



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

4th Session

10th Assembly

HANSARD
Official Report
DAY 23

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 1985

Pages 793 to 833

Speaker: The Honourable Donald M. Stewart, M.L.A.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Speaker

The Hon. Donald M. Stewart, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1877
Hay River, N.W.T., X0E 0R0
Office (403) 874-2324
Home (403) 874-6560
Office (403) 873-7629 (Yellowknife)
(Hay River)

Angottitauruq, Mr. Michael, M.L.A.
Gjoa Haven, N.W.T.
X0E 1J0
Phone (403) 360-7141 (Hamlet Office)
(Kitikmeot East)

Appaqaq, Mr. Moses, M.L.A.
Sanikiluaq, N.W.T.
X0A 0W0
Office (819) 266-8860
Home (819) 266-8931
(Hudson Bay)

Arlooktoo, Mr. Joe, M.L.A.
Lake Harbour, N.W.T.
X0A 0N0
Phone (819) 939-2363
(Baffin South)

Ballantyne, Mr. Michael, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1091
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2N8
Office (403) 873-8093
Home (403) 873-5232
(Yellowknife North)

Butters, The Hon. Thomas H., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 908
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2N7
Office (403) 873-7128
Home (403) 920-4411 (Yellowknife)
(403) 979-2373 (Inuvik)
(Inuvik)
Minister of Finance and Government
Services

Cournoyca, The Hon. Nellie J., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1184
Inuvik, N.W.T.
X0E 0T0
Office (403) 873-7959
Home (403) 979-2740
(Nunakput)
Minister of Renewable Resources and
Information

Curley, The Hon. Tagak E.C., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 36
Rankin Inlet, N.W.T.
X0C 0G0
Office (403) 873-7139
Home (819) 645-2951
(Aivilik)
Minister of Economic Development and
Tourism

Erkloo, Mr. Elijah, M.L.A.
Pond Inlet, N.W.T.
X0A 0S0
Phone (819) 899-8845
(Foxe Basin)

Gargan, Mr. Samuel, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 2131
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2P6
Office (403) 873-7999
Home (403) 699-3171
(Deh Cho)

Lawrence, Mrs. Eliza, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 2053
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 1W9
Office (403) 920-8052
Home (403) 873-2457
(Tu Nedhe)

MacQuarrie, Mr. Robert, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 2895
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2R2
Office (403) 873-7918
Home (403) 873-8857
(Yellowknife Centre)

McCallum, Mr. Arnold, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 454
Fort Smith, N.W.T.
X0E 0P0
Phone (403) 872-2246
(Slave River)

McLaughlin, The Hon. Bruce, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 555
Pine Point, N.W.T.
X0E 0W0
Office (403) 873-7113
Home (403) 393-2226
(Pine Point)
Minister of Health and Social Services

Nerysoo, The Hon. Richard W., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1320
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2L9
Office (403) 873-7112
Home (403) 873-5310
(Mackenzie Delta)
Government Leader and Minister of Justice
and Public Services

Paniloo, Mr. Pauloosie, M.L.A.
Clyde River, N.W.T.
X0A 0E0
Phone (819) 924-6220 (Hamlet Office)
(Baffin Central)

Patterson, The Hon. Dennis G., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 310
Frobisher Bay, N.W.T.
X0A 0H0
Office (819) 979-5941
(403) 873-7123
Home (819) 979-6618
(Iqaluit)
Minister of Education

Pedersen, Mr. Red, M.L.A.
Coppermine, N.W.T.
X0E 0E0
Phone (403) 982-5221
(Kitikmeot West)

Pudluk, Mr. Ludy, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 22
Resolute Bay, N.W.T.
X0A 0V0
Phone (819) 252-3737
(High Arctic)

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

Sibbeston, The Hon. Nick G., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 560
Fort Simpson, N.W.T.
X0E 0N0
Office (403) 873-7658
Home (403) 695-2565
(Deh Cho Gah)
Minister of Local Government

T'Seleie, Mr. John, M.L.A.
Fort Good Hope, N.W.T.
X0E 0H0
Phone (403) 598-2303
(Sahtu)

Wah-Shee, Mr. James, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 471
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2N4
Office (403) 873-8099
Home (403) 873-8012
(Rae-Lac La Martre)
Deputy Speaker

Wray, The Hon. Gordon, M.L.A.
Baker Lake, N.W.T.
X0C 0A0
Office (403) 873-7962
Home (819) 793-2700
(Kivallivik)
Minister of Public Works

Officers

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

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

Clerk Assistant (Procedural)
Mr. Albert J. Canadian
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

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

Clerk Assistant (Administrative)
Mr. S. James Mikeli
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

Sergeant-at-Arms
S/Sgt. David Williamson
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 1985

| | <u>PAGE</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Prayer | 793 |
| Members' Replies | |
| - Mr. Angottitauruq's Reply | 793 |
| - Mr. MacQuarrie's Reply | 802 |
| Ministers' Statements | |
| - On Senior Citizens Personal Care Facility | 820 |
| - On Native Students Attending Post Secondary Institutions | 820 |
| - On Removal of Sexual Discrimination from Indian Act | 821 |
| Returns | 821 |
| Reports of Standing and Special Committees | 822 |
| Orders of the Day | 833 |

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 1985

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Angottitauruq, Mr. Appaqaq, Mr. Arlooktoo, Mr. Ballantyne, Hon. Tom Butters, Hon. Nellie Cournoyea, Hon. Tagak Curley, Mr. Gargan, Mrs. Lawrence, Mr. MacQuarrie, Mr. McCallum, Hon. Bruce McLaughlin, Hon. Richard Nerysoo, Mr. Paniloo, Hon. Dennis Patterson, Mr. Pedersen, Mr. Pudluk, Mr. Richard, Hon. Nick Sibbeston, Hon. Don Stewart, Mr. T'Seleie, Mr. Wah-Shee, Hon. Gordon Wray

ITEM 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

Speaker's Ruling

SPEAKER (Hon. Don Stewart): With regard to the challenge made last evening I have checked the verbatim reports and I find that the chairman is correct, that the motion is in order.

---Applause

Item 2, Members' replies. Mr. Angottitauruq.

ITEM 2: MEMBERS' REPLIES

Mr. Angottitauruq's Reply

MR. ANGOTTITAURUQ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make my Member's reply today.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why today?

Constituency Problems With Air Line

MR. ANGOTTITAURUQ: Why today, I do not know. Maybe because it is a beautiful day and I want to be out of the Assembly. Anyhow, I would like to make my reply. First of all, my constituents have been concerned about the air line which is a private business. At the regional council meetings and any regional meetings they discuss the air line service, which is Northwest Territorial Airways. I told them when I was running to be elected, that I would like to try and do something about it but since it is a private air line I should be dealing with the whole thing directly with the president of the air line and, also, there are other avenues to government departments such as, I guess, through the federal Minister of Transport. The users among my constituents, a lot of them, most of them are outgoing patients and the people who are going back are also patients. Also a lot of them are government personnel. Hardly any private people use that air line.

The ones that are patients complain a lot. We have a lot of pregnant women that go out and from my home town it takes at least seven hours of flying time and waiting time. For a woman that is pregnant she cannot sit all day sometimes, she requires to relax in a better or in a comfortable place.

The biggest complaint is that the aircraft, which is a DC-3, is too slow, and a lot of times those aircraft delay in Cambridge for mechanical problems and other problems. If I were smart enough I could report and write down in my diary every problem or time of waiting I had with Northwest Territorial Airways, since the day that Northwest Territorial Airways started flying around. I have experienced a good number of them. There are always delays for all kinds of reasons. Many of them.

I really do not want to get into the whole story of what days and what happened here and there but I could calculate. I have been flying Northwest Territorial Airways mostly every month since they started their service in my constituency, not only because I became an MLA, which isn't needed to help to calculate all the hours I have been flying. I had been flying with them a good number of times already, which I may estimate at approximately 10,000 hours and probably 5000 hours of those were delays and 2000 were mechanical problems.

---Laughter

That is my estimate. Personally, there was one time I went to another settlement in my area. That was before I became an MLA. To my surprise, due to the delay of the aircraft, I personally lost \$700 because I was not working for a week and a half. That was a shame for me but I did not complain at that time but now I am complaining and I do not know why.

---Laughter

Because my constituents are giving me some pressure, I thought that I would complain to this House for my constituency because I know that this is the GNWT I am talking to, which I hope, if they wish, could help at the same time. I am surprised that we do not have any minister of transport in the NWT. There are all kinds of air lines across the Territories and I believe if we had a minister responsible for the transportation some complaints would have been attended to. Right now, no matter how much we complain to the federal government -- as they say, Nunavut is too large and we are far from Ottawa. I guess that is the reason why we cannot get many replies. They are the ones that are issuing licences for northern transportation, aircraft of any sort.

At this time I would like to leave the transportation or the air line out of my reply and from here on I will look more closely and watch more and try to talk to the presidents, the owners of the air lines. Even with the support of my constituents and even me having the ability to speak directly with the president of the air line, I do not see a fast result. They are a private company and they like to use what they want to use for making money. There is another reason they keep complaining, that they could not get any new aircraft. But they promised, when the regional council applied, supported by my community, that within this year they were supposed to be getting another aircraft. Now, the last report I heard from the regional council is that there are still no plans of getting a faster aircraft.

Constituency Complaints About NorthwesTel

I will move to another subject. It is also another private company -- NorthwesTel. I would have been happy if NorthwesTel and Northwest Territorial Airways got together and formed their business. They are almost exactly the same.

---Laughter

A lucky thing, Mr. Speaker, my wife and I are closely attached. If she did not understand, she would have divorced me long ago because a lot of times I try to phone home and I cannot get through to her -- sometimes a day and a half or two days. There are a lot of times I receive a complaint for not calling sooner, which was completely out of my control.

Therefore, too, my constituents complain a lot about NorthwesTel's telephone system. A lot of them probably have the same view about it. Now, one of my constituents wanted to join Bell Canada and they could not get that through I guess. Now the NorthwesTel is trying to make some improvements, as of the last searift last summer, which have not gone through yet. As they are the same and they are a big company too, if they found that my constituents had some importance in getting service and in making money from, which I do not think is so, they might be in full support of my constituency. For that reason, I do not think they are trying to do the best they can. They are not making too much money on it.

Therefore, it would be nice to combine the minister of transport and minister of communications in the Territories. As people say about the alliance -- I am going to get into that a little later on but I just want to comment on it right now, speaking about information, that is the telephone system. People say our area of the NWT is so large, any kinds of offices across the Territories need some form of a good system of communication, which is the telephone system. There are times I wanted to make a call and especially when you are working on something and you have a business of some kind, there are times when there are deadlines. If it takes a day and a half, sometimes, there are a number of people for sure in the Territories that do not reply, especially in my constituency. A lot of those are served by the NorthwesTel. Calls sometimes take a day and a half. If my phone system was working I could make a call in 15 minutes and meet my deadline. So, I am hoping that NorthwesTel would improve their system some day.

There, again, I should be really dealing with the owners of NorthwesTel. At the same time too, my constituents have been complaining over and over in their regional meetings and writing letters to NorthwesTel and they are not getting much results. I promised my constituents I would try to do something about it and though I am just a speaker for my constituents, if I approach something right I could be a great help to my constituents in private. I am speaking to the House as it would seem to me that I have the authority to speak out in the Assembly. Now, the doors are wide open for me to go out into the Territories to try and do something about these, especially NorthwesTel and the air line.

Now, I will move on to another subject. I wrote notes on a little piece of paper yesterday to follow in my reply but I looked for it -- I was in a hurry, so I had to go back at just about a quarter to one and I ran as fast as I could but I did not take all the papers I wanted. Well, I will try and remember. Sometimes remembering is better than reading.

---Laughter

Well, anyhow, I will look for the rest of the whole reply. I do not have the whole reply. First of all, I should have put it out on the announcements a long time ago but I just want to let the House know in my reply at this time, I have three brand new mayors in my constituency. That brings me some extra hope in the future. For what, I cannot tell you, just because they are new. Right now I find my constituency a rather hard area to work. For one reason, I am a new MLA and what I expected in working with my constituency, is now a whole different story. I want them to tell me or to give me notices of what I should do to help them out and then again, in return, I have to keep giving them information. Maybe I am just taking the wrong step, I do not know.

Well, for my constituents, I believe, to myself, as their MLA I am their educator and I am their translator and, at the same time to most of them I am their king, which I do not want to be, their king, and that is how they recognize me. They figure I have all the money of the NWT, which I do not.

---Laughter

I keep telling my constituents, "I have to ask for you in the House." That is what I am here for. They keep trying to do their own thing -- I do not know, but they are learning. As I said, I am their educator and translator and whatnot -- supervisor, whatever.

---Laughter

I am hoping by 1985 there is going to be some change in my constituency. I would like to be more active, which I wanted to be when I got elected. I am using my constituents' way of doing things. They do not talk enough and I do not.

I ran for the election to talk for my people, to be supported by my people. What is required most, I guess in the Assembly is that the Ministers would like to know when I talk -- they want to know, they want to see what is active in my community. I am sure they want to see it on paper from my constituents, so that I do not personally just try to do things like a king.

Dog Team Trips For Tourists

Anyhow, my constituents right now are really trying to do something about tourism. Last year finally, it is not really official yet, a group of hunters got together. I believe there are about four of them. They tried to form a tourism business of their own. They are trying to start it off

with a dog team and already last year they were tested by the Economic Development personnel from Cambridge Bay to take a dog team trip from Gjoa Haven to Spence Bay. Now, this year they told me that they are going to have two Americans taking this trip from Gjoa Haven to Pelly, which is a little bit further. I hope that the government, in their way, can help these people that are trying to operate in tourism.

In time they will probably be asking for assistance from the government. I personally cannot beg and ask them to get help. It is their business but I just want to report it to the House, that I believe that that is one of the most important things today since the fur prices are down. Tourism is one of the closest things to hunting you can get in the Arctic, because you can go all over the place in the North. When I used to go all over the western part of Canada, I used to talk to people and to some prairie farmers, and a lot of times a lot of people down South would like to see an open area. I hope that in the future that the tourists will start going to the North. Our North is a good place for tourism because it has something to do with history. There are a lot of things that could be done toward tourism. I am going to continue supporting my people, my constituents, to develop tourism. I am always in support of tourism.

Traditional Lifestyle Versus Education

I should really get down to the business of my reply. I have a number of things that I wanted to say at this time. Education is another item of concern in my constituency. I see a lot of drop-outs in my constituency. It is not easy talking to older people. What they believe is a different story, especially native people. I am not saying they are wrong. They are right in a way. But then again this is the time of the fastest change in their lifestyle. What I believe the older people do not seem to understand is that they were brought up without learning another language, without learning another culture. The only education they could have was in their own language and they go out to hunt every day, regardless of whether it is Saturday or Sunday, just if they choose to. They could work seven days a week if they want, hunting. The women used to do a lot of sewing because you see they were living off the land all the time.

Today the young people are going to school. The fur prices are going down, and no matter if you are the best hunter in the world you cannot make a good living right now as a trapper. The older people who have children who are going to school, who are at the age of 17, 18 or 19, figure that their children should not go to school, that they should stay home and hunt for their parents. Some of us who went to school, and there are beginning to be more of us, believe that education is our only route today. If you have a good education today, a native person, to change his style to make a better living for the future -- the more education you have you would seem to be a better hunter because you would be more qualified in taking jobs. That is what I believe in. But the older people do not seem to understand that. I have sympathy for them but in a way, somehow, they have to be given a chance to understand. I am not against their lifestyle but we are changing our lifestyle today and their children have to go to school.

I am sure this government is trying to do its best to keep the students from dropping out, but it is not really the government's responsibility to keep the children in school. It is the parents' responsibility. A lot of times I hear parents say "My child just can't listen, I keep telling her/him to go to school. I can't get the message across. I don't understand it."

In regard to education, I just would like to say I went to school in Inuvik. Last summer I passed through Inuvik and visited the hostel I used to go to. It is run-down. I used to do the polishing of parts of that hostel, we students used to do it. Also going to see Akaitcho and hearing about Akaitcho, it is a little different system. I only wish I could be in Akaitcho right now and go back to school for another 10 years. Compared to my old hostel where I used to be, Akaitcho is free, at least 75 per cent more free than I was.

Problem Of Drop-Outs

It is not the hostels I am really focusing my education concern about. It is the drop-outs. A lot of them just walk around town and do nothing. What time is it, Mr. Speaker? There is lots of time yet.

---Laughter

MR. SPEAKER: You have lots of time, Mr. Angottitauruq.

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: Somebody does not want me to talk. Well, sorry, Mr. Speaker, I am going to loosen my collar a bit because I have a cold and I am hot.

---Laughter

And at the same time, I have a little written reply which I do not have, that makes me a little hotter too because I am trying to work very hard.

---Laughter

That clearly shows it.

Mr. Speaker, I am leaving the education part at this time. I could go on all this afternoon talking about education and I guess this year, too. Even though I say that I have a lot of drop-outs, there are more students from my constituency becoming students in Akaitcho Hall. I believe that there are none from Pelly at this time but I hope that there will be some there next season. I am proud of those students for going to school but then again they are mostly girls. I was hoping that there would be more boys. All the boys dropped out at home and they are just wandering around. They are not taking any of their culture training. Some of them could say "Yes" or "No" -- well, they could say yes or no, they could talk, but they are not good enough to take any available jobs that once in a while appear in my constituency. So, I will leave the education part.

I do not know why I am in a hurry to say what I have got in the back of my mind, and I might as well start saying it now because I do not have my paper. It might be in my brief case but I do not want to look for it right now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you want mine?

---Laughter

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: My own writing, nobody else's. Now, I would like to talk about the division of the Northwest Territories because my constituency is also affected by it and I cannot say none of the MLAs constituents are not affected by the whole thing. I guess that is one of the reasons why I did not have my reply available, is that I wanted to say what I wanted to say about the division and WCF, NCF, regardless. I just wanted to say my piece of mind about the whole thing. You see, Mr. Speaker, I have the right to vote as an MLA in the House and my constituents have free time to speak about Nunavut and the division as they choose to. Well, on the break I did quite a research on where my constituency stands and what it thinks about it.

Confusion On Plebiscite On Division

To tell you the truth, the majority of them, they stand at forming Nunavut, which they support. But then the beautiful stories that are told to me by other people, even though that vote of April 5, I believe it was, to divide the Territories, showed across the Territories that people want division, even the ones that want division want an election across the Territories. It was surprising when I went to Pelly Bay to talk about the whole thing. What they told me there was, when a lot of people there were voting at that time, they were voting for the tree line boundary. They believe if they voted for it, that it is there, it is going to be. Which meant that a lot of them did not understand at the time they were given the vote and which I do not blame them for.

At the same time I personally believe that they have too many people involved in the division of the NWT. They are missing out one forum in the alliance -- they should have had a third in the alliance, which is trying to keep the Territories together. I believe that is one of the things that is really developing about this whole thing. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, in trying to work for my constituents, yes, I can vote for Nunavut. But then again, deep down in the back of my mind, I am afraid of the division; the tremendous amount of dollars that is going to be used to organize and possibly not all of them, some, government employees might lose their jobs because they do not want to move to another territory. If the division goes through, yes, this should be. I think there is going to be a lot of money involved in it. At the same time I seem to believe that the Territories is going to start all over again and once you start something over again, it is harder than the present time.

Right now I do not know why people say that they are too far from the head office -- where the Assembly is. I have never once seen any of the MLAs, since my travels here, that were completely late for the session. Now, we have ways of travelling. We have ways of communicating, regardless of some days trying to call through NorthwesTel could take a day and a half. But we always get through.

Now, at the same time I firmly believe the reason why they want to form Nunavut and why they want to keep all Inuit together, is a simple reason. You take a globe and you look at all the countries all over the world and people that are trying to form Nunavut are called sometimes racists, which I do not personally believe. They are trying to work for the best of their interests of their people. As I said, if you look at a globe and for instance you look at Africa, still today a lot of the Africans wish to have their own government but they are being controlled by Britain. You talk about all kinds of races across the whole world -- races not racists. We are Canadians and next door are the Americans. Looking across overseas, I see some Africans that have their own government. I see Indians over there that have their own government. I see the Japanese have their own government. That is one type of culture and they are lucky. I think what the Inuit are trying to do is they are trying to do similar things. At the same time I am not going to attack both sides. I just want to say my piece of mind about the whole thing.

Listening to the WCF...

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible comment)

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: Don't help me out now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Maybe it should go the other way.

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: I have the floor, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed, Mr. Angottitauruq.

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: And now please do not disturb me, Members.

---Laughter

I might say nasty things if I get disturbed. Anyhow, I am not prepared to do that. I am just prepared to say things peacefully and when I say things peacefully it seems to make more sense. Please keep it quiet, Members of WCF. Maybe I should not say WCF.

Maybe I should just use Canada -- provinces. We are in the Territories and we are talking about division. Today we have British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and the NWT -- I will just go as far as there. I think we are divided from Alberta -- is it not?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

A Free Country

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: From my constituency, patients do go to Edmonton to the hospital and there is no fence that is keeping them away from going to Alberta to hospital. If they are residents of the NWT, they have a health care card which is usually paid by the territorial government. There is nothing stopping any patients from going to Alberta from the NWT. From what I have heard about the division -- and I have been into one of the meetings -- it seems that if you are crossing one of the boundaries as soon as you are over the boundary, automatically your airfare is going to increase. At the same time, it was said you will have no way of seeing your relatives on one side. I thought Canada was a free country.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Hear, hear!

---Applause

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: But working for division some comments that were made at the meetings in some communities were of some that I have not heard in Canada.

As an Inuk of the Territories, you can only believe that I support division and that I support Nunavut. But then again, as I said, I am afraid of that day when it happens. I am satisfied the way it is today but I am not going to be the person to form a third alliance to try to keep the NWT together. It is a good thing that there are 24 MLAs today. They represent their constituents. If we have the division of the NWT, people are going to be happy about the whole thing. But I am just afraid of the beginning of the whole situation. It is going to take a long time again to get to what the Territories is getting today. As I said, we have 24 Members. When they form these two groups, how many MLAs are there going to be on one side and how many on the other side? As of now, the Nunavut caucus has 11. That is almost the same as when the NWT first started their Assembly, but that is small.

We represent our constituents, regardless of how large the NWT is. I am saying for those people that voted "no" to division, there are less. There are more who voted for division. Why I am saying this now is, it is already too late because some people keep telling me that they did not go to the polls because they did not want division. Shame. That was bad. They should have voted, then they might have beaten the ones that were voting for division.

What I am saying is that when I vote for Nunavut in the House -- yes, I may vote for it, for the reason that my constituents support it and I do not want to mislead them because they are more than my single mind. But then again, you see when I am making my reply about Nunavut, I am not wearing any traditional clothes, for reasons. They have no value any more because the price of fur went down. If we divide, I hope the price goes up so that I can start wearing traditional clothes again.

The Inuvialuit and the Kitikmeot West, yes, in the principles of agreement they are put in a situation which I do not approve of either because I believe that they should be given a chance to decide. Not solidly just draw the line.

Fear For Loss Of Power To NWT Through Division

I am running out of words about Nunavut and WCF. So I have expressed my comments on behalf of my constituents and behalf of some people of the Territories, and I have expressed a few of my views with them. I am prepared to keep voting with my Inuit colleagues and my Nunavut caucus. But bear with me, when I vote with them, I am afraid of the NWT splitting or dividing for it will lose a great deal of power that way. Right now we have eight Ministers and 16 ordinary MLAs, ordinary humans, like any other humans across the Territories. The Territories are populated by different kinds of people, even though I spoke of countries overseas having their own governments suited to their own race. Today we have some problems, all kinds of problems across the Territories and this government is trying to do their best to solve these problems. As I said, time and time again, I am afraid of the new beginning of the two territories if they should go through. But then again it is harder for me to say that all they are trying to do in Nunavut is to try and keep their culture together. That is the only thing I could say for them. I would be much happier if division went through and right at the start it operated like the Assembly does today.

A Committee To Keep The Territories Together

I am pretty sure that all the Members have heard this. Before I keep repeating things about Nunavut I might as well cut off the whole thing about Nunavut. I have expressed what I felt and thought about the whole thing. Even though the plebiscite went through April 5, 1982, I believe -- was it the fifth or the second? Well, everybody knows that. When this House was forming the alliance, if some group out across the Territories that lost out, through the plebiscite on division, on keeping the Territories together, if they had formed a third group to keep it together, regardless of this vote they had about the division, regardless of that, if somebody was trying to keep the Territories together with members of approximately six or eight in a committee, even a group from outside the Territories that is just representing the ordinary people, there is no doubt, in my mind, that those would have won their case to keep the Territories together.

You see, reading all these technical papers about WCF and NCF, secretly they are trying to keep the Territories together because...

--Laughter

---Applause

...one side cannot agree. It is as simple as that. If they were really going for it, yes, one side would have agreed already but, technically, they are taking all their time so that they do not agree upon the whole thing, so they keep continually meeting in this place and the Assembly here.

---Laughter

---Applause

MR. MacQUARRIE: The pay is marvellous and the environment is so wonderful.

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: Well, it took me how many weeks to plan for my reply and review the whole thing that is written in the WCF and NCF agreement, it is as simple as that. They are trying to keep it together. I say they are smart negotiators...

---Laughter

...but they outsmarted themselves so that they cannot agree upon it. So now, I guess, the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs is saying, "Yeah, I don't mind, you can take as long as you want to." He is happy because we can continue meeting here.

---Laughter

One day when we get a little more ahead, maybe by next year, maybe we both would want to stay a little closer together and we love being together.

---Laughter

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure.

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: See, that is what the agreement is saying to me. I do not know, and I cannot predict, both sides are solid about the agreement, they do not agree with it.

---Laughter

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: We agree, they do not.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: That is what he says.

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: Well, anyhow. I am just proud to be a Canadian and I am just proud to be a resident of the Northwest Territories.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Hear, hear!

---Applause

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: And, at the same time, I really do not want to be the one to make anything more difficult for both forums...

AN HON. MEMBER: You already did that.

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: ...regardless of where the whole process is. So that concludes my reply, I guess. I require a coffee right now.

---Laughter

Can I do what I want, Mr. Speaker, on my Member's reply and do anything free to the floor? No, that concludes my reply, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for making me...

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Angotittauruq. We will see if we might be able to frame your words of wisdom. Mr. Curley.

Point Of Privilege

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to respond to the report by the press today. I am doing this because when I was asked a leading question by the press the other day, whether or not, if an election were called, the MLAs would be returned, and to me that was a leading question. I recall my answer, that it did not matter what the outcome was. The report in the paper says that Curley said, "Many Members probably would not be returned if a vote was held today." Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely a bunch of baloney. I did not say that. I said, in responding to the question, "As far as the outcome was concerned, it did not matter." What I meant was, that the new Assembly at least would have a new agenda, at least a renewed -- a public exercise, democratic exercise and that is all I was leading to...

AN HON. MEMBER: We would all be back for the same thing.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: ...and you might minimize the importance of the democratic freedom, but I do not. Mr. Speaker, it also states that Curley believes trust has been lost in the Constitutional Alliance. Again, when I was asked the question I was mainly talking about the Assembly, which I was a Member of and I constantly reminded the press that I was not a Member of the alliance, but in my view, the confidence between the two parties is something that is, I think, questioned by many Members of the House and the public, as well as the present arrangement in the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, also in the editorial comment, I would like to disassociate myself from the comments and I quote from that report. It says, "to restore the public confidence"; I am asking for an election to restore public confidence. They went on to say that "is an interesting rouse, but without substance". And again, it says in the editorial that I suggest "that many of the MLAs would lose their seats and their pay cheques". They "concur" they said, Mr. Speaker. I wish to disassociate myself from this concurrence because I have never said that many MLAs would lose their seats and their pay cheques. I never alluded to that fact and I will not be a party to the opinion of the editor of this paper.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Hear, hear!

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: It is not possible. There is no conceivable way that I am going to agree to them so, Mr. Speaker...

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: You will only encourage them.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: ...I only can assume that the editor is biased, because in the original editorial in the past, February 22, 1985, he called this exercise, "Call it what it is, not a gift but a shove." So ever since they have been mounting a pressure for their own interest in that regard, Mr. Speaker. I just wish to clarify some of the points that alluded to my remarks and I would like this Assembly to know that I am all for public confidence. I am all for the fair game in this Assembly, but I do not wish to indicate to the House that I am in favour of seeing many hard-working Members of the Assembly not returning. That is not for me to say. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Inasmuch as the Assembly has been having difficulty with the press, by the number of points of privilege that have referred to the press, I remind you that on page 26 of your rules, "Any Member may either immediately propose a motion or, not later than at the conclusion of the next sitting day, give notice of a motion calling upon the Assembly to take action thereon or referring the same to a committee of the Assembly." If the House feels strongly on the newspaper reporting, it is within your prerogative to form a committee to deal with it. Points of privilege. You have concluded your point of privilege, Mr. Curley? Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Members' replies.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Coffee break. I would defer until that time, Mr. Speaker. If not, I will continue.

MR. SPEAKER: Go on a short presentation. In view of the fact that there is no short address it appears, we will recess for 15 minutes for coffee and allow Mr. MacQuarrie to conclude his speech.

---SHORT RECESS

DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Wah-Shee): The House will come to order. Item 2, Members' replies. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Mr. MacQuarrie's Reply

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me pleasure once again to reply to the Commissioner's Address on this first day of spring, supposedly a time of renewal, and I hope that some of the things that I say in my speech will offer some hope of renewal but perhaps not totally.

There are a number of constituency concerns that I have and that my constituents have. I will not address them because in addressing one of those it will take a fair amount of time. That namely is constitutional and political development in the Northwest Territories which, as Mr. Angottitauruq said, is of concern to all people of the NWT, all constituents. I would wish that I could make a speech as gracious and as pleasant as the speech that was made by the honourable Member for Kitikmeot West. I will attempt to deliver it in the same spirit but I would also like to be as open as he has been and because I have been involved in events, very difficult events, being open will sometimes mean that the things that I would say will not be quite as pleasant as some of the things that Mr. Angottitauruq said.

HON. GORDON WRAY: You have to be cruel to be kind about it.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Cruel to be kind. That is confusing but I will mull it over, Mr. Wray.

AN HON. MEMBER: Heavy duty.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Do not throw anything.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, heavy duty. No, I won't throw anything at all -- a few ideas maybe.

Mr. Patterson was right when he said the other day that historians would have precious little to go on if they were to refer to the record of the debates in this House with respect to political and constitutional development. It is clear that there is a fair amount of confusion in the air. I am sure the federal government to some extent is confused. I know that a lot of people in the NWT are confused about what has happened. I am sure that even some Assembly Members who have not been directly involved in all of this are confused as to what has been happening and the press to some extent has been confused. I do not attribute that to ill will on their part but rather it is a complex and confusing issue. For example, today I noticed in the editorial of the Yellowknifer a statement that says, "Unfortunately, that is not possible under parliamentary procedure unless the western Members of the Assembly rescind a motion which locks the alliance into a course of action." The simple truth is that the Assembly motion does not lock the alliance into any course of action. So it is a misunderstanding on the part of the person who wrote the editorial but as I say it is a complex issue that we are dealing with. So I do not find undue fault with that, although everybody should be struggling as much as possible to understand what has happened.

As a direct participant in some of the events that have taken place over the past couple of years I would like to detail some of those events and present the facts as I see them, so that my account can be reconciled with the accounts of others, in an attempt to enable those who are objective observers to determine as clearly as possible what has really happened. I do this, not particularly to vindicate myself or my colleagues from the West, but so that others who will have to make action judgments and take decisions in the future, whether that is the federal government or other Members of this Assembly or the people of the NWT, will perhaps have a little more certain ground on which to stand when they make those decisions.

Objective For Division Was Political

Some time ago, as everyone here knows, eastern Members in this Legislative Assembly pressed for division of the NWT. We were told that the territory is too large, that many people in the territory are too remote from government, that government must be made more accessible to the people and so that it was time to divide the NWT into two public government jurisdictions. There may have been some reluctance on the part of western Members, nevertheless, seeing that as an objective, the creation of two public government jurisdictions, it was accepted generally, eventually, by western Members and the process was begun. Now, I would like to say that the

objective of creating two public government jurisdictions was the objective that was the basis of the plebiscite. We heard from Mr. Angottitauruq today that there may have been some confusion in the minds of some when they voted. That is entirely possible but it is clear that those who set up the plebiscite understood that the objective was the creation of two public government jurisdictions. Even the question shows that. "Should the NWT be divided?"

I can say quite safely that if there had been any other thought in mind in that objective that, one, the plebiscite question would never have been framed by this Legislative Assembly, and two, that if it had been framed nevertheless, it would not have passed, if it were clear that it were some other objective than a political division, of the NWT into two public government jurisdictions.

That was the objective that was the basis of the Legislative Assembly's support in Inuvik. That is why there was a 19 to zero and one abstention vote. If it had not been clear that a political division of the Territories was the objective, that vote would never have carried in that way in Inuvik. That objective was the basis of the federal government's support for division. That is clear from Mr. Munro's specific statements in the Legislative Assembly, when he said that no single factor, not even culture will be the determiner of that division. So, federal government support hinged on it being a political division. That was the objective that was the basis of the alliance talks and I could refer anyone to an agreed statement by both the Nunavut forum and the western forum from March 1984, which stated quite clearly that the objective was the creation of two public government jurisdictions, each of which was sufficiently viable to evolve some day to provincial status. That objective was also the basis of the agreement that was reached by the Constitutional Alliance on January 13th. The creation of two public government jurisdictions.

A Different Objective In The Minds Of Some Participants

Now, under that objective I think quite understandably and quite fairly, the keeping of one cultural group, one ethnic group in one jurisdiction, while that could be a consideration, is not a pre-eminent concern in creating a political division of the NWT. It is a consideration but not a pre-eminent concern; certainly not the sole determiner of how the existing jurisdiction is to be divided. And certainly not to be used as a criterion of the success or failure of any agreement that is reached under that objective. Now while that was the stated objective of all those who participated, it is obvious in the light of recent events that one or more people who were pressing for the division of the NWT had a hidden agenda. There was some different objective in the minds of some. I think certainly not all, certainly not all Inuit, certainly not Mr. Patterson. I believe that he engaged in the negotiations sincerely to try to bring about the creation of two public government jurisdictions. But there were some people who had a different objective and secretly their objective was the establishment of a jurisdiction which encompassed all Inuit people. I do not say a jurisdiction that excluded other people, non-natives for example, no, but a jurisdiction that encompassed all Inuit people. Now, that is a different objective and it was not stated in the negotiations that we were undertaking. So if that was the objective of some secretly, then I can only say that it is very difficult to deal with people, let alone deal fairly or effectively with people who are not being entirely honest with you as to what you are trying to achieve. It is sort of like someone dressing you up and taking you out to a dance so that they can eventually get to the girl that they really want to be with.

---Laughter

You are sort of used in that sense. They have no compunction in using you for their own ends. And I believe to some extent that is what has happened in all of this.

The people who secretly had that in their mind -- again, I do not think that it is necessarily many people, certainly not all Inuit, but some had that in their minds -- such people have tried to use the established process, the one that we have been engaged in for some time now, for quite a different objective, believing that the process could be successfully manoeuvred to achieve that unstated end. But I can only say that it was not successfully manoeuvred in that direction and so the agreement that was reached on January 13th more or less satisfied those who had embarked on that process sincerely but it appears that it was a bitter disappointment to those who had not embarked on it sincerely or, perhaps, were not directly part of the process. Now, I say that that is one of the reasons, not the only reason, but one of the reasons and a very important one, why there have been recent difficulties. I would like to spend a little more time on that agreement to show how it came about and why it was a good agreement and may still be the basis of a good agreement and, quite specifically, what went wrong, and perhaps who made it go wrong and then I would like to spend a little bit of time on options for the future.

Agreement Based On NCF Proposal

Turning then to the agreement that was reached by the Constitutional Alliance on January 13th. It was based, to a large extent, on a proposal brought to the alliance meeting on January 12th and 13th, by the Nunavut Constitutional Forum. That is where the proposal came from and I would say, for those who doubt what I am saying, there are copies of their original proposal available and if you were to compare it with the final principles of agreement that were reached, you would see that there are not many changes. A few wording changes, but basically it was an agreement proposed by the Nunavut Constitutional Forum.

I would like to assure everyone that that proposal did not spring full-blown into the mind of some one member of the Nunavut Constitutional Forum on the morning of January 12th. Not at all. That is not the way that things worked. In fact, the proposal that was brought to us by the Nunavut forum was planned and prepared by the Nunavut Constitutional Forum largely, we understand, in a meeting that took place in Ottawa, in December. That is a meeting of the NCF, where there was full participation of Nunavut Constitutional Forum members, including the Committee for Original Peoples Entitlement. They had representation at that meeting in December. Hence, the principles of agreement that were finally reached, while they may have been some surprise to ordinary Inuvialuit in the Beaufort area, should not have been any surprise to their leaders. To Billy Day, for example, the president of COPE, or to the honourable Member for Nunakput, who is not specifically a leader of COPE but who is very well-known in that area, and very influential. Such people as these must have known a month before the agreement was reached precisely what was going to be proposed to us in the Western forum.

The proposal had the support of Nunavut Constitutional Forum members, including the president of ITC, John Amagoalik. I know that the responsibility for it has since been dumped on the former chairman of the Nunavut Constitutional Forum, Mr. Patterson, unfairly dumped I think, because if anyone really believes that John Amagoalik is not aware of what is going on or could be used as a patsy by Mr. Patterson, then I would say such a person would have to be naive in the extreme. It is clear that if that proposal came from the Nunavut forum, that Mr. Amagoalik, for example, supported the proposal. I should also say that at that meeting it was clear there were two high ranking people from the Minister's office, from Minister Crombie's office, who were aware of what proposal was being generated.

Events Preceding Striking Of Agreement

I could say that the WCF did not know of that proposal. We knew there was to be a meeting in Yellowknife, January 12th and 13th, and we believed sincerely that it was to be a meeting at which we would examine further some of the principles that we had agreed upon as being important in bringing about a political division in the Territories. There were some big books of research that we thought we were going to be going through. We thought, also, we would be talking a little bit more about the process for bringing about a boundary agreement, keeping in mind that we had already agreed that we should target June of this year as a time to try to reach some boundary agreement. Only mid-week before the January meeting did we start realizing that something was up. We heard through the media reports that Mr. Patterson thought that it would be an historic meeting, which implied that he, at least for one, saw that there might be some kind of breakthrough. We heard rumours in that week prior to the meeting that, in fact, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development was supporting a plan and that plan is essentially the one that you do see in the agreement that was reached and, I must say, to my amazement, on the Friday before that meeting, listening to CBC radio, I was amazed to hear John Amagoalik say that if we did not reach an agreement and come to terms on the weekend of January 12th and 13th that he would go directly to the federal government to settle the matter.

Now, the reason I say we were amazed is because we believed that the previous summer in Rankin Inlet, we had all agreed that June was to be the target for bringing about an agreement, so we could not quite understand how we would be derelict if we did not fully reach an agreement on that weekend. Nevertheless, that was what was said. So, hearing the rumours that the federal government was supporting it and that it was going to be an historic weekend and Mr. Amagoalik saying there must be an agreement, we began to get the message that something big might be up. So, we went into those meetings, heard the proposal, negotiated some changes and by the end of Sunday afternoon an agreement was struck.

Understanding The Agreement Would Be "Tentative"

I would like to make it clear to all Members in this House and to the public of the Northwest Territories that the alliance mandate says that we reach "tentative" agreements and that was always understood. It was a tentative agreement -- unfortunately, not always said again and again and maybe it should have been, but always understood, that we had reached a political agreement in the alliance but we had the obligation to go out and win the support for it from our constituents, from the Legislative Assembly, from the native associations, from the people of the Northwest Territories generally. It is and can be a democratic process, contrary to what the honourable Leader of the Government said on the radio recently. It can be a very democratic process. It is just that you have to have a spearhead somewhere to reach some tentative agreements, because you cannot have 48,000 people sitting around trying to reach an agreement. So the alliance reaches tentative agreements and then must go out to win support and that was precisely what was done.

Agreement Is Still In Place

Now, it is an alliance agreement. Not anybody else's. It is an agreement in the Constitutional Alliance, it is a political agreement, not a legal agreement and has no legal implications at all. It is a political agreement between the Nunavut Constitutional Forum and the Western Constitutional Forum and so that is why I say that agreement is still in place until the Nunavut Constitutional Forum or the Western Constitutional Forum, or both, indicate formally that it no longer exists. Presumably, each group, if they are unable to win support of constituent parties, that is what they would have to say finally. But that has not been said yet. We know there is disagreement in this area or that area, but neither of the forums has yet said, "Forget it." So it is still in place.

I would say that I hope it could still be in place, or some modification of it could still be in place, because frankly I say that it is a good agreement. It is the best that could possibly be worked out, given all the great complexities of our social, political and geographical environment. I would say that if division of the NWT is valid and if the objective is in fact the establishment of two public government jurisdictions, then this is a very fine tentative agreement and I would hope that it could be salvaged in some way.

Representation Complete, Culturally And Regionally

Now to talk a little bit more about why it could be a good agreement. In the body of people who worked toward and finally reached that agreement, we had John Amagoalik, Peter Ittinuar at periods of time, Bob Kadlun, Charles Haogak, who I am told was the personal choice of Ms Cournoyea to participate in these negotiations, Nick Sibbeston, Dennis Patterson, Steve Kakfwi, Larry Tourangeau, and myself. And I remember even Ms Cournoyea, on one occasion. If you examine that representation you will find that there is complete regional representation, right across the NWT. In addition there is complete cultural representation. Because of that, in that agreement, unquestionably, there were the seeds of public acceptability and it remained for them to be nurtured by the people who reached the agreement. Now I do not say that everyone was deliriously happy with the agreement. It was a negotiated agreement and that always involves compromise. So when you compromise you are not deliriously happy. But I would say that there was the possibility of general acceptance of that agreement among the vast majority of the people of the NWT. I think many people, when they heard the announcement were surprised. But also there was a great relief across the Territories, that a thorny and very divisive issue might at last be settled in a rational way, with no injustice to anyone. And I wish to underline that and explain a little bit more what I mean about that because there was no injustice to anyone.

Discussions With Inuvialuit Within Agreement

Let us take the case first of the Inuvialuit. The agreement called for discussions with the Inuvialuit, they were to sit with the West and talk about principles of government that might help to make them feel comfortable if they were to be part of a western territory. It is clear from the agreement that they would be in control of determining whether those discussions were a success or a failure. They would have that right to decide. And if they determined that the discussions failed, then they were not to be forced into a western territory in a divided NWT. It would simply mean that there would be no boundary agreement and we would have to sit again and try to come up with something. I would say that the western forum very sincerely was and is open to thorough discussions. I think most western Members quite accept the principles that were enunciated by COPE before there ever was a WARM document. I would like to say the WARM document was written by Howard McDiarmid a mere mortal, like ourselves. It is not the word of God.

AN HON. MEMBER: I thought it was.

MR. MacQUARRIE: You thought it was.

---Laughter

But the principles that gave rise to that -- let's hear what they are, because I have read them and the COPE organization have said, "They are important to us." They say this. There must be greater control by the Inuvialuit over the institutions of government in their area and they must have greater control over programs and services in their area for things that affect them and not other people. I say sincerely that western people can accept those principles and are prepared to work from them to bring about some agreement. We were and are even ready to discuss WARM -- the specific regional government proposal. But it is true that we were not ready to accept that document before discussions would even begin. We could not see how that was a fair resolution of the difficulty.

Now I noted that Mr. Patterson in his reply yesterday or the day before, spoke approvingly of our recent letter, the western forum's letter to Billy Day, president of COPE, with respect to our position on the agreement. But of course he spoke in an ironic way to try to make out that we now had some different position from that stated earlier. I would merely like to say that that is not true. Our western forum position in this matter has been consistent. If anyone would like to check the first NCF proposal which I alluded to earlier, the words in respect to the Inuvialuit "subject to the above", do not even appear in the initial NCF document. They were added by the Western Constitutional Forum by a staff member of ours, after a private meeting of the WCF on the morning of January 13th.

Once we had received the NCF proposal, we went to our WCF offices, read through it, and saw great possibilities for agreement. In noting the wording that was used with respect to the Inuvialuit, I can remember commenting that it would be in our practical, political interests to have successful discussions with the Inuvialuit, because in the interests of future stability of a western territory it would not make sense to try to drag that area into the West, kicking and screaming. I did not direct the staff member to write "subject to the above" but because he heard those comments and the general feeling of other WCF members, he wrote that in when he revised what we brought back to the Nunavut forum. We were the ones who said their participation would be subject to these discussions.

Now, in fact I could say that every statement in the Billy Day letter, that has just been alluded to, is and has been part of the WCF position. We have always held that. I would say that in addition, we have said that it is clear that the agreement does not name any specific time frame in which these talks have to be concluded. We specifically wanted that because we did not want a situation where we would go to the area, be presented with the WARM document and told to say yes or no and if the answer was no, they would say the discussions are not successful, tough luck.

A Fresh Start If Discussions Failed

So there is no specific time frame and we also have pointed out that there is no specific attainment required by the agreement. The agreement does not require us to accept WARM outright but rather to embark on these discussions and we would want to fulfil that agreement. We did point out, when we were in that area that if the agreement failed, some people there felt that that automatically meant that they went into the East in a divided territory, and we said "Oh no, it doesn't mean that. If the talks fail, what it means is that there is no boundary agreement and we start again to try to reach some kind of agreement." Unfortunately, although that is and has been our position right along, it has been in the interests of some people, deliberately, to distort that position.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Including your own people.

MR. MacQUARRIE: We do not think so. Not deliberately. But unfortunately it is also some of our own ineptness that provided fuel for those who did want to distort it. It is at this point that I would like to acknowledge, that of all the seamy allegations that have been made against the Western Constitutional Forum and myself in recent days, and other members of the WCF, that this is the one allegation that has some degree of substance. Namely, that we were insensitive when we first travelled into the Beaufort area. I acknowledge that to some extent and I will explain the

reason. Back in November we had planned a trip to the Beaufort region. We had planned for it to take place on January 15, 16 and 17. It was for quite another purpose. We were to go there to talk generally to people about what the WCF is and some of the constitutional development things that we would be talking about in a western territory -- to help them understand what we were all about.

Focus Of Meeting Changed Suddenly

When we planned the trip we had no idea that a boundary agreement would be reached on January 13th. When it was reached, it put us in the very difficult position of having reached the agreement on a Sunday and of leaving on the Tuesday for the Beaufort area to sit at public meetings, where suddenly the focus of the meetings was not what we had planned in the first place, but rather the focus was the recent boundary agreement. In the light of that, I must say that we were making statements before we had the chance to hear the concerns of those people. Therefore, not because we wished to distort anything, but from ineptness, if you like, or lack of awareness, we were sometimes not saying things that needed to be said. Not saying things in a way that could minimize the emotional impact for people in that area.

We ought to have emphasized that it was a tentative agreement and we were not doing that. I guess in those early days we were also guilty of assuming that not only ourselves but others who had reached that agreement with us, would have the strength and the courage to stand by the agreement, as we were prepared to do, and would try to help people understand why we reached that agreement and would try to encourage people to accept it. Unfortunately, as subsequent events show, that did not occur. I do not think we were naive in assuming that it should occur, I think we have the right to expect that it should have occurred. Because I for one have absolutely no problem with any citizen of the NWT challenging what is in that agreement, except for those people who sat with me at the table and reached that agreement. Because by shaking my hand at 5:00 o'clock on January 13th, they were telling me that with me they felt it was a good agreement for the people of the NWT. I feel that I had every right to expect that when we went out into the public that they would continue to say that to people, help them to understand, not ram it down their throats, but help them to understand why it was a good agreement and encourage them to take the steps that were being asked of them under the agreement, rather than to detract and undermine the agreement. That is the one thing that I object to. Everyone else is free to speak openly, to attack it and to attack the people who made it, if they wish, but not those people.

Anyway, I will say in that Beaufort trip, as soon as it was pointed out to us that people had certain concerns that we began to respond. For example, I remember the day following the meeting in Tuktoyaktuk, which was the first meeting, climbing into a Twin Otter which was as cold inside as the weather was outside, I could see that Charles Haogak was disturbed. I sat beside him on the plane and asked what the concern was. He said that we were making it appear that the agreement is cast in concrete, that it is finished forever. I said that that is not what we intended, we recognized that it is a tentative agreement and that if the discussions are not successful that there is no agreement. I did say to him that to us it does not mean that you automatically go to an eastern territory, but that it means there is no agreement. He said, "Well, why don't you say that?" I said, all right we would begin to say that and we did. We began to point out that it was a tentative agreement.

So there was no injustice, just to reiterate, no injustice to the Inuvialuit. Because it merely called for discussions. They would control the success or failure of the discussions. If, in fact, this were a legal agreement and they were forced into a western territory without a vote, then maybe, maybe, that would have been undemocratic. But that is not the case. This is a political agreement. They were asked to sit with the western forum and discuss certain principles of government to see whether they could be comfortable in a western territory. They were not to be forced, if they could not accept the results of the discussion. So I say that that in no way is undemocratic.

There was also no injustice in the agreement for the people of the Kitikmeot Region. That region, at least in the alliance meetings, was deemed by both the NCF and WCF not to be critical, absolutely essential to the viability of either territory. So it was concluded that here was a place where a vote could be given. They were right in the middle, as the name suggests, and they were given the chance to choose, either way, which was precisely what we were told was what they wanted. Many of them at first were saying that they preferred no division, but if there had to be division that they wanted that choice.

A Skilful And Workable Agreement

So for reasons like these and in view of the earlier stated objective, I would say that it was a skilful agreement and that it was a workable agreement. That was why, immediately after it was concluded, starting on January 14th, you heard Mr. Patterson say publicly, "It is an historic agreement. It is an historic day." Mr. Amagoalik on CBC radio saying essentially "It is not all that I wanted but it is a necessary compromise", and willing to accept it and work toward its realization. Mr. Suluk, MP for Nunatsiaq, saying that he is happy to see the matter settled. Mr. Taipana -- and this is an interesting case because I have subsequently heard Mr. Taipana say on the radio that he never agreed to all of this. It is a little ironic because at 5:00 o'clock on Sunday, January 13th, there was one person in the room who said, "Shouldn't we sign this agreement?" Someone who obviously supported the agreement and wanted us to be bound I guess by his signature. Who was that person? Simon Taipana. The rest of us overflowing with brotherly love and good faith said "We have reached agreements before, it is a political agreement not a legal agreement. We do not need to put our signatures on it. The fact that we have said we reached it is good enough for us." So obviously even he, at one point, found the agreement acceptable.

We know that most Members of the western caucus in this Assembly support the agreement. Some with some concerns and they wanted the chance, and I am sure will still get the chance to express what those concerns were, but generally they supported the agreement. I even have reason to believe that in an initial polling of Members of the eastern caucus, that the majority found the agreement acceptable. So, a long-held dream of people like Mr. Arlooktoo, Mr. Appaqaq, Mr. Patterson, a long-held dream for the establishment of an eastern territory seemed to be and in fact was in their hands and ready for the taking.

The Minister of Indian Affairs said "Two years time", and you have it. And, of course, others were happy that at last there may be a kind of stability come to the Territories, which has been lacking for some time. Yet despite the broad support that was there when the agreement was first reached, something happened that caused the agreement to begin to crumble and I do not yet concede that it is collapsed. What happened? What went wrong? Well, it is apparent that some people did not like the agreement for their own reasons and they set to work to destroy it. It is clear to me that one of the people who did not like the agreement at all was Mr. Curley. In my opinion, I feel that he would like to hijack the process of political and constitutional development in the NWT...

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: I, like you.

MR. MacQUARRIE: ...and put it onto a track of his own choosing. I will return to that matter in a minute and offer some evidence that will support what I say.

In a different kind of way, it is clear also that Ms Cournoyea did not like the agreement and has worked to damage the stability that could have come from all of us trying to make that agreement work. In Ms Cournoyea's case -- and I will come back to Mr. Curley's in a minute -- it has taken the form of trying to make people in the Beaufort area feel that an injustice has been done to them, when in fact, as I explained earlier, it has not. Ms Cournoyea has made much about the fact that under this agreement people in that area would not have the right to choose the East or the West. But I must make it clear that there is still no East and West. It was a process to try to bring that about, the first step in it.

Member's Amendment To Earlier Motion

So although Ms Cournoyea complained in a sense about the lack of democracy that was involved in this agreement, I find it a little ironic because that is the same Ms Cournoyea who on Friday, May 13, 1983, in this House said, and I quote from page 1129 of Hansard. "MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an amendment to reason number three, that the settlement of Holman not be included in Kitikmeot West but continue to be included in the constituency with Paulatuk, Sachs Harbour and Tuk, as it was originally." Now what that amendment had the effect of doing, Mr. Speaker and Members, some may recall, was the effect of overturning an electoral boundaries commission recommendation...

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MacQUARRIE: ...that Holman should be in Kitikmeot West rather than in Nunakput as it is now called. And why did the boundary commission recommend that? Because the community of Holman had specifically voted...

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: A very close vote.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Well, let me give the figures. The community of Holman had specifically voted 72 to 63 to be included in Kitikmeot West.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: There was another vote.

MR. BALLANTYNE: There was a vote for division, 56 per cent about, eh?

MR. MacQUARRIE: Now, what I would have to say further is that Ms Cournoyea's amendment carried in this House, with no outrage expressed by Members about a violation of democracy. There may have been one Member who intended to but as other Members will recall that day, he had some personal difficulties and was not subsequently around to speak to the motion. At any rate among all those Members remaining there was no expression of outrage about a violation of democracy, certainly not by Ms Cournoyea who moved the motion, because, and there is a reason, because Ms Cournoyea had persuaded all of us that despite that community vote, there were larger and more important reasons that argued in favour of keeping that community in her constituency. And we were persuaded by those arguments.

Well, what I say with regard to our present tentative agreement which imposes nothing that we in the West believe -- well, first of all we know that there is support in some Beaufort communities for coming west. But in addition to that, we say that there are larger reasons and more important reasons why that area ought to be in the West. So, is the agreement so bad? An agreement that does not compel the Inuvialuit to be in the West but invites them to sit and discuss the matter with us? One must wonder why those discussions are unable to take place. I would have to wonder whether the honourable Member I have been referring to or other leaders in that area are afraid that such discussions might very well be successful.

AN HON. MEMBER: Afraid? You're afraid.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Because I believe that they would be successful. Now, as for Mr. Curley. I have evidence and will produce it immediately to show that he has a different agenda and a different objective from many Members in this House.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: What did I tell you?

MR. MacQUARRIE: When Mr. Curley appeared at the COPE annual general meeting in Sachs Harbour on February 16th -- I am not sure why he was there or what his capacity was there -- but there he appeared on February 16th...

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: I stated that -- and he knows that.

MR. McCALLUM: He had nothing better to do.

MR. MacQUARRIE: And he sat at the front table posing as a Member of the Nunavut Constitutional Forum.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame, shame!

MR. MacQUARRIE: Now, that disturbed me at the time.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: He knows that is not true.

MR. MacQUARRIE: I do not know whether Mr. Patterson invited Mr. Curley to sit beside him.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: That's a lie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: I know at that front table, there was Mr. Sibbeston and myself representing the Western Constitutional Forum. Then there was Mr. Patterson at the front table, then there was Mr. Curley. Now, I do not know whether Mr. Patterson invited Mr. Curley to help make the NCF presentation. If he did, then I would have to fault Mr. Patterson because he had no right to do such a thing. On the other hand...

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Curley, your point of order.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for indicating to the Member in saying that is a lie. But I would like to say that it is a misleading statement because I indicated and I did say when I spoke during my reply that when I rose at COPE's annual meeting at Sachs Harbour -- I was very careful to say that I was not a member of Nunavut Constitutional Forum --but because there was a vacancy at that time and the representative of the NCF was not able to appear and the fact that a Legislative Assembly representative had resigned, that I was filling that role just for that trip and I was careful to try and not confuse anybody from that. If I did confuse anybody, it was not deliberate. Thank you.

MR. MacQUARRIE: May I proceed, Mr. Speaker? The word "posing" then may be...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You may proceed.

Presence And Input Of Member At COPE Annual Meeting

MR. MacQUARRIE: What I would have to say is that certainly the appearance, to the people in that room, was intended to be that Mr. Curley had some status at that presentation which he was not properly entitled to. Let me put it that way. Now, if Mr. Patterson invited him then I only say that he shouldn't have. If, on the other hand, Mr. Curley invited himself to that seat, and Mr. Patterson did not refuse him, then I regret that Mr. Patterson didn't. He ought to have had the courage to say to Mr. Curley, "You do not have the right to sit here, you can make your statements from the public arena as well as other people." But I do not really fault Mr. Patterson very much if that were the case because I recognize that Mr. Curley is a very powerful personality and a very powerful man and I am afraid that is one of the problems that we have in the Territories and in constitutional development, that there are all too few people who are willing to have the courage to directly confront Mr. Curley and say something that is contradictory to what he wants. So I understand when people are reluctant to do it. When I first came to this House I had a little reluctance myself but I have since learned.

--Laughter

If more people can gather such courage perhaps we will have the chance to get some real progress in what we are all about. Now, at that meeting here is what Mr. Curley said, and I am quoting from notes that were taken. I acknowledge immediately, taken down by a staff member of the Western Constitutional Forum, but I can assure you that the staff member is paid to take accurate notes and not to write fiction. In these notes this is what Mr. Curley says. "Tagak Curley: I am very happy to be here. As you may know, I was the first president of the ITC and I see many familiar faces here of people who attended our early meetings. Nellie was a representative from this area and supported the Nunavut proposal in those early days. You", speaking to the people in the room, "You were given a choice of remaining with us then and that choice should remain in spite of the tentative agreement which has been put forward. We do not want to be separated, we care for you and share the same life. I think it is important that we never be divided."

Now, I am not unduly disturbed by those remarks in themselves. I am not shocked that someone would make such a statement, but it is clear to me that when Mr. Curley says that, that he has the different objective...

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MacQUARRIE: ...from what the rest of us have been trying sincerely to accomplish for the past two and a half years, but he has not stated that objective clearly to the public elsewhere, or in this House, but chose to allow the impression to be gained that we were trying to effect a political division of the Northwest Territories.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you listening?

MR. MacQUARRIE: I can see, having read those comments, quite clearly why Mr. Curley would want to undermine the agreement that was reached in good faith by both the Nunavut forum and the Western forum and that is, in fact, a fair and reasonable agreement if the objective is to create two

public government jurisdictions. As I said, I do not object to Mr. Curley having a different goal from other people, that is his business and he has every right to pursue it. What I do object to is his lack of candour about what the goal is. I object to what could only be seen as subtle attempts to use the power of this government and the good will of other people and the funding of the federal government for the alliance, to attain something other than what everyone else, or many other people believe is being sought. So, I would say, as I said earlier, I do not know how many others have this same goal as Mr. Curley. I know of other Inuit who do not, but there may be others who do and I say simply that if Mr. Curley has that goal and others have that goal of working toward the creation of a territory that encompasses all Inuit people, then I would invite them to be honest about their goal, to re-establish their credibility and their integrity and state publicly that is their goal and then work toward it.

If there are vast numbers of Inuit who support that goal, along with Mr. Curley, then the present process that we have established is not going to go anywhere. If there are not many who have that same goal as Mr. Curley, then I say let the rest of us who sincerely have the goal of creating two viable public government jurisdictions work together toward achieving that goal because I can assure everybody that if our objectives are the same, then we can find a way to make the agreement work, through the alliance. We can modify it or adjust it as necessary. If our objectives in the two forums are not really the same, then the process that is in place, and this is important, I see that momentarily for the first time in my speech I have lost the attention of some Members so I will struggle to regain it because it is an important point.

Goals Must Be The Same For Successful Agreement

If our objectives in the two forums are really not the same, and I do not blame people for having different objectives, but if they are not the same then I can say that the process that is in place is a mockery, it is a total waste of time and effort and of money. It is sure to end in acrimony. It is only if the goals are the same that a successful agreement can be reached. It is bound to end in acrimony I say, because the one party will be frustrated and angry because certain unstated goals are not attained and the other group will be frustrated and angered because despite their good will they seem never to be able to satisfy and are continually vilified for not satisfying.

Mr. Curley, because of recent events, has suggested to the press that an election might be necessary. He sees some of these events, obviously, as kind of traumatic and he has also suggested that at one point, a renewed process is required. Well, I say that certainly the election part is nonsense. The alliance has a mandate to try to work this thing through on the one hand and certainly the Assembly has a mandate to try to carry on the business of government and we can do it and are doing it but more appropriately, in view of all of the difficulties that have resulted in the last few weeks, maybe some renewal is required and I say along with Mr. Angottitauruq, perhaps it is time to reconsider the question as to whether division itself is even desirable. The reason I say that is because with the two forums as they are now constituted, the objective they have stated and the principles that they have enunciated, both forums agreeing to them, it is hard to see how those objectives can result in any significantly different result than the agreement that was already reached. And so if that agreement cannot be salvaged then, of course, people have to look at other options. And though division is not necessarily my first choice -- I would like to see the agreement work. I am only saying that if it cannot, then other things must be considered and the possibility of no division is one of them.

Certainly when the question of division was first raised -- first put to the people in 1982, there was very little discussion of the real issues associated with a division of the NWT, particularly I believe in the East -- the real issues. But time has elapsed, division came very close to happening and that brought some of the issues clearly into focus. Now, there is a much clearer awareness on the part of many people exactly what division might mean and it is just possible -- and in addition to that, we know that here and there people, even at this time are questioning the need for division. If we look back at the plebiscite we see that there was only marginal support for division at that time -- 56 per cent of those who voted. Many, many people did not vote. Certainly many people in the Beaufort area and the Kitikmeot area and in other parts of the West said "No".

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order has been called. Ms Cournoyea.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Mr. MacQuarrie, under replies to Commissioner's Address, made allegations and continues to make allegations concerning my constituency's repudiation of the agreement of the Constitutional Alliance. Mr. MacQuarrie should be called to order under Rule 33(h), "makes allegations against another Member, an official or a witness;" and under (i), "imputes false or unavowed motives to another Member."

Mr. Speaker, I have tried not to say anything but I really believe that I need an apology -- and my constituents. Thank you.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: He is very good at that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thought we were going to have a very quiet afternoon here.

---Laughter

I would like to indicate under the rules that I would like to allow debate on the point of order. I think Ms Cournoyea has raised a point and I would like to ask her to clarify her point of order and then perhaps we will give the same opportunity to Mr. MacQuarrie to do so. Then based on that we will make a decision. Ms Cournoyea, on the point of order.

Point Of Order

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, I have been making a number of phone calls in the back and trying to listen to the speech by the honourable Member. In one section he did imply that Mr. Haogak was my personal choice and he imputed a motive that even though there is an organization of COPE -- of which I am a member, and I am very proud to be -- that I give a great deal of direction and power over that organization. That was an imputed motive. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there were a number of occasions when I would have liked to rise and if we can take a break and you want to sit down and go through each one of them, I will be happy to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mind on almost all occasions Mr. MacQuarrie's aptitude of using names rather than circumstances and pulling out of names and quoting what he wants to say, particularly out of a certain part of a speech or an activity. However, he must realize, Mr. Speaker, that in the Beaufort Sea communities they have been asked to do a very serious chore in making a decision that would affect everyone. I believe that they are conscientiously trying to do that. The leadership is conscientiously trying to put themselves in a position to be understood...

MR. MacQUARRIE: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: I feel that his reply to the Commissioner's Address is trying to take that away and imply that is not so. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order.

MR. MacQUARRIE: She made her reply already.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What was your point of order first, please.

MR. MacQUARRIE: It was that I felt she was making a speech, Mr. Speaker, and not identifying specific things that I had said. She did identify two. I believe if you look at the record you will see that I said I was told that Charles Haogak was a personal choice of hers...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. MacQuarrie, could I...

MR. MacQUARRIE: But I would like to clarify the other...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could I ask you, Mr. MacQuarrie, to speak to the point of order, please. I have allowed Ms Cournoyea to speak to the point of order and you now have the privilege of speaking to the point of order.

MR. MacQUARRIE: My point of order, Mr. Speaker, was that I felt the honourable Member was making a speech rather than specifically saying what was objectionable about my material and when she sat down the point of order no longer applied, Mr. Speaker. So I am willing to proceed with the speech if you wish.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Proceed, please. Ms Cournoyea, your point of order.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, maybe you can clarify for me, when a Member is making a reply and because he was told -- I mean, are we not supposed to substantiate? The fact is he accused me of having a personal choice, he was told that this individual was my personal choice. The only substantiation he has is someone told him that. I feel that I should have an apology on that because he does not know.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. MacQuarrie, would you speak to the point of order, please.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, I say that, of course it is inappropriate for me to say something that is not true but it is true that I was told this. Now, I think that all that is required is for Ms Cournoyea to say if it is not true, if that is the case. But I cannot lie and tell you that I was not told it because I was.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order, Ms Cournoyea.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, there are many young people in our area who I support to get involved in political activity. Mr. Haogak was not my personal choice for this endeavour. He was appointed by COPE, the organization. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. MacQuarrie, continue with your point of order, please. To the point of order, please. Do we have any other Members who wish to speak to the point of order? Mr. Curley.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I reject the honourable Member's statements to the effect that I had a hidden motive. Mr. MacQuarrie knows very well where my original position stands and...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Curley, you have to speak to the point of order that was raised by Ms Cournoyea and that is the only point that you can speak to. Would anyone else like to speak to the point of order? None.

Ms Cournoyea, just for clarification, do I understand that the point of order is based on the statement that Mr. MacQuarrie made that Mr. Haogak was your personal appointment? Is that the basis of your point of order?

Basis Of Point Of Order

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, I guess when I was expressing myself there were two parts to that. One part was Mr. Haogak and his involvement and the other one was concerning my role with my constituency and the repudiation of the agreement of the Constitutional Alliance. First of all, it was said that he was my personal choice and that was one part of it. The other one was that I was going around the communities -- it seemed to imply that in my trips to the communities that I was getting a repudiation of the agreement and Mr. Speaker, if you look at the motions that were tabled, it was only clarifying how -- later in the explanations, finally after the trip is over -- how that agreement was supposed to work. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. MacQuarrie, would you give me a short explanation of the points raised by Ms Cournoyea, please. Just a short explanation.

MR. MacQUARRIE: It is perhaps unusual but...

---Laughter

...but do you want me to make a ruling, Mr. Speaker?

MR. McCALLUM: It's Hudson's Bay rules, anything goes!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Well, I could only ask that at some point, either during a coffee break or overnight, the record be examined and then some specific points be raised, because it is very difficult for me to respond in that way, and if you decide I ought to withdraw something, I will withdraw, Mr. Speaker. But the record should be examined.

Speaker's Ruling

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: With regard to the point of order raised by Ms Cournoyea, I find that in the first part she does have a point of order with regard to the statement that Mr. MacQuarrie made alleging that Mr. Charles Haogak is the personal choice of Ms Cournoyea. On the second part, I do not feel that there is a point of order but I do wish to ask whether Mr. MacQuarrie would be prepared to apologize to Ms Cournoyea?

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to respect your ruling and all I can say is that I cannot apologize for saying that I was told that, because in fact I was, but I can say that if -- and incidentally, I did not say that he was her personal appointee but rather choice -- if Ms Cournoyea insists that that is not so, I certainly am willing to apologize for that and withdraw it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: With that note, we will take a 15 minute coffee break.

---SHORT RECESS

The House will now come to order. We are under Item 2, Members' replies. Mr. MacQuarrie, please continue.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order. Mr. Curley.

Point Of Order

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With all due respect to the honourable Member for Yellowknife Centre, I would like to ask that he withdraw the remark that I have hidden motives as far as the division of the Northwest Territories is concerned. As for the hidden motives that Mr. MacQuarrie referred to, quite frankly, I do not have any and therefore I would respectfully ask that he withdraw these remarks because I did state my position, I think, pretty clearly when I replied to the Commissioner's Address.

Also, Mr. Speaker, if the Member has any question with my personality, I think it is beyond this Assembly. We deal with each other on a professional basis only and that is the way I treat it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In regard to the point of order raised by Mr. Curley, I believe that it is under Rule 33(i) which reads, "imputes false or unavowed motives to another Member". In regard to that I would like to ask Mr. MacQuarrie if you could indicate to the point of order being raised. The point being that you had indicated that Mr. Curley had some other motives, so would you please address the point of order?

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to do that. I had said in the context that on previous occasions in this House, such as the times when we were talking about division, first of all, and planning the plebiscite, certainly I gained the impression that Mr. Curley was attempting to bring about, along with the rest of us, a political division of the Northwest Territories. Subsequently -- I cited words that Mr. Curley spoke at a recent meeting which were at odds with the perception that had been generally held by people before and it was for that reason. That is not unavowed and I was not referring to motives but, rather, a position and I say that the position that we see stated in what I quoted, was different from what at earlier times in this House the position appeared to be and that is why I said -- I believe I said there was a hidden agenda at an earlier time. Certainly, Mr. Curley's position in these recent weeks may be more public and becoming more clear. On that basis, Mr. Speaker, respectfully, I do not believe that I have offended the House or the Member's privilege in any way.

MR. McCALLUM: Hear, hear!

MR. RICHARD: You appeared to have offended Tagak.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, maybe I did that.

Speaker's Ruling

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In regard to the point raised, my ruling will be that Mr. Curley does have a point and I would like to ask the honourable Member for Yellowknife Centre to either withdraw that statement or apologize. Thank you.

AN HON. MEMBER: You have a choice.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Again, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to respect your ruling but I would ask that that be withheld until a time when both of us can examine the record independently and see, specifically, which words are offensive. I certainly do not want to give any blanket apology for things that I had every right to say and so I would like to know which specific words were offensive and, at that time, I would be pleased to respect your ruling, Mr. Speaker, if that is agreeable to you.

AN HON. MEMBER: Respect that right now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Challenge.

MR. MacQUARRIE: No, I just wish to know which specific words I ought to retract.

MR. McCALLUM: You could get nailed on that, be careful.

MR. RICHARD: Gee, there is really no allowance today. I didn't do nothing yesterday.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In regard to my ruling, it is not debatable and the honourable Member for Yellowknife Centre has been called to order. And when a Member is called to order -- the honourable Member has been given two options. Either to withdraw the statement that was made or apologize and that has to take place at the present time. It has to take place. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Member's Apology

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Certainly what is important to me is that we now know what Mr. Curley's agenda is and, therefore, I willingly drop the word "hidden" from the remarks that I made, Mr. Speaker, and apologize for having used that word.

---Applause

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. MacQuarrie, please continue with your reply.

MR. MacQUARRIE: I will try, Mr. Speaker. It is difficult slogging I am afraid. There are a lot of potholes.

Time To Re-examine Desirability Of Division

I had reached a point, Mr. Speaker, at which I had indicated that in view of the very difficult events that have occurred in the past few weeks and some of the high feelings, that are in the air, this is a time to re-examine some of what we have been doing. Specifically the question of whether division is itself desirable. I had left off at the point that I was saying that in Beaufort and Kitikmeot communities during the plebiscite in 1982, many of those communities voted against division. And I know that a lot of people did not vote. I know that when I have gone to a variety of communities in both the Beaufort and Kitikmeot West areas, people have said to me and other members of the Western Constitutional Forum, "Why do you keep talking about division? Why do you not talk about no division? Is that not better?" So, it is certainly in the minds of some people and then we saw earlier today that it is in the mind of the honourable Member for Kitikmeot East as well. So I have heard that said in Tuktoyaktuk. I have heard that said in Yellowknife. I have now heard it said by someone from Gjoa Haven. Perhaps there are people in Rankin Inlet or Pond Inlet who think that way, having seen the difficulties that have ensued, and there might be some reason for returning to look at that very thing.

One reason why it should be looked at is because it has certainly become clear recently that when you pursue a division of the Territories, it is not merely a theoretical exercise. That in fact if there is a division, people will be divided and I am afraid divided at the cost of great anguish to some. Because I have heard them express that anguish. I am quite aware that there are people in Kitikmeot West who if division were to occur, do not want to be separated from the East. But I am aware just as well, that those very same people if division were to occur do not want to be divided from the West either. That is the kind of anguish they face. So, it is not just the theoretical exercise. Some might agree with Mr. Curley that when I quoted his statement it was that we should never be divided. Well, it is apparent that within a united Northwest Territories the Inuit would not be divided.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: I hope you are talking of Yellowknife too.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Another reason why maybe it should be reconsidered -- that is, whether division itself is desirable -- is that given the fact that even with the possibility in the agreement that was reached of resource revenue sharing, the question of the economic viability of an eastern territory arose. That question if it has validity at all may very well be valid regardless of any acceptable boundary and people ought to be aware of that. Again, I say these are some of the things where we have seen real issues arise. We can see that if division were to occur there may be an enormous financial cost involved, which I expect might be in the magnitude of \$300 million initially to bring about the division and perhaps as much as \$100 plus million each year to run the governments of two territories rather than one. Those are very loose estimates but I think they could be found to have credibility.

Perhaps another reason why the question should be raised again is that travelling as I did along with the Nunavut forum in the Kitikmeot West communities, I heard members of the Nunavut Constitutional Forum say -- and this was when people said to them, "But if this area were to be in Nunavut, it would be such a vast territory so spread apart." And I heard members of the Nunavut forum say "Yes, but you must remember that this is an electronic age when there are rapid communications between people over great distances." They pointed out the modern kinds of transportation we have as Mr. Angottitauruq did earlier this afternoon. Also the Nunavut forum suggested that with appropriate decentralization of government that that would be no problem in a vast territory. But ironically those are all reasons that could be given by someone to say "Well, if they are valid, surely they are valid for a united territory, as well."

It is also true that here and there when we travel we hear people say that maybe there is not a reason for division because in a number of ways government has become more responsive and has improved over the past five or six years. That really what was concerning many people is to have greater accessibility to government, to have government more responsive to people. Another thing that might be considered is to ask whether, despite our obvious cultural differences, perhaps our destiny lies best together as one people in one territory. There are people who say that.

Now, all of this old ground may have to be revisited if with the process that we have established and the tentative agreement that was reached, we are not able to salvage it and effect division along those lines. I will again give this commitment publicly, that if the objective is to create two public governments and to effect a political division of the Territories, I will continue to work sincerely toward that objective.

Clarification Of Recent Events

I want to turn briefly to a couple of events that have occurred since the agreement, that I think it is important to clarify because I fear that some Members of this House, particularly eastern Members who were not a party to everything that happened, may have a wrong impression about some of the things that have occurred and I would like the chance to clarify them.

For one thing. I have heard it rumoured that on February 24th and February 25th, that the western Members did not make any attempt to contact the Nunavut Constitutional Forum to try to bring something into the House on Monday, February 25th, that all Members could support. I have to say that if that rumour is true and some people are being given that impression, I can only say that it is a false impression. I will say that on that Sunday, February 24th, I was twice -- in the afternoon and early evening -- in phone communication with Mr. Patterson. The purpose was in fact to try to see how each group felt about things, to see whether we could come to some agreement that both of us could come to the House with on the Monday. The last time I spoke to Mr. Patterson

was somewhere in the early evening, five o'clock or 5:30, and at that time I told him that the western forum who met in the afternoon were looking for some kind of affirmation of the agreement but that we did not have any specific motion or any specific wording and we were open to hearing what the eastern Members had to say to see if there was some possibility of agreement. Further, I knew that Mr. Patterson was on his way to a Nunavut forum meeting and the agreement between us was that he would phone back after that meeting to let me know whether there was this possibility of reaching some agreement. I did say to him that I was going to bed at 11:00 o'clock because I was tired. If it were to be after that time, please do not phone but phone the next morning.

The next morning, I still had not heard from him. I phoned his office and asked whether I could speak to him and I was told he was not in the office. I said I would very much like to get hold of him. The secretary said "Fine, I will let him know that as soon as I am in touch with him." Perhaps half an hour later or an hour later, I phoned back again to that office and said "Is Mr. Patterson in yet? I very much want to speak to him." His secretary said "He is not in the office but I have been in touch with him and I have told him that there are three urgent messages for him and yours is one of them." I said thank you and waited some more for a call. Late that morning, perhaps 11:00 or 11:30 I phoned the secretary again. She said "He still is not here but you may reach him at home" and gave me his home phone number. I tried reaching him at home and there was no answer.

Reading Of Report Into Record Prevented

So, all that morning I was making the attempt to see if we could get something that all could agree to when it came into the House. But as the morning passed, it became obvious that I was not going to get that kind of communication, that for some reason myself and other western Members were going to be presented with a surprise in the afternoon and indeed surprised we were. Just before one o'clock, I met Mr. Patterson coming into the House and said something, I cannot remember the words but "You have been avoiding me" or something like that. He said "It will all become clear shortly." So, we were surprised by what happened. Then, when the motion came in to adjourn the debate I can sincerely say that I believed that if that motion passed -- and keep in mind it was being proposed even before the report was going to be read -- I sincerely believed that if that motion passed, that would kill any discussion or debate on that issue. That is why we did not want it to pass so that is why the point of order was raised. We wanted at least to hear the report and to be able to discuss it. But the motion to adjourn came quickly. It was overruled and so when it was overruled Mr. Sibbeston began to read the report into the record.

I know that Mr. Patterson says that historians are cheated by not having that report in the record, and the principles of agreement. I can only remind him that when Mr. Sibbeston started reading it into the record it was eastern Members who walked out of the House and left the House without a quorum so that the report could not be read into the record. Now please keep in mind that the eastern caucus at that time probably had a majority of Members in the House and could simply have waited until the report was read -- that would have been a suitable intervening event -- and then move the motion to adjourn and probably carried it. I do not know why they walked out of the House to prevent the report even from being read into the record.

So, I can only feel that we tried fairly to get together beforehand to find a motion that everybody would agree on. Instead, we were presented -- Mr. Curley, you are saying that I am justified in saying what I am saying. Thank you very much for that affirmation, Mr. Curley. Now, once Members went out of the House I hear that there is another rumour and indeed in the paper today there is a big headline that says "Eastern MLAs called from the chamber during western passage of bill".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: What bill?

MR. MacQUARRIE: Well, first of all, yes it was not a bill and secondly, who called them? Was it a call from on high or something? I do not know who called them out of the House. To my knowledge the eastern Members decided themselves to leave the House.

Now, here is the second rumour that I would like to clarify for other eastern Members because it has been imputed that somehow we have been dealing deceptively and so on. I do not think it is true. If anyone reads the record of that afternoon, they will see that there were several short recesses. I can say that during not one of those recesses was I approached and asked if I would come and sit and talk over the matter and try to reach some agreement. Not once. Now, after the last recess, the Speaker was going to come back to the House to shut it down because there was no

quorum. At that very moment, and I will say this openly to the press and the public, at that very moment having not called the night before, not called all during the morning, not informed us of what was going to transpire in the House, not asking us during those intermissions to consider this or that or the other thing, suddenly at the moment when we had a quorum and the Speaker walked into the House -- I was standing because the Speaker was coming in -- I admit Mr. Wray came to the ropes at that very moment, I guess when he saw there was going to be a quorum and said, not kindly, not solicitously, but very much in the manner of a demand, and I do not know to this day whether he was specifically speaking to me or to others because others did hear, he said something like "Send some of your leaders to talk to us."

HON. GORDON WRAY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RICHARD: Another apology here.

---Laughter

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Wray, point of privilege.

Point Of Privilege

HON GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again, facts are being somewhat abused in this House. For the record, when I approached Mr. MacQuarrie, the Speaker was not in this House, he was not even in the hallway. In fact, there was time for me to go back through this Assembly into the back room to tell my colleagues that I had approached Mr. MacQuarrie and we stood there and discussed it for a couple of minutes before in fact we heard the Speaker coming into the House. It was at least five minutes before the Speaker came into the House.

Secondly, for the record, and I quote, I said "Bob, could I see you and whoever you have appointed to speak for you in the back room? We would like to talk to you." So, I am getting a little bit fed up with facts being twisted to suit certain purposes. If we are going to put things in the record, then let's put them accurately in the record.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Mr. MacQuarrie, would you please continue.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, to say...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Pedersen, your point of order.

Point Of Order

MR. PEDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I realize I could have brought it up earlier but I read a little bit slowly and I wanted to confirm it first. Mr. MacQuarrie, just maybe within the last two or three minutes, stated that the Nunavut caucus walked out and deprived the House of a quorum. I would like to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to page 282 of yesterday's transcript where the Speaker stated that when Mr. Wray called a quorum in his place inside of the ropes he did in effect constitute the quorum. Could I have a clarification? Did we, according to the Speaker, have a quorum or did we, according to Mr. MacQuarrie, not have a quorum at the time?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to remind Members that under Members' replies, normally the replies that Members do give are not really a debate. It is an opportunity for a Member to give her or his views with regard to the Commissioner's Address. It has been the general practice in the past that we have given the courtesy to the individual Member when addressing this House to do so with minimum interruptions. I feel that we are setting a precedent for that particular interruption that may proceed in the future and I wish that Members will keep that in mind.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

Speaker's Ruling

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In regard to the point raised by the honourable Member for Kitikmeot West, I would like to say that it is my view that I assume that every Member of this House speaks truthfully when addressing this House. So that is the basis on which the Speaker normally makes his ruling. Now, in regard to the proceedings that have taken place in the committee of the whole

previously, I do not feel that we have to go back because really we are dealing with Members' replies at this point and therefore I do not feel that Mr. Pedersen has a point of order. Mr. MacQuarrie, would you like to proceed with your Member's reply.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the comments that Mr. Wray made, although apparently from your ruling I do not need to regard them, I would like to because it was not my intention to deceive. It is my recollection it was an intense time -- you are under pressure. I do not know whether it was two minutes or three minutes. What I do know is that somebody told me the Speaker was coming and I stood at my place for that reason and did not want to lose the quorum which we had just won.

But my point still stands. However many minutes it might have been, from the whole previous evening and the morning and the recesses in the afternoon, up until that time, no approach was made to try to get something that both of us could work out.

Our Destiny Is In Our Own Hands

The final thing that I would like to say and I am sure that many Members are pleased that I am able to say that, is that nobody is going to come down from the sky to save us. It is obvious that in our territory, great as it is, varied as it is, there is no single person who could win a mandate to represent and lead all peoples in the Territories. So we are faced with a difficult problem. But we should not shy away from it because in fact our destiny is in our hands and that is precisely where we should want it to be. And if we can clarify objectives, it is possible that we will be able to work together toward certain desirable things. If it appears when we clarify them that they are quite different, then we can maybe agree to disagree but still to carry on with this government.

I think that right at this time, it is a time to try to let the air clear a little bit to see whether there are in fact others who would support the kind of objective that Mr. Curley enunciated when he spoke to the COPE annual general meeting and if so, to see the extent of that kind of support. I think we have mandated the Constitutional Alliance to try to work out some of these things and incidently I believe that it is wise that we have done so. To let the alliance meet again and to see whether the process can be picked up and renewed after having had the kind of feedback and information that is available through the media and through the debates of this Assembly. Meanwhile the Assembly has the option and the power...

AN HON. MEMBER: Do they?

MR. MacQUARRIE: ...during the next few months to see what the alliance is able to do to try to get things back on track and, of course, to see whether there is another kind of movement that arises with a different objective. And it would be plenty of time in June to reassess where we are at and to try to figure out in good will, where we should go from that point on. Meanwhile, and it is ironic that I should say this now, after having talked as long as I have, let's carry on with the work of governing the present NWT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. Are there any further Members' replies? Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD: No, Mr. Speaker, I was intending to give my reply today but in view of your rulings I have to rewrite it now and I will give it another day.

---Applause

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Item 2, Members' replies. Does anyone want to take a chance today? I assume that there are no further Members' replies. Item 3, Ministers' statements. Mr. McLaughlin.

ITEM 3: MINISTERS' STATEMENTS

Minister's Statement On Senior Citizens Personal Care Facility

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have an announcement which will be of interest, especially to Yellowknife Members, regarding the construction of a senior citizens personal care facility. This morning, my colleagues on the Financial Management Board gave approval for myself, as Minister of Social Services, to communicate to the Yellowknife Association of Concerned Citizens for Seniors, that the \$100,000 in the 1985-86 main estimates will be available as a contribution on April 1st. Subject, of course, Mr. Speaker, to approval of that item by this House.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Financial Management Board has also given the Department of Social Services approval to advance a supplementary estimate to also make available the \$140,000 presently in the 1984-85 budget which will not be spent in this fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I take credit for being the main obstacle which prevented the spending of that \$140,000, as no one could convince me that any of the proposals or statistics which were advanced to me, were sound. During a recent meeting with Mr. Gino Pin, the architect working with YACCS, I explained to him that I did not like any of the proposed sites and wished the whole project could be held off until the present Yellowknife Stanton Hospital became available in three years, in order that we might be able to provide a continuum of care under one roof, so that Yellowknife senior citizens could live and socialize together in a community complex.

Mr. Pin and I then explored the possibility of constructing a proposed personal care facility near the existing hospital and our preliminary review -- note that review was a successful one -- showed this to have excellent advantages in affording a sound long-term plan for the housing of seniors in Yellowknife. I am happy to report that all of the various departments and concerned groups approve of this concept and I am confident that the community of Yellowknife will be well served by this proposal.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Hon. Gordon Wray, the Minister responsible for Housing, for persuading his federal counterpart, the Hon. William McKnight, to rush CMHC approval for this project. I would also like to thank the Yellowknife Members for not letting me forget the issue, but mostly I would like to thank Mrs. Barb Bromley, president of YACCS, for the excellent leadership she has given to her organization and especially the co-operation and patience she has given to me as a new Minister. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Item 3, Ministers' statements. Mr. Patterson.

Minister's Statement On Native Students Attending Post-Secondary Institutions

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make a statement concerning questions asked by Mr. MacQuarrie during the debate on the main estimates of the Department of Education, February 28, concerning native students attending post-secondary institutions.

The Student Financial Assistance Ordinance was assented to May 21, 1982 with the expressed intention of providing incentives to native students to take post-secondary education. It appears that the legislation has been quite successful although I do recognize that there may well be other factors such as improved quality of education in community schools, the recession, etc. In 1981-82, only 22 native students were sponsored for study at this level. This has steadily increased in each subsequent year until a peak was reached in 1984-85 of 117 native students attending such institutions under the auspices of the student financial assistance fund. This represents an increase of over 500 per cent since the legislation was enacted.

Unfortunately, it is not possible for me to provide details of the success rates of native students. We do retain department statistics but they do not give a breakdown of native versus non-native students. In general, however, we are confident that more and more native students are achieving success at the post-secondary level and we anticipate increased levels of usage by this segment of the population over the next few years. I have instructed my officials to start tracking success rates for all NWT students to enable us to analyse the situation in future years.

---Applause

Minister's Statement On Removal Of Sexual Discrimination From Indian Act

I have another statement, if I may, Mr. Speaker, in regard to another matter. I would like to inform this honourable House that the Hon. David Crombie, the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs, has presented Bill C-31 to the House of Commons. This bill would remove sexual discrimination from the Indian Act. The bill includes provisions abolishing the concept of enfranchisement or giving up of status and the restoring of status on application to those who lost Indian status and band membership through discriminatory provisions in the past. First generation descendants would also be entitled to apply for this recognition. I will table copies of Bill C-31 today and more information can be obtained from my office. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Item 3, Ministers' statements.

Item 4, oral questions.

Item 5, written questions. Item 6, returns. Mr. Patterson.

ITEM 6: RETURNS

Further Return To Question 124-85(1): Funding To Inuit Broadcasting Corporation For Children's Program

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you. I have a return to oral Question 124-85(1), by Mr. Erklou on February 27, regarding the Inuit Broadcasting Corporation proposal for Inuit children's educational television. This is a further response to the honourable Member's question. The proposal is a very worthwhile one and there can be no question of the significance of television and of its potential role in cultural and linguistic change. Although the Department of Education shares IBC's goal of strengthening the language and culture of Inuit people, our role is to effectively use prepared video and broadcast materials to enhance education. We do not have the resources to enter the production phase of this work. Because we recognize the value of this proposal, we have put it forward as a recommended project to be partially funded through the Secretary of State funding for the enhancement of aboriginal language and culture. I am informed that a decision concerning this funding will be announced shortly by the Hon. Richard Nerysoo.

Further Return To Question 150-85(1): Lack Of Adult Education Information

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I have another return to oral Question 150-85(1), asked by Mr. Paniloo, March 15, 1985, concerning adult education programs in his constituency. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that residents in the communities of Clyde River, Broughton Island and Pangnirtung have indicated to the honourable Member that they lack information on the adult education programs in those communities. My officials have informed me that newsletters have been put out on a regular basis in Pangnirtung and Broughton Island to inform the public of available educational opportunities. Community radio is utilized in each of these settlements to advertise programs and advertisements are posted in prominent locations including the adult education centres. The information on programs supported by Canada Employment and Immigration is also distributed through offices where Outreach workers are available.

These three communities are very active in the delivery of adult education programs. I have been informed that nine programs were conducted in Pangnirtung in February. Clyde River delivered four programs and Broughton Island provided five programs. In addition to delivering or co-ordinating these courses, the adult educators are also responsible for counselling, testing of students, local education authority development and preparation of lesson plans. I am satisfied that these adult educators are extremely active in their communities but I will re-emphasize the need for renewed efforts in communicating program availability to the public.

I have another one if I may, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please proceed.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you. This is a reply to Mrs. Lawrence's oral question. Perhaps I will wait until she is in the House. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Item 6, returns.

Item 7, petitions. Item 8, reports of standing and special committees. Mr. Ballantyne.

ITEM 8: REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Report Of Standing Committee On Finance

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an event that I know that many of the Ministers have been waiting for. In accordance with the terms of reference conferred by the Legislative Assembly, the standing committee on finance is pleased to submit its Report on Review of the 1985-86 Main Estimates of the Government of the Northwest Territories. If I could, Mr. Speaker, I would like to name the Members of the committee who are on the committee besides myself: Arnold McCallum, Samuel Gargan, Red Pedersen, Eliza Lawrence, Pauloosie Paniloo, Ludy Pudluk, John T'Seleie, James Wah-Shee, Ted Richard. Also, I would like to thank our staff who worked very hard into the night and many nights, Toni Wells who is our financial analyst, Eileen Olivier who is our secretary and a very special thanks to Titus Allooosie who came at the last moment and has worked very closely with our Inuit Members so they could fully participate in the deliberations of this committee. I, as the chairman, would like to thank the committee Members for their dedication and perseverance. We had countless meetings and I, for one, and the committee are quite proud of what we have here and we hope the government will take it as seriously as we took our responsibility.

I would like to also announce that one of the major reasons that this report is a little bit later than we would have liked is because we have had the report translated. In that vein, I would like to ask my co-Member, Mr. Ludy Pudluk, if he would read the preface to the report in Inuktitut. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Preface

"Ultimately, accountability must rest on the recognition by the people and their representatives that the exercise of power should be closely scrutinized. There is a danger in a developing political system, such as exists in the NWT, too much emphasis will be placed on attaining power and too little on checking power." Report of the Special Representative, Constitutional Development in the Northwest Territories.

The first Legislative Council committees were established in the NWT in 1969. Sanctioning their development, the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs stated that the committee forum "would allow Council Members to take a more active role in the discussion and planning of territorial programs in close conjunction with the Commissioner and Members of his Executive Committee". The role played by the Legislative committee in this context was simply consultative.

In the 16 years since the inception of Legislative committees, the role and responsibilities of the Legislative Assembly, the Executive and the total institution of government has evolved dramatically. The process of political development has been characterized by a constant progression toward attainment of responsible government. In a consensus system of government, with the absence of party discipline, it is critical that checks and balances are integrated into the system of government to ensure the accountability of the Executive to the Legislature and the Legislature to the public at large.

In his report entitled "Constitutional Development in the Northwest Territories", Hon. C.M. Drury wrote, "The Council should consider making much more extensive use of committees, both standing and special. They should be used not only to consider bills after second reading, but also to initiate studies, to investigate problems, to set priorities for government, to approve draft legislation, to examine government spending, and to keep a watch over Executive acts. The use of committees in a small Legislature may put an onerous burden on the Members -- but the only alternative may be government by an 'elected few', which is not a prescription for good or responsive government in the NWT."

Since the report of the special representative, the role of Legislative committees has been steadily strengthened. In part, this has been a response to the need for political input by all elected representatives in government decision-making. In part, it stems from the recognition that the Assembly must provide an effective counterbalance to the Executive to ensure "good ... responsive government in the NWT".

The primary task of the standing committee on finance is to monitor accountability through the detailed examination of the government's annual budget and its related fiscal operations. Under our terms of reference, Appendix A, the committee has the authority to: inquire into such matters as may be referred to it by the Legislative Assembly; review and recommend on the preparation of estimates, expenditures and appropriations required to defray the charges and expenses of the public service of the Territories in each fiscal year; review and recommend on capital projects and capital planning; in consultation with the chairman of the Financial Management Board, examine and recommend the terms and conditions of any agreement relating to financial arrangements with the Government of Canada; in consultation with the chairman of the Financial Management Board, examine and recommend the terms and conditions for borrowing, lending and investing funds; review, evaluate and recommend on any revenue sources that may be available to the Territories; review financial implications of existing and proposed territorial programs and the financing thereof, as well, any other programs which may in future become a charge against the territorial budget; investigate and inquire into those financial matters that, in the opinion of the committee, require investigation; from time to time, the standing committee shall tender general advice and information to the Legislative Assembly on any financial matter that may come before the Assembly in session.

Within the terms of our mandate, we see a significant potential for the committee to influence the financial process in the GNWT and to play a real and effective role in giving direction for future change. It is our intention to fulfil our mandate to ensure on behalf of this Assembly and the people of the NWT, that the government is both financially responsible and fiscally responsive.

I guess my colleague will be next to read it in English.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Ballantyne, would you indicate to the House whether you intend to read the whole report or just a portion of it, please?

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you. It is my understanding that it is in the interest of the House to read the whole report. There have been a number of concerns expressed by certain Members that they wanted to know the feelings of the committee, so for that reason I want to put the report of the committee on the record.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Ballantyne, please proceed.

Review Process

MR. BALLANTYNE: In accordance with its terms of reference the standing committee on finance met in Yellowknife from December 3rd to December 14th, 1984, to conduct its annual review of the 1984-85 main estimates and I would like to make a note first, there is a typo error...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I would think that the House would be pleased to accept the report as read and save the Member the very onerous task of going all through this document. We will all have a chance to read it and will hear his recommendations as each department comes up.

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: It is a waste of time, Mike, seriously.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Table the document.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Ballantyne, would you respond to the request being made to you by Mr. Butters?

MR. BALLANTYNE: Yes, I am quite surprised that I have that response from a number of the Ministers. This is not only for the edification of this House, it is also for the edification of the public and I think after the comments we heard yesterday morning about the importance of this committee presenting a document I, quite frankly, sir, am very surprised that after the hundreds of hours of work, Members of the Executive would not give me and my committee the courtesy of allowing us to put this work on the record of this House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, we are not suggesting that one should not put the work before the House, we are just trying to suggest a quicker method for doing this. We will accept the report as read and it will be made available to the public, it will be made available to us and save an hour of reading.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Point Of Order

MR. MacQUARRIE: There is no legitimate point of order on the other side. There is an item, reports of standing committees, and he is giving the report. He is entitled to and nobody should be able to interrupt on a point of order if that is what the committee chooses, Mr. Speaker. God.

Speaker's Ruling

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are under Item 8, reports of standing and special committees and Mr. Ballantyne is chairman of that standing committee on finance and has the right to read the total contents of the report if the chairman so desires. Mr. Ballantyne, would you indicate what your wish is at this time?

MR. BALLANTYNE: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I intend to read this report into the record of the House. Where I left off there is a typographical error. It says in the report, "1985-86 main estimates"; it should read "1984-85 main estimates" of the Government of Northwest Territories, so there will be no necessity for an errata as we see at this point in time.

In total, the committee examined the proposed budgets of 14 departments, one corporation, four secretariats and three boards. The review process was a very concentrated learning experience for the committee and we feel an effective exercise in demonstrating the committee's ongoing commitment toward ensuring fiscal accountability.

The format for the standing committee's formal hearings was developed on the basis of material contained in the working budget documents; the standing committee on finance review book; the five year capital plan; the 1985-86 main estimates book, and supplementary appropriations ordinances for 1984-85 to date, in order to focus on year-to-year budget changes and developmental changes in objectives. In addition, the committee examined ministerial statements on GNWT priorities and departmental information on programs supplied to the committee during the course of the formal review process. Where applicable, this information was integrated into the standing committee internal material.

The basic format for review of the main estimates which was adhered to for review of all departments is summarized in the following table. In the interests of speeding up the process it is there for the record so I will not read the budget review format but I just hope that all, especially Ministers, take note of the format.

This format constitutes the framework for review of departmental main estimates budgets and, in our opinion, it represents an appropriate method which will be continued for future reviews of the main estimates. The committee is aware of the concern the departments are unfamiliar with this process and it is our intention in identifying the review format to ensure that departmental Ministers and staff are aware of our basic approach to budget review. It must be emphasized that notwithstanding the format of the review, the committee is not fettered in pursuing any lines of inquiry which it deems necessary to fully investigate the financial implications of any programs or activities. This may involve oral responses by departments or when required, it may take the form of a request for written information, explanations or other ancillary material. It must also be recognized that this format constitutes a framework for review and is not necessarily a strategy for review.

The committee has a few minor technical concerns related to format of the working budget documents and we will be working with the staff of the financial management secretariat to effect these changes in the near future.

In the course of its formal hearings, the committee encountered a number of procedural obstacles which we will address in this report.

Translation

Firstly, the working budget documents provided to the committee were not translated. When it became apparent that this might cause some difficulty for Members of the committee, we investigated the cost and time involved in translating this information and we were informed that it would require at a minimum, three to four weeks at a cost of some \$20,000. Due to the time constraint involved, the committee did not pursue the issue for the December review. However, the lack of translated material did cause some difficulty for Members in following and participating in discussions related to detail of budgets drawn from the text of the working documents.

The committee is fully aware of the cost factor and the difficulty of translation, but balanced against this is our concern that all Members be able to fully participate in the budget review process. Accordingly, the committee, by motion, recommended that these documents be translated by departments as they are developed so as to minimize the time and cost of translation services. In addition, the committee feels that it is the responsibility of departments to provide a translated copy of documents tabled in committee during formal hearings. In respect of the translation services provided to the committee throughout the December review, the committee wishes to thank the members of the language bureau, the Inuktitut section, who worked very diligently on our behalf to provide both oral and written translation.

Timing

A second problem encountered by the committee at the present year review, is the time factor. In general, it is our feeling that two weeks is insufficient time to consider all departmental budgets to the degree warranted. The tight scheduling of departments which characterized the present review gave the committee little latitude in thoroughly investigating budget issues before it and resulted in a number of instances in only a cursory examination of capital budgets. Therefore, the committee will be undertaking a three week review for the next fiscal year to be scheduled in late November and early December. It is our intention in extending the time frame for the main estimates review, to afford additional flexibility in scheduling departmental appearances and to allow sufficient extra time to issues of particular consequence to Members of the committee.

Objectives

Prior to the 1985-86 budget review, a letter was sent to the Hon. Tom Butters from the chairman of the finance committee expressing our concern that the objectives indicated in the 1984-85 main estimates were poorly articulated and requesting all departments to undertake development of more comprehensive concise objectives for 1985-86. This letter was circulated to all departments prior to submission. Certain departments such as Renewable Resources and Information responded to this request and provided an expanded set of objectives and goals for the 1985-86 fiscal year. Overall, however, there was little evidence of a consistent attempt on the part of departments to demonstrate through the development of objectives a clear statement of the goals and direction of their respective programs. Consequently, much of the committee's questioning of departmental Ministers related to the development of objectives, year-to-year changes in objectives and the impact of objectives on the present budget.

The committee's emphasis on departmental objectives is a product of our desire to understand the changing directions for programs and to monitor, as well as we are able, through the budget process, the effectiveness of programs. Objectives are the bench marks against which dollars are allocated to particular programs and the effectiveness of the program can be assessed. As a committee of the Assembly, we have a responsibility to ensure on behalf of the Assembly and the public that the moneys which we vote are being used effectively and that the objectives to which these resources are directed are being achieved.

For the upcoming fiscal year budget review, the committee requests that objectives of departments be identified as follows. I will not read it but there is a little chart there for everybody's edification. It is important to recognize that the question of whether to continue to allocate and/or to vote funds to a department or programs is very much contingent on the degree to which that program has effectively achieved the objectives for which it has previously been funded. In an era of limited resources and given the increasing emphasis on federal program transfers, it is important that the GNWT ably demonstrate its ability to give value for money.

Requests For Information

A fourth procedural matter which has developed as a result of the current year review relates to information requested by the committee and difficulties in follow-up for these requests. Of a total of 67 requests for information identified by the committee only 20 had been received as of the start of the session. A list of the outstanding items, as of February the 6th, 1985, is appended as Appendix B to this report.

In accordance with Rule 93(1), the committee has the power to call for such persons, papers and records and to examine witnesses as, in its opinion, are necessary for the conduct of its business. Despite the apparent co-operation and willingness of witnesses before the committee to provide information, several departments failed to respond until the last moment to information requests by the committee and by the office of the Minister of Finance. And that added to the problem of the lateness of this report, because we did not get a lot of that information until the beginning of this session.

While we hesitate in constructing this as a deliberate attempt to undermine the conduct of the committee's business, it is at the very least indicative of an unacceptable disregard of the committee's authority and function. Moreover, this situation has occurred in the face of ministerial undertakings to provide such material quickly.

The committee therefore recommends that all departments be required to respond with information items requested by the committee no later than 14 days from the date of the request and that where departments are unable to respond within that time period, the Minister shall advise the chairman of the committee in writing of the reasons for the delay and shall indicate the date on which the information is to be submitted.

Conclusion

Finally, as a general observation on the 1985-86 main estimates review process, the committee wishes to note the number of instances where departments appeared to be unable to satisfactorily explain the budget process, budget changes involving reallocation of dollars and staff or to defend and justify these changes. This characteristic was most conspicuous in the case of the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation where budget data presented by this corporation did not correspond with information provided to the committee, resulting in difficulty in questioning the witnesses and confusion over apparent discrepancies. The corporation was not evidently prepared for examination of budget details contained in the SCOF review book or the capital plan. We anticipate that having due regard to the explanation of the committee's format and with the implementation of changes to the process recommended in this report, the quality of formal hearings for the 1986-87 budget will be significantly enhanced.

Major Issues

The 1985-86 main estimates are the final product of an approximately 18 month planning process. The budgetary process or cycle is initiated by means of a call letter to departments and culminates in the presentation of the main estimates to the Legislative Assembly. In respect of any one fiscal year, the cycle is complete only with the passage of the final supplementary appropriation. The process by which the budget is developed is of primary significance in determining the nature of the resulting budget.

Recognizing the importance of the budget process as a determinant in the main estimates development, the standing committee on finance examined four key elements of the budgetary process. They are identified in this report as major issues as their application is governmental as opposed to specifically departmental. The major issues arising from our review are: 1) formula financing; 2) priorities; 3) program evaluation; and 4) capital planning.

It is difficult to deal in depth with the complexity of each of the above concepts in the context of the main estimates review. However, in the committee's opinion, we would be remiss not to include in this report some indication of our concerns, comments and findings with respect to these issues.

Formula-Based Financing

The 1985-86 budget process is significant in that it reflects the introduction of the "formula-based" approach to financing the operations of the Government of the Northwest Territories. Formula financing is possibly the single most significant transfer of federal responsibility to the territorial government in recent years. Yet, despite its importance, little has been said and even less is understood about the concept and its impact on the fiscal operations of the GNWT.

Under formula financing, the GNWT assumes responsibility for setting its own taxation and spending priorities within the context of its overall budget. It removes funding levels from federal departmental spending guidelines. It provides a means of "locking in" federal funding thereby providing a relatively stable level of assistance on which to develop longer term financial planning. Formula based financing "mimics" provincial equalization payments.

In December, the standing committee on finance was given a briefing on the status of formula financing. At the time of the briefing, the committee was advised that negotiations on the mechanics of the formula were still ongoing and that it would be some time in the future before a final agreement would be signed. The GNWT in reliance on the federal Treasury Board "in principle" approval of formula financing proceeded with its budget development on the basis of the application of the formula and not through fiscal IGC negotiations as has been past practice. As a result, the budget is reflective of the increased funding levels predicted on the formula arrangement. Since that time, the committee has been advised that the operating grant level of \$440 million shown in the 1985-86 main estimates has been formally approved by the federal Treasury Board subject to ratification of the financial agreement. This alleviates some of the committee's concern over the possibility of immediate federal restraints but does not address our concern as to the possibility of longer-term restraints being applied when the formula agreement is placed before the federal Treasury Board and the Department of Finance for approval. There is little to convince the committee that the GNWT is to emerge from this exercise unscathed by some form of restraint imposed by federal cutbacks particularly in light of the federal government's articulated position on limiting growth in transfer programs.

While we, as a committee, support the concept of formula financing, we are concerned with the mechanics of the arrangement. Specifically, your concern centres on firstly, the adequacy of the 1982-83 gross revenues used to establish the base year, and secondly, the use of an escalator which is tied to a three year average of local/provincial expenditure grown in the South and which is not necessarily reflective of northern growth or needs.

We have received the assurance of the Minister of Finance that the base year used in developing the formula is advantageous. However, given the number of outstanding Treasury Board submissions which identify base deficiencies, the occurrence of base deficiencies identified in the present budget, and the limited access to federal supplementary funding, we remain sceptical.

Our second concern relates to the escalation factor. The committee was advised that, as a result of negotiations, the initial year of the three year average had been moved ahead resulting in a reduction in the size of the escalation factor. In our opinion, the North is being asked to accept the lagged average of southern local/provincial growth in a period of depressed economic growth as a yardstick of our own growth pattern and needs. While we recognize that some appropriate statistical method must be agreed upon and that there is limited statistical data available for the North upon which to premise an appropriate escalator, we strongly urge the development of statistical data relative to economic growth in the GNWT and implementation of assessment of levels of service in ongoing programs to ensure that comparable service exists to other jurisdictions.

In addition, the escalation factor is the logical target for implementation of restraint measures should these be unilaterally imposed. This suspicion is confirmed by the recently imposed federal position and is recognized as a possibility by the Financial Management Secretariat. Without data on economic growth, sufficiency of existing levels of service, etc., this government cannot adequately respond to the...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether I might move a motion at this time to continue the business before us until we are completed with it. I do not think the chairman of the committee is going to finish reading the report into the record before six o'clock. Let us conclude it today if we may.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

Motion To Extend Sitting Hours Of The House, Carried

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I move a motion to continue sitting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do we have a seconder for that motion? Ms Cournoyea. You have heard the motion. All those in favour to extend the sitting? Would you keep your hands up, please. Thank you. Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Mr. Ballantyne, please continue.

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Without data on economic growth, sufficiency of existing levels of service, etc., this government cannot adequately respond to the imposition of restraint measures. If a depressed escalator or other form of restraint is unilaterally imposed, the GNWT will also be hampered in its ability to optimize internal cutbacks to its programs.

It appears to the committee that there is a strong degree of uncertainty relative to the effect of restricting recourse to federal supplementary funding on GNWT programs, particularly as this relates to programs having an identified base deficiency, that is, education services and Young Offenders Act. The entire question of the scope, magnitude and application of the exclusion from the formula is unclear to the committee and it appears from our review process, to many departments.

The introduction of formula financing and the assumption of fiscal responsibility, will have a number of significant impacts on the administration of the budgetary process. We anticipate that it will prompt an increased emphasis on fiscal policy considerations; specifically, the identification of tax sources, the development of revenue sources and an increased emphasis, parallel to the recent federal initiative on cost recovery and maximizing existing revenues. The committee supports the initiative of the Department of Finance in establishing a fiscal policy unit and urges the department to undertake a comprehensive review of revenues.

We also urge the GNWT to explore alternative mechanisms for drawing in federal funding outside formula financing by means of shared cost agreements, foregone federal revenues through taxation and federal taxation reduction. Example would be northern allowances.

A positive spin-off which we see as a result of the implementations of formula financing is that the increased financial autonomy will enhance the GNWT's bargaining position in ongoing federal/territorial negotiations.

Priorities

Another area of concern to our committee is the area of priorities. The document entitled "Budget Procedures - General Overview" describes the main estimates as: "The summation of the priority capital and "A" level planning processes.... The main estimates must be structured in such a manner that the level of resources allocated to individual areas can be clearly related to the goals, activities and current priorities of the GNWT."

As a starting point for its review of the total budget, the committee examined the degree to which the 1985-86 estimates reflected the government's stated priorities and, in particular, the current priorities identified in the priorities statement by the Hon. Richard Nerysoo to the fall session of the Legislative Assembly. We were forced to conclude that while the "A" level programs may well have been structured within the very broad priorities established in 1976, that first of all, there was no evidence of major reallocations or realignment of resources or program enhancements; and that the new programs and funding announced in the Government Leader's address were not incorporated in the committee's budget documents. Now, we have mentioned that and hopefully next year any priority funding will be included in the standing committee on finance documents. The budget documents presented to the committee, in fact, represented "A" level programs which were subject to modest increases for growth and volume. It was basically a status quo budget which maintained previous spending patterns.

During consideration of the proposed budget of the Executive Council the issue of priorities was raised and, in response, the Government Leader provided two further documents to the committee entitled "Summary of Resources Approved for Priorities by Department" and "Summary of 1985-86 Main Estimates Adjustments". In total, these two items identified a further \$19,837,000 in previously unallocated resources for priority areas. The committee received the assurance that this funding would be incorporated into the main estimate book and would be protected in the event of restraint measures. If warranted, budget cuts would be directed at ongoing base programs which did not fall within priority areas.

If I could remind the committee, when we first started the standing committee on finance review process in December -- at that time the degree of funding from the federal government was not known and there was some concern that we might have to make some cuts. As it turned out, we did quite well actually in our negotiations.

The committee has a number of concerns with the priorities process as explained to us by the government and as represented in the material tabled during the formal hearings. Specifically, the development of priorities and the translation of priorities into the allocations process for O and M and capital funding is obscure as is the linkage between priorities and planning committee and the FMB and their respective roles in the process; the process appears to be ad hoc and arbitrary -- there is little distinction between "priorities" and "adjustments" in terms of achieving objectives; the system of priorities development is less systematic than that identified on the chart entitled "Priority Setting Process" as evidenced by the sudden materialization of a number of items to which funds had been allocated in the absence of a definitive policy or program; the lack of any specific weighting of priorities and the scope of existing priorities makes it extremely difficult to distinguish priority programs from non-priority programs so as to render the priority designation almost useless in terms of "A" level budget. If everything is a priority, then nothing is a priority. This has no doubt contributed to the difficulty experienced by departments in identifying the lowest five per cent of priority programs.

While we do not intend to comment at this point on the merit of specific items contained in the summary of priorities and adjustments, we do acknowledge our concerns with apparent systemic problems in the priority process. We are acutely aware that this process will face added demands given the implementation of formula-based financing and the added responsibility of the Executive in setting spending priorities.

Our very preliminary exposure to the process through the budget review, raises a serious question in our minds about whether the system in place is sufficiently rational and capable of meeting this demand so as to maximize benefits to all GNWT residents.

Program evaluation. Are you getting bored? We all are.

---Laughter

This is the downside of politics. Bob MacQuarrie had the exciting thing today.

---Laughter

Program Evaluation

"Industrial development, technological change, urbanization and population growth are just some of the factors influencing the demand for public programs. As the public need for programs change, old programs must be phased out, revised or replaced. Program evaluation, either through strategic reviews or departmental evaluations, provides the information necessary to anticipate and plan for changes." That is an excerpt from the Strategic Review Handbook, Policy and Planning Secretariat, May 1984.

A key consideration of the committee throughout the budget review was the degree to which the government has implemented internal mechanisms to provide ongoing evaluation of its programs.

Pursuant to section 4 of the Financial Administration Ordinance, the Financial Management Board is empowered to evaluate government programs as to economy, efficiency and effectiveness. It was our intention to determine how this authority is being exercised by the FMB and to what extent the concepts of program evaluation and performance measurement are being realized in practical application.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yawn.

---Laughter

MR. BALLANTYNE: In general, our finding is that departments -- I'm really tough. I can just keep going -- that departments vary widely in their approach to and implementation of internal mechanisms for program evaluation. It is generally accepted that some form of ongoing assessment of programs is needed, however, in practice there is little evidence of a consistent effort to seriously look at whether programs are achieving objectives. Some programs such as the economic development agreement, contain an evaluation component. This is largely attributable to the federal government's thrust toward evaluation of all shared cost development agreements.

The Department of Public Works and Highways indicated to the committee that with respect to program effectiveness and efficiency, cost savings had been achieved with the introduction of the maintenance management system and the energy program, however, no programs had been evaluated but that evaluation came largely by results. The Department of Economic Development and Tourism responded to the committee's query on evaluation to the effect that the demand for programs was great and that programs would be examined to see if policy changes were needed. The Department of Education indicated an interest in program evaluation and advised the committee that an independent evaluation of the adult training program was being done.

A major initiative in the area of performance measurement is currently being undertaken as a joint effort of the Financial Management Secretariat and the Department of Social Services. The performance measurement pilot project is the first major attempt to introduce a system which is internal to a department and which measures program delivery. This is a pilot project and its feasibility for governmental application has yet to be determined.

Our conclusion that the present approach to program evaluation is both ad hoc and fragmentary is supported by the fact that the present budget contains little restructuring or reallocation of resources which can be directly attributed to program evaluation.

We have indicated our concern in this report on the necessity of developing measurable objectives as a means of testing the effectiveness of programs. In our opinion, the lack of measurable objectives is a serious constraint to the systematic introduction of performance measurement and program evaluation. We strongly urge this government to direct its senior managers to develop these tools in a consistent fashion to ensure fiscal accountability and to enhance decision making related to resource allocation.

Capital Planning

Another major area was in the major capital planning, Mr. Speaker. Prior to commencement of formal hearings, the committee was provided with a briefing session on the capital planning process. The briefing was requested in order to familiarize the committee with the process by which the capital plan is developed to facilitate its review of the capital budgets of the various departments.

The committee was particularly interested in the capital planning process as it accommodated regional/community interests and the role which MLAs play in the process. It was indicated by Members of the committee that there were differences between regions in the extent of consultation and a suggestion was made that input by MLAs be formalized.

The committee was recently advised that, as a result of these discussions, regional directors have been instructed to invite MLAs to regional community consultation meetings and to provide Members with a copy of the overall capital plan after regional decisions have been taken. We are very pleased at the prompt response to this matter.

Two further items arose in the course of the budget review which we wish to speak to. These are: the interface between the capital planning and priorities process; and the integration of the capital and O and M budgets.

The link between capital planning and priorities is unclear. Indeed, to add to the obscurity, capital planning itself is a priority. It is the stated priority of this government "to make allocation of capital moneys more responsive to community infrastructure in keeping with the growth of communities". There is example that this priority is being addressed through development of

regional capital planning committees, increased community consultation, etc., but it is more difficult to determine how this process fits in with GNWT priorities and how the capital plan exemplifies these overall priorities. It is, in our opinion, reflective of the general systemic difficulties with the priorities which we have alluded to in our earlier discussion on the subject.

The committee has been advised that with the introduction of formula financing, the distinction between capital funding and O and M funding is extinguished for the purpose of determining the overall level of the federal grant. We heard, in some detail, the effect of the negotiated approach on the capital budget and the restraints placed on capital moneys by the federal government which...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Sibbeston.

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum. The Member is wasting our time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no quorum so the Sergeant-at-Arms will ring the bell for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes a quorum. Mr. Ballantyne, please continue.

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I could start on page one again...

---Laughter

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Assembly for coming back and listening to this report. I appreciate that.

Two further items arose in the course of the budget review which we wish to speak to. These are: the interface between the capital planning and priorities process; and the integration of the capital and O and M budgets.

The link between capital planning and priorities is unclear. Indeed, to add to the obscurity, capital planning is a priority. It is the stated priority of this government "to make allocation of capital moneys more responsive to community infrastructure in keeping with the growth of communities". There is example that this priority is being addressed through development of regional capital planning committees, increased community consultation, etc., but it is more difficult to determine how this process fits in with GNWT priorities and how the capital plan exemplifies these overall priorities. It is, in our opinion, reflective of the general systemic difficulties with the priorities which we have alluded to in our earlier discussion on the subject.

The committee has been advised that with the introduction of formula financing, the distinction between capital funding and O and M funding is extinguished for the purpose of determining the overall level of the federal grant. We heard, in some detail, the effect of the negotiated approach on the capital budget and the restraints placed on capital moneys by the federal government which permitted only limited growth. With formula financing, the GNWT is now free to allocate moneys between O and M and capital as an internal decision.

I think I read half of that page twice.

Over the past year and with the present budget, we see an acceleration in capital development. It has been explained to us that this growth proceeds from the need to "catch up" after years of restrained growth. However, we are concerned that this accelerated growth in new capital infrastructure should be monitored so that future long-term O and M requirements do not mushroom to the point where they displace other programs.

The committee recommends that the Executive undertake a complete review of the present capital planning process with a view to integrating capital planning with the budgetary process for O and M. In terms of our fiscal negotiations a separate process for capital funding is no longer required and the integration of both types of funding, even if the distinction is maintained in practice, would permit a greater sensitivity to the O and M implications of new development.

Capital planning is an extremely complex process involving numerous participants. We have heard from the players some of the problems in co-ordination of program delivery, particularly as these relate to interdepartmental roles in the delivery of housing and land assembly. Part of the

problem appears to be an overabundance of process involving too many participants with overlapping mandates. Added to this is the serious dilemma of the reporting relationships of regional directors and regional staff to program departments and the respective role of the Minister in exercising political control.

We therefore suggest that the Executive Council, as a component of its review, assess the feasibility of integrating capital planning within the relevant program departments.

Departmental Issues

Because of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that this House has been quite co-operative I will move quickly through the departmental issues we have identified. Departmental issues in the Executive are to do with the capital planning and priorities process and in regional operations, the accountability of regional directors.

In Justice and Public Services: the reorganization of departmental functions; community consultation on government regulations; the development of a policing agency; appointments of justices of the peace; the capital costs of the Young Offenders Act. Also, we have identified a problem with museums' access to private funding.

Under the Department of Personnel, we have identified a problem with the affirmative action policy and the cost of staff housing.

In the Financial Management Secretariat, a very important area that we have looked into and will continue to look into is the area of special warrants. The committee advised the Minister that we had serious concerns regarding special warrants, their authority and application, and we would be monitoring closely the government's use of this device. We intend to address this issue in the course of our examination of supplementary appropriations and in the context of a detailed examination of the provisions of the Financial Administration Ordinance as a whole. Our intention is to present a report of our findings, concerns and recommendations to the Legislative Assembly.

In the Department of Finance, there are concerns to do with the review of the current tax regime. In Economic Development and Tourism, we had a concern with policies for priority funding items. In the Department of Social Services, we had some concern with priority funding items and social assistance and in the performance measurement pilot project and generally in services to the community.

In the NWT Housing Corporation there were concerns outlined in our report in the capital plan; major cost overruns on capital projects; in reporting relationships with GNWT finance and planning organizations. We had concerns in the Housing Corporation as to the objectives for district operations; the Treasury Board submission for upgrading maintenance and administration salaries and benefits; the needs survey, prioritization and allocation of units.

In Education, we had serious concerns with outstanding Treasury Board submissions and with the capital cost of schools development. In the Department of Public Works and Highways, we had concerns with the leasing of office space. In the Department of Information we had some concerns with interpretation requirements. In the Department of Health, policy for priorities initiatives and native hospital workers.

In the Department of Local Government we had concerns with justices of the peace; increased charges for municipal services; MLAs role in capital planning; effects of decentralization; person year changes; residential land development and the definition of community.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes my report. I would like to thank Members of the House for their patience in putting up with this. Thank you very much.

---Applause

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The item has been concluded. The Chair will recognize the clock. Mr. Clerk, orders of the day, please.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Announcements, Mr. Speaker. There will be a meeting of the CPA executive immediately after adjournment today.

ITEM 17: ORDERS OF THE DAY

Orders of the day for Thursday, March 21, at 1:00 p.m.

1. Prayer
2. Members' Replies
3. Ministers' Statements
4. Oral Questions
5. Written Questions
6. Returns
7. Petitions
8. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
9. Tabling of Documents
10. Notices of Motion
11. Notices of Motion for First Reading of Bills
12. Motions
13. First Reading of Bills
14. Second Reading of Bills
15. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills and Other Matters: Tabled Document 36-85(1); Bills 7-85(1), 3-85(1), 9-85(1), 10-85(1)
16. Report of Committee of the Whole
17. Orders of the Day

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This House stands adjourned until 1:00 p.m., Thursday, March 21st.

---ADJOURNMENT

Available from the
Publications Clerk, Department of Information,
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