



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

DEBATES

2nd Session

9th Assembly



Official Report

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1980

Pages 101 to 149

Speaker: The Honourable Robert H. MacQuarrie, M.L.A.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

SPEAKER

The Honourable Robert H. MacQuarrie, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 2895
Yellowknife, N.W.T., X0E 1H0
(Yellowknife Centre)

The Honourable George Braden, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 583
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0
(Yellowknife North)
(Minister of Economic Development
and Tourism)

The Honourable Thomas H. Butters, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1069
Inuvik, N.W.T.
X0E 0T0
(Inuvik)
(Minister of Education and of Justice
and Public Services)

The Honourable Arnold J. McCallum, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 454
Fort Smith, N.W.T.
X0E 0P0
(Slave River)
(Minister of Social Services
and of Health)

The Honourable Richard W. Nerysoo, M.L.A.
General Delivery
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0
(Mackenzie Delta)
(Minister of Renewable Resources)

The Honourable James J. Wah-Shee, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 471
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0
(Rae-Lac la Martre)
(Minister of Local Government)

Mr. Kane E. Tologanak, M.L.A.
Coppermine, N.W.T.
X0E 0E0
(Central Arctic)
(Deputy Speaker)

Mr. Dennis G. Patterson, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 262
Frobisher Bay, N.W.T.
X0A 0H0
(Frobisher Bay)
(Deputy Chairman of Committees)

Mr. Tagak E.C. Curley, M.L.A.
Rankin Inlet, N.W.T.
X0C 0G0
(Keewatin South)

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

Mr. Moses Appaqaq, M.L.A.
General Delivery
Sanikiluaq, N.W.T.
X0A 0W0
(Hudson Bay)

Mr. Mark Evaluarjuk, M.L.A.
Igloodlik, N.W.T.
X0A 0L0
(Foxe Basin)

Mr. Robert Sayine, M.L.A.
General Delivery
Fort Resolution, N.W.T.
X0E 0M0
(Great Slave East)

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

Mr. Peter C. Fraser, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 23
Norman Wells, N.W.T.
X0E 0V0
(Mackenzie Great Bear)

Mr. Nick G. Sibbeston, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 560
Fort Simpson, N.W.T.
X0E 0N0
(Mackenzie Liard)

Mr. James Arreak, M.L.A.
Clyde River, N.W.T.
X0A 0E0
(Baffin Central)

Mr. Bruce McLaughlin, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 555
Pine Point, N.W.T.
X0E 0W0
(Pine Point)

Mrs. Lynda M. Sorensen, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 2348
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0
(Yellowknife South)

Ms. Nellie J. Cournoyea, M.L.A.
Box 1184
Inuvik, N.W.T.
X0E 0T0
(Western Arctic)

Mr. William Noah, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 125
Baker Lake, N.W.T.
X0C 0A0
(Keewatin North)

Mr. Donald M. Stewart, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1877
Hay River, N.W.T.
X0E 0R0
(Hay River)

OFFICERS

Clerk
Mr. W.H. Remnant
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0

Clerk Assistant
Mr. P.F. de Vos
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0

Sergeant-at-Arms
Major D.A. Sproule, C.D. (SL)
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0

Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms
Captain H.L. Mayne, C.D. (Ret'd)
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0

LEGAL ADVISOR

Mr. S.K. Lal
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

5 February 1980

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	101
Notices of Motion	101
Motions	102
Second Reading of Bills	
- Bill 18-80(1) Loan Authorization Amendment Ordinance No. 1, 1979-80	104
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Motion 1-80(1) Museum of the N.W.T.	105
- Bill 1-80(1) Appropriation Ordinance, 1980-81	125
Report of the Committee of the Whole of:	
- Motion 1-80(1) Museum of the N.W.T.	124
- Bill 1-80(1) Appropriation Ordinance, 1980-81	149
Orders of the Day	149

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1980

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Arlooktoo, Mr. Arreak, Hon. George Braden, Hon. Tom Butters, Mr. Curley, Ms. Cournoyea, Mr. Evaluarjuk, Mr. Fraser, Hon. Arnold McCallum, Mr. McLaughlin, Hon. Robert H. MacQuarrie, Hon. Richard Nerysoo, Mr. Noah, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Pudluk, Mr. Sayine, Mr. Sibbeston, Mrs. Sorensen, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Tologanak

ITEM NO. 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

SPEAKER (Hon. Robert H. MacQuarrie): Item 2, continuing replies to the Commissioner's Address. Any replies? I will remind Members that when I call for replies tomorrow that that will be the last time unless measures are taken to extend the five days that are called for in the rules. Are there any replies?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: On a point of clarification. Did you say tomorrow will be the last day for replies unless a motion for extension were placed?

MR. SPEAKER: That is correct, Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Were not the five clear days -- what were the five clear days you are referring to then? Friday...

MR. SPEAKER: Thursday, Friday, Monday, Tuesday. This is the fourth day and tomorrow will be the fifth day. I think that someone may have the intention this afternoon of moving to extend. Is that correct? Yes. I just wanted to serve notice that that would be necessary if Members wished to reply beyond the five day period. Just before passing then, are there any replies? A couple of Members have come in since I called the last time. Replies to the Commissioner's Address?

Item 3, oral questions.

Item 4, questions and returns. No written questions. Are there any returns from questions that have been posed in the past? No returns.

Item 5, petitions.

Item 6, tabling of documents.

Item 7, notices of motion.

ITEM NO. 7: NOTICES OF MOTION

Hon. Mr. Butters. Mrs. Sorensen. There are fingers going in all directions.

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to serve notice that on Friday, February 11th I will move that -- I think I have the wrong date. What is Friday's date?

MR. SPEAKER: It would be Thursday, February 7th.

Notice Of Motion 8-80(1): Time Extension For Replies To Commissioner's Address

MRS. SORENSEN: Thursday, February 7th, I will move that Rule 34 be waived and that the number of days to reply to the Commissioner's Address be extended an extra three days, the last day to respond being Monday, February 11th.

MR. SPEAKER: I will remind Members that when a motion is introduced Thursday that would be too late already so if Members are agreeable it will require a motion tomorrow with unanimous consent to introduce the motion. Notices of motion, any others?

Item 8, motions.

ITEM NO. 8: MOTIONS

Motion 1-80(1), Mr. Sibbeston.

Motion 1-80(1): Museum Of The N.W.T.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Member Peter Fraser, that:

WHEREAS the museum of the Northwest Territories has been named "Prince of Wales" by the former Commissioner of the Northwest Territories, Stu Hodgson;

AND WHEREAS Mr. Hodgson did not properly consult with all representatives of the peoples of the Northwest Territories and therefore did not have the mandate for so naming the museum;

AND WHEREAS there is dissatisfaction shown by all segments of the northern people of the Northwest Territories towards the present name of the museum;

AND WHEREAS there are already many geographic names and government buildings honouring various members of the royal family: Princess Alexandra Falls, Lady Louise Falls, Virginia Falls, Princess Alexandra School in Hay River;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that the Executive Committee be instructed to change the name of the museum of the Northwest Territories to a more appropriate name after consultation with the Legislative Assembly, and all other major organizations, both native and non-native in the Northwest Territories.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder?

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Fraser.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Fraser is seconding? It has been moved and seconded that the Executive Committee be instructed to change the name of the museum of the Northwest Territories to a more appropriate name after consultation with the Legislative Assembly and all other major organizations, both native and non-native in the Northwest Territories. To the motion. Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, I will simply state by way of opening the debate on this matter that a primary reason why I think that it would be important to change the name of the museum to a more appropriate northern name is that I feel that there is general dissatisfaction throughout the North. Like I know in our part of the North here in the Mackenzie Valley there is occasional discussion about the matter of the museum and I know that the name of the museum was given at a time when a lot of people did not like the name given to it by Mr. Hodgson, but people seem to have gone along with it then. So I just sense generally that there is dissatisfaction with the name given to the museum. My understanding from talking to a number of people is that even the committee which was set up to deal with the museum, even that committee was very unhappy with the name given to the museum. I spoke to two members of the committee which dealt with that matter at the time and they said that they were quite opposed to the idea of having the museum named the Prince of Wales, yet the Commissioner insisted that it be named as it is and so they were in a sense forced to go along with it.

The prime reason that I am proposing this motion is that I object to the way that the name was given. You know, whereas I also have respect for the royal family, in changing the name it is not my intention to show disrespect to the royal family. I do respect the royal family but I object to the way the Commissioner then, Mr. Hodgson, went about giving the museum the name as he did. I just have a feeling and have information that he was one of the only ones who really wanted the name and there was resistance or dissatisfaction with the idea and yet he persisted and used his power as Commissioner to put a name on the museum that did not really have wide support in the Northwest Territories.

Geographical Names Honour Royal Family

Mr. Speaker, I have also had the Clerk obtain for me all of the geographic names in the Northwest Territories that have the names of the royal family and I will have the Pages distribute the page so we will give the Assembly an idea that the royal family is certainly honoured here in the North. There are just numerous geographic places in the North that are given to honouring the royal family and I think that the royal family is sufficiently honoured here in the Northwest Territories.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I am proposing is that the museum's name be changed and that the Executive Committee be given the task to find a more appropriate name. I suggest that this could be done by them checking with the various native organizations in the North and the various non-native organizations in the North. After doing this they could perhaps come down, bring a list and have this Legislative Assembly eventually make a final decision on the name for the museum. So those are my comments for the time being and I hope that the matter gets a good discussion and debate and I have some other remarks to close the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Other debate? Mr. McCallum.

Motion To Amend Motion 1-80(1)

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, in light of the remarks of the hon. Member opposite in that he would like to see the debate in terms of this particular motion, may I suggest then that in order to provide the forum for that free debate back and forth and to get away from the situation that may exist, may I now move this motion into committee of the whole?

MR. SPEAKER: There is a motion to refer this item to committee of the whole. Is there a seconder for that motion? Mr. Pudluk. I would remind Members that if it is referred to committee of the whole, it would not, unless it were the Members' expressed wish, be debated immediately in committee of the whole and please correct me, Mr. Clerk, if I am wrong, but it would be my understanding that it would be placed at the end of the list of items that presently exist in committee of the whole and would be debated as we arrive at it. Is that correct, Mr. Clerk, unless the Members expressly wished to debate ahead of some of the other items?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Yes, sir, that is correct.

Motion To Amend Motion 1-80(1), Carried

MR. SPEAKER: There is a motion to refer. Ready for the question? All in favour? Please hold them high and keep them high. Those opposed? Carried.

---Carried

It will be referred to committee of the whole.

Item 9, second readings of bills.

ITEM NO. 9: SECOND READING OF BILLS

Bill 18-80(1). Mr. Braden.

Second Reading Of Bill 18-80(1): Loan Authorization Amendment Ordinance No. 1, 1979-80

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Pardon me, Mr. Speaker. I move that Bill 18-80(1), An Ordinance to Amend the Loan Authorization Ordinance No. 1, 1979-80, be read for the second time. The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to authorize the Commissioner to borrow and to loan funds in respect of third parties for the purpose of assistance to industry.

MR. SPEAKER: A seconder? Mr. Butters. I remind Members there may be debate on the principle of the bill at this time, but none on the details. Are you ready for the question? All in favour, please indicate. Opposed? Carried.

---Carried

Item 10, consideration in committee of the whole of bills, recommendations to the Legislative Assembly and other matters.

ITEM NO. 10: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS, RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND OTHER MATTERS

Would a Member of the government indicate what they would like to do in committee of the whole? Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, if we could return to committee of the whole and consider the Appropriation Ordinance.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson.

Motion To Discuss Motion 1-80(1) In Committee Of The Whole At This Time

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the motion presented by Mr. Sibbeston discussed in committee of the whole now.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you so moving that it takes precedence, that it be discussed immediately in committee of the whole?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, I so move.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder for that motion? That the museum question take precedence? Seconded by Mr. Curley. Mr. Clerk, could I see you for a moment? A little bit of a procedural problem. The normal practice will be in the future and should have been this time that whoever makes a motion to refer, if they want it to take precedence should state so at that time. If they do not, but someone else would like to see it take precedence, they ought

to so amend that motion of referral so that it will take precedence. Again we are all in a learning situation, that was not done this time. I will treat this as not a waiver of any rule and, therefore, unanimous consent not required. I will put the motion to a vote and if there is a majority which wants to discuss this ahead of the Appropriation Ordinance, I will grant that. Mr. Fraser.

MR. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, we have a piece of paper here with orders of the day. Should that not be on the paper prior to discussing this motion?

MR. SPEAKER: I am not clear on your point. Should not what be on the paper, Mr. Fraser?

MR. FRASER: Should not this request for moving into committee of the whole of that motion be on the order paper?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that it need not appear on the order paper. In other words, it was to be discussed under motions and since it was referred, the person who referred the motion, could not have known that it was going to be referred. It could not be on the order paper. I believe that it would be a fair ruling in the light of what has occurred and in the light of all of our inexperience that if the majority of Members present wish to debate this motion before the Appropriation Ordinance that that would be acceptable.

Motion To Discuss Motion 1-80(1) In Committee Of The Whole At This Time,
Carried

All those in favour of the motion being passed that the question of the museum be debated immediately in committee of the whole please indicate by raising your hand. Those opposed? Please indicate by raising your hand, those opposed to debating it right now. There are obviously many who are still a little bit confused. We will do the vote again. The motion states that we will consider the museum question immediately in committee of the whole. If you approve of that motion, please indicate by raising your hand. Those opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

This House will now resolve into committee of the whole to discuss the museum question and following it the Appropriation Ordinance, with Mr. Tologanak in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into committee of the whole for consideration of Motion 1-80(1): Museum of the N.W.T., with Mr. Tologanak in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER MOTION 1-80(1): MUSEUM OF THE N.W.T.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): The meeting will now come to order for the consideration and discussion of Motion 1-80(1) which concerns the museum of the Northwest Territories. The motion was moved by Mr. Sibbeston. Would you like to start off the discussion?

MR. SIBBESTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will just state briefly again that the main reason that I think the name of the museum should be changed is firstly because I do not think the name Prince of Wales has widespread support in the North. I know that people in my area, Dene people in particular, are not very happy about the fact that the name of the museum was named after someone in the royal family. I know generally amongst native people in speaking to people like the Dene Nation, some of the members of the Metis Association and even a lot of the non-native people that we know in the city here and in Fort Simpson think that a better name for the museum could have been gotten if it was done properly.

The other reason, as I said that I do not like the name Prince of Wales museum, is that the Commissioner -- I do not like the way in which the Commissioner went and got that name. I feel that he did not consult because really after all the museum is a place where you keep things from in the past and I guess it stands to reason that most things from in the past would be about the Dene and the Inuit and some of the early explorers so, you know, the Commissioner should have checked with the native groups to get their advice and see whether they thought some good northern name would have been more appropriate to the museum. I understand that Mr. Hodgson was quite insistent that the name of the museum be called Prince of Wales. I guess the Commissioner had a great deal of respect for the royal family but I do not think he should have imposed his personal love or respect for the royal family on all of the North.

Museum Committee Did Not Support Museum Name

I understand that before the naming of the museum there was a museum committee which was made up of native people, non-native people and that they, too, did not like the idea of having the museum named Prince of Wales, yet the Commissioner imposed his own will and decision over this group. So just generally I object to the way that the Commissioner went about naming the museum. Surely it is high time, surely we have arrived at a stage in our political development in the North where this Assembly can at least have a say in naming government buildings rather than have the Commissioner impose his own will. The Commissioner, as you may know, has done this quite often in the past. Like if he respects somebody he will use his name. He did that to the Laing Building. I guess Mr. Laing appointed him Commissioner and so he respected him I guess and wanted to do something good back to him so he gave it his name. So that is the way things have been in the North for a lot of years and I think that times are changing, that we do not need to have things done in that way any longer.

It is about time that any government buildings, any geographic places are given good northern names instead of, you know, giving them royal family names or names from the South. So I just think that it would be very good for people of the North, all the native people and also the non-native people, if a good northern name could be found for the museum and, more importantly, that in finding the name the Commissioner and the Executive Committee consult with the various groups in the North and also with the Legislative Assembly.

As I said, the royal family has been given a great deal of respect by a lot of geographic names in the North. I have a list of at least 47 geographic locations of islands, of lakes, of seas and inlets, rivers that are given royal family names so I think the North has certainly paid its due respect to the royal family. So I do not think it would hurt them very much. I do not think they would feel sad or be insulted if we were to change the name of the museum. In fact I think if the name is changed, if we have agreement that the name of the museum should be changed, then I would think that either the Speaker or the Commissioner would write a letter to the royal family and just explain to them that the name was given to it by a past Commissioner without the due, full support of northern people and just explain to them that the Commissioner, you know, did not fully consult with all of the people in the North.

Name Change Is Part Of Decolonization

I think you could also tell the royal family that to change the name to a more northern name is just part of the process of decolonizing the North and I think that they would understand because I am sure England and Britain have been involved in countries and as these countries become independent people there take over and I am sure they change the names. Just like recently we have had Rhodesia which has been named Zimbabwe which I take it is a Negro name and I think they would understand that we in the North here are doing the same, that as we become more responsible we want to decolonize ourselves. We want to give names to government buildings, geographic names that are truly northern names instead of as in the past. So I just think that we should not think that if we change the name that the royal family is going to be insulted or hurt or anything. I think they will quite properly understand. After all, what is it to them? I am sure it does not mean anything, but to the people of the North it means a lot to have a good northern name.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. Mr. Fraser.

MR. FRASER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not always agree with my colleague and I do not want it to go to his head that I agree with him but I have to this time. I made that motion in the House about three years ago. I forget whether it was a motion now or a written question. I think it was a motion to have that name changed, but the motion was shot down, nothing was done about it and I hope that this time we can maybe do something to have that name changed. It was quite a concern to a lot of my constituents to name the museum which cost the taxpayers a lot of money. I would not even begin to try and put a price on it. However, it was built in Yellowknife for many millions of dollars maybe to create more employment. I do not know what it is. I do not know how many people they have got working there, but I do agree with my colleague Mr. Sibbeston that the name should not be Prince of Wales. We have three pages here of lakes and fiords and islands that were named after the royal family. I am just wondering maybe if we should send the budget over there and see what happens.

---Applause

Reasons For The Choice Of Name

Mr. Chairman, I would like maybe after some brief comments if the present Commissioner, Mr. Parker, would maybe tell us why or if he knows any reason why the museum was named Prince of Wales museum. There could be some reason behind it all that we do not know anything about. If there is, I for one would like to know the reason, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, I would welcome an opportunity to speak to this matter, but I am in your hands as to whether or not you would like me to speak at this time or whether the committee wishes to hear from other Members present first.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): What is the wish of the committee?
Hon. Mr. Butters, do you have a comment on that?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I think it was not the Commissioner who moved this motion into the House. I thought lots of people would like to speak and I would like to hear comments from other Members. If nobody wishes to speak, I will speak now, but I would like to hear the comments from those Members who voted to move it into committee discussion at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): We have Mr. Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. I agree with Mr. Sibbeston and Mr. Fraser that the choosing of the name for the museum was not done properly, that Mr. Hodgson undoubtedly did not properly consult with the people. I also agree that the name may well be inappropriate in that, as far as I am aware, the Prince of Wales being quite young has not had an opportunity to make any significant contribution to the North apart from his visits here. I do agree that important names should be given after important people who have contributed to the history and culture of the Northwest Territories. However, I must speak against the motion for reasons which I will explain.

Opposition To Name Change

First of all, I think quite frankly what the motion is doing is censuring Commissioner Hodgson. I have tried to find out a little bit more about how the museum came to be named the Prince of Wales museum and everyone I speak to who seems to know something about it points to Commissioner Hodgson. I think probably that it was his scheme, his plan, his baby all along and in fact what you are doing is censuring Mr. Hodgson for pushing his own opinions on the people of the Northwest Territories, but the point I wish to make is why slap the royal family in the face because Commissioner Hodgson persuaded them to lend their name to this museum? I respectfully suggest to the Hon. Mr. Sibbeston that a letter of explanation to the royal family is not going to persuade everyone that there were not much less noble motives involved in our removing the Prince of Wales' name from the museum if we decide to do it. I can see the headlines. I can see the press and public discussion as being summed up as the Assembly has removed the Prince of Wales' name from the museum and frankly I do not have anything against the Prince of Wales, especially when one considers that this young man is still alive.

I do object, as I say, to the way that Commissioner Hodgson conducted himself and I remember being astonished at the time to discover that a director of a department had been dispatched by Commissioner Hodgson to some place in the United States to escort some paintings here to Yellowknife which were going to be displayed in conjunction with the visit of the Prince of Wales. I thought this was an astonishing waste of valuable civil servants' time and an astonishing waste of public money and I think generally that Commissioner Hodgson was given to extravagant and largely symbolic exercises of this nature which we probably now cannot afford.

Disproportionate Representation Of English Aristocracy

I was curious at the time too, as to who paid the bill for the extravaganza that surrounded the opening of the museum and the expenses that were incurred as a result of the visit of the Prince of Wales, but I still say that well, it was a mistake. Undoubtedly, the answer is not to change the name now. The answer is to ask the administration and make the present Commissioner aware that these things are important, these names are important and that there is a disproportionate representation of the English aristocracy in the Northwest Territories. It is a heritage that we do not want to overemphasize. In Frobisher Bay, I have always wondered why the place has been named Frobisher Bay. The local people shot Sir Martin Frobisher in the ass with an arrow when he sailed up Frobisher Bay over 400 years ago and I now wonder why we have honoured him with the name of a place which has had an Inuktitut name for years. In northern Quebec, I notice that recently all the Inuit settlements have been given Inuktitut names.

I think that this should happen in the Northwest Territories in places where people who speak another language are in the majority, but with respect to the Hon. Mr. Sibbeston, because I do agree with the sentiments of his motion, I think it will be misunderstood. I think it will be seen as a slap in the face of the royal family. I think it will reflect personally upon the Prince of Wales who is not to blame for having lent his name and having lent his person to the ceremony. He was asked and we should be grateful that he came. It is the process that led up to his being asked which points directly at a certain unwillingness to consult the people on the part of the former Commissioner that we are objecting to and I think that the fact that this motion is presented and that this debate occurs should provide a salutary effect in warning the administration and the present Commissioner that these issues are important. I do not think that we need to go further and change something that is already in place, especially when we are involving a living member of the royal family and considering that the matter would undoubtedly be misunderstood by the public. So, with all respect to the intent of the motion, I am not going to support it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Are there any other Members? Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with the Member's initiative relative to the naming of places and structures and various other geographical points of reference in the Northwest Territories to the extent possible using references which were used long before the white man appeared on the North American scene. I understand that and as I say I sympathize with that as I expect does everyone in this chamber.

I would suggest that this long list of names which was presented to us, two and a half pages, did not happen during the time of the previous House or the House before that or even in this century. It occurred during the time when Martin Frobisher -- not Martin Frobisher, Franklin, was lost on the end of King William Island and I would expect that all of those points of reference or many of them were established and put on the maps and charts of Great Britain in the 19th Century.

Discourtesy To Royal Family

The motion itself, I do not know whether or not the former Commissioner consulted or did not consult or whether he acted unilaterally or arbitrarily, I do not know this from my own experience. I do remember the hon. Member's motion of a couple of years ago, but to my knowledge he was the only one who protested. I do not recollect there was a large outcry at that time and maybe had there been, the former Commissioner would have acted otherwise or would have certainly given it consideration, but I think that what this motion will do is much more than a discourtesy. It is an insult and I do not think that the people of the North wish to be party to an insult to the royal family. I agree with the Hon. Member from Frobisher. While the motivation of the mover of the motion is understandable and one can sympathize with the intent, the result of the motion will have horrendous implications for not only Members of this chamber who are part of it, but for the Northwest Territories as a whole and maybe, you know, that is the spelling we will get after a motion like this passes, h-o-l-e. I think that we must be very cautious in considering this and recognize what we are asking to be done and I would suggest to Members that the motion should be defeated, with respect.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Evaluarjuk.

MR. EVALUARJUK: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a short statement. I am not sure of the motion and I cannot support it. It is just a name that we are deliberating. It does not seem to matter too much to me. It does not seem so important to me. There are certain names given to islands and lakes and geographical names. It is not our way to give certain names of geographic areas where there are certain activities such as hunting and fishing areas.

Inuit Have Their Own Name

I do not understand why this should be under great discussion and I do not really care too much about it. Concerning the museum, it was given the name of the royal family and we, the Inuit, do not think that we will ever call it the royal family's name; we will simply call it the museum. It will be called the royal family's name, but us, we will only call it "the museum in Yellowknife". Maybe the others who are the Dene, those people will also name it their own name, although not using the royal family's name.

I cannot fully support this motion and I think I spoke with the former Commissioner and I asked him what was the reason for giving it that name and he replied that the Prince of Wales supported it and that was the reason why the name was given. As far as I am concerned I am not very impressed about the discussions of the names of buildings.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. MacQuarrie.

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would simply like to say that I concur very much with the remarks of Mr. Patterson. The one idea that I would like to add is that without question I sympathize with the original inhabitants of the Territories who would like to see a restoration of many of the names which they used for geographical features. I am prepared to accept any concrete proposal that has as its aim the naming of some very significant geographical features in the North, renaming them with the original names or other suitable native names, not on such a large scale perhaps that there is great expense and great confusion in doing it, but when I say some very significant features, I mean that.

Policy For The Future Proposed

I could absolutely agree to it and I could also absolutely agree to any policy which, from this time forward, attempted to give every consideration to the original people of the North with respect to the naming of newly discovered geographical features or buildings that are erected or parks or other sites and so on. I would definitely support it, but, like Mr. Patterson, I cannot go in favour of this motion. I would not want to see when so very recently, I am sure, the Prince of Wales, who is an innocent party, was pressed to allow his name to be used and now we are a party in a sense dishonouring him by revoking that honour. There are plenty of other opportunities for us to do what we want to do without having to do it in this way. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, it seems not very important but as far as the non-native people are concerned they go towards a goal and they have their own way of life and it has been a part of their life to recognize people who achieve something in their lives. They do give names, although I have never really met them, but looking at it, it is important for them to know that this is the name of an important person that was given. It is just a name. Maybe in the future we will begin to understand that he did something or accomplished something and why was he so important and why the name was given in Inuktitut.

This is a very important motion, but we are beginning our involvement in various managerial affairs and the younger people will begin to grasp this and it seems like part of the big discussion now is everybody is trying to support the natives and the younger people. I think the two cultures are beginning to work together. They are beginning to talk and they will hear that the Prince of Wales museum, the named was changed, and people will say how many native people do you have working there? Who is involved? I think that to start giving names to prominent people, the younger people will begin to respect them and maybe in the future the name of the museum, the person who the museum is named after, he will come to Yellowknife and the only way he would be able to assist us is to give us recognition, but I do not think he would be able to assist us financially and many people will be able to go to the museum and look and see what is in the museum.

Consultation With People Important

I do not recall, I do not think there were any northern native people who have gone inside. I have not been there but if it was given an appropriate name I think I would have been there and I would like to know why this museum was named after this man. I think I would be very curious to know more about it, but I would like to add further that people say this should not happen again in the Northwest Territories, naming structures and various other places. I think it is becoming not a problem, but I would be very disturbed giving names to things to identify them in the North. I feel I do not agree but I will support the motion of changing the name. Thank you very much. People must recognize they cannot just go and do things without consultation with the people when they name structures and buildings after somebody but we need to identify it so I suppose it is necessary. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Hon. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to state at the outset that I cannot support this motion for two reasons. The first is that I do not think the Executive Committee of the Government of the Northwest Territories is the proper part of government to be dealing with this rather significant issue. I agree in principle with a lot of the things which Mr. Sibbeston has indicated or told this House and I just simply feel that the present composition of the Executive Committee would not allow for the proper consideration of what has been proposed here.

Secondly, I think that the hon. Member's comments are simply an indication of a much broader issue. I do not know if other Members have received a letter from Mr. MacQuarrie but he sent one to me a few days ago where he asked for my ideas on how some of the tradition and ceremony within this Legislature could be modified, altered, changed to introduce more of the northern culture into the proceedings or the physical structure of this House. I think to a certain extent what Mr. Sibbeston is proposing falls into the same kind of category where we are looking at names of buildings or geographical areas.

Special Committee Suggested

So in conclusion I think that the Member has brought up a good point, but I cannot support the motion because the Executive Committee is just not the right agency to deal with this and I would say to Mr. Sibbeston that if he was willing to perhaps amend the motion or present a new one where perhaps a special committee of the House would be charged with not only his particular concern but also some of the things that Mr. MacQuarrie has brought up or which other Members may identify from time to time, that I would certainly be prepared to see such a special committee go ahead and investigate this thoroughly including the consultation with the people of the Northwest Territories. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Hon. Mr. Braden. Are there Members who wish to speak on this matter? Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, am going to vote against the motion. However, I certainly understand and respect the point that the Hon. Mr. Sibbeston has brought forth to the Assembly today. However, I remember the early days of the planning of the museum and I, too, remember some of the wily ways of our famous Commissioner Hodgson and am aware of some of the mechanisms that he used to achieve an end result. The end result in this case being a museum for the Northwest Territories which from the beginning it is my understanding was opposed by Ottawa. The Ottawa, which I might add, holds the purse strings and which was at certain stages of the development of the museum withholding completion funds for the building.

Suggestion To Delete

From what I can gather Mr. Hodgson used every bit of his determination in direct opposition to Ottawa to get the Prince of Wales to lend his name to the building with the intention that once this was achieved how could Ottawa refuse the funds to complete the building? It seems to me that if this is true -- and I have every reason, knowing Commissioner Hodgson, to believe that it is true -- and if we value the museum, a museum which is a northern museum and I am sure most of us do, then perhaps we should recognize that the royal name might have made the difference between having a museum or not having a museum of such high calibre in the Northwest Territories. I would like to suggest that perhaps we delete the Northern Heritage part of the name of the museum and simply replace it with a name that is more suitable. We would then keep Prince of Wales and add a suitable northern name. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you. Are there some Members who wish to speak? Mr. Nerysoo.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: I have never been quite popular as a supporter of naming any kind of river or lake by the name of people who have never somehow participated I guess in the development of the North, but I guess at this time I would find it difficult to sort of support a motion which condemns someone really who had no influence in having his name put forward to an institution that he only saw when he arrived here. I will in fact, if this motion is defeated, put forward another motion which would in fact ensure that no other buildings or institutions or rivers or lakes or islands in the future would be named in other names in the sense that I will not allow, for instance, the Lester B. Pearson island in the Beaufort Sea to be in that sense or else some river. I think there is a need now to change that attitude of naming names according to those people who inhabit the area but that is the only reason I will, in fact, vote against the motion itself but I will, in fact, put forward another motion to suggest that no other island or no buildings will ever be named again in the names of other people.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. Nerysoo. Mr. Parker.

COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, I think that Members have spoken very well to this subject and have brought forward the views that are held by quite a number of people. It was suggested early in the debate that I might say something about the background of the naming. I think that former Commissioner Hodgson had two things in mind when he pressed for the use of the name Prince of Wales. The first one was his admiration, and that of many other people, for the Prince and members of the royal family who have dealt very fairly with Canadians, particularly with northern Canadians. In fact, the Queen as our sovereign, and members of her family have taken perhaps a greater interest in the Northwest Territories than they have in many other parts of Canada. Indeed, she is our Queen.

Money Was A Factor In Choice Of Name

A second concern with regard to the naming was just as has been stated by Mrs. Sorensen, that the rocky road to construction was paved with lack of dollars, and if I can mix a few metaphors. We had a very difficult time gaining funding and one of the ways of getting funds was to gain acceptance through having the royal family's permission to use the name, and in fact, agreement that the Prince of Wales himself would take part in the opening ceremonies in large measure assisted us in getting the funds to complete the building. It seems to be pretty well agreed that we have a magnificent facility which is admired by all and which will indeed enhance the history, background and whatever of the people of the Northwest Territories.

There is a third thing that I would like to mention to you and that is by involving the royal family through the name we were able to catch the attention of many people in Great Britain and perhaps even throughout Europe. This is a very difficult thing to do in a place that is as small as Yellowknife, in a jurisdiction which has such a small population as does the Northwest Territories, but we caught the interest and the fancy of many people in Europe. I want you to bear in mind that rightly or wrongly, and certainly beyond any of our control, early explorers who came to the North took back to the old countries of Europe artifacts which we are now interested in recovering either on loan or recovering permanently, or at least knowing the whereabouts of them. We have already made some major moves in this direction through the M'Clintock family. Had not these initiatives been taken by Mr. Hodgson, I think that these sorts of things that are now coming back to our Heritage Centre would not be available to us and we would have a very major gap in our collections and a gap in our archives and things missing from our history which are very important to all of us, that is, to all residents of the Northwest Territories.

I personally think that it would be seen as an insult, as Mr. Patterson has outlined, because the Prince of Wales is the innocent person in this regard. He did not seek to have his name used, but the Queen gave permission that it could be used and therefore if there are questions about the methodology, those questions have to be dealt with or relegated to past history, but I would ask you to not seek to discipline or embarrass or insult the royal family because of some other aspect that did not meet with general approval.

Prince's Sincere Effort To Understand People Of The North

I would hate to see innocent people hurt. The Prince of Wales has made three trips to the Northwest Territories and has made a sincere effort to understand the people of the North. He came to the opening and he will be at some time our future King and I would want you to think very carefully before taking action in that way. I think there are many other ways in which this Legislature can demonstrate that it wishes that new directions be taken.

Just a word, if I may, on the transport of the painting. I do not seek to go into a great explanation there, but perhaps suffice to say that a painting was requested of an eminent artist in the United States and it became necessary to get the painting here from his home. I can assure Mr. Patterson that although it seems an unusual means to have someone go down and drive the painting back

in a truck, we examined the alternatives, and there were really very few, strangely enough. It was not, proportionately, an expensive operation and, in fact, it was no swan, it was a harrowing experience trying to get this thing through rainstorms, snowstorms and customs, without difficulty. However, these things come to try us.

One other thing I would like to assure Members, that Stu Hodgson did not name Frobisher Bay either.

---Laughter

There are even two or three other things around that he did not name.

Proper Concern And Northernness For Geographic Names

With regard to geographic names, I think it is appropriate that we take the directions in the future to name them after persons of significance to the North and proportionately speaking, those will be native persons and, very well, they should be native persons. I would hesitate to support a move to say that they may only be native persons because there might even be some significant long-time, born and raised, northern "others" who you might wish to honour at some time, but the move to bring proper concern and northernness to geographic names is one that I heartily endorse. I think that it is important for us perhaps not so much for us changing names, but there may be some that are appropriate to change. But for those geographic names where the native people have their own names which are well used and well understood, in those cases then, it makes sense to examine whether or not they should be changed or whether the name is so well entrenched that it really does not matter. But, if there are cases where the name is well used by native people and significant to them, then I would be first in line to support such a move. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. Parker. Ms. Cournoyea.

MS. COURNOYEA: I think Mr. Parker dwelt on the area that I was going to stress, in terms of the future of these kinds of actions, not only in naming, but also in placing facilities in particular locations. At the point of time that the decision was taken to build the museum or to seek funds, there was one community in my constituency which had begun to make plans to have a museum in their particular part of the country and any money that was available, no matter how small, was not available because of this museum in Yellowknife. I believe that it is not only the name, it is the methodology as the Commissioner related on how these things are done and obviously, the museum was not placed there by native people, so it has a name that is not native. But, I believe that in areas of interest where people will go, it does not always necessarily have to be in Yellowknife and I think the whole way of placing structures, naming structures, has to be seriously questioned and direction placed before this Legislative Assembly on how that is going to be done so that we do not have a repetition of this problem that we are facing today.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Are there other Members who wish to speak who have not spoken? Mr. Pudluk.

Lack Of Support For Name Change

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Chairman, the motion that was made I will not support for two reasons. If the museum's name is going to be changed, I do not agree with that; as far as naming the rivers and the lakes, they all have names that already are names of the royal family. If you are only going to change one name, they probably will have to think about changing other names of other communities too, by looking at these papers in front of us. If you were to change the name, like in my settlement, we have names that cannot be translated. Mr. Nerysoo said that he would like to make another motion. I would be fully in support of that, for the next time that somebody names anything, like they should name buildings, rivers or other things, but if only one name is going to be changed, that of that museum, if they are going to change that, then I will vote against it. I will only be in support of it if we can change all the other names too. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Is there further discussion? Are there Members who have not spoken, who wish to speak? Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I get the feeling that there is some opposition to it and it is unfortunate. The one time that Peter Fraser supports me, it seems that the usual supporters are not coming through.

In my view, this is kind of like the first real chance that we have to do something, a chance to undo the past. I am just a bit disappointed that everybody is not supporting it and some of the usual persons that I would have hoped for support like Mr. Nerysoo who is, I believe, vice president of the Dene Nation from where there has come the biggest outcry or criticism when the Prince of Wales museum was named. I am disappointed that the Inuit are not supporting this because it just seems to me that it is a good opportunity to undo the past, and it seems like there is no lack of support, or there seems to be agreement with me about the way it was done. People, I think, agree with me that Mr. Hodgson did not do it very right and there seems to be no problem up to there. But, then I take it, because the name was given a royal name, people find it a little bit difficult to change the name and it is too bad that people are getting cold feet or chickening out on this point. I do not think the Prince is going to be sad or insulted; he probably will not even know.

---Laughter

How do you write to His Majesty? Do you write a letter just in the ordinary course of the mail or does it go through 1000 offices before it eventually gets to him. So, he probably will never even know that we are changing the name and yet people think he is going to be insulted.

MR. FRASER: Phone him long distance.

Legislature Would Have Final Say

MR. SIBBESTON: So, the point raised by Mr. Braden here that he did not think that the Executive was the appropriate body to deal with this, well, the alternative to the Executive is the Commissioner here and now. And how do we know, he might have some royal family somewhere in the world that he has personal love and respect for and he might want to give them the museum's name? You know, we do not know. So, I was trying to ensure that the Commissioner would not then give it an offshoot or some name which we, in turn, have to change again. So, the idea to have the Executive deal with the name and get consultation with people I think is a proper approach and they eventually have to come back to us here and the final name of the museum should be according to what we think here.

I am just a bit sorry that people are putting more weight on the fact that the Prince or the royal family might be insulted. To me, it is more important to have a good northern Inuit or Dene, or even, a name which pays respect to a long-term white person in the North here. To me, if we got one of these good northern names, that would be more important than worrying as to whether the Prince or the royal family were going to be insulted, and in that regard, I am just a bit disappointed that you feel this way.

Like I say, I see this as the first kind of chance to undo the things that, I think, we are all unhappy about; the way the things have been done in the past. Yet people are chickening out and not prepared to go all the way. I just find that disappointing. However, I guess, it appears that if the motion is lost that people will be agreeable that in the future, this sort of thing is not done arbitrarily by the Commissioner.

MR. PATTERSON: Hear, hear!

Land Claim Settlement May Affect Name

MR. SIBBESTON: Are we saying now that what is past, is done and we cannot undo it absolutely? To me, it is easier to take that attitude to life, you do not offend anybody. But, in my view, it is just a matter of time anyway. If we do not change the name now, it is going to be changed some day in the future anyway. When land claims are made, if I am alive when land claims are made, that is the first thing I am going to do, change the name to a good northern name. So, if the motion does not pass today, then the museum's name is going to be changed some day anyway. So, it seems to me, it is a better time now than trying to change it as the name has been in use a number of years.

So, I just really encourage you people, colleagues, friends, relatives and so forth, to vote for the motion and it is not a big deal, in some ways. Perhaps we should not be wasting our time talking about a thing like that; there are lots of important things to deal with, but to me, it is important, because it shows that this Legislative Assembly is prepared to deal with things now and also redress or undo the things that were undone back in the past. So, I see it as a bit of a challenge, and if the motion does get passed, that people could say, "Yes, this is a real Council that is prepared to deal with things. It is a new Council and it is a new ball game," and so forth.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Any further discussion? Mr. Noah.

MR. NOAH: Mr. Chairman, what I am going to say might not make very much sense to some people. Some places have names like the Iglu Hotel in Baker Lake but this is not operated by the Inuit. They have a committee, there are Inuit members on the committee but in southern places there are some names like Inuit because that is the only word they know in Inuktitut.

Inuktitut Names

I would support the motion, like I would want to see in the North, in the whole Northwest Territories all the places have Inuktitut names. I have travelled northwest of Baker Lake and all the lakes and hills have Inuit names, names in Inuktitut. The ones that named different places, when they are named in English they are named after famous people or well-known people but Inuit name it after their girl friends or whatever, to remember that place. Like, if they leave that place to go to another place and they want to remember it, they sort of remember it by something that they like. To the real Inuit these are very useful and it does not really seem to have any meaning to people who cannot speak English. When I came here for the first time and when Prince Charles was here I was really amazed. I was really amazed by these rooms saying Katimavik A, B and C, Inuktitut names, having Inuktitut names. It seems like this is the first time I have noticed this and it seems a lot clearer to see these names in Inuktitut and it made a lot more sense.

The museum was made by white people so I do not really mind what name it has, but the things that we are concerned about in the Northwest Territories are all the names, like we have names in the whole Northwest Territories but when the white man started coming to the North they started naming them in English even though they already had Inuktitut names. Right now I really cannot support this museum's name because it was made mostly by white people. It has things that were made by Inuit and Indian people but I would support it if all these places were named in Inuktitut that already have names in Inuktitut. I cannot say very much more about this and I thank you for making me able to speak up.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. Noah. Is there any further discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Question being called.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, may I ask for a recorded vote?

Motion 1-80(1), Defeated

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): There will be a recorded vote. One moment, please. Mr. Sibbeston has requested that it be a recorded vote so as a procedure in this case when I call for the vote, all those who are in the affirmative stand and remain standing until it has been recorded, until the Clerk has recorded all the necessary names. All those in the affirmative for Motion 1-80(1), stand, all those who are in favour. Stand and remain standing, please.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Mr. Fraser, Mr. Noah, Mr. Curley, Ms. Cournoyea, Mr. Sayine, Mr. Sibbeston.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): All those against.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Arreak, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Pudluk, Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Stewart, Mr. McCallum, Mr. Nerysoo, Mr. Butters, Mr. Braden, Mrs. Sorensen, Mr. MacQuarrie.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Abstentions, those who do not want to vote.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Evaluarjuk, Mr. Arlooktoo.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): The motion has been defeated.

---Defeated

The committee will now recess for coffee for 15 minutes.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): The Chair recognizes a quorum. We will come back to order. Is it the committee's wish to return to Bill 1-80(1)? I believe we were on general discussions. Is it agreed? Is it the committee's wish to have Mr. Nielsen and Mr. Burch as witnesses as well? Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, before we do that I wonder if I could just bring up one point and it concerns my report, my standing committee report. At this time in my capacity as the chairman of the standing committee on finance I would like to obtain general agreement from the Members that the general recommendations contained in the standing committee's report to the House on Friday, February 1st, will be discussed when the Department of the Executive comes before the committee of the whole and in addition that the departmental recommendations also contained in that report will also be discussed when each individual department's main estimates are considered again in committee of the whole. Could I have general agreement of the Members on that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Do the Members agree with that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Responsibility For Finance Department

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, yesterday there was some concern that I, as the Member of the Executive Committee who introduced the budget, was not responding to questions made in this House and that Mr. Nielsen was having to respond to some questions that were of a political nature. I may have been remiss in not paying that close attention to the questions that were asked following my opening remarks, but I would like to make it clear to the House that while I presented the budget I am not the finance minister of the Government of the Northwest Territories. No elected Member is the finance minister of the Government of the Northwest Territories and when that situation does occur I think that that individual, whomever he or she may be, would understandably respond to each and every question that Members wish to put.

I would also point out that while I have a line of responsibility and authority with officials of the Department of Education, the Department of Justice and Public Services, I have no line of authority through Mr. Nielsen and other members of his staff. I must say that I am most grateful to Mr. Nielsen and his staff for the excellent support work they gave me in this unfamiliar role of putting together a budget overview and much of the credit, if credit is due -- that presentation is due to the financial people.

Endorsement Of Deficit

To make amends for what might have been an oversight on my part yesterday, I would like to look at one question of one of the Members which is contained in the debate record and it is that of the Hon. Member from the Western Arctic who asked: "May I ask my question again? We are being asked to allocate a \$13.9 million -- it is five there but I think she said nine -- deficit. If we as an Assembly vote the institution of the Government of the Northwest Territories to spend that we are endorsing that deficit." The answer is yes and if I have any criticism of the finance committee's report to this House it is that it does not specifically support the position which we are putting to you and that is that there is a deficit. I cannot find in the report of the standing committee where there is full and firm support to the deficit position. I think that the hon. Member's question is most important. If Members cannot answer Ms. Cournoyea's question in the affirmative or yes, then they must look at the areas in which they are going to remove the \$13.9 million from this budget.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Is it the committee's wish to call Mr. Nielsen as a witness again during the general discussion? Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. My understanding is that by motion we were asked to study the previous question as a special consideration. I would think that we should report to the Assembly and then formally debate Bill 1-80(1). I would think that since the Speaker left the chair because there was a special motion to deal with the previous motion, I would think then that we would have to report back to the Assembly and then proceed to deal with particular bills. Maybe the Clerk should check the rules of the House.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): One moment, please. We will just check the procedure here. Members of the committee, when the Speaker left the chair he explained that perhaps rather than playing musical chairs all day after each discussion on the orders of the day for consideration under committee of the whole perhaps it could be discussed at the end of the committee of the whole meeting when we are reporting to the Speaker but that was not the normal practice of the previous House. The previous practice was that a motion that the chairman would leave the chair and report progress was always in order. In other words, a formal motion for the meeting to return to the formal session to report progress to the Assembly would be in order but the committee should decide that at this point. You should make a motion first if you want to do it in that regard.

A Previous Practice Of The House

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: Perhaps I could explain. This was after consultation with the Clerks and they explained that it was customary as each item of business was concluded in committee of the whole that we would go back into formal session and report progress. It was thought that there would be no harm and no detriment to the business of the House to simply carry on with each item of business in committee of the whole and then at the end of the deliberation report progress rather than on each item continually putting the Mace up and down and the Speaker going back and forth. If Members do not want to change the previous practice and insist on reporting progress after each item the rules allow for any Member here to ask that the chairman vacate and the Speaker return and that progress be reported so it is a simple matter of someone raising that motion now.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Curley.

Motion To Have Chairman Report Progress

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, the reason I asked that is, I would be in favour of moving such a motion which I will move now, and that is that the chairman report progress to the Assembly and mainly because this was a special consideration and a recorded vote was taken that I think it has some significance to the Assembly and the content of the motion, I believe, was very important and for this reason I move that the Chair report progress to the Assembly.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Is there a seconder? Mr. McCallum. Question.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I think if the mover of that particular motion would agree, we do not report progress, but we report the resolution of that particular motion. We have finished with it and I concur with what he says, but I think that it is not that we report progress, but in fact, as the mover indicated, that we resolve that motion by a recorded vote and if we are going to do it, I would second the motion. If the mover would indicate that you are to report the resolution of that motion...

MR. CURLEY: I agree to the reporting of the resolution of the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Curley, do you want to report progress right now?

MR. CURLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, on the issue that we just dealt with.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Curley, no debate is necessary. Just a seconder is required. Is there a seconder?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I indicated that I will second the motion, but I do not think the proper terminology of the motion is to report progress. I submit to you that the proper terminology is to report resolution of the motion with which we dealt.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): I will return to our "book of knowledge". Rule 74, Mr. McCallum, states: "A motion that the chairman leave the chair and report progress is always in order and shall be decided forthwith without debate; no second motion to the same effect shall be made until after some intermediate proceeding has taken place." Is that understandable? Do we have a seconder? Mr. Fraser.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I guess the point that I am trying to get across is that we have concluded with the business for which we went into committee of the whole. Is that not your understanding?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): No, Mr. McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Sorry.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Curley has a motion on the floor. It states that we report progress at this time. Mr. Fraser has seconded the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Question.

A Question Of Terminology

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: Could I ask something first? It seems to be a question of terminology. Could one of the returning Members please explain this to me, so that I will understand it a little more clearly. In the past if there was business conducted in committee of whole, and it was actually concluded, a motion was passed, or whatever, and would you not use the phrase "report progress"? Would someone explain that to me, please? Perhaps that is where the stumbling block is here.

COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, Mr. McCallum is not trying to argue; he is just trying to make the point that the practice really is not to report progress. Progress is only reported if a matter is not concluded, or if there is a desire that the matter be not discussed any further, but if a matter has been referred to committee of the whole and has been dealt with, and this particular committee was given that responsibility to deal with the matter of that motion, and it dealt with it. It called a vote on it, so that means that the matter has been concluded and I would think the normal practice would then be to have the chairman report to the Speaker that the matter has been concluded and to give the results of the discussion. The effect of voting to report progress simply means that the matter would have to be repeated on the orders of the day until at some time in the future it was reported on.

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: If I may ask a further question by way of clarification. Would I also understand that by using the terminology "reporting progress", that we might thereby be winding up business in committee of the whole for this day? Would that be your understanding if we use that term?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I would submit, yes, that is a possibility.

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: Perhaps you could repeat that in a moment. I think he was preoccupied, Mr. McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, in response to the query by the hon. Member, I would submit that, yes, that is a possibility.

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: That is if we were to use the terminology "reporting progress", that might well mean that we are winding up the business of committee of the whole for this day. I asked the question; I am not making the statement.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Curley, do you want to comment on your motion?

Intention Of The Motion

MR. CURLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The intention of my motion is that you report progress to the Assembly, to Mr. Speaker, whether the resolution has been concluded or not. I think reporting to the Speaker, or to the Assembly, whether or not, is your privilege as chairman of the committee of the whole, to state to the Chair, to Mr. Speaker. My only concern is that the proper recording be done on the resolution of the motion that was of some significance to some of us.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Okay. We have a motion on the floor. The terminology has been discussed. We know the result of the motion. It was a recorded vote. So, if we report to the Assembly then we can return to committee of the whole afterwards.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, if the motion to facilitate this, if there is nothing within our rules that will allow you to report only the resolution of the previous motion, and if you have not got a seconder for Mr. Curley's motion, then I will so second the motion to get this concluded. We are going around in circles, I guess, but if Mr. Fraser has seconded it, I call the question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): The question has been called. Those in favour of reporting, raise your hand nice and high so I can see. Let us put them up again, please. The motion is carried. Thank you.

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: I would ask for those opposed, please.

Motion To Have Chairman Report Progress, Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Those opposed? Abstained? No, we do not need abstained.

---Carried

I will now report progress to the Assembly that this motion has been concluded.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Tologanak.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF MOTION 1-80(1): MUSEUM OF THE N.W.T.

MR. TOLOGANAK: Mr. Speaker, after much confusion, your committee has met to consider Motion 1-80(1) and wishes to report that the motion was defeated.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Tologanak. Just while I am in the chair, I would just like to simply reiterate the desire of the Chair to facilitate the business of committee of the whole and that was why we had thought to deal with one or two or three or four items in committee of the whole before reporting progress, so that we would not be up and down, up and down. I will still make that attempt, but absolutely, if you feel that it ought to be made, please inform me at suitable times. Mr. McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, sir, I think I would agree and go along with what you would request. If and when we go into committee of the whole to discuss certain bills, motions, that are of one particular topic or relate to a singular topic, I would agree with you, to facilitate that.

I am sure that as we go through the business of the day there will come times when we will so move that we will go into committee of the whole to discuss certain bills that relate one to the other or relate to a certain topic, but I suggest, sir, again, and with due respect, that you would have to, I think, enquire as to the House itself whether, in fact, we wanted to go in and it would have to be our particular decision.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, the Clerk has suggested that as long as there are several items under consideration of committee of the whole on the order paper, that it would seem to be quite proper to move from one to the other as each is resolved and the reporting of progress not be done until that day's business of committee of the whole is completed. But if at any time a Member wants to report progress immediately, the rules do permit that, and consequently, it can be done in that way. Are Members agreed that we will return to committee of the whole to consider Bill 1-80(1), Appropriation Ordinance, 1980-81?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

---Agreed

The House will now resolve into committee of the whole with Mr. Tologanak in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into committee of the whole for consideration of Bill 1-80(1): Appropriation Ordinance, 1980-81, with Mr. Tologanak in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL 1-80(1): APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1980-81

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Good afternoon. Is it the wish of the Members to return to general discussion on Bill 1-80(1), Appropriation Ordinance, and ask Mr. Nielsen and Mr. Burch to return as witnesses?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Nielsen and Mr. Burch, please. So, we will get back to general discussion. Mr. Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have an opportunity to make some general remarks, if I may, since I was not able to speak yesterday.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Yes, go ahead, please.

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, someone yesterday said that budgetary planning in the Northwest Territories was in a mess or words to that effect, and I agree with the statement. I would like the members of the financial management committee and the directors of departments to understand that if things are confused in Yellowknife as they have been this year, this fiscal year, and if there is uncertainty about where we stand in terms of how much money is going to be available for departments in Yellowknife, the confusion and uncertainty is multiplied many times by the time it gets to the remote regions.

I would just like briefly to outline to you the horrendous exercise that we all went through in the Baffin region this fall until the present time in connection with the budget for this last fiscal year which is ending March 31st, 1980. Particularly, I would like to describe it in terms of the education budget because that is an area of my particular concern.

Shortage Of Money For Education

While this Assembly was in session for the first time in early November we were told and it was well known by everyone that there would be a serious shortage of money in the Education department. The very controversial memo of the Director of Education, Mr. Lewis, had been circulated to the regions and it was well known by people who worked for the Department of Education that it imposed substantial restraints. I would say that the reaction of the teaching staff and education committees in the region to those restraints in the main was a very healthy reaction in that people were willing even at the last minute to make sacrifices. There was, of course, a great deal of controversy about any steps which would remove classroom assistants and Inuktitut teaching staff from the schools, but we were pleased that those parts of the restraint measures were varied so as to prevent the loss of any of those positions in this fiscal year.

After those restraint measures were announced we also understood that similar restraints would be imposed upon the Department of Education for the coming year in the estimates that we are considering now and as the minutes of the standing committee on finance reveal in their meeting in early December, there was a great deal of, I think, very thoughtful and useful discussion about how money could be saved. I would like to say again that the public and even the people who work in the Department of Education, for example, and I am sure it is true of other departments, are not unwilling to tighten their belts and they are not unwilling to lose positions. In fact many of my constituents said, "It is about time that some of the fat is trimmed in these departments. It is about time that we had an excuse to get rid of people and programs which are obviously surplus."

Regions Should Determine Priorities

At the time the standing committee on finance met, while I objected to the manner in which cutbacks were made or were suggested by the Executive, in that I thought they were arbitrary suggestions where whole programs would be cut all across the Territories, I did tell the standing committee on finance, as I wish to tell this Assembly, that I think if there was some way that the regions could determine priorities and could determine what should be cut and what should not be cut, in a department which depends on public consultation such as Education where there is a high degree of public interest, you would find that a significant amount of money could be saved without destroying or in any serious way impairing the quality of education. We were willing to entertain staff cutbacks in places where the attendance rates at schools was not high, in situations where the teacher-pupil ratio might seem to be too high but, in fact, because of poor attendance was not really that high. We were willing to make sacrifices like the kind I suggested to the finance committee, stop buying new vehicles in the coming year, even make this a restraint measure across the Territories. How much money could we save if we do that?

There was a certain amount, of course, of concern on the part of people in that everything was rushed and there was some worry that positions would have to be terminated. I believed then and I believe now that if planning takes place in a long-range manner, positions can be eliminated by attrition in many cases and hardships on individuals can be avoided in most situations. Now, however, when everyone was preparing to tighten their belts and really looking hard and I thought it was a very fruitful exercise, we were looking hard at trimming the waste in the Department of Education. Many of my constituents are worried about waste of money.

When we were looking hard at trimming the budget in a healthy way, now suddenly we learned in the late fall that while the restraints are off, there will be moneys appropriated it appears, we will be rescued, there is nothing to worry about in the fiscal year 1979-80 and furthermore recently we learned that by this device of a deficit budget everything looks good now for 1980-81 in the Department of Education. The program will operate more or less at the same level it operated before and nobody really has to scrutinize carefully the manner in which these significant amounts of public money are spent.

Voting A Deficit Budget

I raise all this, Mr. Chairman, because I think we should devote some attention to the basic question raised by the Hon. Member from the Western Arctic yesterday and alluded to by the Hon. Minister of Education today. That is, are we willing to vote a deficit budget? I raise it in the context of the uncertainty and increasing problems of credibility that this government will undoubtedly face if we do not know until the end of the year or until near the end of the year -- I am not satisfied the best efforts of the Executive Committee and the best efforts of the Director of Finance and the Commissioner can give us very much more warning, advance warning of what the real situation is going to be, than we have had this year. I understand that still the Treasury Board has yet to make a ruling on our request for supplementary funding for this year. We still really do not know...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Patterson, your time has expired to speak. Is it the Members' wish that he continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you. I will try to be not much longer. We still do not know this year at this time, this late in the year whether or not we are going to be rescued by Ottawa. I am not optimistic that the situation is going to be much better next year, frankly, and I am very concerned about the sort of confusion and uncertainty that a deficit budget will impose on us and I am also very concerned that we in voting this deficit budget will be skating over the real question. That is, are we wasting money? Where are we wasting money? How can we cut back the tremendous waste of government funds that seems so obvious to the outside observer? I would like to ask this Assembly and ask perhaps the Minister if he will respond. Should we not seriously consider at least trying to reduce the extent of this deficit?

Areas In Which Money Can Be Saved

Should we not look seriously in the Department of Education and other departments at areas in which we could save money? Should we not be asking questions like, "Do we need to purchase new vehicles in the coming year?" Is the busing system in Education a bit of a luxury? Can we not cut back teaching staff without seriously damaging the student-teacher ratio across the Territories? Does the government charter too many aircraft in travelling? These are the sorts of questions that I am afraid having a deficit budget may lull us into not asking when we consider these estimates. All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is I would like to see, particularly at this point since the budget speech has just been presented, I would like to see some justification from the Executive Committee as to what made them decide to recommend a deficit budget when the first draft of the main estimates would have imposed severe and, I think in many ways, healthy restraints on spending.

Can we consider this broad issue and come to some expression of the consensus of the Assembly because if there is a consensus that a deficit budget for many reasons is a dangerous thing and is to be avoided at all costs, then maybe we can scrutinize these departmental estimates much more closely to try and find ways of saving money and if you, Mr. Butters, would be willing to reply to that and if any other Members have any views I would be grateful because I think this is an important question of principle that we should deal with now before we plunge into the detailed departmental estimates. I would particularly like to know, did the Executive Committee carefully consider the option of not having a deficit budget and if you rejected it -- if you carefully considered that as I am sure you did, what were the reasons for proceeding with a deficit budget? Why should we do this? Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Hon. Mr. Butters.

Reason For Presenting A Deficit Budget

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Member from Baffin South used the words "uncertainties and confusion" on a number of occasions and pointed out that confusion and uncertainties are multiplied when it is devoluted to the regions. I would take it one step further and point out that that confusion and uncertainty did not start here in Yellowknife. It began in Ottawa and the reason that there is concern and uncertainty is that at the present time only one of the major parties have said how much we could expect the cost of energy to rise. The Liberals have shilly-shallied and dilly-dallied and refused to point out what cost they will expect to charge for fuel and I have not heard the New Democratic Party say anything.

The major problem and the reason we are presenting a deficit budget is not that we want to reduce or cut back but because we have no way of determining what fuel oil is going to cost, especially when we are importing the bulk of that product from overseas. You know that while Alberta oil is selling for something like \$15 a barrel, various nations across the world have just raised their oil to \$35 a barrel, \$37 a barrel and you could probably pay \$50 on the spot market. That is why there is confusion. We do not know what that aspect of our budget is going to be. If you can tell me, do so. Mr. Trudeau

would like to know because apparently he does not know either if he returns to government. There is uncertainty, yes, and this is the forked stick we are caught in and we will be caught in it again and again as long as petroleum supplies must come from offshore. You know what you have to pay for gas, as somebody mentioned in Coral Harbour, and those prices are not going to go down. That is why we are presenting a deficit budget. I would like to go on and look at the manner in which the strictures were made known to the communities.

The manager who is the Deputy Minister, Mr. Lewis, was told that there would be certain restrictions on the amount of money available to him to carry out his programs. On being told that, he then had to indicate to the various regions the restrictions that had been placed on him. I believe that this has probably been the reverse of what is usually the case. The ideas do come from the field, but this time he was told what cuts had to be made and he determined that he would try to protect the area of the school programs and that other areas, adult education possibly and special education and busing and these things should be looked at first. The superintendents were advised of that and they made their recommendations, I believe, in consultation with him. They met here and made their recommendations to him.

Now, the Hon. Member from Baffin says that the input that he has heard from his constituents is that: "It is about time. It is great that we now have no money or a reduced amount of money to spend on these programs which have been put in place over many years." That is not what I get. My desk is littered with paper as a result of that letter in September saying, "Do not cut this. We need this. It is most important." People from his constituency, the Eastern Arctic, are saying that too. They are saying that. They are telling us not to cut.

Concern Of Finance Committee Over Cutbacks In Education

When the Executive Committee met and discussed this fiscal situation which this government found itself in in November, unfortunately, because of the change of government and the new players coming on the field, a situation occurred where the standing committee on finance and the Executive Committee were meeting at the same time, and we did not make our decision relative to a deficit budget until we had the report of the standing committee. Now, I have not only the minutes of the committee that made that report, but I have my hand written notes of what the chairman of the standing committee said to us. And they impressed upon us, and I think they ably and adequately reflected this concern in the Territories as a whole that there were going to be cuts in a number of areas in education. They indicated to us that they did not wish to see these cuts occur.

They also indicated to us another thing. It was that there must be a re-evaluation of how the money is currently being spent. They wanted to know how the money is being spent and this is valid. This is what Members are sent here to determine and to decide on. On the basis of that recommendation, and their recommendation had a great impact on the thinking of the Executive Committee, we determined that we would put the money back in. We had already agreed that we would transfer \$2.7 million from capital. There is a telex in existence from Ottawa which gives us permission to make that transfer and we would put back in the various programs what had been cut and especially in education. This is what we did, and this is why we present to you a deficit budget.

Cutbacks Have Been Done Competently And Effectively

I will be surprised if there are that many cuts that can be made when we look at it in detail. I think that you will find that the cutting exercise has been done ably and consistently and competently and that as this budget goes forward you will find many areas in which reductions have taken place, that the fat has been trimmed off. We agree that there should not be any fat, but we think that we can assure you as we examine the budget that that exercise has been done competently and effectively.

So, I look forward and expect that the matter will be raised again when the Department of Education estimates come before the House, and I am delighted that this will occur because I would like to be able to speak to the specifics of some of the concerns that were raised to us. But I would just close by saying that we believe that we have done a job in meeting your wishes and your directions. We believe we will be able to show that we have in most cases followed the direction and guidance given to us by the standing committee of this House, maybe not in every detail, but I think in most cases. So that I would look forward to the debate going forward and scrutiny of our work and our decisions being carried out by this House.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mrs. Sorensen.

Finance Committee Could Not Find \$14 Million Worth Of Solutions

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Butters is quite right when he said earlier in his comments that the committee in its report did not fully endorse the deficit of \$13.95 million and we did that on purpose. As I said in the report, we were overwhelmed with the seriousness of the situation and in our comments we took pains to point out that this budget presentation was an unusual one and that were we to go ahead we would be doing so without the guarantee that the deficit would be covered by the federal government.

We also reviewed the budget in our limited capacity given our newness and our lack of long-term government budgeting expertise. We reviewed the budget in December with an emphasis on what hardships would be imposed upon the people of the North if this Assembly was to vote a balanced budget. In other words, take the necessary restraint measures in all departments. Frankly, we had some recommendations, but we did not have \$14 million worth of solutions.

The reason that we decided that we could not fully endorse the entire deficit is that we are yet to be completely satisfied that certain individual departments cannot operate with less than what appears in the main estimates. In other words, we do not necessarily accept that Education requires the full \$46,227,000 to operate for 1980-81, or that the Department of Public Works requires some \$63 million to operate during 1980-81.

On the question of the principle of approving a deficit budget, I would think, and my committee will correct me if I am wrong, that we could support that move but only if we are assured that it can be fully justified, and to me that is what the next few weeks are all about. That is what we are going to be doing when we review each department and that is the time when we can decide to try to whittle down that deficit, if it is at all possible. In conclusion, if I can get back to my original comment, we could not find \$14 million worth of solutions.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Mr. Butters.

Communication With Ottawa

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Just to point out what I did not stress in my remarks immediately before the Hon. Member from Yellowknife South spoke, but coupled with the action we were taking here, there was persistent and continuous communication between this government and Ottawa to ensure that they did recognize that our requests for supplementary funding were valid, reasonable and realistic ones, and we have this assurance from the Treasury Board and from the current Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

So, it was on this assurance and in fact we are expecting that we may hear today that our submission for this year has not only been before the Treasury Board, but that the concept of supplementary funding for extraordinary expenditures, energy, has been accepted by that government. So, it was on the expectation and on the encouragement from the senior government that we put forward this deficit budget at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Any further general discussion? Mr. Patterson.

Deficit Should Be Kept To Minimum

MR. PATTERSON: I do not know if it is in order for me to speak again, Mr. Chairman, but I found the comments of Mr. Butters very useful. I think it is important that these questions be discussed publicly. I was one of the ones who cried the loudest about the cuts which appeared were going to have to be imposed upon the Department of Education and I do not want to imply for a minute that I am not in general agreement with continuing things at the present level. The only point which I wish to make to this Assembly is that for obvious reasons it is in our best interest to keep the deficit to a minimum, and I would hate to see us casually approving these estimates without looking for ways of cutting back waste money simply because we expect to be rescued by Ottawa later on.

The only other point I would wish to make is that if at the end of the exercise, and I am sure that it will happen, particularly in view of what the Hon. Mrs. Sorensen says, if at the end of this whole exercise we do discover that the budget must be a deficit budget, then I would urge this House as an Assembly and not just as a group who are confirming the action taken by the Executive, I would urge this entire House, all of the Members, to present a very strong motion to the federal government and make a very strong petition to the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs, whoever he may be after the end of our deliberations, explaining that we have done our best to make sacrifices, and that we urge them at an early time to avoid this uncertainty. To avoid the morale problems that are going to arise, to avoid the credibility problems which this government will have even if it is not our fault that we do not know where we stand, to avoid those sorts of problems we should stress in the strongest terms possible for some kind of early indication from the federal government that they will recognize these energy costs. I think in the meantime that it is important that in considering these estimates, we avoid a deficit of this size and avoid putting ourselves in this situation as much as we possibly can.

---Applause

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Braden.

Commitment For 1980-81 Fiscal Year

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you. I have a general question and then some comments and, Mr. Minister, if it is all right with you, I direct the question to Mr. Nielsen. Can you tell us, Mr. Nielsen, in a general way about the kinds of commitments which the Government of the Northwest Territories has vis-a-vis their 1980-81 programs and services and if I can elaborate a bit, commitments where we need a decision in the next month in order that orders can be placed and the various other types of steps taken to ensure that as of April 1st, 1980, the program can move ahead? Do you understand what I am getting at? Can you give us kind of a general overview of this particular topic?

MR. NIELSEN: In terms of commitment for the 1980-81 fiscal year generally, no hard commitments are made until after the 1st of April or on the 1st of April, primarily because funds are not available and no funding can be committed. So I would say between now and April 1st the only thing that we would be talking about are orders that we have had to place for things like fire trucks and perhaps commitments on certain parts of construction where they are continuing over in our capital budget but certainly nothing of any major significance. As Mr. Butters would know, there are commitments that would have to be made, approximately in May, to teaching staff. Those are the major employee commitments that would be made early in the year, but as the Commissioner pointed out yesterday, we hopefully will have resolved the direction by that time and at least have some indication as to what funding is available.

A Plan Of Action Needed

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you. With respect to my comments, I agree with the remarks the Member from Frobisher Bay made and I think we must determine at this time the principle of how we are going to deal with this issue of a deficit budget. If we are to reject this concept, then I think that we should determine that now, so that in our examination of the budget we can identify areas where we have to make changes, where we have to make cuts. I believe that we have to make these changes in this public forum so that the public and the people of the Northwest Territories understand and are knowledgeable about what we are doing. Now if we are to accept the concept of a deficit budget, then let us try and understand the implications of such a move. While I wish I could share the optimism of the Commissioner and the Minister or Mr. Butters, I suspect that we are going to have a difficult time dealing with the federal government. So let us define, given that condition, a plan of action which we can use to obtain the extraordinary funding in the future from the federal government.

I just want to conclude by stressing again that if we are to make more cuts, then let us get that straight now. Let us not wait until four weeks from now when we have gone through everything and decide we do not really like this business of a deficit budget and that it is up to the Executive, to find a way to make \$14 million in cuts. I think we have to start now with some idea of the route we are going to take with this budget. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. MacQuarrie.

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: Mr. Chairman, if it is all right with the hon. Minister, I would like to address a question to Mr. Burch. Do I understand, Mr. Burch, you are involved with financial planning in the Territories?

MR. BURCH: Yes.

Alternate Sources Of Revenue

HON. ROBERT H. MacQUARRIE: With what is happening this year this might be but the beginning of a series of problems in ensuing years. While we are talking about the budget in a general way could you maybe give Members some indication of planning that is going on at the present time to try to ensure in the future that legitimate program needs will be met? That would be in addition to trying to persuade the federal government that they ought to fund us a little more generously than they are doing. Are you looking at alternative sources of revenue and so on?

MR. NIELSEN: Mr. MacQuarrie, if you do not mind I will perhaps take responsibility for answering that question. The financial planning aspect of finance takes place throughout the year. It is an ongoing process. It starts at least a year in advance of a budget year. We have recognized problems and we have been working towards those solutions and, as was identified in the budget speech, initiative has been taken by the Executive Committee to commence negotiations for a new type of financial arrangement.

We met this morning with officials from Ottawa, as a matter of fact, and in that discussion identified the problem and had started down a track that hopefully will at least provide for a far better minimum interim arrangement to satisfy ourselves with a reasonable level of funding. It will be part of the negotiation process which hopefully will at least set up some sort of structure even if it is only an interim structure by May of this year, but long-term planning and the requirements for that have been identified by the financial area and by the Executive Committee. In fact, in the review of the budget process this year it was identified as a priority and an area in which our financial management secretariat should be devoting considerable time. So I would say that in some respects the ball is in our court now to go out and get some economic indicators to evaluate other provinces' financial arrangements and make a proposal to the federal government and that is something we have placed as a very high priority at the moment.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Stewart.

Certain Amount Of Money Necessary To Operate

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Deficit budgeting is nothing new. It has certainly been going on for some time in all parts of the world, not only in Canada, and it appears to me that we have the word of our Executive Committee and our standing committee on finance that the budget that is being presented to this House today is the amount of money that is necessary to run the Territories for the next fiscal year. Then surely let us get on with the job of having a look at it and if somebody can find something that may stand out as possibly something that we may be able to do without, fine, but to try and make a decision at this time after we have had some people working on this thing for nine months, putting this thing together, to argue whether it is going to be deficit or not deficit at this position is in my opinion ludicrous.

There is a certain fee or a certain amount of money that we have got to have to be able to operate the Northwest Territories and we are told that this is the amount that is needed. They have cut everything out of here they can cut. Let us get on with the job and see whether or not that is true. Certainly if the Department of Finance in Ottawa has the blessing of the Minister of Northern Affairs of the day for the Territories for a deficit budget, then surely this government, being a creature of the federal government and the federal government being our chief banker, what position of endangerment are we putting the territorial government in? As far as I can see, none. So let us get on with going through the thing and get on with the job at hand because deficit or not deficit does not really make any difference. If you have got to have it, you have got to have it. That is all there is to it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. Stewart. Mr. Curley.

Cutbacks Mainly Affect Eastern Arctic

MR. CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make some general comments in respect to the deficit budget that we are facing. Coming in from the Eastern Arctic it is very disillusioning to me to see all the cuts so far have mainly affected the Eastern Arctic -- in terms of budget cutbacks. I believe the hon. Member just stated that we have got to get on. No doubt Yellowknife is not going to suffer nor is it going to make any major changes because certainly it is going to carry on with the size of the staff that it has, and likely will increase the Executive staff. As far as my region is concerned I see the main concern of the region is to have more autonomy but so far we have not seen any measures that would give the Eastern Arctic more control to deal with education, regional government, hamlets. As a matter of fact, the hunters' and trappers' grant this year is going to be cut rather than giving more responsibility to manage wildlife affairs. So I am very disillusioned with those things because surely the Executive Members may want to get on with the job, but at the moment I do not see how they are going to make the program services available to our people. I do not know whether I am going to be able to support such a budget that would bring more burden to our people in the Eastern Arctic.

So far as the energy cost is concerned I think we have been assured by the Conservative government that they will be increasing fuel costs by imposing an excise tax on fuel of 25 cents per gallon and an excise tax on gasoline of 18 cents. You know, these are very disillusioning factors to us in the Eastern Arctic and mainly because of transportation being the problem. This government seems to have sat on its feet when all of the economic factors in the Eastern Arctic seem to be the most profound problems. I think the Hon. Member from Inuvik has just stated that the energy cost is the main problem and in fact it is a problem in the East particularly, but there have been no measures that I see that would encourage me to support the budget in terms of finding other alternative solutions to the transportation system.

Transportation System In The Eastern Arctic

When we look at the transportation system in the Eastern Arctic, in the Keewatin region, the government, the administration has sat and remained silent when the air fares and everything else, freight rates are going to be increased. I just received a letter today on a decision of the transport committee. I attempted last October to try and get this government to support proper air services so that the people in the Eastern Arctic, particularly the Keewatin, could not be given an extra burden in terms of transportation costs for small businessmen who have to handle all their costs, whether it be energy or utility costs. When I say I am disillusioned it is because I have not seen any measures that would better satisfy us or policy announcements that would reassure people in the Eastern Arctic that this government is concerned with the unfair relation that we see with this area at Yellowknife headquarters.

The main program we are going to be voting on mainly will be controlled and managed by the headquarters at Yellowknife and very little we see of devolution measures that would give more control, more involvement with the people at the community level and regional level so I do not know. I just do not want to sound negative, but if we are going to get on with governing the Territories we had better make sure that we are not just creating a divisive program and divisive government but make sure that the programs are going to involve people in the communities. I am interested to ask the administration officials here whether in fact there have been measures to tighten up the departmental controls.

As Members of the Assembly who are supposed to represent the small man and the far regions, we do not have very much control as far as expenses are concerned. We cannot spend more money than we are allowed as Members. I can tell you that telephone calls that are expensive in the Eastern Arctic because the transportation is difficult, even that is controlled. We are only allowed \$1500 a year to look after constituency matters and sometimes we must deal with Yellowknife and telephone calls. I would ask the treasurer whether or not similar measures are, in fact, taken to handle the directors' travel or the directors' telephone calls, and there may be cases where a small junior clerk who would likely spend more money on telephone charges than some of us Members. Could you advise me whether or not there have been measures that have been taken to tighten up the travel expenses and whatnot, or unnecessary travel for charters, or minimizing travel rather than having two people travel for small matters? Could you make some response to that?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. Curley. Before we ask Mr. Butters to speak or Mr. Nerysoo, I did not get a cup of tea the last time, so we will break for 15 minutes for our coffee break. We will break for our coffee break. We will then come back and discuss the topic that we are currently talking about. Are you objecting to a coffee break?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, if I could suggest that Members adhere to the 15 minute stricture that you have put on the break, for every minute that we spend over that time standing around, walking and talking, costs about ten dollars a minute is what the rental of this place costs, I think.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): I will ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to remind everybody at 14 and one-half minutes.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): I note that we have a quorum. I would like to get an indication from the Members when questions are asked specifically to a witness. Do you want those questions to be answered immediately or wait until the other people have finished speaking?

MR. PATTERSON: Immediately.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Well, in the absence of the person who was asking questions, I will go on to Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that in response to the Hon. Member from South Keewatin, his statement that he feels that major cuts were made in the estimate material on expenditures from the Eastern Arctic, I would hope and I believe that on examination of the budget on a detail by detail basis, it will show that where a major cut has been made in a major item of expenditure, it would be spread out, evened out. I think that we will be able to show that we have not treated the Eastern Arctic less generously than any other area, even though, as yet, the two Members from that area have not been chosen to sit on the Executive Committee.

I would also ask, sir, that possibly Mr. Nielsen might answer the question that Mr. Curley put and it related to what economies has the administration developed in the area of travel charters and long distance telephones, I think it was.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Nielsen.

MR. NIELSEN: The Hon. Member from Keewatin South is not here. Did you want me to answer the question in any case?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): I told everyone to be here, at your request, in 15 minutes that everyone be here. Mr. Curley, you have questions that are being answered. We appreciate your presence.

Co-ordination Of Air Charters

MR. NIELSEN: Mr. Chairman, first of all, a specific response with respect to the air charters. A few years ago, I think this would be as much as four, the Government of the Northwest Territories, the administration, recognized that there was a problem with air charters and has taken extensive steps to co-ordinate air charters in headquarters and in the regions over the period of the last four years. The last two years have seen significant improvements in that to the extent that the reports that we now get have indicated no exceptions, no exceptions in air charter activity whatsoever.

There is a reasonable amount of air charter activity on the other hand, but there is certainly a question as to whether or not the program can be effectively delivered by reducing that air charter activity much more and I would say that at the moment, to a very large degree, the Deputy Ministers of each department are charged with that responsibility, to ensure that there are no air charters being taken.

With respect to my own department, which is the only one that I can speak for, for all travel activity I have upgraded the approvals which previously could have been authorized by managers or supervisors. I now examine every individual travel authorization and I think there are a number of departments that are doing that, simply because the funding is not there.

Three Major Increases In Expenditure

To put things into perspective, I think I would like to give you an indication of what we are talking about. First of all, there are only three areas that have caused major increases in expenditure. The first one, which is the Housing Corporation, which has had a 22 per cent increase in its contribution and that is directly attributable to utility costs in the Housing Corporation, in the housing association. At Justice and Public Services, which have increased in one area, and that is the Police Services Agreement, by 22 per cent and that is directly attributable to a Police Services Agreement with the federal government. That increase has been negotiated outside the fiscal framework with the federal government. The third area is the Department of Public Works and to give you an indication of the budget to budget increase, last year the Department of Public Works had approximately \$14 million in its budget for utilities. The projected utilities expenditure for 1980-81 is \$29 million, that is an increase of \$15 million, 106 per cent -- 105.7 per cent. That increase in utilities in the Department of Public Works alone is the reason for this deficit budget.

I should also like to point out that the deficit budget of \$13.9 million is in operations and maintenance alone. Taken together, capital and O and M, the deficit budget is \$9.1 million.

Again, putting things into perspective, I would like to just indicate to you as was pointed out by the Hon. Member from Frobisher Bay with respect to the concern as to whether or not these budgets really are restraint budgets. The Executive budget has had a 9.6 per cent decrease, excluding the Housing Corporation. The Department of Information has had a 2.8 per cent decrease. The Department of Personnel, 4.3 per cent increase. Government Services, 0.8 per cent increase. Public Works a 2.6 per cent decrease and those numbers can continue. The point that I am making here is that if you were going to take last years budget or last years actual expenditures and increase them by what would be considered to be just maintaining the status quo you would have had probably nine per cent or more increases in every budget. So, every budget that has been presented to you with one or two exceptions, in fact, is a real and significant decrease, a restraint budget of which the likes of this government has never really seen before.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Nerysoo.

More Programs In The Eastern Arctic

MR. NERYSOO: Yes, I just have a couple of comments to make with regard to continued reference that the Western Arctic, it seemed was receiving, I think, much more benefit from the budget than the Eastern Arctic. I can assure you from looking at the amount of money that has been allocated to the Eastern Arctic, that it is far more significant than those, in fact, fundings that have been allocated to the Dene communities. Each time that you refer to the fact that the Dene communities are, in fact, receiving more funding than are, you are extremely wrong. You are assuming that every one of us, for instance, has a hamlet council; that every one of us, in fact, is receiving trucks that can, in fact, operate with no or very few roads. We do not have those things. We do not have those luxuries, as I would call them. You have a language development program that we do not have. You have housing programs that we do not have. You are participating in the housing program to the extent that we are not participating. You have a right to decide basically the types of housing that are going to be constructed in the East that we do not have and are only getting into now.

We are talking about authority and hunters' and trappers' association and participation. The kind of funding that you get is, in fact, more extensive than we get, and in fact, I have negotiated more funding this year for that area than any other region has ever gotten.

Now, for you people to come here and suggest that our people in the West are getting more funding, I think you should really re-evaluate that and look at it because I have sat here for the last couple of days and this idea of East versus West, and it is not that and I think that you should re-evaluate. All you have to do is go seven miles from here and see that we are not in fact receiving the kind of funding you are. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Ms. Cournoyea.

Clarification Regarding Fuel Subsidies

MS. COURNOYEA: Just on a point, to the Member from Inuvik. I just want to clear up the clarification. He made a statement that they were waiting for word from the federal government in regard to the fuel subsidy. I was wondering if he felt that this was going to be a favourable response and that we may be getting word in one or two days. Is this for the 1980-81 budget, and if it is, in fact, the money that we are talking about, would it not be a deficit if this subsidy is forthcoming?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Do you wish to respond?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: No, it would not be for the 1980-81 budget. It would be for our current situation.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I think the importance of the submission at this time is the gestation period was rather subnormal and it was only six months. I submit to Members here that if you have difficulties here with the six month gestation period just think what the Executive Committee of this government is feeling. We had a two month gestation period to bring forth the birth of this particular budget. I suggest that is rather low. Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I think that in terms of the remarks that have been made about the acceptance or the non-acceptance of this particular budget and the kinds of accountability exercises that we went through I want to assure Members of this committee that, in fact, we did go through the accountability exercise and in order to maintain the level of services and in some instances increase those levels of services where there had been demand for such we were not able to come up with a budget different than the one we have now.

We have identified certain extra energy costs and, as my colleague on the Executive, the Hon. Mr. Butters has indicated, those costs are directly related to increased utility costs, fuel costs and we are not able, under the present system under which we work that has been labelled as antiquated, outdated and everything else, to do very much more than guesstimate and in fact we really cannot guesstimate what they will do in an attempt to get further funding through the process we now go through.

Possibility Of New Revenues

In terms of the budget, because there were certain pieces of legislation that this House will have to okay, we have not been able to take into account the kinds of increased revenues that this government is proposing. We will have to deal with those pieces of legislation later on but we have identified the possibility of new revenues, new prices, new fuel taxes and it is true we have no guarantee from the federal government to get increased funding but other Members put five of us on the Executive Committee to take the responsibility, not just to sit back and condemn, but to take the responsibility to go forward and present a political case to the federal government that we have to be treated differently than in the South.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I know I can speak for the other four elected Members on that Executive Committee, that that is exactly what we intend to do. But at the present time to whom do you go? There is not anybody down there. But we intend to go for the 1980-81 year and present a political case and change the ground rules because we are tired, sick and tired of being treated as a division, as part of a department of the federal government.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Hear, hear!

---Applause

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I think that we are capable of doing that but I hear demands for increased services. I hear demands for increased funding and I do not hear anybody telling me we have got to cut out something. It is very easy to cut out 50 to 60 teachers, for example, in the Northwest Territories and we may very well get a certain amount of money, we will say \$30,000, the cost of a teacher. Multiply 30 by 60 or 100, but on the other hand and I know from experience that there were demands from other communities that they want increased educational services. In fact, if you look at some of the correspondence to the board, the standing committee, rather, on it, there are references to changing pupil-teacher ratios. In fact the Hon. Member from Frobisher Bay suggested we should increase the pupil-teacher ratio from 19 to 25.

Problems Of Bringing Forth A Responsible Budget

That may be very easy for an individual who is not on the Executive Committee to suggest. I will tell you dollars to doughnuts that it comes down to the accountability to put this across and to put that particular increase in the pupil-teacher ratio across to schools in the Northwest Territories. The guy to whom that can is going to be tied or to whose tail that can is going to be tied is the person who is going to be responsible, is our Minister of Education. He is going to be like a skunk at a garden party -- all alone. I think that we have gone through, in the limited time that we as an Executive Committee have had at our disposal, to bring forth a budget that is responsible, that is a restraint budget because make no mistake about it we are not increasing programs or services. We are attempting to maintain because that is what we have. We have gone through, we have cut, we have scraped. Just ask my good buddy alongside how things went.

MR. STEWART: It is not over yet.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I know that. I am waiting. We have gone through with that exercise and if we can identify where there should be more, as a committee, as a House, then we as an elected Executive will go along with that. You gave us the responsibility to listen to what you have said about where we should be putting the emphasis and we may put the emphasis on the wrong syllable at some times but nevertheless the decision has to come somewhere. It comes down to that and we have made the decision in the limited time that we have had at our disposal to bring forth that budget.

Responsibility Of Members

I believe, as do other Members of the Executive Committee, that it is a responsible budget because everybody is not going to win their own things. Sometimes you have got to lose some. It is very easy to sit back and say, "We need more money. We need more financing. But you have got to cut out something." You determine as an elected Member what to cut out because the minute you do cut it out you can bet your bottom dollar you are going to get criticized from the House for doing that as well.

---Applause

If you will not take the responsibility of being in the position to make the cuts, if you are not willing to stand up and take that responsibility, then you have to accept that there were certain kinds of decisions made by those who will take that position. If you as a group decide that it is not responsible, that it does not show enough restraint, that we have not gone through the accountability exercise properly in your view, then as Mr. Sibbeston yesterday indicated, you have the wherewithal as to our particular future. I accepted that as I am sure other Members did when they were appointed, selected by you people. If you do not think we are doing the proper job, let us know because I will be one of the first guys to say let somebody else have another shot at it, Jack. I will take a step back. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Patterson.

Allowing Regions To Set Priorities

MR. PATTERSON: I would like to ask anyone who is willing to answer why planning, financial planning is not devolved to the regions. Why, for example, regions cannot set capital spending priorities and do not set capital spending priorities? Why you cannot give the Baffin region its overall budget and leave it to groups like the Baffin Regional Council and groups like the Baffin region civil service to allocate priorities and decide where the money should be spent? Why must things be done on a territorial-wide basis? Why do we have to pay such loyalty to this notion of equality across the Territories? Mr. McCallum referred to my comments about the pupil-teacher ratio. I do not recall suggesting it should be raised to 25 to one but as an example, if it will help clarify my question, there are schools in the Baffin region where attendance is very low. Nobody knows particularly why and obviously it is a question of concern, but the pupil-teacher ratio which I think is 19 or 20 to one is based on the registers, not on the attendance ratios. There are schools in the Baffin region where due to the attendance the ratios are phenomenally high between pupils and teachers. In those areas we can do without a few teachers. We understand what our priorities are. We understand where programs are effective and where they are not, but this budgetary planning process as far as I can see is a very centralized process. There is input from the regions and superintendents have things they can say but ultimately the decisions are made here in Yellowknife on a principle that the Territories should all be the same.

Has anyone given any consideration to allowing the regions to set the priorities? Mr. Moore promised the Baffin Regional Council when he was regional director that steps would be taken to allow the Baffin Regional Council to set priorities for capital spending in the Baffin region on a regional basis in communities that we know better than most decision makers in Yellowknife. Has anything been done about that? Will anything be done about that? This is to me one of the reasons why the budget process is so difficult at the Assembly level.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. McCallum, I think you showed an interest in answering Mr. Patterson.

Role Of Public Servants In Capital Planning

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I will take a shot at it. Somebody else might want to take a shot as well but I will take a shot at it. In relation to the first and opening question of Mr. Patterson as to why regional public civil servants should not have an input into capital planning my response to that is that if I were a Member or as a Member of this particular body, the House, Legislative Assembly, I do not want a public civil servant telling me what should go on in my particular area. I want to have that kind of input into it. That is the first answer and somebody else may want to say something regarding that. I consider regional groups, as we now know them, administrators. They carry out the policy. That is not a regional government that sits in Fort Smith. That is a regional administration and they are accountable to the Executive Committee for making sure that the policies and the services and programs go out into those areas. That is the way I would want it under the present system. I do not want to have five governments of the Northwest Territories and as well as I do not want to have 14 departments who consider themselves to be governments of the Northwest Territories.

In relation to capital planning I think one of the things that Mr. Patterson should know is that in point of fact we are doing something about getting more, and when I say "we" that is the Executive, the administration if you like, getting more regional input because now we have the director of regional operations overseeing capital planning and being responsible for it.

I think that we have been able to respond in a way and notwithstanding that the honourable gentleman that you referred to, Mr. Moore, as a regional director, as a regional administrator suggesting that, yes, the Baffin region will have more input into capital planning. As the MLA from Slave River in my opinion I hold a view, I do not know how many agree to it, I would not want the regional director of administration going into particular communities of the Fort Smith region and overstepping his particular role and saying that, "Yes, I know what will be best for Yellowknife or Hay River or Fort Smith or Fort Simpson or Fort Resolution." Because I believe Yellowknife Members will know what is best in terms of capital and if they do not their electorate will soon tell them, as they will tell me, and as they will tell Mr. Sibbeston in Fort Simpson. Mr. Sibbeston in Fort Simpson and Mr. Sayine in Fort Resolution, they are the people who should be taking the viewpoints of their particular areas in this House and to put forth that viewpoint. That is my reaction to your comments. There may be other Members of the Executive who would like to comment on it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): On the question, Mr. Braden?

Input From The Eastern Arctic

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I guess I could just add a short footnote to what Mr. McCallum has said. We are hearing from Mr. Patterson about problems with the financial planning process. We heard last week and today from Mr. Curley about the problems in decentralization of government, devolution to community governments or possibly regional governments. I guess I could just say that we have to deal with these issues and as the Executive is presently structured we are a group primarily from the West. While I am not going to come right out and say that without your representation from the Eastern Arctic in the Executive we are not able to make intelligent decisions, on the business of the problems in financial planning I would certainly be prepared to work further with Members and other individuals in the Eastern Arctic in coming to some satisfactory arrangement whereby the people in the East felt that they were, in the first instance, contributing to a good financial plan and that there was some measure of authority at the local level or at the regional level for the expenditure of dollars which are allocated to the Baffin or the Keewatin or the Central Arctic. I guess that in order to produce that kind of thing it means a lot of work and a lot of commitment and one logical step is for you to have some people sitting here in Yellowknife working with us to make the changes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: If that is not agreeable at this point in time, then let us work out something else, some other arrangement, so that we can start working together closely.

I will just conclude by saying that Mr. Curley's remarks the other day, and what you are saying today as far as I am concerned, are well taken. We have been at work in the Executive for two or three months. It is a new group and a new organization and we are trying to get things established. I anticipated that we would have problems and we would be criticized in the first few months but your comments are well taken and I look forward in the future to working these things out and getting a better working relationship between East and West. That is all I have to say. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. McCallum.

Mr. Patterson's Views On Education

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Patterson indicated that he did not recall suggesting changing the pupil-teacher ratio. I would refer him to his letter of December 10, 1980 to the chairman of finance, the standing committee on finance, to page two at the bottom. The bottom paragraph where he suggests that "...he can see..." and the "can" is underlined, "...making cuts in continuing or adult education and administration, but the budget for children in school should not be preserved at all costs as proposed in the figures to date. I would strongly urge that there be an increase in the pupil-teacher ratio and elimination of ordinary teacher positions, but a much more appealing device of attrition rather than through termination which would be the result of the virtual elimination of adult education as proposed. The pupil-teacher ratio in the schools is now 19 to one. If it were adjusted to, for example, 25 to one, we could save many of the most vital positions in continuing education and, at least, retain the important administration positions and expenses." Thank you.

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you. I am glad to see somebody is reading my letters.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: You better believe it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Noah.

MR. NOAH: Mr. Chairman, in my constituency my constituents prior to receiving hamlet status were given money to operate various municipal services. At this time it is still not what we expected and we continue to ask for utility assistance and have not gotten it.

Co-operation To Solve Problems

The government realizes now that in the Northwest Territories, the various agencies and bodies in the Territories realize that we people in the East live in a very cold climate. It is very much colder than the West and we use more fuel oil and fuel oil spending or usage will never stop. At this time I think that if the Members will not work together this will continue to be a problem and will continue to grow to be a bigger problem.

Various problems that exist, and if we do not try to solve them, that the government or the public service are continually travelling to various communities and spend a night or a few hours and it costs an enormous amount of money. Usually it is not of too much benefit to the community. When they do arrive in various communities to try to assist the communities they are always in a rush and it does not seem to help very much.

I fully support the teachers and that their salaries should be as they are and, in fact, we should increase them. Secondly, the local government, that local government can be given enough funding and that money could be used very wisely.

We have known too many times when there has been careless spending. We know **very** well that the utility bills are very expensive and that housing construction is increasing and that fuel oil and the various energies are increasing in cost. These houses are becoming worn out. I do not think any of you have not seen our houses and you should see them, because most of the houses are suited for garbage.

At this time, let us try to solve these problems or let us get hold of some money to try to get this cleared up. You may think that it is a problem now but in the future it is going to get even worse. I am saying that at some time let us work together and solve the problem together.

---Applause

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Hear, hear!

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Curley.

Communication Is A Problem

MR. CURLEY: Yes, I can remember trying to resolve all of those Members who wanted to be chosen or appointed to the Executive Committee about three months ago, so all the talk that we are going to work together, and all of those promises that we have got to communicate, everybody agreed, and do you not remember, Mr. McCallum, that we were going to have to communicate after sweating out the resolution of the final vote and we were going to need all the help we could get and agreed to communicate and work together. Now, we seem to be experiencing a little problem, that we have not been communicating well and once you join the establishment the only people that you can communicate with are the bona fide or authorized people.

I was very interested in Mr. McCallum's statement with regard to regional directors. He does not have to talk to them. He does not have to talk to the regional director when he wants information, the Member is fine, he is the one who is going to tell me. So that further convinces me and supports my statement on the day I made my reply to the Commissioner's Address when I said that eventually we are going to have to get rid of the regional officers. Mr. McCallum says he has no use for them and that further convinces me that the regional government like Baffin Regional Council can better serve the needs of these people and he does not have to talk to the regional government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

High Cost Of Regional Government Staff

MR. CURLEY: On a point of privilege, I would just like to substantiate that because I do not see any reason why they are sitting around here these days because we have the best types of communications that have been established during the last five years. Regional government, regional branches, regional offices were formed traditionally by the Government of Canada because there was not any communication. You know, there were no transportation systems, so they had to be out in the field, but today does this government really believe that we have to have all those expenses, all of that money spent and wasted by the regional staff? You know, I can tell you and I am going to ask for figures, how much does it cost to maintain one game officer in the settlements? At least \$50,000 for one game officer, providing his house, all his benefits and all that goes along with providing a civil servant in a settlement. So, I would just like to see -- I think we are not that naive in the Eastern Arctic when we say that we can improve the spending over the way the government has been operating in the field. We could probably do it better and we could probably do it cheaper and I am convinced that in a regional government it would be cheaper to operate than in the high cost government regional staff.

If I may, you know, and I am delighted to hear that not only myself has no real support for the regional director's position. I think that we have many good men and women in these regional offices, but I think their roles can be better utilized either in the head office or somewhere else or transferring to the regional or community groups. So, you know, this encourages me because it is my belief that transferring those responsibilities to the regional organizations, regional bodies, Members can have better access and communication links directly with the Executive Members, as we said we would during the last caucus meeting in October when we had finalized the selection of the Executive positions. I think we should stick by those principles we made at that time. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, perhaps you will allow me the opportunity to say again so this time the hon. Member opposite will understand what I said in relation to the regional director.

MR. CURLEY: I will read the transcript tomorrow.

Regional Director's Role

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I indicated in reply to a question from the Member from Frobisher Bay how I saw the regional administration and I said I consider the regional director an administrator and if there were to be capital projects from my particular community within a region that I as the Member, elected Member, for that particular community would bring to this Assembly those kinds of requests. That I would not ask the regional director to do that, nor would I want him to do it. I did not in my statement say that I would not talk to the regional director, that I would never talk to him, that I would not become involved in any aspect of the regional government. I said that I would not want him to take capital projects or suggestions to the Executive. I said that that was my particular job as the Member from that particular town and that is the point I was making. Not that I would not talk to them. I can remember in Hay River the Old Timers' baseball team got into a scuffle over, not government but something else, but I talked to him but not in relation to what he thinks should go on in the town of Fort Smith. I consider that to be my end of it as the elected person and I talk to other people and organizations within the town to bring forth their particular points. I suggest that the Member when he reads the transcript tomorrow will find out that I did not say I would never talk to him.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. McCallum. Ms. Cournoyea.

Evaluation Of The Budget As It Is Discussed

MS. COURNOYEA: I find all of this very interesting, but I think we have got a budget to deal with and I was wondering, I think all of us are concerned about moving into a situation where we are approving at the outset a deficit budget of \$13.95 million. I think somebody corrected me on that. Is there any direction that we could go that will allow us to begin getting into the different departments without having to make the commitment or the resolution of accepting the \$13.95 million at this point in time? Is there a process we can go through that would allow us to evaluate as we go along and maybe at a later time come to the conclusion if we feel comfortable with it that this is the only way we can go? Is there a process to deal with this matter?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Butters, do you wish to reply to that?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Yes. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that when the general comments are concluded we can move into the first department, which I understand would be the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation. There is no requirement on the House to put a motion forward now that they would support a deficit of this, that or the other amount. I think if they could I would certainly like that encouragement but there is no requirement that they do. Once the general comments are concluded and completed we could go to the Housing Corporation which is the first item I believe on the agenda.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Ms. Cournoyea, did you wish to clarify?

MS. COURNOYEA: No. I was just going to ask that and Mr. Butters clarified the point that we could move into the process of business dealing with the various departments once the general comments are concluded.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Continuing with general comments, Mr. MacQuarrie.

HON. ROBERT H. MACQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think it is important to continue a little longer in discussion in a general way rather than going quickly to departments and figures because I believe that I see a kind of attitude developing in the Assembly which is not very encouraging as far as I am concerned and which if it were to continue would make consensus government very difficult, if not impossible.

Eastern Arctic Members Should Share Executive Responsibilities

I think that first of all I can agree with Mr. Braden and I will say more about this in my reply to the Commissioner's Address, that it is incumbent upon Members from the Eastern Arctic to very seriously consider sharing Executive responsibilities. Even should they do that it must be apparent to Executive Members that there will still be a number of Members of this Assembly who are not part of the Executive, who are not privy to everything that goes on in Executive boardrooms and who have some very legitimate questions about what has gone into shaping the budget.

I think that when those questions are asked the Executive must not adopt the attitude that somehow they are being denigrated for what they have done or that it is a challenge to their integrity or whatever. The fact is that many Members want to know what went into the making of that budget. The fact is that many Members might feel that it is a matter of principle as to whether or not we should vote a deficit budget. Members might have very legitimate questions about whether there is not fat in this department or that department and it is not a put-down of Executive Members to raise these questions. If they can be answered I would ask Executive Members to answer them in a very cool and rational way. If it appears then that something was overlooked, then let us help to sort it out because my opinion is that we all share responsibility, not particularly Executive Members. We all share responsibility for the final result as far as this budget is concerned.

---Applause

Give us the answers and give us the opportunity to help you arrive at a sensible budget for these Territories.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Patterson.

Budgetary Planning On A Regional Basis

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not think my question was answered and I will try to state it more specifically. By the way, Mr. McCallum, I only mentioned the regional staff because not even the regional staff seems to know what is going on in the budget planning process, not even the regional staff and nobody else does. Now my question is: Has this government, Executive Committee or the Department of Finance, considered a new method of financial planning which would allow planning to take place on a regional basis and not on a departmental basis to recognize the unique differences in each region, the fact that the priorities are different in each region of the Territories, to stop trying to pretend that the Territories is all the same and plan on a territorial-wide, departmental-wide base? Has any consideration been given to allowing regions to determine their own priorities and to plan their budgets on a regional basis? I am not talking about setting up regional governments. I am talking about budgetary planning and capital planning. Has this been considered?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, since the Member's question refers to more than just the last few months, quite obviously perhaps it is appropriate that I say a word or two on the subject of planning. His point is very well taken. It has always been our desire and we have probably fallen short in the delivery process to meld together the very best information that we could get from the regions and from regional groups together with the views gleaned from the Legislature, of course, and the views of Executive Committee Members supported as they are by both regional directors and headquarters directors. Now that sounds like a great big mix to you I am sure, but it has always been our desire to do that and if we have fallen short, and we have, then that is a clear indication that we have to improve our financial planning system.

Ministerial Government Relatively New In N.W.T.

We are relatively new to ministerial government in the Northwest Territories. We have had elected Ministers for four years plus the few months that we have had this new Assembly elected. We have many debates and discussions as to the best way of responding to a Minister who has been first of all charged with the responsibility for a department and that Minister wants to see how he can best make the departmental projects and plans work right across the North, but he has also to seek advice from and information from the regions in order to make that work. In our regional offices we cannot enjoy the luxury of having a mini-departmental structure complete unto itself as is perhaps the case in the federal government which is a very, very much larger government. So we have regional offices that offer the services to the area that we believe are appropriate.

As Mr. McCallum says, we have set up a system whereby our capital planning function is actually now regionally based and the initial capital planning information which is fed into our five year capital plan will come from the regions and it is the responsibility of the regional director to be responsive to groups within his area like the Baffin Regional Council, to take their advice and to translate that into part of his regional plan for capital funding.

We have been less successful, I think, in designing a system whereby our operations and maintenance funding can be influenced by the region but it is indeed influenced. The question was put whether or not we have looked at the possibility of breaking up our budget into four major segments and basically placing those budgets into the regions. There has been discussion of that and to some extent that happens but not to the extent that I believe Mr. Patterson is suggesting in his remarks.

Need For Flexibility In Basic Programs

I suppose one of the reasons that we have not done that yet is that we are still developing basic programs and there is a desire to retain a certain level of flexibility, a high level of flexibility as between the regions in the Territories. A program that is suitable in one area may not be applicable in another area. Now, that is an argument in favour of breaking the budget up in a more regional sense, but I think we need to retain a certain amount of flexibility.

I think that we can, though, do a better job of ensuring within regions that we will have a certain size of budget available in that region, bearing in mind that when Members come together here in the Assembly they will want, from time to time, to have the opportunity to redirect spending and to change priorities.

That is a rather roundabout and long explanation that I have given you, but it is intended to indicate that we are making some very definite strides in responding to regional needs on our capital budget and that we are still feeling our way as to devolving the budget in total to the regions.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. Is there any further general discussion? Mr. Nerysoo.

Executive Discussion On Methods Of Accounting And Budgeting

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Mr. Chairman, with regard to a reply to Mr. Patterson, as well I do believe that as Executive Members we did have discussion regarding the method of accounting and the method of budgeting or the setting up of the budget and we were not too happy about it either, because as you know we were late getting there and we were not really part of the overall budgeting and stuff like that. It was basically a last minute thing that we had to become part of, the overall budget. We were not too happy about it, that is for sure. I just wanted to make that clear.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Again just a footnote in response to Mr. Patterson's question. If it is the wish...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Mr. Braden, can you speak a little bit louder?

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Okay. If it is the wish of Members of this House to pursue the manner in which financial planning is done and to consider a regional approach, I would suggest that this is something that the standing committee on finance may be able to consider. Now, as I understand their terms of reference they are quite considerable and this possibly could be the route to go, and to have them report back to the House on the feasibility of pursuing this further.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mr. Braden. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The standing committee on finance has discussed this very point a number of times. Regional budgeting is something that interests us very much. Just to elaborate a little bit and in support of what Mr. Patterson has been saying I will share something with you concerning the concept of regional budgeting.

Comments From Standing Committee On Finance

Frankly, myself as chairman and the other committee Members of the standing committee were very impressed during our deliberations to receive from Mr. Patterson who worked with the regional director in the Baffin region and the eastern Members in the Baffin region, to set their priorities given the restraint measures that at least we thought were going to be imposed in the 1980-81 budget. They worked very, very hard over a period of three days and looked at those figures and said, "Okay, if we are going to live within these restraints what are our priorities?" In nearly every case their priorities were different from those priorities that had been set by the individual departments and by the Department of Finance. Clearly this has to tell us something about the situation that we have here in financial planning in headquarters and the situation that exists out there in the regions. As far as I am concerned I would be delighted and I know my committee Members would be delighted to take on this responsibility. However, we do not have a research staff.

---Applause

If we are going to take on any more work please give us the tools to do it.

MR. PATTERSON: Hear, hear!

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Is there any further general discussion? If there is no further discussion and in view of the time, we can either go into the first department or report progress to the Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Report progress.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tologanak): We will report progress to the Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Tologanak.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILL 1-80(1): APPROPRIATION
ORDINANCE, 1980-81

MR. TOLOGANAK: Mr. Speaker, your committee has met to consider Bill 1-80(1) and wishes to report progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Tologanak. With respect to announcements there is a unity committee meeting tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock in Katamavik A next door, 9:00 o'clock that is. Mr. Clerk, are there any other announcements? Would you read them, if not, orders of the day?

Item 13, orders of the day.

ITEM NO. 13: ORDERS OF THE DAY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Orders of the day, February 6, 1980, 1:00 o'clock p.m., at the Explorer Hotel.

1. Prayer
2. Continuing Replies to Commissioner's Address
3. Oral Questions
4. Questions and Returns

5. Petitions
6. Tabling of Documents
7. Notices of Motion
8. Motions: Motion 4-80(1), 5-80(1), 6-80(1), 7-80(1)
9. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills, Recommendations to the Legislative Assembly and Other Matters: Bills 1-80(1), 2-80(1), 3-80(1), 4-80(1), 5-80(1), 18-80(1)
10. Third Reading of Bills
11. Assent to Bills
12. Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER: This House stands adjourned until 1:00 o'clock p.m.,
February 6, 1980, at the Explorer Hotel.

---ADJOURNMENT

Available from the
Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories,
Yellowknife, N.W.T. at .50¢ per day, \$5.00 per session and \$12.50 per year.
Published under the Authority of the Commissioner
of the Northwest Territories