



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

4th Session

10th Assembly

**HANSARD**  
Official Report  
**DAY 25**

**FRIDAY, MARCH 22, 1985**

**Pages 890 to 919**

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

Cournoyea, 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. Canadien  
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

FRIDAY, MARCH 22, 1985

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	890
Oral Questions	890
Returns	892
Notices of Motion	892
Notices of Motion for First Reading of Bills	
- Bill 5-85(1) Council Act	892
- Bill 6-85(1) Council Retiring Allowances Act	892
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Bill 7-85(1) Appropriation Act, 1985-86	893
- Department of Local Government	914
Report of Committee of the Whole of:	
- Bill 7-85(1) Appropriation Act, 1985-86	918
Orders of the Day	919

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

FRIDAY, MARCH 22, 1985

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Angottitauruq, Mr. Appaqaq, Mr. Arlooktoo, Mr. Ballantyne, Hon. Tom Butters, Hon. Nellie Cournoyea, Hon. Tagak Curley, Mr. Erkloo, 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 (Hon. Don Stewart): I am going to need your assistance in deciding whether or not there is any use in trying to sit extra hours this weekend. Could you, by a show of hands, show how many would be available to sit from 1:00 p.m. this afternoon until 6:00 p.m? By a show of hands. How many would be available?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the question might be put when more Members are in the House. I see there are about eight absent.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ballantyne.

MR. BALLANTYNE: Some western MLAs have been invited to go to another meeting. I have no problem myself with meeting on Saturday or Sunday, but today may be a little bit tough for some of the Members.

MR. SPEAKER: I will let the matter stand for a while, as suggested by the honourable Member until there are more Members present. Orders of the day for Friday, March the 22nd.

Item 2, Members' replies. There do not appear to be any replies this morning.

Item 3, Ministers' statements. Item 4, oral questions. Mr. Paniloo.

ITEM 4: ORAL QUESTIONS

Question 173-85(1): Sale Of Outpost Camp Housing, Pangnirtung

MR. PANILUO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister of Renewable Resources. Regarding the letter from Ipeelee in February, I am wondering if you will be responding to that letter regarding the houses that are being used by the outpost camps. These houses have been left behind in one of the outpost camps outside Pangnirtung. The person that wrote the letter would like to buy these houses that are in the outpost camps outside Pangnirtung.

MR. SPEAKER: Ms Cournoyea.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, I will take that under advisement and come back at the next days sitting to reply to that. Thank you.

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

Question 174-85(1): Information On Home-Ownership Programs

MR. PANILOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister responsible for the Housing Corporation. The people in my constituency are not too aware of the home-ownership program. They do not know how to go about applying for home-ownership. They would like to get a copy of the policy if it is possible on home-ownership programs. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wray.

Return To Question 174-85(1): Information On Home-Ownership Programs

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly will instruct the corporation to provide all documentation of home-ownership to the community but I will go even further than that and I will commit somebody from the Housing Corporation in Frobisher Bay to go to Clyde River in the very near future and talk to the community about home-ownership and talk to the housing association board of directors. Thank you.

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

Question 175-85(1): Appointments To Task Force On Languages

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am directing my question to the Leader of the House. In our session on June 28th, I made a motion with regard to lobbying Ottawa to give aboriginal languages the same standing as English and French in the NWT. I would like to ask the Leader about this task force on languages, with regard to the appointment of Brian Lewis and some other people on this board. Have these appointments been made?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 175-85(1): Appointments To Task Force On Languages

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Mr. Speaker, I think for the last time, Mr. Brian Lewis is not on the task force. The task force is a different process. He is an administrator dealing with the issue of languages. He is not a member of the task force. That is one.

Secondly, I have not appointed the individuals because I requested input from the Members opposite and I suggested two names of which one has already been suggested and rejected by a Member. Now, if that is the case, then I have to go back again to find an appropriate name. It is coming to the point now that I am going to have to make a decision unilaterally so that we can get on with the job because I do know that the Members of the Eastern Arctic have already indicated and supported two members that they feel can do the job. In one case we are already in the process of developing a contract to ensure that one person is already on the task force, with the idea of speaking again to another individual to take leave from another job that that individual has at this moment. The Dene have not supported the recommendations that I have made. In fact one has been rejected by one of the Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Mrs. Lawrence.

MRS. LAWRENCE: (Translation) Thank you. I did not realize that they were waiting for us for this. If he was waiting for us he should have let us know. I did not realize that he was waiting for our decision. Today, like in the afternoon, I will give him two names in this regard. Sometimes I do not really understand what is happening and this is why a misunderstanding took place. So later on today I will give him two names. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not exactly a question. Are there any oral questions? That appears to clean up oral questions for today.

Item 5, written questions. Are there any written questions for today? Item 6, returns. Are there any returns for today? Mr. Butters.

ITEM 6: RETURNS

Return To Question 151-85(1): Cost Increases For Radio Telephone Licences

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, a return to oral Question 151-85(1), asked by Mr. Ballantyne on March 15th, 1985. The honourable Member advised that the costs of licensing mobile and standard radio telephones had increased some 150 per cent from the previous year and asked if I would inquire as to the rationale for the increase. I have been advised by the local Communications Canada officials that the increase is as a result of an observation by the Auditor General of Canada which recommended that the Department of Communications should operate as closely as possible to a break-even point.

The licensing of mobile radios is the responsibility of the federal Department of Communications Canada and if the Member so directs I would be pleased to write to the responsible federal Minister to express concerns with this large increase in the licensing fee.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Are there any further returns?

Item 7, petitions.

Item 8, reports of standing and special committees.

Item 9, tabling of documents. Item 10, notices of motion. Mr. T'Seleie.

ITEM 10: NOTICES OF MOTION

Notice Of Motion 18-85(1): Boating Safety Practices Legislation

MR. T'SELEIE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on Monday, April the 29th, I will move this motion: Now therefore, I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Deh Cho, that this House recommend to the Executive Council that appropriate legislation be drafted to incorporate the recommendations of the coroner's jury and that this legislation be introduced at the spring session of the Legislative Assembly. Mr. Speaker, I will ask to have unanimous consent to deal with this motion today.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of motion. Mr. Sibbeston.

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: Just a point of order. Mr. T'Seleie mentioned April 29th. I wonder if that is the correct date he wants to make the motion?

MR. T'SELEIE: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I should have said March the 25th.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Are there any other notices of motion? Item 11, notices of motion for first reading of bills. Mr. Nerysoo.

ITEM 11: NOTICES OF MOTION FOR FIRST READING OF BILLS

Notice Of Motion For First Reading Of Bill 5-85(1): Council Act

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on Monday, March 25th, 1985, I shall move that Bill 5-85(1), An Act to Amend the Council Act, be read for the first time.

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

Notice Of Motion For First Reading Of Bill 6-85(1): Council Retiring Allowances Act

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on Monday, March 25, 1985, I shall move that Bill 6-85(1), An Act to Amend the Council Retiring Allowances Act, be read for the first time.

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

Item 12, motions. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. T'SELEIE: Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to deal with the motion that I gave notice of earlier.

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent is being requested to deal with Mr. T'Seleie's motion. Does he have unanimous consent? Unanimous consent has not been given. Motions.

Item 13, first reading of bills. Mr. McLaughlin.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask for unanimous consent to proceed with first reading of Bill 4-85(1), which I gave notice of yesterday for Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent is being requested. Are there any nays? Unanimous consent has been refused. First reading of bills. Mr. McLaughlin.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Just a point of order. Yesterday I gave notice for this bill for Monday and I am just asking a procedural question, Mr. Speaker. If you can be in the House tomorrow, would it be in order for me to proceed with that tomorrow? Because 48 hours would have lapsed.

MR. SPEAKER: No, Mr. McLaughlin, it would not. The idea of putting a date on it is so that Members who may be interested in that particular piece of legislation or motion, would be available in the House to deal with it. So you cannot arbitrarily change without unanimous consent even though it does meet the time frame. Item 13, first reading of bills.

Item 14, second reading of bills. Before we go into committee of the whole, we are back to dealing with extra sitting hours. By a show of hands, how many would be available to sit this afternoon? It is obvious that we will not sit then. How many would be available to sit on Saturday from 11:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.? If anybody has a change of heart between now and when we adjourn, would they please advise me because I would hate to call a meeting tomorrow and not have a quorum and put other people out. Mr. McLaughlin.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, if you tried for one o'clock, there would be three more of us available to be here.

MR. SPEAKER: All right. I'll ask to put the question from one o'clock to six o'clock. How many would be available? Thank you.

Item 15, we will resolve into committee of the whole for consideration of bills and other matters: report of the standing committee on finance on the 1985-86 main estimates; Bill 7-85(1), Bill 3-85(1), Bill 9-85(1), Bill 10-85(1) with Mr. Gargan in the chair.

ITEM 15: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS AND OTHER MATTERS

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE ON REVIEW OF 1985-86 MAIN ESTIMATES; BILL 7-85(1), APPROPRIATION ACT, 1985-86

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): The committee will now come to order. We are dealing with the standing committee on finance report on the review of the 1985-86 main estimates, with Mr. Ballantyne.

Report Of Standing Committee On Finance Review Of 1985-86 Main Estimates

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. First of all I would like to thank Mr. Curley for giving me this opportunity to have an in-depth discussion of the report of the standing committee on finance. I think after all the discussions about constitutional development sometimes we forget the reason we are here is this budget and we feel that this particular document will be of assistance to the government and to this House in months and years to come. So, I am glad that Mr. Curley at least is taking this document seriously.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: In your case, political.

MR. BALLANTYNE: The Government Leader will have his chance to speak for his documents, so I will try to speak to mine if I could. I would like to explain the role of this committee. I think there is some misunderstanding of what we are trying to accomplish by having the report adopted by this House. There have been a number of comments by Ministers over the past number of days about

the way this committee carries on its business, so I think for everybody's edification we will try to explain what we think we should be doing, and what we are doing so that there is no misunderstanding about it.

As everyone knows, this committee actually grew and its mandate expanded under Mrs. Sorensen. What we have done is build on that. We have a different approach than Mrs. Sorensen had. When Members here that were on that standing committee, Mrs. Sorensen's committee, dealt with a lot of the specific detail of the budget...

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Point of order.

MR. BALLANTYNE: Point of order. You wanted me here.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): What is your point of order, Ms Cournoyea?

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, it was not Mrs. Sorensen's way of dealing with it. We had a finance committee of which I was a Member and we had other Members on it, we worked as a group and it was not Mrs. Sorensen alone doing the job and I would like to correct that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: It is different now.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): This is not a point of order, it is a point of debate. Mr. Ballantyne.

Definition And Achievement Of Objectives By Departments

MR. BALLANTYNE: I take the Member's comments seriously. I was about to say "the role of all the Members of that committee" before I was interrupted but I will not discuss what that committee did. That is fair enough and I appreciate the Member's comments so I will go on to say that what we are attempting to do is have departments define their objectives for the course of a year and, as a committee, we want to see whether or not they have achieved those objectives. If they have not, then why, and whether or not they utilized their resources in the best and most efficient way possible. That is the basic thrust of what we are trying to do.

I think Ms Cournoyea's comments are in order. Each committee has its own style, individual chairpersons have their own style and, in fact, individual Ministers have their own style. I know many Ministers have ideas of how we should run the committee and many committee Members have ideas of how you should run your ministries and maybe some day everyone can live out their fantasies.

MR. McCALLUM: And never the twain shall meet.

MR. BALLANTYNE: The reality is that the role of the government is very different from the role of committees, especially the standing committee on finance. As we outlined in the report, we try to emphasize the importance of the committees in a non-party system. All of you are very familiar with what Mr. Drury said -- except for the Government Leader -- but I have it available if you want to read it. None the less, Mr. Drury, who had been involved in politics for, I think, longer than all of us except for Mr. McCallum...

---Laughter

...I think made some very good points and we made those points in our first two pages of this report which you have all had an opportunity to read now, and we take our role very seriously. Contrary to your belief our committee has worked very, very closely together. We have worked many hours and I am quite proud of the committee's work. Now, I think rather than criticism by our illustrious leaders, they should deserve a little bit of thanks for the work they put into a very tough job.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible comment)

MR. BALLANTYNE: Well, I was told it was a waste of time. I have been told a number of things. I have heard a number of expressions of criticism. Perhaps that is not criticism -- probably it is a backhanded compliment. If it is I thank you.



If we could, I would like to go through the report because I know Mr. Curley had some concerns about what we were trying to achieve in this report. I know Mr. Patterson had some valid concerns, about what it is that this House would be adopting if in fact they adopted this report. I really hope that Members of the Executive who have the most concern will ask some questions on some of these areas that we have touched on. We are quite prepared to get into a lot more detail about those areas. We have a lot of ideas. What we tried to do here is just summarize those ideas but if there are problems, we are prepared to back up any statement that we made here.

#### Consideration Of Report As Working Document

In fact the only specific recommendations in this document are the recommendations at the beginning of the book to do with translation and requests for information. Then there is another recommendation at the end of the book to look at integrating the capital planning process with the O and M planning process, which the Minister of Finance has said he is in fact doing. So I do not think that there should be a major difficulty with adopting this particular report. We will get to that a little bit later on. But my feeling of adopting it was that, understanding the limitations of timing, understanding that many of these recommendations cannot be carried out overnight, that the Executive Council would consider this a working document and would look at the ideas in this document. If they have problems with those ideas we would like to hear those problems and their reasons why some of these ideas cannot be carried out. We would like to hear about it. So obviously we are not expecting the Executive Council to adopt verbatim exactly everything in here tomorrow.

I know Members of the Executive Council said they want motions from us. Well, it takes four days per motion but if we had a year we could put forward many motions. I think though that we can go around and around in circles and talk about the details of how we get our points across, how we give direction. I think whether it is through a motion, whether it is part of a report -- I think the actual procedure is not the idea. The important thing is that you know these are our concerns. I am serious about this. I think it is a serious process and we hope that you will take this document seriously because there has been a lot of effort put into this document. Also, motions may be made. That is fine, we will make motions during the process. I still think that it is important that this document is treated differently from the hundreds of tabled documents that come to this House each year and are sitting somewhere in some file. I think since we are talking about a budget, this particular document is the essence of the work of our committee and as such I think -- even though Mr. Curley smiles because his mind is on other things, my mind is on the budget -- I think that this document every year should be treated...

---Applause

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible comment)

MR. BALLANTYNE: That is not a motive. I said he is smiling. Merely an observation. It's a spring day and Mr. Curley is smiling and I am happy. What did you learn from it, is the point? Excuse me.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Gained.

MR. BALLANTYNE: Gained. I gain a feeling of doing a good job. Someday you will understand that feeling.

MR. McCALLUM: That is an interesting conversation you two people are going through.

MR. BALLANTYNE: Okay, I am sorry. Then if you look at some of the requests that we have made at the beginning to make our committee more effective, and we agree that there is work to be done, we will be sitting down with Mr. Butters and the Financial Management Secretariat to try to streamline this process. Hopefully next year, the process will be better, it will improve. The interaction between our committee and between Mr. Butters and the Department of Finance and the Financial Management Secretariat will improve. Hopefully the sort of direction we give next year will be more concise than what we are doing this year.

I would like to know if anybody has any questions, then, about those specific requests that we made in order to improve the effectiveness of the committee and if anyone has any ideas then this is the time to say. We are open to any ideas of how you feel this committee should be made more effective.

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

Executive Council Unable To Support Adoption Of Report

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to comment briefly on the reason the document is here at this time. I was very pleased to hear the chairman of the standing committee on finance say that he is not expecting the Executive Council to adopt everything here tomorrow or the next day, or words to that effect but the unfortunate thing is that is what the word "adopts" suggests. That is why we took exception to the motion last night and the wording of the motion. I will just make a brief comment which will explain our position and I hope will be helpful to not only the chairman of the committee, but also Members.

We commend Mr. Ballantyne and Members of the standing committee on finance for developing what is a very well-considered and most relevant report. This report will be extremely useful to the government and its Ministers as they develop policies and direct the operations of their departments but as I mentioned earlier the motion put yesterday requested the report be received and adopted. I and my colleagues do not believe that to be the standard practice in this Assembly. I believe the standard practice is something of this nature, and that is, where a report contains recommendations not in the form of motions, they are all placed at the end of the report, which is in this case here. Then they would be given separately, with a proper motion to adopt the recommendation made at that time.

Such adoption though in effect endorses the statement and it makes the Assembly, or those Members who support it, responsible for it. Obviously, in keeping with what the chairman of the standing committee on finance has said, the Executive Council cannot be expected to adopt everything here tomorrow or in the near future. If Members will keep that in mind and realize that when this report is discussed further, if it needs to be discussed further, that the Executive Council cannot be bound by the report because through such an adoptive process, we have not had time to consider the observations in detail, and the implications of the implementation of such observations and recommendations. Therefore, the Executive Council Members will not be voting for the motion to adopt when the chairman of the standing committee puts it forward.

It is, however, and I so assure the chairman, that it is the government's intention that each observation and recommendation will be carefully considered and where the recommendations are appropriate, they will be put into effect as quickly as possible. Where there is some disagreement or some problem with the recommendation or the observation then it would be our intention to so advise this House and the standing committee on finance as quickly as possible. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Butters. General comments on the report. Mr. Curley.

Apparent Departure From Tradition

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, I would like to thank the honourable Member for a very good job in presenting the finance committee report. I think he would not want to miss someone giving it such a compliment. It is a different report. It has changed from the traditional convention of presenting a committee report which consists of a series of recommendations which are then presented to the Speaker because really you are Mr. Speaker's committee, you report to him and you make recommendations to the government through Mr. Speaker, because this is a Legislature. By way of practice it seems to have departed from that. This is no longer the property of the Speaker and the Legislature, but the finance committee making direct intervention and thereby by-passing the Legislature, the parliamentary system, and shooting right directly to the government. I think that is my concern. I know it may not be the case but that is the way it appears. For one reason, I wanted an opportunity for the Ministers to respond to the items that affect them.

I can see a whole lot of them. For instance, in the report you make references to JPs, that federal civil servants should be appointed as JPs and again in the other section you indicated that municipal workers should be appointed as JPs and the Minister of Local Government, again should re-emphasize that point. The question that I have is, if this Assembly adopts the report and the points made, does that then compel the government to respond to the report as adopted or should it come forward in a form of consideration for the government to deal with? This is the point that I had in mind.

### Departmental Issues

I did want to respond to some of the comments. On page four, objectives. I would like my department's position read into the record. The department is referred to by way of omission. The objectives of Economic Development and Tourism could be more definitive, we agree. They have been outdated and I think we have inherited some objectives that have really not been updated for a while. I can assure the Member and Members of the standing committee that the exercise is now being carried out and they are going to be brought forward to the whole of the Executive Council. Overall objectives of the estimates as they are listed in the estimates have never really been renewed, so, reading the comments from my department, "The achievements of the long-term goals of the department have been measured in terms of the accomplishments of the objectives." Again, I would like to indicate that this normally has not been the case but I think through our response to your question when we present the estimates, we are actually responding to that point.

Furthermore, objectives could be defined as ongoing or for a specific period. I think by way of explanation I would say that we normally attempt to do that when we appear before the committee of the whole when we are dealing with our estimates. So for program evaluation, the comment from my department was, "A structured evaluation program, in our view, is not essential." However, as a part of the operational planning process, it would be remiss if departments did not address their existing programs at reasonable length to determine their effectiveness and possible revision to existing policies. The five per cent low priority exercise contributes to such an evaluation, and we could spend a little more time on it. I notice, and I can tell you that that question was not posed to my department and, therefore, in my presentation I did not allude to it nor make a point of it but if it was raised I would have pointed it out.

As for the policies for priority funding items, the committee's concern about being asked to support a request for funds for programs that are not adequately defined nor approved is valid. I think that was evident during our presentation. Much of the problem comes from the timing of the priority process, from our point of view. It should be prior to or concur with the operational plan. I think, again, as far as that point is concerned, the Executive Council has reviewed that. It is an ongoing concern because our process of defining priority items comes late in the year, in the fall. I know that that will be one item which has been raised by the committee that I can assure you we are going to probably put in a place where they can be eventually included in the estimates.

Regarding the overall other matters that are not directly related to my department, in my view, this report could create quite a bit of difficulty. I am not trying to suggest that the chairman -- that you tried to create a difficulty. That is not my point. The way in which it referred to a whole lot of policy guidelines I think is a good point but if we use the words "that it be received by the Assembly and adopted", I am wondering, and maybe you could explain to me, if it is adopted what is the committee's expectation then? Are you suggesting to us that we now, as a government, abide by the adoption and therefore it is taken as a direction from the Assembly to the Executive Council? Would that be the point? Or are you suggesting that we take it as a form of a recommendation to the Executive Council? These are the only two points that I would like to hear from you. Thank you.

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

### Report Outlines Areas Of Concern And Possible Solutions

MR. BALLANTYNE: I appreciate the Minister's comments and those responses. That is the sort of discussion that we hoped that this document would provoke. What we are trying to do is have this document adopted so that it will become a working document of this House and of the Executive. If for whatever reason, the Executive has some difficulty in any of the areas in carrying it out, we would be satisfied with a valid explanation as to why that is so. I think, again, Mr. Curley talks about the finance committee dealing directly to the government. That is not really the case. The finance committee made this report in the House and asked the support of the House to adopt it. One must also recognize that there are a number of Members who are not on the Executive or on the finance committee and we are asking for their support also. I do not think that the Ministers have to be overly concerned about some hidden meaning in the word "adopted". That is not the intent. The intent is for you to look at this as a working paper between now and May. We would like to get some responses, for instance, as to what ideas you can work on, what ideas you are having problems with and why.

To give an example, we were very careful how we worded things in the document. Mr. Curley referred to justices of the peace. In both those instances and I will read it, "The committee felt that the rules, particularly those in the present Municipal Ordinance regarding the eligibility of certain members of municipal bodies up to hamlet status, to serve as JPs and instances of government employees appointed to the position should be reviewed." What we are saying, and we are saying exactly the same thing in Local Government, is that the committee wishes to re-emphasize our desire to see the issue of JPs and their relationships to hamlet councils or other forms of governments clarified. We are not saying to appoint them. What we are saying is we want it clarified. We want the issue dealt with so that everybody understands it. That is what we have tried to do throughout this whole report, not telling you exactly what we think you have to do but outlining the areas and outlining some possible ways of coming to grips with it. Does that answer your question, Mr. Curley?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): General comments. Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I found the report of the standing committee on finance useful. I think it would have been even more useful if we had had it at the beginning of the budget session. I understand that it may have been ready but I do not quite understand why it was not presented earlier. However, we have it and I have just a few comments.

I would like to say generally that I agree with Mr. Drury that the Legislative Assembly in a consensus government is well-advised to take advantage of standing committees. I am even so committed to that principle that I found myself a fairly active member of the special committee on education while I was at the same time Minister of Education, which was not always easy. I do think that we must rely heavily on our Legislative committees in this government. I welcome the advice that is given.

I must say just generally that I found, with all respect to the standing committee on finance, that they seem to be very preoccupied with internal process in the Executive Council. I think they should be perhaps a little less concerned about how we do things internally and a little bit more concerned about what the results are. I have been really wondering when we were going to be asked how many cups of coffee we drink at the average Financial Management Board meeting. I guess that question has yet to be asked.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: A very serious nature.

#### Consideration Of Priorities In Development Of Budget

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Believe me, we are counting. We are counting now.

Generally, Mr. Chairman, I find some of the criticisms a little bit difficult to understand. I note on page 10 for example that the committee says that there was no evidence of major reallocations or realignment of resources or program enhancements. Yet on the next page it has admitted that priorities and main estimates adjustments totalled \$19,837,000 in the coming fiscal year. We got that money somewhere. Perhaps we did not identify exactly clearly enough where it was obtained from but I think we have had a significant priority exercise in developing this budget. It is more significant I think than in any previous budget I can recall having participated in developing. I know that the process was not perfect. I know for example that it is true that, as the committee notes on page 11, funds had been committed in the absence of a policy or program. I do not apologize for that. I think that if we waited to develop a policy we would not commit the funds and we would not have anything new to report to the Legislative Assembly at this budget session. I think there is nothing wrong with committing funds to an initiative but requiring that a policy be in place and developed before those funds are actually finally disbursed.

So, I trust the Members will understand that the priority-setting process identifies priorities and we should be able to do that without knowing precisely under what policy those new moneys will be spent. I also note a criticism on page 11 that there does not appear to be any specific weighting of priorities. Again, with respect to the committee, Mr. Chairman, I would say that the weight is reflected by how much money we have put into the various priority areas. And I would say for example, that it is pretty clear that the Executive Council identified housing as a priority based on the recommendations of the special committee on housing and maybe we did not put housing at the front of the list but at least in terms of dollars I think that there were significant increases over what was spent last year. I would say the weighting of priorities can be gauged by the dollar expenditures.

I also welcome the committee's emphasis on evaluation. I have indicated in presenting the budget for the Department of Education that this is an area where I think we really must concentrate. I agree wholeheartedly with the committee's emphasis on developing measurable objectives and I think, in Education anyway, that applies to students, teachers and programs. I am hoping that we can really improve our evaluation policies in my Department of Education and other departments as well.

#### Capital Planning, Priorities And O And M Budget Processes

The other comment I just want to briefly make -- it is noted that the link between capital planning and priorities and the link between capital planning and the O and M budget process is unclear. All I can really say is that the same people are involved and I hope that, if it is not evident to the committee, that there are links of process. It should be understandable that eight people develop the capital plan, develop the O and M budget and develop the priorities. We do so through different committees of the Executive Council -- priorities and planning committee, the Financial Management Board -- but the same bodies sit on those committees, by and large. I like to think there are linkages because of that alone. Maybe that is simplistic but I think that we have to remember that there are real people on those various committees and that they are all the same people. There are not that many of us, we work together and I think we work hard. I am not really sure why the committee has determined that these are all separate processes, or even unco-ordinated processes. I know that sometimes we plan capital projects without necessarily fully considering the O and M implications but you know there are only eight of us and we are the people that serve on these various committees. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you for those comments, Mr. Patterson. I will try to respond to them.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Ballantyne, while we are on how much coffee the Executive uses, we will take a 15 minute coffee break.

---SHORT RECESS

The committee will come to order. Mr. Ballantyne, I believe you were ready to respond to Mr. Patterson.

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you. Again as I say, Mr. Patterson brought up some good points and I will try to go through the points he brought up to explain our thinking. The first point is that Mr. Patterson thought the committee spent an inordinate amount of time dealing with the inner workings of the Executive Council. I do not agree and maybe there is a little misunderstanding and I will try to explain what we were trying to do. What we looked at are four basic areas of process of government as a whole. We looked at formula financing, which is very important, priorities, program evaluation and capital planning. So they were the four general threads that we dealt with. Then we also looked at specific departments. We think it is very important because these concerns are more than the workings of the Executive Council, in fact those areas are the workings of government. And we see our responsibility to make recommendations to streamline the workings of government.

The next point I think was on page 10. "The budget documents presented to the committee in fact represented 'A' level programs which are subject to modest increases for growth and volume." Remember this report comes from the standing committee on finance meetings in December. So in the actual SCOF documents, the priority money was not included. What we are saying is that hopefully next year, if there is a priorities exercise, it will be streamlined and it will be included in those original SCOF documents. That was the thinking on that particular one.

#### Funds Committed Before Policies Developed

The idea of funds being committed before policies have been developed -- I think this is important and I will read just a short paragraph of some of the background work we did on that. "The situation in the NWT is markedly different from the South. Firstly, departments are not created by legislation nor the powers and duties of Ministers circumscribed in law in the same manner as in the South. The authority for grants, contributions and other transfers of funding is the Appropriation Act. The criteria and guidelines for these expenditures are set out in policy directives which are initiated by the Executive without the requirement for formal legislative approval." Okay, up to that point we agree.

"Because the Assembly cannot in many cases look to specific legislation to define the authority for expenditures, it is imperative that at the very minimum it be able to ensure that the conditions of the expenditures as defined in policy are in place prior to giving legislative sanction through the passage of the Appropriation Act. Without prior notice of program guidelines, policy directives, etc., it is very difficult for the Assembly to ensure that expenditures have been made in accordance with a specific purpose for which the Assembly voted the funds. In a number of instances involving priority programs, the Assembly is being asked to give authority to the government to carry out programs which are not defined, as well as to authorize the funds to carry out the program. When these programs, policies, etc., are developed, it will be too late for Members to support or reject the financial expenditure on the basis of informed judgment of the merit of the program." That is our point. I think Mr. Curley when he responded, said his department will be looking at next year improving that situation. So essentially before we approve the expenditure of funds, for us to do our job properly we really should know how those funds are going to be spent. So what we are asking is if the Executive can make every effort to try to develop those policies before they ask us to approve funds. If it is not possible for instance to do that in the main estimates then the other alternative would be to do it in the next supp, when those policies are developed. That was the point on that one, Mr. Patterson.

We talked about the capital planning process and interrelationship between O and M, capital and priorities. After a fairly intensive review of every department before Christmas, we found that those linkages can improve. Though Mr. Patterson is right when he says that the FMB is the common denominator within all those three processes, the reality is there are many other people involved in the process. Obviously the Financial Management Board has so many responsibilities they cannot be expected to keep track of all the policies developed in those three areas. Our feeling is then -- and Mr. Butters said he would be looking at it -- it would really help to integrate for instance the capital and the O and M process. And now under formula financing that will be possible. Also for next year, though we recognize this year that with that \$20 million there were certain circumstances and situations that necessitated the process, we can start from there and next year any priority money I think we could look at it or the Executive can try to integrate that into the process earlier. So our point here is not a total criticism of the process. Obviously it has worked. What we are saying is that there are ways to streamline it and there are ways I think that the Ministers will find it easier to do their jobs if the process is streamlined.

Mr. Patterson, did I miss any of your questions?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. General comments. Mr. Richard.

#### Appreciation Of Comments And Suggestions

MR. RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make some general comments about the report and the role of the committee and appreciating that I have just joined the committee in recent months. I think it is good, Mr. Chairman, that we did refer the report to the committee of the whole so that we could have this discussion. I appreciate, as a Member of the committee, comments that some of the Ministers have already made this morning.

The process of the standing committee on finance that I have participated in to date simply -- related to the main estimates -- the two weeks that we spent in December and the time that we have taken in this House as Members of the Assembly to date. There have been suggestions made to me, both in the Assembly and outside by Members of the Executive Council that the standing committee on finance should do things differently. One suggestion that was made, Mr. Chairman, was that we should forget about the review in December and just do the whole thing here in the Assembly because some have felt that Members of our standing committee are being repetitive in asking the same questions that were asked in December. I, for one, accept that comment or criticism but I disagree with the solution. I personally would rather do a more exhaustive examination in the standing committee and strive to be more time-efficient in this Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. RICHARD: I simply for myself have to admit that I am doing it for the first time and I think we, on the committee -- the committee is only as good or bad as the Members that are on it. We may be imperfect communicators, perhaps more or less as imperfect as Members of the Executive Council. I believe those of us who go to the meetings of the standing committee on finance are trying to do our job. As I say, I appreciate the comments this morning from the Ministers. I

personally have received comments from Ministers of how we should do our job and sometimes it is related to how they did the job when they were on this side of the House. I guess sometimes I get a little offended by that -- that they are telling me how I should do my job. But I try and override that because those Members have more experience in this than I have. I think we can get better. We have a good group of people on the standing committee.

Mr. Patterson's comment this morning that perhaps our committee is overly-concerned with the internal process of the Executive Council -- that is fine. I accept that comment. I had not thought we were doing that but perhaps we were. But I do believe that we should be concerned as the standing committee on the overall process. Too often all of us in this Assembly are criticized for our narrow concerns of constituency matters. This role of MLAs on the standing committee on finance is an attempt I think to overcome that and look at the entire process as we see it and how it might be improved to fulfil our mandate to protect the public's interest.

Turning to the report, Mr. Chairman, I think the report is an excellent one.

HON. RICHARD NERYSO: (Inaudible comment)

#### Procedural Problems Faced

MR. RICHARD: It should not surprise the Government Leader for me to say that. The report, Mr. Chairman, clearly indicates some of the procedural problems that we faced as a committee. The translation problem was clearly an obstacle for the Inuit Members of our committee and that continues to be a problem, particularly with documentation.

Regarding the objectives, Mr. Ballantyne and Mr. Curley have already referred to that remark in the report and I concur with them that departments should strive to more clearly state in the budget documents, the goals and directions of the department's programs.

The other procedural matter that is raised was the committee's difficulty in getting responses or documents from Ministers or their departments. Now, that may be seen as critical, Mr. Chairman, but it is just a fact of life. I participated in the review in December and up to and including today and that is a fact. We have had difficulty in getting responses and documents and I am afraid it just has to be said in the report, whether it is criticism or not.

The remarks of Mr. Curley about appointment of JPs -- I believe my chairman, Mr. Ballantyne, has already corrected that if you will in that, as opposed to some motion that was put and failed yesterday in the Assembly, this report does not take a position on JPs appointments. When it refers to the two departments involved, Local Government and Justice and Public Services, as Mr. Ballantyne has quoted from the report, it simply suggests that the policies of the legislation regarding appointments be rationalized in view of the recent -- it is not referred to, but certainly the recent court case. That is all the report says. I do not think the report is critical in that respect and does not take a position as opposed to a motion recently in the Assembly that did attempt to take a position.

#### Source Of Adjustment Funding

The reference in the document to the priorities process -- I have to say that I agree with the comment here that it was difficult for the committee to understand these two sets of priority documents. One was called "priorities" and the other was called "adjustments". They were roughly \$10 million each. I have to say, Mr. Chairman, that I had some difficulty distinguishing between the two documents. They both purported to spend \$10 million in special areas to address the most important concerns of the government. I must say to date I am not convinced, in relation to Mr. Patterson's comment, that the adjustments document, the \$10 million there, that we got that money from somewhere -- he says we have not, as a government, communicated well regarding where we got it. Well, that is precisely the point. I was told in committee meetings by one or more departments that there is an effort to find the lowest five per cent priority and one questions and no official confirmed, that that process works at all. I had referred earlier in this session to a statement in a priorities document that was tabled here, a glossy document that on one page stated that these priority funds were taken from existing programs and redirected. Well, I think it is important for me, representing members of the public, to find out where it was taken from and I have not been told the answer. I would like to know.

My conclusion is that it was simply money that was left over -- there was no plan, there were no cutbacks in any areas, it was just money that was left over. I appreciate that the Members of the Executive Council, finding \$10 million left over did not just spend it willy-nilly, they came up with a list of priorities as to where they are going to direct these funds. I just am not convinced yet that there was a serious sincere search for where we can cut back. That comment is made in the report and I think it has to be made.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: (Inaudible comment)

#### Importance Of Program Evaluation

MR. RICHARD: Well, we were rushed that evening, Mr. Curley, if you recall. Mr. Chairman, there are many things in this report but I guess the two that I would like to refer to before concluding my general comments are two that I have a special interest in and I indicated that in the meetings of the standing committee. One is program evaluation. I will simply read from the short paragraph on page 13 of the report. The committee's conclusion was "that the present approach to program evaluation is both ad hoc and fragmentary" and that conclusion "is supported by the fact that the present budget contains little restructuring or reallocation of resources which can be directly attributed to program evaluation". Mr. Patterson, for one, Mr. Chairman, has been quite candid in his support of the committee's thoughts about the importance of program evaluation. I think it is very important that we, as an Assembly, and the government, as a government, find out whether they are getting the best bang for their buck so to speak. If money is spent on programs year after year after year, and I am not imputing motives when I say that...

MR. MacQUARRIE: Construed as such would you say?

MR. BALLANTYNE: Construed as a motive, I like that.

MR. RICHARD: I think...

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible comment)

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, it is very important -- I do not like being interrupted. I think it is very, very important, Mr. Chairman, that if government is going to spend millions of dollars year after year after year on programs, government must do an evaluation as to whether it is an effective expenditure of money. There was indicated to us and we had a special presentation on it and I appreciated this pilot project that is taking place in the Department of Social Services in this very area. I think the committee endorses that and simply says that there should be more of it. That is a comment that is highlighted in this report and I think it is important that that was done.

#### Use Of Special Warrants

The other matter, sir, that I would like to refer to is the comment under the Financial Management Secretariat regarding special warrants. Our committee has spent some time speaking on this topic and have some very serious concerns about it. I certainly do. The Members of the Executive Council will not be surprised that when we deal with the supplementary appropriations next week, that the committee may well advance a specific motion regarding the use of special warrants.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think these things are all brought out in the report and many other matters were brought out and I think it is an excellent report and no matter what wording of what motion our committee chairman may propose this morning or today, I am satisfied from the comments so far by the Ministers who have spoken to the matter that they will take these matters in the report under consideration. That was simply the goal of the standing committee and I think it has already been accomplished. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Richard. General comments. What is the committee's wish? Mr. Nerysoo.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will say one thing first. The quote that Mr. Ballantyne raised with regard to Mr. Drury is something I agree with but I think that if you read the recommendation as it was laid out or the comments that he made, that he indicated that the function of a standing committee is to scrutinize, which is not to say for them that their role is to act as an executive arm. They are a watchdog body and can be much more effective if that is the approach rather than carrying on the functions of the Ministers.



That is not to undermine nor to criticize the responsibility of this standing committee on finance because really the standing committee on legislation itself has a certain responsibility as well on behalf of all Members of the Legislature. Whether the Members are on the Executive or not, they have still an accountability as well. Without question, clearly the responsibility is outlined -- particularly relating to finances and the manner in which the government was expending its appropriations and to make sure that that expenditure was within the budget and the allocations that had been outlined in the particular budget.

#### Standing Committees Have Unique Opportunity

Now, one unique thing about the role of the standing committee on finance, and really about the role of the standing committee on legislation which is unique in this country, is that you both receive either legislation and in the case of the standing committee on finance, the budget before it is tabled in the House. You have an opportunity to scrutinize the budget, to make your comments with regard to the budget, to make recommendations on development of an upcoming budget and that is not in existence anywhere else in this country.

You also have the unique opportunity, as well, to really have an effect on the capital expenditures of financial resources of government. Obviously, from the dollars that were reallocated or found within government, some of the concerns that each Member here raised were addressed. We agreed to expend money on those particular items.

As much as there was criticism about the functioning of the Executive Council, I really think that we have to improve the relationship between the committees in government and the committees of this Legislature. There was no recommendation as to how we could improve that relationship. I think that while there is criticism about having found \$20 million, there has been no support in the document for the priorities that were stated by the government for those issues on which those expenditures, that \$20 million, were made.

The other point that I believe is necessary to comment on was the idea that, for the priorities and the time on which those priorities were to be dealt with, a three year period -- would they receive the support of the standing committee on finance or did you see us going in or at least adjusting in future in other priority areas and what might those priorities be?

I guess I just raise those points with you because it is important that you -- if you are suggesting that we improve the process then what is it that we are going to attempt or how are we going to try to improve that? There is no question that we have some particular ideas. The other thing is that the reality is past budgets and the manner in which we handled past budgets may have been the basis on which we have been able to find those additional finances. There is no approval or support or any suggestion in the document that indicated that we had done well in ensuring that we had enough money to deal with those critical areas in government that come up during the particular year. I guess that is another issue because as much as we can try to budget for our expenditures for a particular year, there are always those items that require emergency response that do not necessarily have policies within government and we had to have the ability and we do have the ability to manoeuvre. But the suggestion is being made that maybe there is no need, and there should be that ability to manoeuvre. Maybe my interpretation of what is being said is wrong, but I think that ability, whether it is this government that is in place now or a future government -- they should always have that particular ability to manoeuvre wherever possible, not necessarily with policy but ensuring that that direction took place.

#### Role Of Executive Council In Priorities Process

I will go back now to the priorities process. I think what I did not hear and have not seen in this document is -- and it is a point I made earlier -- did the committee itself support the priorities, and the manner and amounts expended in those priorities and the commitments of this government over a period of three years to those priorities?

One other thing, the priorities exercise is one area in which the government shows that they have responded and are responding to the concerns of Members in this Legislature. It is the one time. I think that one has to understand that. All the other elements in the budget are either ongoing or we can make the adjustments of removing programs, we can explain why -- this is one time that we show that we have done the job that we were directed to do. So in that sense that clearly has to be taken into consideration.

The other thing, Mr. Chairman, that is really in my opinion the responsibility of government, particularly the Ministers. It is not to take away from the role of Members in this House and the committees of this House, but the one area in which we have accountability as well, are in the policy areas, the programs, developing political direction, things like the inner workings of staffing initiatives, the application of legislation. That really is the role of the Executive Council. That is not to suggest that the direction and the comments being made by the standing committee on finance are not appropriate. Certainly, without question, I think that some of the recommendations you make are or can form the basis on which we improve the running of this government. Again that is an area that I feel is clearly a responsibility that you have given to the Executive Council.

#### Capital Planning Process

I do want to make one point, particularly in the capital planning process. I believe that there is probably a better way of dealing with that particular item. The chairman and probably Members know that we are reviewing the possibility of an earlier session in the fall to deal with that question of capital and capital expenditures, because of the approvals that are necessary to release the appropriate tenders and to ensure that the approvals for expenditure were given earlier so that we could meet particular contract obligations that are necessary to be met. So I am just indicating that that particular item is in review now and that we are looking at some way in which we can improve that situation. But really the capital expenditure is a much different item, even though what I think we have to do is ensure that we address the implications of any capital project to the O and M budget. Without doubt that is necessary. I think the manner in which we approve the budget is something that has probably to be reviewed.

#### Role Of Committees To Shorten Deliberations In The House

I guess the other point I want to raise is that it is certainly my impression -- maybe I got the wrong impression -- that the intent of our standing committees of this Legislature and the process by which they hold hearings is to try to shorten the deliberations in this House. Without questioning the motives or the concerns that each individual might raise on a constituency by constituency basis -- of course without dealing with those general policy questions that may still be outstanding in the minds of the individuals -- that in itself probably has to be dealt with better and perhaps I have to get a better understanding of the reasons as to why we have standing committees. If that is the case, that they are to improve the process in the House, then maybe that has to be clarified to me. I was always under the impression that that was the intention and certainly one of the needs for standing committees.

There are a number of other specific points that I could raise of a general nature and perhaps deal with once the report itself has been recommended to Executive Council to deal with. As well, at some time perhaps the co-chairmen could indicate at what time or if there will be a process of ongoing discussions as to how we are going to deal with a response to the items in the documentation. I guess it is through the ongoing process that you will hold meetings in the next year or this fall as we begin the discussions all over again with regard to a development of the budget. That in itself we can deal with outside the House and the standing committee on finance might best deal with that issue as to how to proceed.

There are specific issues I would probably raise. I wanted to raise one particular issue with regard to leasing office space. I know I can deal with the issues under my responsibility but it says "receives the lowest cost for services" under leasing of office space. Maybe I might caution the idea to necessarily use the services as they relate to lowest costs because there may be situations where northern companies may end up losing an opportunity. If you are talking about lowest costs associated to those buildings that are in existence, maybe that is something very different but the ability for new companies to compete, new companies that are being formed in the North, in competition possibly with southern companies coming in and leasing at a lower cost, that itself might not be in the interest of the residents of the business community of the NWT, because there are some people in other communities in businesses where their cost may be a little higher, so I just wanted to raise that point with you.

I just want to say that without any question the report itself could have been extremely helpful, I might say, had it been made available to the Members earlier. There are a couple of things that we each probably could have responded to in regard to the questions and concerns in the document, as Ministers. But I must commend the two chairmen and the committee for the work that they have

done. Possibly we have had differences of opinion as to the nature and the responsibility of the committees and probably we will continue that, but I must commend them for the long and hard work that they have carried out over the past several months and really the commitment on the part of both chairmen to try to do a very in-depth review of the budget itself. In that sense I would just like to commend those people for the commitment they made to their committee. Thank you.

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

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you. Just one point of clarification. There was not just one committee but two separate and distinct committees. I chair the finance committee which deals with the budget and Mr. McCallum chairs a separate committee with totally different terms of reference, the public accounts committee. That process will all be happening in the spring. They are two separate and distinct committees.

#### Role Of Committee In Relation To Executive

If I could respond to some of the Government Leader's points. I think the point about the role and responsibility of the Executive and clarifying that role is an important one. I think we all have to understand what the role of the government is and what the role of the Legislature is. I, as the chairman of our committee, say our committee has no intention whatsoever to try to do the work of the Executive. We have charged the Ministers with that responsibility. As the Government Leader has said, we are in a unique situation here in the NWT as to the role of our committees but I guess one has to remember that in southern jurisdictions, there is party politics which in itself forces accountability on a government. There is also any number of checks and balances within the system in the South, which makes it very difficult for a cabinet to expend money or makes it impossible for a cabinet to spend money without proper authorization.

I want to emphasize that we recognize and respect and understand the role of the Executive Council. Our role is to provide a check. Our role is to provide suggestions to the Executive Council. Hopefully many of these suggestions will be perceived as positive and will help the Executive Council in carrying out their duties.

The Government Leader mentioned the \$20 million. We have said many times in this House that we appreciated the efforts of government in responding to the needs of the people of the NWT for that \$20 million. In fact we will support that \$20 million by passing this budget.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible comment)

MR. BALLANTYNE: Well, you asked to be here this morning. It is not that we are against this \$20 million, but we think that the process can improve. And the reason, to answer Mr. Richard's question, that we have the \$20 million is because the very good negotiations by Mr. Butters and the FMS with the federal government allowed us this flexibility this year, and we respect that. I think they were very good negotiations. But our concern is unless we develop a process for priorities, that is, a more streamlined process, two or three years down the line we might not be this well off and it will be very necessary then for this government and for us as a Legislative Assembly to start to prioritize. To say, if housing is a priority, that means that something else will not be one. We are very fortunate right now that because of this negotiation we do not have to do that. But what we are saying to the government is let's start planning for that day which is going to come, when we are going to have to make some very tough political decisions about where we spend our money.

The Government Leader also alluded to the necessity of a government to be able to respond to subjects of an urgent nature. We agree. Especially in the North, because of the difficulty in administering the NWT, that is a reality. Government has to have the flexibility to respond to that reality. What we are saying is in order to safeguard the public interest, that a more streamlined process can be put into place. For instance, now with the \$10 million capital reserve, there is a fund that will be able to respond to the capital needs of an emergency nature. It is a matter of developing procedures so that money can be accessed in a way that maximizes its benefit to the residents of the Territories. So, we agree with the Leader. There has to be flexibility in government.

The Minister referred to the capital planning process. I am glad to hear there is a review taking place of the capital planning process. I am glad to hear there is a review taking place of the priorities exercise. I understand that during this session, the Minister will be making some comments on the priorities exercise and I think that there are valid concerns. We will be very pleased to hear exactly how the government is going to respond to those particular concerns.

Committee Questions On New Policies And Programs

My last point is, I think the Minister's point about the actual role of this committee, as far as responsibility to shorten debate in the House, is only partially true. There are some realities that I think should be explained. The fact is that we have not asked many of the detailed questions that we asked in the standing committee on finance. We received adequate answers to many questions and they have not been asked. But this government has introduced many, many new programs. Probably more programs than other governments in the past. There are new policies being developed so in fact the workload of the government has increased and the workload of the committee has increased, to respond to those programs. I do not think that the questions we are asking are unimportant questions because in many cases we are dealing with new programs and new policies that neither the Assembly nor the public at large are totally familiar with. We are attempting to streamline the system to try to prevent asking needless questions that really have been responded to in finance committee meetings. I think we have achieved that most of the way but we obviously can improve. It is a process that can be improved and next year if we get our information a little bit earlier, we will have this particular document there at the beginning of the session. I think that with co-operation between the Executive and the committee, there is room for both sides to improve this process.

I will end there by saying that I appreciate the Government Leader's response. We will be working closely with Mr. Butters to try to streamline the process for next year. We think it has been a useful exercise and we hope that our work will be helpful to the Executive.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. Ms Cournoyea.

Future Reports Might Be Shorter

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I do not have a 15 minute speech. I was just wondering if possibly the future reports could be a little shorter. I know myself, I try very much to read and understand a lot of documents and sometimes I feel that maybe things can be said in fewer words. I know the interpreter corps would probably appreciate that too. Since this is a first document from the finance committee, I just would like to recommend that perhaps in future documents could be a bit shorter. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. Mr. Ballantyne.

MR. BALLANTYNE: If the Executive responds to these concerns, I can assure the Member that next years document will be shorter. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am neither a Member of the Executive Council nor the standing committee on finance...

MR. RICHARD: Pity, pity.

MR. MacQUARRIE: ...and so everyone will appreciate that my comments are objective and probably more valuable than other comments that have been made in this committee today.

---Laughter

AN HON. MEMBER: Unbiased.

MR. MacQUARRIE: I would like to start off by complimenting the standing committee on finance. The chairman, all its Members and the staff who have obviously...

MR. BALLANTYNE: I didn't pay him for that.

MR. MacQUARRIE: ...worked very hard to prepare what I feel is a valuable report. They have obviously taken their job seriously and I think done it well.

Attitude Of Executive Council

I want to talk a little bit about the matter of attitudes. Words are one thing and I am sure if someone were to read a record of the debate that is taking place here today, were to read it tomorrow, they might receive one impression. But I say that attitudes are betrayed in things that go beyond words. They are betrayed in looks, off-hand comments, reading newspapers when business is going on, being absent from the House when business is going on. They are betrayed in contemptuous comments of one kind or another. For example, "I don't have a 15 minute speech" was just said after the chairman of the finance committee took the time to make what I thought were some very good points...

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Shame, shame!

MR. MacQUARRIE: ...points that I was willing to listen to during that time. In sizing up all of the indicators of attitude and these are important indicators, I feel that there is an attitude on the Executive Council that is not acceptable to me. Certainly from a number of Members on the Executive Council with respect to the role of the finance committee.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Move a motion.

MR. MacQUARRIE: I believe that there are some who have more respect for the work of the committee than others but I feel that the general attitude is not acceptable. And I just received a note from an Executive Council Member which would reinforce what I say, but...

---Laughter

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't give it to Arnie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: I will not betray the confidence where it came from or what it says but I can tell you it further shows me the kind of attitude that prevails. And it is not acceptable.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Well, move a motion...

MR. MacQUARRIE: The fact is that just as this House gets its authority from the people, so the Executive Council gets its authority from this House. And I fear that there are some Executive Council Members who feel that the independent authority they have -- and they do have some independent authority -- somehow derives from some other source than this House, and that is not a good attitude. It is important for Executive Council Members always to recall what is the source of that authority. It is in this House and they are answerable to the House.

Primary Intent For Establishment Of Committees

The committees are established not as the Government Leader suggested, but I will admit he did not make it as a statement, in fact he said that he would like to learn more about why the committees are established. But they are certainly not established with the primary intent of trying to shorten the business of the House. They are established with the primary intent of ensuring that the House has an adequate chance to review government practices, initiatives of one kind or another, legislation and so on. If the committees can be assured that the government is effectively doing its job and the House generally has confidence in the committees, then it probably will in the intermediate term have the effect of shortening the business in this House and that would be desirable. But that is not the primary intent at all.

Mr. Patterson -- who incidentally, I feel is one of those who is more open to the House having input into Executive work and so this is not intended as a criticism of him in that respect -- but he did stress at one point in his remarks that it is people who are on the Executive Council and that we ought to remember that. In fact I do remember that and that is why I say the role of the committees is so important. People on the Executive Council have the control of expenditures that run into the hundreds of millions of dollars and the control of programs and services that affect the people of the NWT. It certainly is the right of the House to have opportunities to ensure that the authority that Executive Council has been given to do that, is handled properly. If there is

at this time, in this report of the standing committee on finance, some preoccupation with internal process, I think it is warranted because I believe that in the past in this Legislature certain practices and procedures have developed in an informal or ad hoc kind of way. They are not necessarily the best and the committee at this time has apparently decided that it is time to have a good look at internal processes. I say that is a legitimate thing for the committee to do because it is obvious that those kinds of processes are established to try to ensure, even though it is individual people on the Executive Council, that the decisions they are making will be made in such a way that it is ensured the decisions are thoughtful and that they are just. And so if it comes to the attention of the committee that there may be some procedures which do not adequately ensure that, then I commend the committee for drawing attention to these and for strongly urging that some changes be made.

#### Difficulties In Follow-Up To Requests For Information

There are a few points in the report on which I would like to touch. The first is on page five, about requests for information. I will read what the committee says. "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." Now I would say that right from the very start that should be one way in which the Executive Council is co-operative in the utmost. That does not mean to say, from my point of view and I am trying to be objective, that every item that the standing committee on finance asks for is of equal importance with every other item. It could be that there are some individual requests that are not as important as others. I will ask the chairman of the standing committee to comment on that in a minute but I do notice in Appendix B that as late as February 6th, when our session started, there were "outstanding information items by departments" that had not at that time been delivered to the standing committee, although it had met back in, I believe, November, to discuss the budget. So, I would like to know, from the chairman of the standing committee on finance, circumstances surrounding this. Have these documents appeared yet? Are they information items that were requested by the whole finance committee or were some of them perhaps just individual requests for information? Have all of them been received to date? If the standing committee on finance considered that some of them were critical to an effective review of the budget, and they have not been received to date, then that is a serious matter as far as I am concerned. So I would like to ask the chairman of the standing committee on finance to comment on that.

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

#### Timing Of Completion Of Report

MR. BALLANTYNE: At this point in time all the information that we requested has been received. Mr. Patterson mentioned that he thought this report had been prepared for quite a while, but the fact is that it was only printed the day before I moved it in the House and we could not complete it until a lot of this information came in. That gave us some difficulty. I will say, Mr. Butters has been extremely co-operative. The process we use is that any of the requests by the committee went through me to Mr. Butters. I can only ask that for next year it will just make our work that much easier if we do get the information early enough and then we will present this report at the beginning of the budget debate where it most appropriately should be.

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

MR. MacQUARRIE: Do I understand then, Mr. Chairman, that all of the outstanding items as of February 6th are now received?

MR. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Okay, thank you.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Apology!

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Apology!

MR. MacQUARRIE: I merely asked a question. That is precisely -- there are Members, two Executive -- this is for the record -- there are two Executive Members across the floor, Mr. Nerysoo and Mr. Curley, asking for an apology when I had merely asked a question earlier and certainly no apology is in order.

If I could move to page 10. With respect to priorities -- I should have said that the comments of the two Ministers earlier were part of the kind of attitude that I was referring to earlier.

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

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Curley, you have a point of order.

Point Of Privilege, Ruled Out Of Order

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: In my view the Member imputed that the Executive were not willing to provide information. I would just like to read a letter I sent to the House Leader of our government which deals with the very subject which the Member is indicating, that some of us were not willing to provide...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Curley, that is not a point of order. Mr. MacQuarrie.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Point of privilege.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Curley, your point of privilege.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: ...mainly because I strongly disagree with the honourable Member. With all respect to the ability that he has to be a helpful individual with all his expertise in public affairs, I do not think that he is helping the process of good government. I would like to read, because I do disagree with the Member accusing me of not providing information...

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

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: This is a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Do I have the floor, Mr. Chairman? If the honourable Member has a point of privilege in order, I would be pleased to hear it but otherwise I thought that I had the floor, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Curley, what is your point of order?

AN HON. MEMBER: Privilege.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Privilege, I am sorry.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was saying to you that the Member is suggesting that I am one of the ones who were not willing to provide information to the House and I would just like to respond to that by way of reading a very short letter that I did send to our House Leader in dealing with the matter.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Point of order.

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

MR. MacQUARRIE: Well, I cannot believe that by asking a question I could be accused of "imputing" something, which is an active verb which is suggesting that I am laying something on somebody. I merely asked the question, Mr. Chairman. If the honourable Member, because of thoughts that are in his own mind feels that that is an imputation, I surely can hardly be responsible for that, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Curley, you do not have a point of privilege. Mr. MacQuarrie does have the floor. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you. I heard the honourable Mr. Curley say that I was never wrong and I do not pretend that I am never wrong but apparently, through your sustaining the judgment, Mr. Chairman, I was not wrong this time. With respect to priorities, I would like to say that a statement Mr. Patterson made earlier, I certainly agree with, so I am not suggesting that the Executive Council should knuckle under immediately every time the standing committee on finance makes some assertion. It is the job of the standing committee on finance to win the support of

this House for the positions it takes and I accept that. But at any rate, Mr. Patterson said that surely the government ought to have the right, recognizing certain needs, to be able to act quickly to take initiatives and to say that spending ought to take place in a certain area. I accept that and he did qualify it by saying that he recognized there should be no disbursements of funds or expenditures until policies were in place governing it. I do not have a legalistic approach to life and I really approve that the government should do that but at some point, with respect to priorities, there does seem to be some confusion about the way priorities are established now and the way they are handled. If not in the government's minds at least in the minds of some other Members.

#### Discussion And Affirmation Of Priorities By The House

In Houses where there is party politics, it is more easily perhaps and more clearly handled because a party is elected with a particular mandated program...

MR. RICHARD: Hear, hear!

MR. MacQUARRIE: ...and they have the authority, in a sense, to carry out that program, to move toward it. For Mr. Richard's benefit I would like to say that I did not intend it to support party politics because there are other very serious concerns I have about party politics. At any rate, with respect to this House, that is not the case. We are all elected as individuals and then priorities are established by what is now not an absolutely clear process; the role of the House and the role of the government and that sort of thing. I recognize that the government attempts to take account of motions that were passed in this House in previous times or the tenor of discussions that take place and develop priorities from that. Could I ask the Government Leader whether, in the future, a priorities planning process will be more regularized and whether as part of that it could be that the government having in its own mind determined what the major priority should be for a coming year, would deliberately come to this House for a full and frank discussion of those priorities? Not merely tabling the paper but the government itself initiating a discussion on the priorities which it intends for the coming year so that those priorities, once having been discussed thoroughly by the whole House then could have the affirmation of the House if the House is inclined.

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

#### Objections To Member's Remarks

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I did not intend to speak. However, the remarks by the honourable Member for Yellowknife Centre have forced me into the position of speaking because I believe the type of acrimonious remarks made, first of all, take away from the business in hand and that is addressing the report of the standing committee on finance. I do not think they were necessary. The honourable Member, in his opening remarks, said that because he was not on the Executive and not on the finance committee, he had hoped that his remarks would be a little bit more objective. He then proceeded to taint or tar the Executive Council inasmuch as he seems to suggest that we are less than responsible toward, or our attitudes are less than responsible toward that of the standing committee on finance. I would offer two things.

First of all, toward that, and I did not particularly want to say this but I will, inasmuch as when I look around this room, one thing I can say, at least I see eight Members of the Executive Council here. I cannot say the same thing for seeing full membership from the standing committee on finance.

Secondly, if the honourable Member was aware of the hours that those on the Executive have spent on this budget, that we have spent preparing ourselves for the standing committee on finance, the large amount of time that our officials and ourselves have spent in preparing responses to the standing committee on finance, the hundreds of hours that officials spent putting together briefing books for responses to the standing committee on finance, then his remarks are completely out of order. He is just not aware of the process it has gone through and the time that we have spent.

I would also suggest to him that I take personal objection to his remarks, because I spend many, many days and months away from my family, living in a city that I do not particularly want to live in, to do this job. I spent 11 weeks in 1984 at home, but I feel it is my responsibility to be here, to do the job. When I hear comments like that I say to myself, well maybe it is not worth



it, maybe this body, this Legislature, maybe this government is not worth spending all the time over. When we try to do a job and you hear remarks like that -- now perhaps maybe those remarks were not pointed in my direction...

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: He did not name names.

HON. GORDON WRAY: ...but they were certainly pointed at the Executive Council which I am a part of. I really object to those kinds of statements being made. If the Member has some specific problems with some Executive Council Members about them not paying attention and not doing their job then let's hear them but do not taint the whole Executive Council with his rationalization and what he thinks of the problems. He goes on to say he feels there are a number of ways which you can do it -- by reading newspapers. Well, if you walk around this table I do not think that newspapers are the sole possession of the Executive Council Members, I do not think the lack of attention is the sole possession of the Executive Council Members. If the Member wants to be objective then let him address the whole Assembly. Let's not take a few facts and point them toward the Executive Council. That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Wray. Mr. Curley, to the report.

#### MLAs Can Resolve Issue By Way Of Motion

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make a supplement to what I indicated earlier. I have never gone against your speeches in the past. I was supposed to read this document earlier and I was supposed to respond to the finance committee. At the end of my speech I asked if I have answered the things that were asked for and if you wanted to ask more questions that I was available. Mr. MacQuarrie, if you are just going to judge what we do perhaps you could become a lawyer for the Government of the NWT because I think you would be very good at being a lawyer. I just wanted to tell him, if I am not doing my job well and if the MLAs are not happy with me, I should not be here. There could be a motion put forward that they are not satisfied with what I am doing. While we were working on the budget I have not heard you saying that this is not a very good program and ask to remove it. If I should look and say that I do not like it, I am pretty sure that he will go against what I have to say. I have been waiting for the MLAs to say that they are not happy with something and have it resolved. I have not seen this yet. These Ministers are not the people that set up the programs, they are set up by the departments. Now we have started working on fixing these.

About six months ago the staff were hard to convince to do things the other way. It seems like the government employees, the public and others, seem to be happier now with the Ministers' responsibilities. As Ministers we are trying to work for the whole NWT. We are trying to see if people are unhappy with some programs or if there will be any complaints. We are just waiting for complaints and resolutions to the problems. It seems like we are just being blamed or in court and judged. I do not want Bob MacQuarrie to say that I am wrong. I think he should say that he does not agree with what you are saying. I am tired of being told that I am doing the wrong thing. It seems that you are not happy with the Executive Council. Maybe you should make a motion that you are unhappy, that would be better and then maybe you could become the Executive Council.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Minister, general comments.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe that there was a question asked. I just want to indicate that in tabling the statement on priorities, as I did in the November session, it was, I believe, an attempt on our part to get the opinions of the Members of the Legislature with regard to the general priorities that we wanted to establish. Of course there were specific items that were included within that statement but clearly, in allowing for the tabling of that particular statement to occur in the House, it gave Members here an opportunity to see what direction the government would be taking and what general priority areas we had established for ourselves. Now in doing so, it allowed for individual Members to make suggestions as to how we can deal with particular items specifically.

In the case of housing, we did a number of things: put more money into the home-ownership program, we added additional money for public housing programs, and we suggested that we should get a supplemental financing program. As to the details of that and how we would provide that, I indicated that that was now the responsibility of the appropriate Minister. Really it gave people an opportunity, in my opinion, to give an opinion as to whether that is really the priority that

you wish to go with. That formed the basis, for any additional money that we would find within government. I made it quite clear in my statement, the amount of money that was associated with the five priority areas. Again there was no indication on our part what amounts at that time were being specified, until Mr. Wray himself identified, I believe, a commitment on the part of government to expend a certain amount on public housing, which we really had to do at that particular time because of a need to have a response early in December.

The other point that I made clear at that time was that this priority exercise was for a three year period. So for any additional suggestions that were being made or any of the items that were being dealt with, the general items of priority, that would allow for Members of this House to recommend how we might respond to a particular item, priority area, and what program if they thought of one, that this government could look at and review.

So it was not, at that time, a statement that closed the door. We had ideas. I would not indicate to the Members that we did not have ideas as to what we would do because that was part of the discussion that occurred over the past five months, when we were starting to deal with the budget. A point was raised earlier that the Members did not see where we made the cuts. I will tell you that during the exercise leading up to the actual presentation to the standing committee, there were significant cuts that took place, there were numerous requests that were made. As well, addressing the \$10 million, what we did say is that we took it right out of the budget itself. We removed it completely. We said that \$10 million is removed from any moneys that we had in addition and that \$10 million itself would be identified with those priority areas that we announce. So in that sense in my opinion, that is probably the best way to deal with it, giving advance notice as to the priorities and getting some input from Members. We are not closed to ideas from the Members of this House.

What I did not see in the document is a point I raised. While individuals have stated that they do agree with the priorities, it was not stated in the document that we support these priorities and the kinds of programs that were identified. I know I heard the honourable chairman of the standing committee on finance say that he himself supported it but the committee itself had not indicated it in the document. I understand your position. I believe that that is a reply to the honourable Member.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Nerysoo. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MACQUARRIE: Thank you. I would like to first of all say a response to Mr. Wray and to Mr. Curley. I did not at any time say or imply anything about the competence of the Ministers. In fact, for the record, I will say that in a general way I believe that the Ministers are hard-working and effective. That was not my concern at all. I did say that I felt there was a less than desirable attitude toward a standing committee and the important work that a standing committee had done. I stand by that and I would simply ask the Executive Members to recognize the important role that it is playing, to respect it and to co-operate as much as possible.

With respect to Mr. Nerysoo's answer then, I would ask one further thing. I recognize the opportunities we have right now for having some impact on priorities. But what I was getting at more was where, in southern jurisdictions, there are party politics, you have this idea of a government mandated specifically to carry out a certain program. We do not have that here because we are all elected as individuals.

MR. RICHARD: Pity.

#### A More Formal Process For Consideration Of Priorities

MR. MACQUARRIE: So what I am asking then is, could the priorities process be formalized a little more? Like each year now we have a sort of formal process for budget and budget review and it is anticipated that each year this is how things will be handled. What I am asking is, is that not also possible with a more formalized priorities process, where it is anticipated that each year, to reaffirm or to introduce new priorities is part of the whole schedule? That comes into this House and Members have their full chance to talk on it, to disagree or to reaffirm. Of course the Executive's position will be much stronger if that is the case.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Nerysoo.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Mr. Chairman, the idea of the priorities exercise and I see my predecessor Mr. Braden leaving, but he really developed the idea that there was a need to ensure that there were priorities in the budget to deal with those issues that this Assembly thought were important to well-being and direction that the House, generally, approved of. Now, I just want to say that people here now know that there is this exercise in addition to the usual budget process. The review of the budget itself is one thing. Now, there is an additional need to discuss what the priorities of the Legislative Assembly are, what the priorities of the standing committee on finance are and really what Members feel are priorities that ought to be dealt with within their own particular constituencies.

I am not so sure if it is not formalized in that that is now part of the process. In making the announcement that I did in November, I made it very clear that there is this additional commitment that this Legislature ought to make. I think that next year and the following year we will be reviewing the idea of additional priority expenditures on behalf of this government. While the program, itself, is established as a three year program with those five items, it may be that the Executive Council and the standing committee on finance, but the Executive Council in particular, recommend additional resources to the priorities exercise. That is why I have indicated to you that it is a three year process, so in that sense every year we are coming back to say well, we have seen these issues, here, which are successful but we think these other items are going to require additional moneys and we have come back to the Legislature for approval of those particular items. The third year, we may look at additional resources for maybe another two year period. So you are increasing what we feel are commitments on behalf of Members of the Legislature in the priorities that they have given as opposed to suggesting that it is the bureaucracy that is making those suggestions.

But we have also got to respond, I believe, to those issues that are raised by agencies outside of this Legislature. We have to respond to the municipal councils, we have to respond to the regional councils. So we are working trying to bring together all those particular directions that have been given to us. And that is why a few days ago, we raised the point that we need some direction -- I look at this document, while it is very well done, there is no direction on, yes, we will proceed with this particular priority process and the priorities as established. Now, I think that maybe that is something that we are going to have to formalize in the sense of laying some ground rules down on the process. But I am not so sure if we should formalize it so much that it is a certain period, as opposed to all year and listening to everything that each Member has to say during the year. But you know in budget preparation particularly between the months of August and November, that we will be coming and dealing with what might be considered to be the priorities that we would table as a priority statement in the fall session. Further comments can be made by Members of the Legislature so that what we are doing and the kinds of programs that we might want to establish, are the kinds of programs that are going to address that particular priority, and it has in my opinion, addressed the general priority.

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

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you. I am going to make a motion but what I want to do is I want to thank Mr. Curley and the Executive. I think this opportunity was very useful for all of us to discuss the report. In the same way we asked the Ministers to account and explain decisions that they make or the departments make. I think it is only right that we should be asked to explain and defend positions we take. So I found this a very useful exercise and I also understand what Mr. Wray said. I know the Ministers spend many, many hours. I know our committee Members also have worked very hard. Generally, we, as a committee, have appreciated the co-operation given to us by the Executive. We have outlined ways of improving and streamlining. I think everybody sees areas where improvements could be made and we really hope that the observations we have made and the recommendations that we have made will be taken seriously by the Executive.

Motion That SCOF Report On 1985-86 Main Estimates Be Adopted And Executive Council Consider Recommendations, Carried

On that note I would like to move a motion. I move that the report of the standing committee on finance be adopted and that the recommendations and principles contained in the report be considered by the Executive Council.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Ballantyne, your motion is in order. To the motion. Question is being called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried. Thank you.

---Carried

This concludes the discussion on the standing committee on finance. We will now go on to the Department of Local Government.

Bill 7-85(1), Appropriation Act, 1985-86

Department Of Local Government

Is it agreed that the Minister brings in his witnesses?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): For the record, would the Minister introduce his witnesses?

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: It is Mr. Moore to my right and Mr. Kronstal to my left. Things don't change very much. The other thing is, it has been weeks it seems since I prepared for this time and if I do not have all the answers it is because it has been so long.

Directorate, Total O And M, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Minister. We are on the main estimates, details of Local Government. We are on directorate right now. Directorate. Total O and M, \$31,568,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Community Planning And Development, Total O And M

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Community planning and development. Total O and M, \$1,606,000. Mr. Ballantyne.

MR. BALLANTYNE: There is a question here that we discussed at some length in the standing committee on finance which is in fact the decentralization of this department. As I understand it now, each region now has a full complement of community planning staff with planner, engineers and technicians. This question I have asked of a number of the departments. The Department of Local Government has decentralized more and at a more rapid pace than other departments. Talking to other departments, that has caused some problems because you do not have a full complement in the regions but those people still have to interface with departments which are much more centralized. How do you see that problem being alleviated, Mr. Minister?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Minister. Mr. Moore.

Planning Teams In Communities

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I think the difficulty that is being referred to is really only with one department. It is true that a lot of the work of this division, the community planners and the municipal engineers who are in the regions to serve the communities, particularly the hamlets who, for the most part, do not have the capability to plan or have no planners or engineers of their own, those people in our regions in community planning and development do have to work very closely with the Department of Public Works and Highways. For the most part, the infrastructure which is being put into place in those communities is being built for us by the Department of Public Works.

However, in at least two of the regions the Department of Public Works now is quite well decentralized and certainly in the Baffin Region the two have come into line, I think effectively. Public Works now has architects and project engineers in their own department in the Baffin Region and there the two departments have come into line. I cannot entirely deny that we may have got out of step with Public Works but I am quite sure that basically we were correct from the point of view of the communities, to put these people into the regions where they could give direct assistance to communities who need that help with planning and municipal engineering.

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

MR. BALLANTYNE: If I could just follow up a little bit on that. I see that when departments decentralize that we run into a situation where departmental employees and administrators have a dual reporting relationship with the department and with the regional director. Does the Minister see, if this trend continues, the possibility of ministerial government weakening because of that dual reporting relationship?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Minister.

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I do see a problem that exists -- a situation that exists more than, I suppose, a great problem. Because some of the regions are so far removed from Yellowknife I think it is necessary for proper administration, I can see the need for regional administration and for someone to oversee the whole administration. This is the function of the regional directors of the various departments, Local Government, DPW, where there is some accountability. They account somewhat to the Minister in the headquarters in terms of the day to day co-ordination, and there is need for the regional director to have that role. In this system of organization it does weaken the ministerial system of government. However, for the regions that are very remote from Yellowknife, I honestly do not know what the alternative to that would be.

If this present system was taken away then you would have all Local Government staff, as an example, reporting and being accountable to the Minister and the Minister simply is not aware of the goings on in the regions and there may be a lot of unco-ordinated efforts by Local Government and other departments that work with them. I see it as a situation that is not the best but I honestly do not know what the answer is. I would say that for the future, I guess, until division occurs this system in place is probably the best system. I would say in a place like Fort Smith, where the regional centre is much closer to headquarters it may be possible to change things and have Local Government staff more accountable to the Ministers. It is something that I guess our government in the future, or when division occurs, we will have to deal with. So I do see that it is not a completely satisfactory situation, but I do not have the answer.

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

MR. BALLANTYNE: I thank the Minister for his comments. I know it is of some concern to me, but it is a very difficult area and there are no easy solutions to it. But I am glad to hear that the Minister is looking at it and seeing if there are ways to improve the situation.

I have another problem on the development of residential land through the NWT. I understand now in discussions we have had with Mr. Wray and with yourself, that that co-operation and co-ordination between the Housing Corporation and Local Government has improved considerably. And we have enough land, I understand, available in communities to allow this coming years building program of the Housing Corporation. Is there the possibility in future that the allocation of housing really will be dependent on what communities have easy accessible land? It is something we should have got into a little bit more with Mr. Wray but I think that will be a prime consideration, that some communities have easily available land so the obvious decision would be to put housing there even though the need might not be greatest there. Is there a problem with that? Or do you have any solutions to a possible problem?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Moore.

Program Well-Integrated With Housing Corporation

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that alternative is acceptable, that the Housing Corporation would be forced to build houses in places where the need was not so great but because there was land there. I think that would be unacceptable to the government and certainly this department would not want it to be that way. I think with the program we have in these main estimates and the priority and special money which was put into this department by the Executive Council for the purpose of residential land development and in the main estimates you will see there is quite an enhancement of our normal budget. That amount of money, \$2.8 million, will give us a very considerable program of residential development for future years.

That program, I think I can say now, has been well-integrated with the Housing Corporation. That degree of co-operation which I am the first to admit was lacking previously, which we have had to do something about because of the high priority placed by this House on the building program, for the Housing Corporation, I believe that co-operation now is in place. I think that we are in a

situation where the Housing Corporation for the next few years will not have to decide to put houses only in places where there is land. The land will be prepared where the Housing Corporation has to put the houses.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Moore. Community planning and development. Total O and M. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. T'SELEIE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask what is the process in planning a community? That is my first question. It seems to me to be a less expensive system to use if you go into a community, have one major meeting to develop a plan for maybe a couple or three years and get agreement on it, than to, for instance, come back every year and change it. That approach seems to me to make a lot of sense in some communities. I wanted some comments on that.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Minister.

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, the planning that goes on in communities actually is quite an exhaustive type of project. Just to give Members an idea, we recently have completed a community plan for Tuktoyaktuk and this is a report of it. It is quite an involved process and usually involves a great number of meetings between the communities and my department. It is not a quick or one meeting type of process. I am advised by my officials that many, many meetings occur and generally the plans are for a 20 year period. I hope that this satisfies the Member.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. T'SELEIE: I have seen the book as well. I am just wondering about some of the communities in my constituency. I have not seen any community plans like that and I wonder if the department has them.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Minister.

#### Community Planning In Sahtu

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I will attempt to get more precise detail as to the state of community plans in Mr. T'Seleie's constituency. I am aware that there is community planning going on in Norman Wells and it is just in a very late, almost complete stage. I will find out for the Member what the status of the communities in his constituency is. I am aware that community planning is not restricted to just larger communities. In my own constituency, little Jean Marie River of 75 people has a community plan and this was a project that entailed a couple of summers and eventually the report was made. And in that case the report was made in Slavey and in English so I am aware of the work that the department is doing in some of the communities in the North. I will review the state and status of planning in Mr. T'Seleie's constituency.

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

MR. T'SELEIE: Mr. Chairman, I am not clear on my question but in this division it identifies sanitation facilities as one of the duties under this division. I was wondering, in those communities that are mostly taken care of by the honeybucket system, whether or not the government increases the amount to the contractors that take care of the sewage and the garbage each year, whether or not there is a set rate of increase at the beginning of each new fiscal year.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Minister.

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, with respect to things as the Member mentioned, sanitation, honeybuckets, things of that sort, generally this work is done by contract. Public tenders are put out in the communities and where the community government is a hamlet, or anything more than that, then the communities are responsible for that. They are given moneys from our department and they use the money. They issue the tender and eventually give the contracts for that work.

In smaller communities where there are band councils or settlement councils, it is still the responsibility of my department but the department usually co-operates with and works through those small councils. Usually a tender is issued and contracts are considered and the contract given to the lowest bidder. So, the work done is on a contract basis.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Minister. Community planning and development. Total 0 and M. Mr. Paniloo.

MR. PANILOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question will be regarding community planning and maintenance. In some of the communities, the hamlet employees are not very well-supported or given proper housing. My question would be about the hamlet employees. I think the Local Government is responsible for the hamlets, if I am correct. Most of the hamlet employees reside in housing association or Housing Corporation public housing. They get deductions from their pay cheques which is quite a big amount.

I do not think the hamlet councils will cease or stop to become councils. I think they are just going to keep on having hamlet councils in the communities. I think they will always be in existence. So what I wanted to know was could Local Government be responsible for the hamlet housing in the communities? Or could they be given a housing subsidy each month? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Minister.

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, the matter of housing for hamlet employees is the responsibility of the hamlets. Generally when a community becomes a hamlet, the government transfers at least two houses over to the hamlet council for its employees. As the Member indicated, some of the employees live in public or housing association houses obviously because there are not enough hamlet houses for its staff. All I can say is that the matter of staff housing is the responsibility of the hamlets and the payment to the employees and benefits is a responsibility of the hamlets. The funding that we provide to hamlets takes into consideration those benefits. Inasmuch as a hamlet is responsible for its employees in its housing and does give benefits such as housing subsidies, it is all the responsibility of the hamlets.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Paniloo.

MR. PANILOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be asking another question. I do not understand what he is talking about. It is something to do with community planning. In the constituency I represent, two of the communities have requested a road or a trail. One of the communities is Broughton Island. They wanted a road to their water lake. I mentioned this before and I have not received an answer to date. I would like to receive an answer. I am asking to get a reply today.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Paniloo. Mr. Minister.

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I do not have the information readily available and I will provide the Member with a reply in the next day or two.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Paniloo.

MR. PANILOO: (Translation) I do not have any more questions so I am thanking the Minister for replying to my concerns. Thank you.

Community Planning And Development, Total 0 And M, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Paniloo. Community planning and development, total 0 and M, \$1,606,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Land, Total 0 And M, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Land, total 0 and M, \$540,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Progress being called. I will recognize the clock and rise and report progress. I would like to thank the Minister and the witnesses. See you tomorrow, same time, same place.

MR. SPEAKER: **Order**, please. Mr. Gargan.

ITEM 16: REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE ON REVIEW OF 1985-86 MAIN ESTIMATES; BILL 7-85(1), APPROPRIATION ACT, 1985-86

MR. GARGAN: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been considering the report of the standing committee on finance of the 1985-86 main estimates and wish to report this matter concluded with one motion being adopted. Mr. Speaker, your committee has also been considering Bill 7-85(1) and wishes to report progress and that Bill 3-85(1), Bill 9-85(1) and Bill 10-85(1) are recommended for further consideration in committee of the whole.

Motion To Accept Report Of Committee Of The Whole, Carried

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

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Members have heard the report of the chairman of the committee of the whole. Are you agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Carried

Changes In Sitting Hours

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Now with regard to trying to work in some extra hours to get our work completed, I wish to inform the House that to assist with dealing with the business, the House will sit tomorrow, Saturday, March 23rd, 1985, from 1:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Starting Monday, the House will sit daily from 1:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. There will also be no breaks at 2:30 p.m. or 4:00 p.m. We are losing well over an hour a day with these breaks and we are losing up to an hour and a half. Members will be able to leave the chamber to have coffee which will be available continuously during sitting hours and I will also be pleased to provide a light snack starting at 3:00 p.m. so that Members can have some sustenance, and to make sure everyone has a snack the snacks will be individually wrapped with your name on the package.

---Laughter

AN HON. MEMBER: Can some of us get double portions?

MR. SPEAKER: A list will be passed around so that each Member can choose his or her preference. I am sure that this arrangement will assist all Members and will give us time, so that we do not have to come back after supper. I think that the supper break and then coming back does not necessarily give us that much added time. I think this will give us as much time and we will be out at 7:00 p.m. Are we agreed to try that program for Monday?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any announcements from the floor? Mr. Clerk, announcements and orders of the day please. Mr. Wray, I am sorry.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that there are some of us who need more sustenance than others, so I would hope we would be able to avail ourselves of that privilege.

---Laughter



MR. SPEAKER: Yes, we will make certain that you have sufficient. Mr. Clerk, announcements and orders of the day.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Announcements, Mr. Speaker. Members of the special committee on housing are asked to remain in the chamber after adjournment today for a photo session. There will be a meeting of the special committee on housing this afternoon at 2:00 p.m. in the caucus room.

ITEM 17: ORDERS OF THE DAY

Orders of the day for Saturday, March 23rd, 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: 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. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. This House stands adjourned until Saturday, March the 23rd, at 1:00 p.m.

---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