warning and cautioning the other, there will be enough people who will show that they are not very happy with the way this was handled that it will never happen again. This kind of decision-making will not take place in the future.

Debate Will Set Tone For Future

I think it is a disgrace and a dishonour to our House that when things like NCPC, the health transfer, and the rest of the budget still have to be dealt with, we have to demonstrate to this government how displeased we are about the way this particular issue has been handled. If this debate has achieved nothing else, it will set the tone for the next three years, Mr. Chairman, that we want to deal squarely with each other and when decisions are being made, we want to know on what basis they are being made. Also, we want to see the Government Leader, when he is faced with something that causes him difficulty, say, "No", just as was outlined in the directions paper. He should have done the same thing on two or three other occasions. "I am the boss, I say no, that cannot work." We are only going to be credible if we make decisions that practically everybody will agree are sensible decisions.

This is not a fight between Yellowknife and the rest of the Territories. To be quite frank, on this one issue, as far as I am personally concerned, I agree with my colleague Mr. Richard, that Yellowknife does have jobs. I agree with that. But the decision that was made is that there is a whole bunch of people from all over the Territories including Inuit, who 10 years ago would never

want to go to Fort Smith, I was told. Now simply because they are in custody where they do not have a choice, they are going to be told, "That is where you go." At least the students in the past, if they did not want to go, they did not have to go. This bunch will have no choice.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is my final comment on this particular issue. I really feel that we have debated it enough and if I am the last person to speak, at least we will have given our message through to the people on the other side that some people here are not happy with the way this has been handled. Thank you.

---Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Ernerk.

MR. ERNERK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I tried to be patient. I ran all the way here from Rankin Inlet so I arrived quite breathless. I did not want to miss this session. We flew within a two hour period. Thank you.

This morning in Rankin Inlet in the Keewatin I met with organizations of different sorts. The people that I met with in the Keewatin included all of the mayors and their secretary-managers. A workshop was held and I got an opportunity to meet with them. As I talked with them regarding different issues, including some of the things that we discussed here regarding education and renewable resources, during the course of our discussion, the young offender secure custody facilities came up and I was asked to present this to you. Though it may be short, I wish to present it.

Constituents' Recommendation To Member

If the facility is to be relocated to Fort Smith, then I was recommended not to vote for that motion. It has been recommended to me that I do not vote for the motion during this government's sitting. Seven of the mayors recommended that I take that vote.

We will be putting in an application eventually. We would like our own facility within the Keewatin. We understand that there is one planned for the people in the Baffin to facilitate young offenders. We will be putting in the same request for one in our region. We should encourage our young people to hang on to their own cultures and their own environment. This is why we are going to keep working at obtaining our own facility.

However, after listening to the discussions this morning, as well as listening to the media, the radio, on what was occurring here as the ongoing discussion about the decision made to locate the facility in Fort Smith, I would like further clarification as to what amount of money is going to be used for O and M. What amount of money is the government going to spend, if this is not going to be located in Yellowknife, for the operations and maintenance of the facility? I realize I am a day behind on the debate, but while I leafed through this piece of paper I did not come across any information to that effect. This being the case, and we discussed this in our region, how much money is going to be spent on top, now that it is going to be relocated in Fort Smith?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): A point of order.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Mr. Chairman, I move that we extend the session to conclude this item.

MR. BUTTERS: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Wray. Your point of order, Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. That was not a point of order. I have had my name on your list there for a while and it has not been called and I was certainly on the list before Mr. Wray. I demand my time.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Okay. Mr. Wray has made a motion. This motion is not debatable. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, what about my point of order? I had my hand up before Mr. Wray and Mr. Wray cannot intrude on the discussion on a point of order. It was not a point of order. He made a motion. We are talking about a point of order.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Butters, you are correct. In order to make a motion, the Chair has to recognize that you have possession of the floor, and in this case Mr. Ernerk had the floor. It is six o'clock. I will report progress.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will come back to order. Mr. Gargan.

ITEM 18: REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE ON THE 1988-89 MAIN ESTIMATES; BILL 1-88(1), APPROPRIATION ACT, 1988-89; MINISTERS' STATEMENT 43-88(1), WESTERN ARCTIC MAXIMUM SECURE FACILITY FOR YOUNG OFFENDERS; TABLED DOCUMENT 101-88(1), DEVELOPMENT PLAN, YOUNG OFFENDER SECURE CUSTODY FACILITIES

MR. GARGAN: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been considering Report of Standing Committee on Finance on the 1988-89 Main Estimates; Bill 1-88(1); Ministers' Statement 13-88(1); Tabled Document 71-88(1); Tabled Document 80-88(1); Ministers' Statement 43-88(1); Tabled Document 101-88(1); Bill 25-88(1); Bill 7-88(1).

Motion To Accept Report Of Committee Of The Whole, Carried

Mr. Speaker, I move that the report of the chairman of the committee of the whole be concurred with.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Gargan. Is there a seconder for the motion? Mr. Angottitauruq. Thank you. To the motion. Those in favour, please signify. Thank you. Those opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Mr. Clerk, orders of the day.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Announcements, Mr. Speaker. There will be an ordinary Members' committee meeting at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow.

ITEM 19: ORDERS OF THE DAY

Orders of the day for Friday, March 25th at 10:00 a.m.

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. Tabling of Documents
12. Notices of Motion
13. Notices of Motion for First Reading of Bills

14. Motions
 15. First Reading of Bills
 16. Second Reading of Bills
 17. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills and Other Matters: Report of Standing Committee on Finance on the 1988-89 Main Estimates; Bill 1-88(1); Ministers' Statement 13-88(1); Tabled Document 71-88(1); Tabled Document 80-88(1); Ministers' Statement 43-88(1); Tabled Document 101-88(1); Bill 25-88(1); Bill 7-88(1)
 18. Report of Committee of the Whole
 19. Orders of the Day
- MR. SPEAKER: This House stands adjourned until Friday, March 25th at 10:00 a.m.

---ADJOURNMENT

Available from the
Publications Clerk, Department of Culture and Communications
Government of the Northwest Territories, Yellowknife, N.W.T.
\$1.00 per day; \$30.00 for 1st session, \$20.00 for 2nd and 3rd session; or \$50.00 per year
Published under the Authority of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly
of the Northwest Territories

Mr. Charlie Crow, MLA
Legislative Assembly