



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

7th Session

10th Assembly

HANSARD  
Official Report

DAY 24

Mail Received

JUN 20 1986

CLERK OF THE  
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 11, 1986

Pages 972 to 1017

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

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

## Speaker

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

Angottitauruq, Mr. Michael, M.L.A.  
Gjoa Haven, N.W.T.  
X0E 1J0  
Office (403) 360-6600  
(Natilekmiot)

Appaqaq, Mr. Moses, M.L.A.  
Sanikiluaq, N.W.T.  
X0A 0W0  
Home (819) 266-8808  
(Hudson Bay)

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

Ballantyne, The Hon. Michael, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 1091  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
X1A 2N8  
Office (403) 873-7658  
Home (403) 920-2968  
(Yellowknife North)  
Minister of Justice and Housing

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

Cournoyey, Ms Nellie J., M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 156  
Tuktoyaktuk, N.W.T.  
X0E 1C0  
Office (403) 979-2737 (Inuvik)  
Home (403) 977-2405  
(Nunakput)

Curley, The Hon. Tagak E.C., M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 36  
Rankin Inlet, N.W.T.  
X0C 0G0  
Office (403) 873-7139  
Home (819) 645-2351  
(Aivilik)  
Minister of Economic Development  
& Tourism

Erkloo, Mr. Elijah, M.L.A.  
Pond Inlet, N.W.T.  
X0A 0S0  
Office (819) 899-8903  
Home (819) 899-8345  
(Amittuq)  
Deputy Chairman, Committee of the  
Whole

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

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

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

McCallum, Mr. Arnold, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 454  
Fort Smith, N.W.T.  
X0E 0P0  
Office (403) 872-3224  
Home (403) 872-2246  
(Slave River)

McLaughlin, The Hon. Bruce, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 2637  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
X1A 2P9  
Office (403) 873-7113  
Home (403) 873-6200 (Yellowknife)  
(403) 393-2939 (Pine Point)  
(Pine Point)  
Minister of Health and Social Services

Nerysoo, Mr. Richard W., M.L.A.  
Fort McPherson, N.W.T.  
X0E 0J0  
Office (403) 979-7112 (Inuvik)  
Home (403) 979-2668 (Inuvik)  
(Mackenzie Delta)

Paniloo, Mr. Pauloosie, M.L.A.  
Clyde River, N.W.T.  
X0A 0E0  
Office (819) 924-6336  
Home (819) 924-6340  
(Baffin Central)

Patterson, The Hon. Dennis G., M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 310  
Frobisher Bay, N.W.T.  
X0A 0H0  
Office (819) 979-5993 (Frobisher Bay)  
(403) 873-7123  
Home (819) 979-6618  
(Iqaluit)  
Minister of Education

Pedersen, The Hon. Red, M.L.A.  
Coppermine, N.W.T.  
X0E 0E0  
Office (403) 873-7959  
Home (403) 982-5221  
(Kitikmeot West)  
Minister of Renewable Resources and  
Culture & Communications

Pudluk, Mr. Ludy, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 240  
Resolute, N.W.T.  
X0A 0V0  
Home (819) 252-3719  
(High Arctic)

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

Sibbeston, The Hon. Nick G., M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 560  
Fort Simpson, N.W.T.  
X0E 0N0  
Office (403) 873-7112  
Home (403) 695-2565  
(Nahendeh)  
Government Leader, Chairman of  
Executive Council and Minister  
of Personnel

T'Seleie, Mr. John, M.L.A.  
Fort Good Hope, N.W.T.  
X0E 0H0  
Home (403) 598-2325  
(Sahtu)

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

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

## Officers

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

Clerk Assistant  
Mr. Henry Zoe  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

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

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

Sergeant-at-Arms  
Major David Sproule, C.D.  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

TABLE OF CONTENTS  
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 11, 1986

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	972
Ministers' Statements	972
- 27-86(1) Equal Employment Program	972
- 28-86(1) Nordic Trip	973
Oral Questions	975
Written Questions	984
Returns	984
Petitions	986
Tabling of Documents	986
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- First Report of the Special Committee on Rules, Procedures and Privileges	987
Report of Committee of the Whole of:	
- First Report of the Special Committee on Rules, Procedures and Privileges	1016
Orders of the Day	1017

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 11, 1986

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

ITEM 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

SPEAKER (Hon. Don Stewart): Orders of the day for Wednesday, June 11th. Item 2, Members' replies. Item 3, Ministers' statements. Mr. Sibbeston.

ITEM 3: MINISTERS' STATEMENTS

Minister's Statement 27-86(1): Equal Employment Program

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement with respect to the equal employment program. I am pleased today to report progress to Members of the Legislative Assembly on this government's equal employment program and its affirmative action planning. Members will have already noticed the posters on display in the lobby. These were produced by the Department of Culture and Communications for the equal employment directorate. I believe they exemplify the spirit of what we hope to accomplish with equal employment.

Mr. Speaker, all of us know the concerns and criticisms that have been directed against our affirmative action program, but I would like to demonstrate today to all northerners that this government has a good program in place which serves a very important purpose, a program that has the approval of the Canadian Human Rights Commission.

The native employment policy has two main goals: to develop a work force that is representative of the population it serves; and, no less important, to have a public service that is competent. In the Northwest Territories the majority of the population is native. Yet, for whatever reasons, that number has never been reflected in the public service. To resolve this problem our government developed the native employment policy and established the equal employment directorate.

Native People To Hold 52 Per Cent Of Public Service Positions

The native employment policy states that northern native people will have equal access to employment, training and promotional opportunities in the territorial public service. The policy also gives native people responsibility for preparing themselves to take advantage of these opportunities. The native employment goal is that within five years native people will make up 52 per cent of the public service so that their participation in the public service matches their representation in the working age population. The equal employment directorate's work this year has concentrated on implementing and working toward this employment objective. The result is a public-service-wide affirmative action plan. The Executive Council has decided to seek, through the supplementary appropriation process, three million dollars for this program so that the plan can be put into action by September 1st.

Our success in implementing this policy depends on the hard work and commitment that has already been displayed by the Department of Personnel and, particularly, the managers throughout the public service. The results of the past year's work are encouraging. Since the program's implementation on July 1st, 1985, 330 native people have been hired by the territorial government. This represents just over 34 per cent of all appointments in that period. The percentage of native employees has risen from 25 to 30 per cent.

While these results are encouraging, I hope they also serve to dispel the fear that all public service jobs are going to native people. Using headquarters as an example, almost 85 per cent of the public service appointments in Yellowknife have gone to non-native candidates.

Mr. Speaker, affirmative action is basically a practical personnel management system that ensures our policy is being implemented effectively, consistently and fairly. We ensure that jobs are properly defined and that the qualifications are not inflated. We are able to plan for long-range staffing needs. Affirmative action provides for a better public service overall and a fairer system of hiring and promotion than ever before.

#### NWT Affirmative Action Advisory Committee

To assist us in our work, we recently appointed an NWT affirmative action advisory committee. This nine member group has representatives from management, unions and native organizations. I will soon be announcing new additional representatives from the NWT Council for the Disabled and the NWT Advisory Council on the Status of Women. These appointments will assist us to develop affirmative action plans for those groups over the coming year.

This committee will provide advice and recommendations to our government on overall affirmative action strategies for the public service. It is through this committee that I hope many of the recent public concerns about affirmative action can be dealt with and resolved.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reassure all northerners that we do not want to disrupt the public service or alienate those people who have devoted so much of themselves to this government. We do want to build a competent, skilled and stable work force. Our objectives for equal employment are not narrow ones, nor are the issues simple but I trust that northerners can agree that we all have the same basic goal; to make the Northwest Territories an even better home for everyone. It is for this ideal that I look forward to all of us working together to make it come true. Mahsi cho.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Item 3, Ministers' statements. Mr. Curley.

#### Minister's Statement 28-86(1): Nordic Trip

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Mr. Speaker, earlier this session I announced that I would be taking a delegation on a mission to the northern part of Finland, Sweden and Norway. The group consisted of seven NWT Business Council delegates, three presidents of native development corporations, one being my colleague, Mr. James Wah-Shee, the honourable Member for Rae-Lac la Martre, my colleague, Mr. Red Pedersen, Minister of Renewable Resources, and some officials.

The purpose of the mission was to learn about the highly developed economy of the Nordic countries and gain ideas which could be implemented back home. The trip was a resounding success, as we saw examples of business development which I am convinced will be applicable in the Northwest Territories.

It is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to table a full report of the trip, including the report from the business council, in the House at a later date. However, I would like to highlight a few observations. We saw some very successful businesses: numerous meat processing plants for reindeer, which forms a large part of the economy; a highly developed arts and crafts industry with excellent marketing ideas -- for the Members' benefit, my colleague, Mr. Pedersen and I will be displaying some of the articles on the table here later so during the break Members can see some of the exciting products that they produce and market throughout Europe; forest industry opportunities such as computerized sawmills, a kiln factory, prefab housing plants, a furniture factory, a mobile cabin plant, and numerous small businesses generated by this industry; several different types of fish farms ranging from a very small operation to a multimillion ton per year

arctic char fishery; several examples of tourism businesses from a small village totally dependent on tourism to a service industry which knows how to cater to the public -- we even got to see a Santa Claus based at the Arctic Circle in northern Finland, for the purpose of bringing tourism and sending letters to children all over the world. Providing you leave the address there, he does reply; small manufacturing plants which includes a grinder factory, highly mechanized, a unique garage door manufacturing plant, a small heavy machinery plant, and a small scale knife factory which exports more than one million knives annually to the United States and Canada; and finally, several examples of small scale hydro generation not requiring dams but capable of producing enough power to service our larger communities. We are not talking about nuclear energy.

#### Ideas Applicable To NWT Economy

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of exciting ideas which have come out of this mission and are very applicable to our economy. There is a very competitive private sector in the Nordic countries, yet at the same time they believe in certain subsidies. Of particular interest is a transportation subsidy to bring raw materials into remote communities and ship finished products out. This enables the manufacturing industry to thrive in the northern area.

They believe in public equity in business. It is not perceived as government equity, but public equity, and the public is proud to buy their own products. They believe in subsidizing not only the capital costs to start up new industry but also operating subsidies for up to five years and, in some special cases, a total of seven years. This is done on a sliding scale, and if there is no viability shown, the assistance is withdrawn and the operation is terminated with little apparent outcry.

Mr. Speaker, they firmly believe in manufacturing goods from their raw materials and exporting finished products. And I was certainly impressed to see small communities indicating that the world is their market place. This is certainly an area that we can learn from and must do something about.

Another major observation is the support and involvement of municipalities and regional councils, I would call them the district, in the private sector. We saw numerous examples of municipal governments subsidizing housing for newly created businesses, and some hotels owned by municipal governments but operated by contractors. Their philosophy is to stimulate as much business as possible by reducing municipal taxes, in some cases, as they recover more from personal income taxes and corporate taxes. We also saw a splendid example of an incubator mall. An incubator mall is a new idea, whereby businesses which are just starting up can share facilities and business services until they grow large enough to rent or purchase their own buildings and hire their own staff.

Mr. Speaker, we know that we have economic problems in the NWT with our declining oil and gas industry and our mining industry that is experiencing difficulty because of world metal prices. While it is difficult for us to offset the impacts, we have lots that we can do. We must diversify our economy. We must rely more heavily on our renewable resource industry and develop it to its optimum. We must create light industry in the NWT and encourage investment to help us properly capitalize our businesses. We must develop a manufacturing industry based on raw materials and put a lot of effort and funds into marketing, and we must get our people to be more open and supportive of business development and job creation.

I know, Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. Pedersen, will be making further statements about his observations. And we were able at least to establish communication with a committee of Nordic Ministers that meets every year to share scientific, economic policies amongst themselves. My colleague suggests that we should consider joining them so that we can at least share and gain experience from them. He will be making a further statement on that.

Mr. Speaker, the challenge is not to try to respond to an oil and gas industry over which the territorial government has no control but to create a more diversified economy with many small businesses each providing a few jobs and less dependence on international factors. I intend to take action, along with my colleagues jointly, to develop and recommend to our Executive colleagues new programs to move quickly in this direction; but I cannot do it alone. I need your support and I look forward to reporting back to you in the fall session with some concrete plans and programs. Qujannamiik.

AN HON. MEMBER: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order, Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make a point of order. I thought that any person who is sitting in the House should not wear a hat. In the House of Commons, even ladies are not allowed to wear a hat. Thank you.

---Laughter

AN HON. MEMBER: You call that a hat?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Pudluk, our rules and regulations say that native dress is appropriate in this House. I presume that was part of a native costume and therefore is allowable. I understand that it possibly is part of Santa Claus' uniform; however, the wearer should put a little more weight on if he wishes to act in that capacity.

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker...

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not argue...

MR. PUDLUK: ...I myself am closer to the North Pole which is where Santa Claus is but I have never seen that kind of hat as native uniform or part of Santa Claus' hat or something like that. It is out of order.

---Laughter

MR. SPEAKER: Your remarks with regard to the fact that it is out of order will be noted in the record, Mr. Pudluk. The Chair rules that it is in order.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Put it on.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 3, Ministers' statements. That appears to conclude Ministers' statements for today. Item 4, oral questions. Mrs. Lawrence.

ITEM 4: ORAL QUESTIONS

MRS. LAWRENCE: Mahsi cho. (Translation) Yesterday when I came into the House I noticed all the wall hangings and all the decorations in the House. I think this is an oversight, but I thought maybe today they would put up some of the western crafts. I am wondering why they have crafts only from the Eastern Arctic. Does the western craft not rate a place in this room any more or what? So I would like to ask who is in charge of hanging all these wall hangings in here and I would like to receive a reply.

MR. SPEAKER: This is a question of the Speaker and the Member cannot question the Speaker. Therefore your question is out of order. Oral questions. Mr. Arlooktoo.

Question 223-86(1): Airstrip For Lake Harbour

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) Lake Harbour does not have an airstrip or airport. Their strip is very short and ever since I have been at this Legislative Assembly I have asked the Minister of Local Government, Mr. Wray, when are they going to get an airstrip in Lake Harbour. We have been asking in the past, over and over, for the airstrip. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 223-86(1): Airstrip For Lake Harbour

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I realize that the airstrip in Lake Harbour has been a priority over the years. However, I have to be completely honest with the Member. I have absolutely no idea when Lake Harbour will get an airstrip. Right now, I cannot even get funding

from Transport Canada for communities that have no airstrips at all. The federal government will just not fund capital construction of airports in the Northwest Territories at this point in time. So, I have no idea. I would suspect, though, that it is going to be quite some time. Thank you.

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

Question 224-86(1): Funding For Cape Dorset Sewing Centre

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) This is not a supplementary, this is another question to the Minister of Economic Development, Mr. Tagak Curley. I have not spoken to him yet, person to person, but I have a question and he knows the question. Last winter I asked the same question. In Cape Dorset the arts and crafts sewing centre for sealskins was asking for funding. To date we have not found out how they will be assisted for the crafts. We would like to find out if they will be given financial assistance for the crafts in Cape Dorset. I would like to get some answers during this meeting. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: (Translation) Mr. Speaker, as to Mr. Arlooktoo's question, I will have to look into it further during this meeting. Before the meeting is over I will get back to him after I get some clarification on this, in a few days.

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

Question 225-86(1): Lifeguards For Long Lake Beach, Yellowknife

MR. RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism, and it is with regard to the beach and campground at Long Lake in the city of Yellowknife, Mr. Speaker. I understand that in years previous, there has been a contractual arrangement between the territorial government and the city of Yellowknife to operate that campground and beach which are, I believe, territorial property. The agency contract with the city of Yellowknife, however, was not renewed, I understand, by the city for this coming tourist season that we have already entered. I am aware that the campground, however, is going to be operated by the hunters and trappers association on behalf of the government, but the beach area is not going to be supervised by lifeguards. It is not so much, Mr. Speaker, the cheap city council, as my friend the Minister of Public Works indicates; it is the territorial facility that the city was operating on their behalf, as is my understanding.

Can the Minister responsible for Tourism undertake to investigate this matter soon and attempt to get sufficient funds or sufficient contract with somebody to ensure that lifeguards will be in place at that beach, so that the swimming and recreation there will be supervised this summer? The summer begins in the month of June, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Some years.

AN HON. MEMBER: I never noticed yet.

Return To Question 225-86(1): Lifeguards For Long Lake Beach, Yellowknife

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the Member for giving me notice, yesterday, about the issue. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years our department entered into a contract with the city to operate the campground and the day use area of the Fred Henne Recreational Park. The city decided not long ago that they wished to withdraw from some of these services that we had an agreement with; therefore we had to contract some other service groups in communities to operate the day use area and the recreation area. As far as the issue of the lifeguards is concerned, the city had previously used federal make-work projects and the Katimavik group to provide the lifeguard services. I think there is a bit of a difference as far as whether or not the department, which is really not responsible for municipal services, should really be getting into the business of hiring lifeguards. Therefore our department, at the moment, has refused to provide additional funds because the funds that were used from our department were really to operate the two areas, the day use and the beach area, and the park as a whole, in the city.



I would think, Mr. Speaker, that my officials will be attempting to settle the deal. Therefore, even though the land is considered Commissioner's land, our department feels that the territorial government is really not responsible for providing lifeguards to the city because there are other communities that provide lifeguard services from their operational funds. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like again to assure the Member that we will be exploring the problem further and attempt to come to a deal with the community or the city. At the moment I am not all that certain whether we will be able to provide additional money, but I am sure my colleague, the Minister of Local Government, will want to reassess the situation as well. Thank you.

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

Supplementary To Question 225-86(1): Lifeguards For Long Lake Beach, Yellowknife

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the Minister's commitment to investigate the possibility, but I do think that within the Minister's own portfolio, being responsible for Tourism, it is a territorial campground and the beach is adjacent, and I think it is essential in the development of the tourism industry. It is a major attraction in that campground, an adjacent beach area, and I would hope that the Minister would find it within the responsibilities of the department to at least solve the matter even if it means getting the Minister responsible for recreation to, in some way, find funds to support a summer lifeguard program. I am wondering if the Minister could make a commitment to investigate the matter in the context of his responsibilities as Minister of Tourism. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Richard, that was some question! Mr. Minister.

---Laughter

Further Return To Question 225-86(1): Lifeguards For Long Lake Beach, Yellowknife

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we do find the day use of Long Lake as a very important area for the visitors and tourists coming into the city, and therefore we think it is important that they should settle the issue of lifeguards. In the meantime if the agreement has not been reached, there will have to be appropriate signs established that citizens are swimming at their own risk or something of that nature. In the meantime, I am sure my Executive colleagues will want to try to ensure that the program is continued and that we at least try to find funds to operate a lifeguard program in the city, because this is one of the largest cities we do have and the park is very important and a very busy area. I will undertake to communicate that to my other colleagues. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. The Chair at this time would like to recognize the grade five and six class from St. Pat's Elementary School and their teacher, Mr. Jackman. Welcome to the House.

---Applause

Oral questions. Mr. Erkloo.

Question 226-86(1): Lowering Of Petroleum Products Prices

MR. ERKLOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Hon. Tom Butters, Minister of Government Services. In the whole world the oil and gas and crude oil prices are dropping. They have been dropping for a whole year. Can you tell me in the Northwest Territories if you can lower the price? When can we expect lowering of prices in petroleum products?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 226-86(1): Lowering Of Petroleum Products Prices

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, there will not be any reduction of prices in the Eastern Arctic where resupply is by vessel. Any changes there would occur when we have made our purchases at the best price we can get now and have it delivered on site. Then there will be a change in price.

The Eastern Arctic communities have enjoyed a lesser charge because of the fact that we did get some pretty good prices in past years. The major concern, I think, would be of consumers in the western part of the Territories where the resupply occurs by road. The government intends to bring before the House a suggestion for equalization for Members' consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Erkloo.

Supplementary To Question 226-86(1): Lowering Of Petroleum Products Prices

MR. ERKLOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is supplementary to my question. You said that last year you were able to get good prices for petroleum products. Do you think that you will be able to negotiate even better prices for the petroleum products this summer?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Further Return To Question 226-86(1): Lowering Of Petroleum Products Prices

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are expecting to negotiate a better price this year which reflects the downward plunge of world oil prices.

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

Question 227-86(1): Radiation Levels In The NWT

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister responsible for the environment. This spring there was an accident in Russia with a nuclear reactor, and my constituency has not been notified properly through the news or by any other means, and nuclear accidents such as that can travel a long way. We have heard about southern Canada being notified properly with the proper equipment. I would like to know from the Minister, how was the Northwest Territories reading near that accident date?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 227-86(1): Radiation Levels In The NWT

HON. RED PEDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the Member for giving me notice of this rather technical question yesterday. I can advise the Member that radiation measurements are taken by Health and Welfare Canada and the atmospheric environmental service at five stations in the Northwest Territories: Inuvik, Resolute Bay, Coral Harbour, Yellowknife and Hay River. Samples were taken on a daily basis during the incident but they are now back to their normal reporting period of weekly sampling for precipitation and monthly samplings for air. The first indication of increased radiation levels in the North was on May 3rd of this year. From May 6th when readings were taken to May 26th at stations in Hay River, Inuvik, Yellowknife and Yellowknife again, the measurements were in Becquerels per litre. A very technical thing. I honestly do not know what it means but the measurement that you use to measure radiation with, respectively, varied from six at the beginning to as high as 66 in the middle on May 13th and on May 26th down to a level of 1.0. By comparison to this, the highest level of radiation in precipitation reported in Canada during this period was May 12th in Vancouver at 68. Radiation levels of this magnitude were not considered to be a health concern by the Department of Health and Welfare. A comparison of the radiation levels during the Chernobyl incident, normal levels and levels during above-ground nuclear testing can be made utilizing air measurements.

For the information of all Members, I could relate that the normal reading in the Northwest Territories in 1984 averaged 0.4. During the Chernobyl incident between May 10th and May 12th, with the highest reading being on May 14th, the reading was between 30 and 80. Comparing that to the period of time when we all suffered through the readings generated by atmospheric nuclear testing in the heaviest testing period between 1962 and 1964, the reading was 200. As can be seen by a review of the above figures, the radiation levels of the Chernobyl incident are considerably lower than those experienced during the heavy nuclear testing period of 1962 to 1964. Mr. Speaker, that is the information I have been able to gather so far. Thank you.

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

Question 228-86(1): Medical Evacuation Incident, Resolute Bay

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In my community on May 27th, 1986 there was an accident. Three young people got into an accident, and Nordair had just arrived. The plane was still on the ground when the accident happened, but Nordair would not stop and take the young people on a mercy mission. When there is an emergency accident like that the transportation companies should be told to wait to save lives. I would like to ask the Minister of Health or Tom Butters, transportation Minister, regarding this incident. They had to wait for 12 hours to get transportation to go to the hospital. If Nordair had waited, it would have been about three hours difference to get to the hospital. Because of this incident, if the transportation companies are not going to be responsible or take into their hands to be kind and considerate to their customers, I would like to ask the transportation Minister or the Minister of Health to review their transportation needs so that they can service our area much better, as we depend on them. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member's question disturbs me, that airlines would not do that. We, through Health and Welfare Canada and my own department, utilize these airlines on a commercial basis to transport people who are going out for regular medical trips. Therefore, it is a significant amount of their business, and it surprises me that they would not delay themselves during an emergency situation. I will look into the matter and will tell you that I will advise the airlines that if they are not willing to extend themselves during an emergency, even though it might interrupt their schedule, that maybe we will seek to use other commercial airlines for the regular business.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Then you are going to take the question as notice and report back. Thank you. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Supplementary. I am going to table a document this afternoon with all the details in it.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Pudluk, that was not a question. Oral questions, Mr. MacQuarrie.

Question 229-86(1): Compulsory Liability Insurance For Outfitters

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Renewable Resources. The Minister is aware that outfitters who belong to the NWT Barrenground Caribou Outfitters and Guides Association, under the laws of the NWT are required to have liability insurance. He is also aware that they are finding it very difficult to find that insurance. On the other hand I am aware that the Minister's department has been making efforts to try to see what can be done, either directly or indirectly, to ensure that these outfitters are able to get liability insurance. But the matter, it seems, is becoming critical because if something is not done very soon, these outfitters may have to cancel their season. So could I ask the Minister where that matter is at? Can these people be assured that very soon some resolution of this problem will be made?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 229-86(1): Compulsory Liability Insurance For Outfitters

HON. RED PEDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member is correct, the situation is getting critical on this. We have attempted to get insurance brokers, both the companies that generally do all the Alberta outfitters, to handle the NWT outfitters, but we have been unsuccessful. I can advise the Member that on June 9th, just two days ago, my staff were advised that all attempts to obtain insurance coverage were unsuccessful. It is true that it is our regulations that dictate to the outfitters that they must have their insurance and because the regulations, of course, are intended to facilitate the industry, I have instructed my staff to prepare the necessary paperwork to allow an amendment to our regulations. A preliminary report with Justice does not indicate that there will be a legal problem with this approach. We want to ensure that all outfitters can continue to operate this year and we are pursuing all options. But outfitters will indeed operate this year. We will change the regulations if necessary.

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

Supplementary To Question 229-86(1): Compulsory Liability Insurance For Outfitters

MR. MacQUARRIE: I very much appreciate the Minister's efforts and the response. Was the Minister able to get from our Justice department officials, a time frame as to when they would be able to effect the necessary changes? Are we talking about a few days or a week or what is the time frame?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

HON. RED PEDERSEN: No, I did not get a time frame. We are putting the utmost urgency on it and I will advise the Member as soon as I get a time frame. As I mentioned, we just had the last correspondence on June 9th. I will get back to him.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. You are taking that part of the question as notice and will reply to the House. Oral questions. Mr. Richard.

Question 230-86(1): Interference By Executive Council In Interview Selection Process

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Personnel and it is with respect to his statement today on the equal employment policy. I do for one, Mr. Speaker, appreciate the Minister making such positive statements about the equal employment policy and I would urge the Minister to do more positive communicating with respect to that policy in the light of very negative remarks being made in the media and in the public about the government's Executive or implementation of that policy. Some of us have been defending the government's policy of equal employment in recent weeks. The problem is the implementation of that policy. Three months ago this Assembly passed a motion, given that the equal employment policy was in place, asking the Executive Council not to interfere with the interview selection process.

The incident cited by my colleague from Slave River yesterday, is an incident of interference. Mr. Speaker, such an incident does serious damage to the affirmative action policy. Will the Minister assure this House that such interference will not occur again?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 230-86(1): Interference By Executive Council In Interview Selection Process

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, I cannot assure the Member that I will not interfere when the occasion warrants my interfering. I can tell the Member that I did state that in the normal course of my duties as Minister, I will not interfere in the daily running of the department with respect to staffing and the implementation of affirmative action plan. But where there are matters, where there are problems identified to me, that come to my attention, and if a situation warrants my interfering, I will. I say to the Member that I would be remiss in my duty if I did not deal with matters that occasionally arise. So I cannot give the Member that assurance.

Generally, I am not involved on a day-to-day basis on the management, particularly the staffing duties that are done by my officials in the department, but when problems are brought to my attention and, as I said, if they warrant my intervention then I will become involved. I only become involved in instances where it is my duty and where the situation warrants interference on my behalf. It is only in serious cases, serious incidents of injustice or certain blocks that are brought to my attention that I will become involved.

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

Question 231-86(1): Resurfacing Of Access Road, Fort Providence

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Public Works. It is regarding the resurfacing of the access road into Fort Providence. I believe that in the capital plan there was an amount of \$480,000 designated for that particular project. Unfortunately the settlement council, for example, have said that this particular project was not going to be going ahead this summer. I would like to get some details since I asked the same question during the winter session. I did not get a response at that time and I would certainly be interested in getting one now.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 170-86(1) And Question 231-86(1): Resurfacing Of Access Road, Fort Providence

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was originally intended to pave the Fort Providence access in conjunction with the reconstruction and paving work of the Yellowknife highway adjacent to Fort Providence. However, I have to advise the Member that we have had to defer this work in favour of higher priority projects. When the funds were transferred from the federal government we did not get the funding that we had asked for so we had to spread our program out over 15 years instead of 10 years. Since then also some other things have happened which has caused us to defer this project.

The 1985 flooding in the Hay River area destroyed one bridge and severely damaged another bridge. These two bridges on the Fort Smith highway required immediate replacement so we have had to defer projects to do this. We have also had early failures or accelerated failures in the Hay River highway, the Fort Smith highway and the Rae-Edzo area highway and we have had to commit funds to fix these as well. We will be undertaking the work. It will not be this year though. But it still is in the plan and I can assure the Member that the work will be done. It is just that we have had to defer it and spread the planning out over a longer period.

I should also mention that we are not helped by the fact that we have had some of our funding cut by the federal government in the recent round of cuts that the federal government announced. Our northern roads program was cut quite severely so we have had to reassess our total highway program. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Supplementary To Question 231-86(1): Resurfacing Of Access Road, Fort Providence

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a supplementary concerning the high priorities of other projects. I would like to ask the Minister what is designated as a high priority regarding highways. I certainly believe that Fort Providence is an area where there is a substantial amount of traffic that does go through in order to get to Yellowknife, so I would classify that particular area, too, as a high priority area, but perhaps the Minister might be able to clarify what he means by other projects that are of a higher priority. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Further Return To Question 231-86(1): Resurfacing Of Access Road, Fort Providence

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can give you examples of what we consider to be a higher priority. As to how we arrive at the priority decisions, I really could not answer that under oral questions. We have a manual that thick which we use to determine cost-benefit analyses, economic analyses of highways and I could answer the Member but it would have to be in a written form because it would be a fairly long, complicated answer. So, with your indulgence I will take the second part of the question and answer it in a written form.

The first part of the question, the Rae-Edzo access is high priority simply because there is more use. There is existing paving which has failed, which has the potential for some serious accidents given the nature of the failures. The Hay River resurfacing project, where just outside of Hay River the road has also failed, is a high priority item. The replacement of bridges which were destroyed by floods is high priority. Those are some examples but this question would be much better answered in a written form, Mr. Speaker, because it is a longer answer. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. I understand you will be giving a written reply to that section of the question. Oral questions. Mr. Richard.

Question 232-86(1): Release Of Funding For Safe Houses

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Social Services. Earlier this year in the budget session the Assembly voted funds for the establishment of safe houses for battered women in both Frobisher Bay and in Yellowknife. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that none of these funds have been released yet. Can the Minister indicate the reason why the funds have not been released to the proponents of the homes, who have detailed proposals in place that were I believe approved by the Minister's department? Why have the funds not been released to date and also when might those funds be released for the programs that these houses were supposed to deliver?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 232-86(1): Release Of Funding For Safe Houses

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Actually, in a letter I sent to the Member this morning which he probably has not received yet, I have indicated to him that we only recently hired the program officer for that position after advertising it. The actual policies, detailed policies which have been worked out by her, have not yet been approved by the Executive Council. In the letter I have sent to the Member I have indicated that we were going to be giving interim funding to the major organizations which have programs virtually ready to go. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Supplementary To Question 232-86(1): Release Of Funding For Safe Houses

MR. RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When, Mr. Minister, might those organizations expect to receive the first instalment of the interim funding?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Further Return To Question 232-86(1): Release Of Funding For Safe Houses

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: In the letter I sent today I indicated we can do that as expeditiously as possible...

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, come on...

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Give me a week.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Mrs. Lawrence.

Question 233-86(1): Monitoring Of Fishing On East Arm Of Great Slave Lake

MRS. LAWRENCE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Renewable Resources. All summer, and especially on weekends, people, professional people, whatever you want to call them, from Yellowknife are always going into the East Arm of Great Slave Lake, which is in my constituency of Tu Nedhe, and fishing in this area steady all summer long. No monitoring or patrolling is done and it is causing some problem for my constituents to obtain even a little small business licence because they have to do a research. Research is not going to prevent these people from fishing in this area. Therefore, can the Minister look into this more seriously, for more monitoring or patrolling of this area? Mahsi cho.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 233-86(1): Monitoring Of Fishing On East Arm Of Great Slave Lake

HON. RED PEDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The short answer is, yes, I can, I will.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Question 234-86(1): Cultural Background Regarding Minister's Hat

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Economic Development. I could say, Mr. Minister, that I regretted very much that the conservative Mr. Pudluk called you on a point of order on the hat that you were wearing some time ago. Personally, I thought that it added colour and pizzazz to what is otherwise a pretty gray Assembly. Unfortunately, Mr. Minister, you did not get the chance to tell us at all what culture the hat belonged to and why you wore it to the House. And very briefly I would appreciate hearing that, Mr. Minister.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 234-86(1): Cultural Background Regarding Minister's Hat

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: In Saami language or Inuktitut or English? Mr. Speaker, very quickly. Yesterday some Members were disturbed that I was wearing a very bright blue colour and they thought that I was going to be associated with the blue party. I changed my tie and decided to wear this very colourful Saami hat, a traditional hat, from Norway which my colleague, James Wah-Shee and I had the pleasure of visiting. This particular hat, the length of it, represents the status of the individual. So you can see that the more successful you are the longer hat you can have. Apparently these four corners represent the four winds of Norway. So you can see from amongst all the hats for men that they do have these four corners. They represent the four winds which we are quite familiar with in this part of the world. Thank you.

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

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So the Minister will confirm that his intention was to celebrate another northern culture and that it was not an attempt to keep the costs of the trip under his hat. Is that correct? He does not have to answer that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. McCALLUM: Just tell us how much.

---Laughter

MR. SPEAKER: I am glad that everybody is making the rules today in the House. Are there any oral questions so that we can get on with the business? That appears to conclude oral questions. Mr. Gargan.

Question 235-86(1): Arctic Airports Policy

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Finance concerning transportation. I understand that there was a letter addressed to Mr. Butters concerning transportation in the North and the lifting of that ceiling on transportation. However, Mr. Don Mazankowski, when he replied to that letter regarding the motion passed here, was not supporting that particular motion. Going on with the letter, the Minister indicated that in the North, for example, we do have breaks on fuel tax and landing and taking off, those sort of concessions. He also said that there were going to be substantial improvements in communications, radar system and air traffic control. However, he did not indicate anything that is going to be improved here in the North. I would like to ask the Minister whether there is a move in the area of the arctic airports policy that was implemented or was not in effect since 1982 and whether there might be a move in that area to make substantial improvement in the North with regard to airports, since Mr. Mazankowski has not addressed those particulars.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 235-86(1): Arctic Airports Policy

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, the situation with regard to the arctic airports policy remains, as it has been in the past, in that it is under negotiation between my honourable colleague, Mr. Wray, and Mr. Mazankowski. However, referring to that item and other items which the honourable Member raised in his question, I think I will table the report of the federal standing committee on transportation which made a tour to the Territories within the last three or four weeks. The recommendations of that committee were very supportive of the position taken by this House on the matter of the airport transportation tax, taxes on fuel and the proposed tax on freight, and that committee recommended that the tax be abolished. So I will table that report which has gone to Mr. Mazankowski. Mr. Mazankowski will be responding in the near future, I believe. But the federal subcommittee on transportation did accept many of the recommendations that have been made by this House and through me to the standing committee and to the Minister of Transport.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Oral questions. Mr. Wah-Shee.

Question 236-86(1): Paving Of Highway Between Rae-Edzo And Yellowknife

MR. WAH-SHEE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works, if he has the time to reply -- I wonder whether your department has any plans to pave the highway between Rae-Edzo and Yellowknife; if you have any plans in the future.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question under advisement and return to the Member tomorrow. I do not think so, but I want to make sure.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Oral questions. Oral questions. Item 5, written questions. Mr. Arlooktoo.

ITEM 5: WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Question 237-86(1): Funding For Aulatsivik Centre, Cape Dorset

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a written question for the Minister of Social Services concerning the Aulatsivik Centre in Cape Dorset. I refer to my Question 153-86(1). At the last session they were to be given some funding for the work they are going to do but to date they have not received any funding and they are having a problem. They have to pay the power and fuel bills and for this reason I think they will need some funding. Would the Minister of Social Services please look into this matter at his early convenience? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Arlooktoo. Written questions. That appears to conclude written questions for today. Item 6, returns. Mr. McLaughlin.

ITEM 6: RETURNS

Further Return To Question 212-86(1): Care Of The Elderly, Snowdrift

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a return to oral Question 212-86(1), asked by Mrs. Lawrence on the 10th of June regarding home care services in Snowdrift.

A detailed response to the Member's letter on May 30th, 1986, has been prepared and will be forwarded to her within the next few days. I, however, wish to single out the following points in reply to the Member's oral question. First, home care services have been restored in Snowdrift as of the 9th of June, 1986. Second, the withdrawal of home care services was as a result of an administrative oversight within the regional and area offices. Third, assessments of aged and handicapped have been conducted in Snowdrift during this past week. This will provide for a better service to those residents of Snowdrift. I thank the Member for having brought this matter to my attention.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Returns. Mr. Curley.

Return To Question 222-86(1): Wilderness Camp On Great Slave Lake

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A return to written Question 222-86(1), asked by Mrs. Lawrence, regarding a wilderness camp on Great Slave Lake.

On June 10, 1986, the honourable Member from Tu Nedhe asked me a written question about the establishment of a wilderness camp on Great Slave Lake for one of her constituents. The issue is complex, as 13 years ago, in order to protect the unique trophy fishing, lodge development on Great Slave Lake was frozen.

Two years ago, on the advice of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, the number of outfitters on Great Slave Lake was frozen. In order to obtain accurate information on the fish resources, a study will take place this summer jointly by my department and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, on the East Arm of Great Slave Lake. In the fall, we should have a good idea of what level of activity the resources can bear and it was my intention to then review the freeze on lodges and outfitters.

It is certainly my intention to support and enhance tourism business opportunities in the Northwest Territories and I am very encouraged by the efforts of the honourable Member's constituent in developing her idea, making business contacts and lining up potential customers. There is a need for more native business people to become involved in the tourism industry and I have taken this into consideration in reviewing the application.



I am pleased to tell the honourable Member from Tu Nedhe that I will be approving an outfitters licence for Evelyn Cook to enable her to establish her tourist fishing business on the East Arm of Great Slave Lake this summer. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Returns. Mr. Sibbeston.

Further Return To Question 221-86(1): Competition For Administrative Officer, Fort Smith

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday Mr. McCallum asked Mr. Patterson a question as to why the requirement for three years of FIS experience was originally included in the job qualifications of the administrative officer in Fort Smith. Mr. Patterson has asked me to provide this response in his absence.

I have reviewed this matter with the department. Apparently, the superintendent of education had had some difficulty in having this job adequately done by the previous incumbent. His financial skills were not his strongest skills and this created some difficulties when he had to work with the FIS system. The superintendent obviously hoped that by requiring FIS experience he could ensure that any new employee entering the system would be fully functional from day one. Clearly any employee entering a new position requires a period of orientation. It was determined on subsequent review that what was really being sought was a candidate with strong financial skills. Such a candidate could easily acquire the specific knowledge required by the FIS system during the natural orientation period. The requirement for FIS experience then became an unreasonable barrier to entry that, in fact, resulted in several highly qualified individuals being screened out of the competition either before or during the interview process.

I would like to point out that the deputy minister of Education was fully consulted and concurred with the decision to cancel the competition and remove this unnecessary and unreasonable qualification from the job description.

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

Return To Question 219-86(1): Funding For International Inuit Youth Camp, Ikpik Bay

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a reply to an oral question asked by Mr. Angottitauruq on the 10th of June concerning the international Inuit youth camp at Ikpik Bay.

In 1985-86 a contribution of \$5000 was provided to Inuit Tapirisat of Canada for the holding of an international Inuit youth camp as part of International Year of Youth activities. In late March of this year a request for approximately \$40,000 for the holding of what is now described as an annual event, was received by my office. In a reply to Mrs. Innuksuk, president of ITC in early April, I indicated that the scope of the project and the size of the funding request did not fall within the youth initiatives program of my department.

The total amount of contribution funding available in 1986-87 is only \$40,000. This is to provide for community, regional and territorial projects geared to foster youth involvement within the Territories, but primarily at the local levels. It is my hope that through the efforts of two recently hired youth initiative officers, that local and regional youth groups will access the available contribution funds so as to stimulate local youth participation. Already considerable interest has been expressed by youth in Cambridge Bay, Spence Bay, Gjoa Haven and Coppermine to form local and regional youth groups. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Further Return To Question 214-86(1): Positions At Correctional Centre For Women, Fort Smith

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: I have a return to oral Question 214-86(1), asked by Mr. McCallum on the 10th of June, 1986, regarding the closing of the Fort Smith correctional centre.

There are currently 12 staff at the centre, six permanent and six term and casual. As per government policy and in compliance with the collective agreement only the permanent staff members will be assisted.

On June 25th and 26th, 1986, a senior staff member of the corrections program will, along with representatives of Personnel, interview the six permanent staff to determine their desire and/or flexibility to move within the corrections services. All will be offered positions in corrections at similar levels.

Again, in compliance with the collective agreement, assistance will be provided to those who wish to remain in Fort Smith with respect to employment in other GNWT departments. This would as well apply to staff members seeking employment within the GNWT across the Territories. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Returns. Are there any further returns? Item 7, petitions. Mr. Erklou.

ITEM 7: PETITIONS

MR. ERKLOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Petition 8-86(1) is signed by five principals for the Early Intervention Program which was stopped. They would like to see it back in progress. This petition is for it to be continued.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Paniloo.

MR. PANILOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a written letter to the Hon. Dennis Patterson from my constituents. This is Petition 10-86(1) that was signed by 96 people concerning the school in Broughton Island. There should be renovations for this school. It is not large enough for the students.

The second petition, Petition 9-86(1), also from Broughton Island, concerns the small houses and is signed by 46 people. It is directed to the Housing Corporation. I am not reading it because it is written properly and you can read it. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Paniloo. We note that two petitions were entered. Are there any further petitions? That appears to conclude petitions for today.

Item 8, reports of standing and special committees. Item 9, tabling of documents. Mr. Pudluk.

ITEM 9: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

MR. PUDLUK: I would like to table two documents which are going to be addressed to the Minister of Social Services. Tabled Document 61-86(1), regarding transportation of persons injured in Resolute Bay, May 27th, 1986. He can address this letter to somebody responsible for transportation. And Tabled Document 60-86(1), regarding social services in my communities. This has happened twice and I think we can call it kidnapping. I can discuss this more sometime before we adjourn this Assembly, so we can resolve this problem.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Pudluk. This would have been the proper place to make your comments with regard to the transportation company not waiting for the injured people -- when you table the document rather than under oral questions. Do we have any further tabling of documents? Mr. Curley.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table Tabled Document 62-86(1), which is a clipping from the Vancouver Sun, June 7th, entitled "Expo Films". I am pleased to tell the Members that the NWT Expo film about Canada's North has been judged one of the best three films at Expo '86, receiving the highest award of five stars. The Vancouver Sun gave this outstanding rating to only three pavilion films: Canada's pavilion, Alberta's and the NWT.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you and congratulations, Mr. Minister. Is there any further tabling of documents?

Item 10, notices of motion.

Item 11, notice of motion for first reading of bills.

Item 12, motions.

Item 13, first reading of bills.

Item 14, second reading of bills.

Item 15, consideration in committee of the whole of bills and other matters: Bill 13-86(1), Write-off of Assets and Debts Act, 1985-86; Tabled Document 37-86(1), Constitutional and Political Development in the NWT; First Report of the Special Committee on Rules, Procedures and Privileges; Bill 5-86(1), Jury Act; Bill 7-86(1), Official Languages Act; Report of the Standing Committee on Legislation on Bills and Other Matters; Tabled Document 42-86(1), Report of the Task Force on Aboriginal Languages, with Mr. Wah-Shee in the chair.

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

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER FIRST REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON RULES, PROCEDURES AND PRIVILEGES

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): The committee will come to order. The Speaker has put on a number of items for consideration in committee of the whole. Mr. Butters, as government House Leader, could you give some indication as to what we can deal with at this time?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, with respect, we would suggest to the House that the first order of business this afternoon would be the First Report of the Special Committee on Rules, Procedures and Privileges, to be followed, if that is concluded, by Bill 7-86(1), Official Languages Act and then possibly we could come back to Bill 13-86(1) for which some information is required for Members before it can be concluded.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Does committee agree?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): The first order of business will be the Report of the Special Committee on Rules, Procedures and Privileges and then the second item will be Bill 7-86(1) and the third item will be Bill 13-86(1). We are dealing with this report. You all have copies of it, the First Report of the Special Committee on Rules, Procedures and Privileges. I would like to now ask the chairman, Mr. Richard, if he has any opening remarks at this time.

Opening Remarks By Chairman Of Special Committee On Rules, Procedures And Privileges

MR. RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This committee's first report is not nearly as exciting as the report of the task force on aboriginal languages or the estimates, but it is at least as exciting and interesting as the Society of Management Accountants Act and all of the other legislation we passed yesterday. So I am sure that Members will be very attentive on the subject matter of rules and procedures.

The special committee was struck in the fall of 1985. The membership consists of myself, Mr. McCallum, Mr. Erkloo, Mr. Angottitauruq and the Hon. Tom Butters. We have had very able assistance from the Clerk, Mr. Hamilton, and the committee researcher, Mr. Schauerte, throughout our work. This first report was tabled in the session earlier in March and results from input from all Members of this Assembly. The report considers some of the matters within the mandate of the committee, but not all. Other matters are yet to be considered by our committee.

I hope Members have had an opportunity to read through this report. I propose shortly to go through the recommendations one by one in the order in which they are set out in this report; the general recommendations, those requiring new rules, those requiring amendments to current rules of this House and recommendations for miscellaneous amendments to the rules as well.

It is hoped, Mr. Chairman, if the Assembly agrees to our recommendations, to have these changes made to go into effect for the commencement of the fall session. That way we will have a trial period for the balance of this 10th Assembly to use the changes to the rules.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to mention briefly that since this report was tabled in March the committee has travelled to four other jurisdictions, Queen's Park in Toronto, the House of Commons in Ottawa, and also to the legislatures in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. We met there with legislators and the rules committees of those jurisdictions. Each of those four jurisdictions, Mr. Chairman, have recently changed their rules. In the case of PEI they are changing their rules, in fact, this month. We did obtain valuable information from our meetings with these people and in observing their legislatures and their committees at work.

Mr. Chairman, as I was telling our Speaker this morning, one of the things our committee gleaned from this quick trip to these four jurisdictions and particularly from observing their committees and their legislatures at work, is that we in this legislature do not take a second or a back seat to any of the others.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. RICHARD: The word "zoo" is more appropriate for other legislatures and certainly not for ours.

MR. McCALLUM: Hear, hear! I believe him too.

MR. RICHARD: On the committee's recent trip, Mr. Chairman, a separate report is being prepared and I hope to present that on behalf of our committee before this session is out, sometime next week, with a few more recommendations for changes in our rules. Mr. Chairman, those are the introductory remarks I have and if you permit, sir, I would now go to the specific recommendations, one by one, but I am at your pleasure.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Does the committee agree that we deal with the report now? Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Richard, do you wish to get into the details of your report at this time?

MR. RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, during the work of the committee in February and March we did provide Members with a preview of these 25 or 30 recommendations and at an informal meeting Members did have an opportunity to comment on them. So, Mr. Chairman, I take it I should not feel guilty about moving fairly quickly through some of these recommendations. Do I have your leave, Mr. Chairman, to move fairly quickly?

MR. McCALLUM: You have mine.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Chairman, I believe you lack a quorum. This is a very important issue we would like to deal with. I think we should have a quorum. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Would the Sergeant-at-Arms sound the bells, please? The Chair recognizes a quorum, so we can carry on. Mr. Richard, would you like to go into Recommendation 1?

MR. RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first recommendation deals with the elimination of a scheduled spring session and, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the Members consider this Recommendation 1 in conjunction with Recommendation 6 over on page 10. Recommendation 6 deals with the notion of a sessional calendar, that we have two fixed sittings each year, in the winter and in the fall. The first recommendation, Mr. Chairman, arises out of the concern...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Richard, before you get into your report, I would like to ask other Members if they wanted to have general remarks before you get into the details of your report. So, I would like to get that out of the way first and then perhaps we can carry on. Are there any Members who would like to make general remarks? Mr. Pudluk.

Speaker's Terms Of Reference

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Regarding the recommendations and the future regulations, I am pleased with them in our Legislative Assembly but one recommendation that we had asked to be included was in regard to the Speaker's terms of reference. Sometimes the Speaker has too much power and Members cannot ask him any questions. Maybe we can put it in the recommendations that while he is in his Chair that he can move to his constituency's chair once in a while, and if he can be accountable for some of his responsibilities I think that should be included in the recommendations. But sometimes we had some problems prior to this because of his power, regarding his supreme power, and when we tell him about a problem one day, the following day it is usually a little too late to have a good effect. If, when we have an immediate problem we can talk to him right away about it, it would be a -- when you have to wait a day or two days in order to be able to tell him it seems to create more problems in that aspect. Regarding the Speaker's powers, where could we discuss that? How could we include that into the recommendations? I would like that included in a recommendation. Maybe in the next election I might try and get in to become Speaker. I would not wish to be entrusted with that much power. That is all I have to say regarding the Speaker. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Richard, do you wish to respond to the issue raised by the honourable Member?

MR. RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I was not aware of this particular concern. The current rules do place some restrictions on the Speaker. The committee is certainly prepared to look at changing that rule and I should explain, Mr. Chairman, that this report today is the committee's first report. There are a number of items that we have not yet considered as a committee. Specifically, there is a list of items referred to our committee from caucus. Mr. Pudluk, as chairman, wrote a letter to our committee asking that five specific items be considered by our committee and the letter came from caucus after this report was produced. So we have to consider those other items and I will add the concern about the powers of the Speaker to that list. I will have the committee consider Mr. Pudluk's suggestion and we will be providing another report to this Assembly in the fall session and, perhaps at that time we can come up with a recommendation that can be debated by all Members.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. General comments, Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Thank you. I would like to thank the chairman because he was able to make the recommendations. I will wait until next fall to get that recommendation included. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. General comments. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the chairman of the committee on rules would indicate again what his expectation is with regard to those recommendations that are passed at this sitting.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, if Mr. Butters could refer to Recommendation 29 on page 30, the committee is recommending that any changes to the rules that are approved today or at this sitting come into effect on the first sitting day of the fall session.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): General comments. Does the committee agree that we go into the details of the report at this time?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Richard.

Recommendation 1: Elimination Of Scheduled Spring Session

MR. RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first recommendation deals with the elimination of a scheduled spring session. Again, I ask the Members to consider this recommendation in conjunction with Recommendation 6 which calls for a specific two sittings a year, based on calendar dates.

Recommendation 1 arose out of the concern expressed in recent years of the costs of having the spring session out of the capital city and the complementary value of that session. The original intent of that spring session travelling to another community was to take the government and its legislature to the northern people and to personally make contact with them and to hear their concerns.

The special committee feels that this public contact and exposure can be more easily attained these days through increased travel into the small communities by the Executive Council as a body, and the standing and special committees. The smaller communities, those that have not yet hosted the Legislative Assembly because of inability to do so, will be able to accommodate the committees but could not, in the past, accommodate the large Assembly and staff.

Motion To Discontinue A Scheduled Spring Session

So, Mr. Chairman, I move that the Legislative Assembly discontinue a scheduled spring session.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): The motion is in order. To the motion. Page 4, Recommendation 1, elimination of scheduled spring session. To the motion. Mr. Gargan.

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With regard to this motion, most of the Executive Council meetings are done confidentially and the same would apply to the standing and special committees. If these people meet, the only time that they would be able to go into the communities is in the evenings when they are not sitting. I wonder what the merits of this will be and what the Executive Council or standing and special committees travelling to the communities would accomplish.

The other concern I have, Mr. Chairman, is that I understand there is an added factor to travelling to the communities for spring sessions but I do not think that we should eliminate that option and that if we do sit for three months of a year, perhaps we are still saving money by not having a spring session so that could be very well utilized in having, if it were appropriate, a session in one of the communities. I certainly do not want to see that option eliminated. Those are the only concerns I have at this time, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. To the motion. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will not be in support of the motion. We have been given a job as elected Members. The jobs that we have to deal with, we have to deal with them. Our job is very heavy and it involves a lot of work. If we are going to meet in the spring I think our job would be lessened. If we do not meet for quite a long time we are going to get very loaded with work and the population of the NWT is also increasing. So, for that reason I do not think we should be too worried about when to meet -- whether it would be spring, fall, winter or summer. We have been put to the Legislative Assembly, to this House, by the people of the Northwest Territories and we have to think about them first instead of thinking about our plans here. So, for that reason I will not be in support of the motion that was just made.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the motion. Mr. Erkloo.

MR. ERKLOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to clarify for the Member beside me. Under Recommendation 6(2), it states the Commissioner, if he is asked by the Executive Council, will call an emergency meeting.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: I thought we are dealing with Recommendation 1, not 6. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): I believe they are both related. To the motion. Mr. Erkloo.

MR. ERKLOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You are right, they are related. It does not mean we are not going to meet in the fall. If there is an emergency, there has to be a meeting if one is called.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the motion. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Mr. Chairman. According to our Recommendation 1, it says "discontinue". What does that mean?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Richard, will you clarify your report please?

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, maybe I can try and assist Mr. Pudluk. The important word in the first recommendation is the word "scheduled". The committee is recommending in Recommendation 6 that we have a definite sitting commencing in February for four or five or six weeks and we have another definite sitting in October for four or five or six weeks and we do that every year. In addition, we can meet at other times of the year, if necessary. If you go back to recommendation 1, the committee is recommending that we discontinue a scheduled definite sitting every spring. We will only do it if we have to. I think that is the important part of the first recommendation -- the word "scheduled". I hope that is of some assistance.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the motion. Recommendation 1. Mr. Gargan.

MR. GARGAN: Perhaps it would be more appropriate if the recommendation read "that the Legislative Assembly discontinue one scheduled session."

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Gargan, we have to deal with the motion on the floor. To the motion. Recommendation 1. Mr. Arlooktoo.

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not think I am going to be in support of this motion. I think we are going to be away from home for a long period. It would be better to sit here for three weeks. If they are going to take the spring session out, I think we are going to have a long fall session and the wishes of our constituents might be delayed if we do not meet for a long period of time in-between. So for that reason I do not want to discontinue the spring session. I was in favour of our scheduled sessions. When we meet in the spring it does not take that long.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

Motion To Discontinue A Scheduled Spring Session, Carried

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question has been called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Mr. Richard.

Recommendation 2: Quorum

MR. RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The second recommendation arises from a concern expressed by some Members about reducing the quorum for committee of the whole. Our current rules provide that a majority of the Assembly, which with the current numbers is 13, is required in four instances. A quorum of 13 is required when we begin our meeting each day at 1:00 o'clock or 9:30; a quorum is required when a Member draws the attention of the chairman of committee of the whole or the Speaker to the lack of a quorum; and a quorum is required on all votes. Once the sitting is declared open the quorum is presumed to be present until someone brings the attention of the chairman or the Speaker to the lack of a quorum. Then of course, as we know, the Speaker or chairman rings the bells and calls in the Members. This issue was debated by the committee and it was a feeling of the committee that because it is not always mandatory to have a quorum here, that we do conduct our committee of the whole work, especially, with sometimes less than 13 when there are really unexciting topics, like rules and procedures, being discussed, and it was felt that it was not necessary to change the current rules with regard to quorum.

Motion That Quorum Remain At "A Majority Of The Assembly", Carried

So I move, Mr. Chairman, that the quorum remain at "a majority of the Assembly".

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Your motion is in order, Mr. Richard. To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question has been called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Mr. Richard.

Recommendation 3: Deletion Of Reference To Quorum

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, Recommendation 3 deals with an amendment to the Northwest Territories Act. When we were discussing quorum we noted in the federal act that there is a provision there in section 11(5) that in our Assembly a majority of Members would constitute a quorum. Our committee felt that the matter of quorum is a prerogative or should be a prerogative of this Assembly and not the federal government. It should be up to us to decide our own quorum and that any reference to a quorum in federal legislation is inappropriate and should be deleted.

Motion To Request Amendment To Northwest Territories Act, Repealing Section 11(5), Carried

I, therefore, move that the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories request the federal government to amend the Northwest Territories Act by repealing section 11(5).

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): The motion is in order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question has been called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Mr. Richard.

Recommendation 4: Non-Government Agencies/Ad Hoc Special Committees

MR. RICHARD: The Recommendation 4 deals with the procedure in committee of the whole. Currently Rule 96 of our Rules allows witnesses to appear before committee of the whole if they are requested to do so, if they are government officials and if they are essential to the conduct of the committee's business. Our committee recognized that these rules are worded very widely. We also noted, and it was brought to our attention by Members of the Assembly, that there had been a recent increase in the incidence of non-governmental witnesses appearing before the committee of the whole. In an effort to use the time of the committee of the whole more valuably and more effectively we are recommending that non-government groups, and the examples cited in the report in recent years are the TFN, Canada Post Corporation, Atomic Energy of Canada, manufacturers of SLOWPOKE, the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, the Dene Nation, etc., that these groups should meet with caucus rather than appearing before committee of the whole.

We are therefore recommending that the rules relating to witnesses, governmental officials, remain at present and that government officials only come into committee of the whole when it is essential to the conduct of our business. We further made the observation, Mr. Chairman, that if there is a time when one of these non-government agencies has an issue, if the issue warrants it, the Assembly should strike a special committee or an ad hoc committee to meet with that interest group or that organization and report back to the Assembly.

Motion That Rules Governing Witnesses Remain Unchanged And Non-Government Groups Meet With Caucus Or Special Committees

So I move that: 1) non-government agencies, organizations and interest groups meet with caucus rather than appearing before committee of the whole; 2) if the Legislative Assembly is of the opinion that a non-government group warrants formal discussions with a special committee that such a committee shall be struck through the appropriate motion; and 3) the current rules which govern witnesses remain unchanged.



CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Your motion is in order, Mr. Richard. To the motion. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will speak against this motion. The matter as to which groups might appear before the Assembly is within the control of Members now. We are not obliged to hear from every group that wants us to hear from them, so we can control appearances in this House. I admit that having that kind of control places a bit of a burden on Members to make a determination from time to time as to whether we will or will not hear from particular groups and I recognize also that that makes us liable to criticism when we decide to hear from one group and some time later decide not to hear from another group. But notwithstanding that, I believe that as much as possible we should make it possible for concerned citizens -- and particularly those that have formed in groups and are addressing issues that have a great deal of relevance and importance to public activities in the Northwest Territories -- I believe we should make it possible for them to speak directly to their legislators and to speak publicly to their legislators unless and until we at some point have a well established and well developed committee system such as for example they have in the federal parliament where there are special or standing committees on a great number of areas that are of general importance. There are public committee meetings and witnesses are able to appear before them. We do not have that yet and there are a number of reasons why we do not. Until we have that kind of system I think that we should continue with the practice of, from time to time, enabling groups such as the task force on aboriginal languages or perhaps the major native associations or the Public Service Association or the youth of the Territories or whomever we might feel warrants that kind of attention to appear before us from time to time.

Going back to the matter of the committee system, we do have a standing committee on legislation. However, the meetings of that committee are not public because we recognize that in order to make them public we would have to go to transcript with full documentation of everything that transpires during the committee meetings. That adds a great additional cost and means further facilities for the Assembly and so it is for reasons like that that we have not made standing committee on legislation meetings public. Because we do not have that yet, I say once again then that I think it is important for us to continue the practice that we have had in the past, noting again that still leaves us the control. If we are burdened by a great deal of other business that is good enough reason to say that we cannot hear from particular witnesses but I would like to see the option remain open to us.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the motion. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that everything that the Member wishes can be done by unanimous consent of the House. If there is a special group that the House particularly wants to hear, the rules can be overridden quite simply. So this rule is not cast in stone. The type of people that Mr. MacQuarrie indicates the House may wish to admit on a moment's notice could be accommodated by a very simple unanimous agreement.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. To the motion. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: In response to the honourable Member's remarks I can only say that I recognize that that is true but that also leaves opportunity for a single Member, who may have some special reason for not wanting to hear what that group has to say, to torpedo the whole thing, because every Member of this House would have to agree to have them in if we put this in our rules. I would not like to leave that in the hands of a single Member.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the motion. Do I hear question?

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

Motion That Rules Governing Witnesses Remain Unchanged And Non-Government Groups Meet With Caucus Or Special Committees, Carried

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question has been called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Mr. Richard.

Recommendation 5: Commission On Members' Salaries And Benefits

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, Recommendation 5 deals with the matter dear to our hearts, that of the salaries and benefits of Members and Ministers. The committee discussed the current practice of Members and Ministers voting on increases in the level of their own indemnities, allowances and expenses, and I believe Rule 15 says that is not a conflict, if you vote on your own salary. We noted that in some other jurisdictions, notably Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, there is an independent commission established by the Speaker or by the Executive Council to make recommendations and in the province of Nova Scotia, in fact, the commission's recommendations are binding. Our committee found merit in this system -- in other words, having an outside group take a look at what the level of remuneration should be for us, hardworking Members of the Assembly, rather than voting on it ourselves. The committee was of the opinion that the Assembly should at a very minimum have some guidance from an outside, independent source on the appropriate level of remuneration.

Motion To Establish Independent Commission On Members' Salaries And Benefits And To Prepare Legislation Required, Carried

Mr. Chairman, I move: 1) an independent commission be established by legislation to annually review Members' and Ministers' salaries, allowances, benefits, expenses, indemnities and per diems. Further that the commission report to the Assembly with its recommendations; and 2) the Management and Services Board prepare the legislation required to amend the Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act to give effect to this recommendation.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Your motion is in order. To the motion. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: I would like to speak very strongly in favour of this recommendation. Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is important that the public be satisfied that there is an objective and fair process in place to determine Members' salaries and benefits. That is not to imply that the salaries and benefits that are established now because they were established by Members' are out of order in any sense. I believe that they are not but I know that from time to time it is difficult, perhaps even a little embarrassing in some sense to be put in a position where you are determining these things for yourself.

I would very much like to see happen what is being recommended by this committee. I note that the independent commission would make recommendations to the Assembly and, of course, if the Assembly felt that in some way those recommendations were inadequate, they would have the opportunity to modify them but to do it publicly and to be expected to justify it publicly in order to make the amendments and I think that is very desirable.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question has been called. All those in favour? Thank you. Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Mr. Richard.

Recommendation 6: Sessional Calendar

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, Recommendation 6 deals with the notion of a sessional calendar. This is a recommendation that we gleaned in part from the comments we received from Members of this Assembly and also from our observations of the practice in other jurisdictions. In recent years, a number of the other legislatures in the country have gone to a fixed calendar as is being proposed in Recommendation 6. The committee was of the view that a sessional calendar should be planned on the basis of two sitting periods each year. This calendar would ensure with some certainty the dates and the duration of the periods that the House would sit.

Recently, our sessions have been of a duration of 11 or 12 weeks in total every calendar year, meeting from Monday to Friday. The committee recommends the adoption of a sessional calendar which would see a winter session commencing on the second Wednesday of February and lasting for approximately five or six weeks. The fall session would begin on the first Wednesday of October and last again for approximately five or six weeks.

The committee feels that identifying these sessions would help planning by the government, the legislative division, the Assembly Members, the staff, the media, regional councils and any groups who are affected by a sitting of the Assembly. Setting the starting date of the two sessions in our rules would replace the decision currently made by the Commissioner on the advice of caucus.

It should be noted clearly, Mr. Chairman, that our committee understands that the implementation of this fixed calendar would not affect the Commissioner's rights to convene an additional session at any time under special circumstances or emergency situations. This recommendation, then, does not preclude the holding of a spring session or a session at any other time or, for that matter, a session in another community other than the capital. Caucus would continue to make those kinds of decisions, it would just be an addition to what is in the rules. We are just going to put some certainty in the rules.

Motion To Schedule Two Sessions A Year With Special Sessions Convened Upon Request

So, Mr. Chairman, with that background I move that the following new rules be added:

- (1) During the term of an Assembly, the Assembly shall hold two sessions a year: (a) one commencing the second Wednesday in February; and (b) one commencing the first Wednesday in October.
- (2) Notwithstanding Subrule (1) the Commissioner, upon the request of the Executive Council, shall call the Assembly into session for the convening of special sessions.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Your motion is in order. To the motion. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) I think I have a problem with that because of the first recommendation. When we are going to meet when there is an emergency situation, I think that the Executive could set up a session but I do not think that the Executive should be deciding all this for the Legislative Assembly, the MLAs. I think we should have a say whenever there needs to be a meeting or there is any emergency situation.

Motion To Amend Motion To Schedule Two Sessions A Year With Special Sessions Convened Upon Request

I would like to add something to the first recommendation. Subrule (1) During the term of an Assembly, the Assembly shall hold two sessions a year. Take that "two" out and put "not more than three sessions a year". Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Pudluk, in regard to your amendment to the motion, your amendment to the motion would give the impression that the Legislative Assembly does not have to hold any sessions in a given year and, legally, we have to sit at least one session a year. The way you have amended your motion would give the impression that we do not have to hold any session. So, that is really posing a problem. I believe before I can entertain any remarks I would, as chairman, have to rule on the amendment. Mr. Pudluk, to your amendment.

MR. PUDLUK: Again? (Translation) I am considering this, that should there be an emergency situation, there should be something available. We will not be using it all the time, I am sure, but in the future it will enable the Legislative Assembly to meet as this will be in existence for a long time. If the Members should increase over the years, for instance one more Member from Yellowknife, if we become 25 Members we will probably be meeting more often. Following that increase I am sure there will be more special meetings that will be occurring frequently and demand for the third meeting of the year -- not to hold two meetings a year but possibly three. I am a Member of the Legislative Assembly and wish to have input in the Executive decision. That is why I am trying to make an amendment to the motion.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the amendment. Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, I think I understand Mr. Pudluk's concern and if I understand him correctly I can agree with him. If I am correct, for a special session, a third session if it is necessary, he wants to have not the Executive Council but the Legislative Assembly to have that authority to tell the Commissioner, "We need a third session." So I am going to ask, Mr. Chairman, if the mover, Mr. Pudluk, would consider changing his amendment to the second part, Subrule (2), where it says "the Commissioner, upon the request of the Executive Council". If that read "Executive Council or the Legislative Assembly", if we made that change, it would satisfy his concern about this recommendation. That I think would be more appropriate in doing what he wants to do.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think both (1) and (2) should be amended. I would like to keep that amendment under Subrule (1) and also Subrule (2) should be amended with Executive Council and also the Legislative Assembly itself. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the amendment. Mr. Wray.

Amendment Would Wipe Out Scheduled Sessions

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The only problem that I have with Mr. Pudluk's first amendment would be that if we changed to "shall hold not more than three sessions a year", then paragraphs (a) and (b) of Subrule (1) will be wiped out. In other words, you will not be able to set a time. Whereas if he was to accept Mr. Richard's suggestion of "the Commissioner upon the request of the Executive Council or the Legislative Assembly", then that would still allow the Legislature to be able to call a spring session which I believe is what the Member wants to ensure takes place, because if the amendment goes through -- perhaps you could give me advice, Mr. Chairman, does that not mean that (a) and (b) are automatically wiped out?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Your assessment is right. To the amendment. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if that amendment went through there may be some question as to whether the two scheduled sessions would occur on schedule but I would assume that they still would, so we would have a session commencing in February and another session commencing in October. It could be that under the terms of this recommendation that the Assembly or the Executive Council might ask for a special session in June of that year so we are up to three sessions. Now it could happen that in July or August there is something of a very urgent nature that needs to be addressed. Perhaps it might be a war over the use of the Northwest Passage or something like that which the Member might be vitally interested in. But if you have written this kind of rule then a fourth session would not be allowed. All I am saying is that I would not like to see the passage of a motion that puts a cap or an upper limit on the number of sessions that could be held and that is what his amendment is doing. I will vote against the amendment.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the amendment. Mrs. Lawrence.

MRS. LAWRENCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am very confused on these recommendations that are in front of us here. Recommendation 1, why bother passing it if we are going to have Recommendation 6 where, at the request of the Executive Council, the Assembly will be called into session again. I guess I am a bit confused because there is going to be a lot of -- what happens after six weeks in the February session if we do not deal with all the important bills? I do not believe that activities in the Territories are going to be less, in fact we are going to probably get more bills to deal with. One recommendation is contradicting the other recommendation so I am really confused about this whole recommendation. Mahsi cho.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the amendment. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: I think I should be more clear. I was dealing with only Subrule (1) and now I would like to deal with (1) and (2) at the same time. I was going to make an amendment to Subrule (2)...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Pudluk, we can only deal with one amendment at a time. We will have to deal with the amendment you have proposed. So to the amendment. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: There is some confusion already if we are dealing with only Subrule (1). I think we should really deal with the Recommendation 6 as a whole. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): We are dealing with Recommendation 6 and the recommendation contains two parts to it. That makes up the whole motion. Right now we are considering your amendment to the motion. Mr. Erkloo.

MR. ERKLOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To the amendment, I will not be able to support it for the reason that we are able to meet, considering the recommendation, for twice a year for the Legislative Assembly and we could also meet three or four or five times if we wanted to but with the amendment to motion we will be able to meet two more times for this year. If there should be an emergency that arose we would be able to meet only one time per year and it will not go more than three per year and I think with the amendment we are not able to have any authority over the sessions and I will not be supporting the amendment to the motion.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question has been called. Mr. Gargan, to the amendment.

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to have a question on whether -- for example this winter session we did recess for about three or four weeks and then resumed that session. Does this rule apply for this particular case?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Gargan, we are dealing with an amendment. However, if you want points of clarification then I think the mover of the amendment could clarify certain points for you. But, for your information a session could be open-ended. It could last for two years if Members wished to have such a lengthy session. Then, if you hold two sessions within a given time frame then you would only be holding two sessions within your term of office. To the amendment, Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Are we still dealing with Subrule (1)(a) and (b), except (2)?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): We are dealing with your amendment, Mr. Pudluk, and your amendment now reads: "During the term of an Assembly, the Assembly shall hold not more than three sessions a year." And that is the amendment that we are voting on now or will be dealing with. To the amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

Motion To Amend Motion To Schedule Two Sessions A Year With Special Sessions Convened Upon Request, Defeated

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question is being called. To the amendment. Question is being called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The amendment is defeated.

---Defeated

To the motion. Mr. Curley, to the motion.

Motion To Amend Motion To Schedule Two Sessions A Year With Special Sessions Convened Upon Request

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think it is only right that the Assembly would like to have a say as to when the special session should be held. Obviously it should be indicated. Therefore, I will move an amendment right after the second paragraph at the end of the comma there, "the Executive Council or Legislative Assembly shall request the Assembly into session".

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): You might want to consider "Legislative Assembly" before "the Executive Council". Your amendment is in order. To the amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question is being called. Mr. MacQuarrie, to the amendment.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, if I could question the mover. I certainly approve of the intent but the need for it may arise when the Legislative Assembly is not in session and, therefore, technically it could not be the Assembly that would call for the session. So, could it read, "upon the request of the Executive Council or the majority of Members of the Legislative Assembly", or something.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. MacQuarrie, would the Speaker be appropriate instead of the Legislative Assembly?

MR. PUDLUK: Point of order.

---Laughter

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Point of order, Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I recognize the second recommendation should be moved first and deal with it after.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): The amendment has been moved so we are dealing with the amendment that has been made by Mr. Curley. Mr. MacQuarrie was asking a question of the mover in regard to his amendment. To the amendment. Mr. Curley.

Motion To Amend Motion To Schedule Two Sessions A Year With Special Sessions Convened Upon Request, Withdrawn

---

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do concur with the Member's concern that the Members will not be together in one room somewhere and therefore it will be difficult. If the Legislature is in process then obviously it is meeting and therefore they do not have to make a special request to the Executive Council or to any other person. So, therefore, I think I will withdraw my original motion in that regard because it is confusing and appropriately I would give it back to the author, the chairman of the rules committee, to put in appropriate wording but it more likely should be "or request the Speaker" because he would certainly be co-ordinating comments from the other Members throughout. I am withdrawing my amendment.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. The amendment has been withdrawn, now we are dealing with the original motion. Mr. Richard, to the motion. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Motion To Amend Motion To Schedule Two Sessions A Year With Special Sessions Convened Upon Request

---

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, I would like to move an amendment to number 2 of this recommendation and it would be: "that upon the request of", this is in the second line of number 2, "upon the request of" and then I would insert new wording: "the majority of Members of the Legislative Assembly, or" and then the remainder of the clause would be as it is.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): How would you determine the majority of the Assembly? Mr. MacQuarrie, your amendment is in order. To the amendment. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Motion To Amend Motion To Schedule Two Sessions A Year With Special Sessions Convened Upon Request, Carried

---

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, there seems to be some confusion as to how it would read now. It would read: Number (2) "Notwithstanding (1) the Commissioner, upon the request of the majority of Members of the Legislative Assembly or the Executive Council, shall call the Assembly into session for the convening of special sessions."

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question is being called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The amendment is carried.

---Carried

To the motion as amended. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Chairman, I am not really satisfied with your ruling which took place earlier when I was trying to make an amendment. The mover of this motion read from (1) (a) and (b) and (2) at the same time. You were allowing me only to deal with item (1) which was moved by the chairman of the standing committee and he was moving the motion from (1) (a) and (b) and (2) at the same time and I thought I was allowed to deal with those Recommendations (1) and then (b) and (2) at the same time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Just to clarify the concern here. The motion that was moved by the chairman of the committee of this particular report, the motion contains two parts, part (1) and part (2) and that is the way the motion was moved. I, in turn, indicated that the motion was in order. Then after that you wanted to make an amendment to the motion and the motion contains two parts to it. As chairman, I could only deal with one amendment at a time, whether you are dealing with part (1) or part (2). I have to dispose of these amendments on the motion whenever they come to the floor. That is the way that these recommendations are moved for your consideration.

To the motion, as amended. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Chairman, I agree with you but one thing, that bracket should be removed -- (1) and (2).

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the motion, as amended. Mr. Curley.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to indicate the fact that I realize the Member's concern. But I think what was happening, in my view, was that he was making an amendment to his amendment. That is where, I think in my view, procedurally it did not go because he had already moved an amendment and, subsequently after some discussion, was trying to make another amendment to the motion as a whole. Therefore, in that regard as far as I was concerned, my understanding is that you cannot make an amendment to your own motion. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the motion, as amended. Mr. MacQuarrie.

#### Benefit Of Fixed Calendar Dates

MR. MacQUARRIE: The only real question remaining appears to be as to whether fixed calendar dates are desirable for the two sessions and I really believe that they are desirable because I think they would facilitate planning by the government and by the legislation division that is preparing legislation for consideration. It would have benefit to Assembly Members, the Assembly staff certainly, the media and even groups such as the regional councils which are forbidden in law I think, I recollect that, forbidden in law to meet during the time that the Legislative Assembly is meeting. So, having fixed calendar dates for the opening of the two major sessions would be beneficial I think for a lot of people and I support the recommendation.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. To the motion, as amended.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

Motion To Schedule Two Sessions A Year With Special Sessions Convened Upon Request, Carried As Amended

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question has been called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried as amended.

---Carried

Mr. Richard.

#### Recommendation 7: Members' Statements

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, Recommendation 7 deals with the concept of Members' statements. This is one of the significant changes that the committee is recommending. This topic was discussed at length in caucus or informal meeting in March, and it follows a change, Mr. Chairman, that is being made in some other jurisdictions, notably in the House of Commons. They have been doing it for the last year or so and in Queen's Park in Toronto for the last number of months. The Members of the

committee met with some of those parliamentarians and legislators in recent weeks, and, without exception, everyone feels that this change was very beneficial to individual Members in participating in the process in the Assembly.

This led our committee to recommend that a similar procedure be implemented in our Assembly to provide an opportunity for individual Members to express themselves on matters which are of concern to them and their constituents, and that this opportunity be made available to them on a daily basis. Mr. Chairman, it can be compared to two other matters which we have on our orders of the day now. One is replies. Members understand replies. They are in a sense mini-replies that are available every day that we set for a period of two minutes each.

In British Columbia the rules there allow private Members to make a statement that is confined to one matter. It cannot revive discussion on the matter which had previously been discussed. It shall not anticipate a matter which has been put down for consideration by the House, and it shall not concern a point of privilege.

Our committee was of the view that our Assembly should be less restrictive with regard to the use of Members' statements and follow more closely the Ottawa example. Their standing orders in Ottawa allow ordinary Members to make a statement for not more than 90 seconds each day in the 15 minute period that is provided for prior to oral question period. Those rules provide in Ottawa that the Speaker can order a Member to sit down if in the Speaker's opinion the Member is making an improper use of the standing order on Members' statements. What constitutes improper use is not defined, but the Speakers of the House of Commons have stated that this opportunity is not to be used to convey congratulatory messages, to read newspaper articles or editorials, to comment on legal actions, nor for what the Speaker considers frivolous purposes.

Under our recommended procedure, the period before oral questions would be for Members, including Ministers, to raise matters of concern to them. Statements could be made by Members who are Ministers, but those statements could not relate to the Minister's responsibility as a Minister. Every Member would be recognized by the Speaker for a maximum of two minutes to make a statement. We were able to put the two minutes in for everybody, Mr. Chairman, because we have only 24 Members, who would use a maximum of 48 minutes. It is not as if we were like the House of Commons, where they have 280 Members. They clearly could not let everybody speak every day, but we feel, for the trial period at least, that we should implement this and allow everybody to have a say on something that concerns the Member for two minutes maximum each day.

Before I make my motion, Mr. Chairman, I might ask that Members refer to page 26 in the English version. I do not know if the Inuktitut version is numbered, but if all of these recommendations are accepted, you will see that in the new order of business, after the prayer there would be Ministers' statements and then Members' statements. That would be the opportunity for the Speaker to call on Members to make a short statement on one matter.

#### Motion To Add Rule Allowing Members' Statements

I move that the following new rule be added:

- (1) A Member may be recognized to make a statement on any matter.
- (2) The Speaker may order a Member to resume his seat if, in the opinion of the Speaker, improper use is made of such statements.
- (3) Statements made under Rule (1): (a) shall not exceed two minutes; (b) shall be confined to one matter; and (c) shall allow every Member to make one statement per day.
- (4) A Minister may make a statement in accordance with Rule (1) but such statements must not relate to the Member's responsibility as a Minister.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Your motion is in order. To the motion. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. T'SELEIE: Mr. Chairman, I have a question on this rule. In one of the rules that is made for this new rule, on page 11, it says that (b) statements "shall not revive discussion on a matter which has been discussed in the same session". I am wondering how far that rule goes in terms of discussion, whether that means discussion that takes place in committee of the whole or discussion that involves Members' statements. If one Member were to discuss a topic and I wanted to make a statement the next day, I am wondering whether I would be ruled out of order, based on this restriction on statements.



CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, my friend from Sahtu was referring to the middle of page 11. Those are the rules in British Columbia, and we felt that we should not adopt that one restriction that Mr. T'Seleie was referring to. So if you turn to page 12, this is our recommendation, and we are not recommending that one restriction. We took it out. So you would be free to discuss in your little short statement something that had previously been discussed in committee of the whole or anywhere.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the motion. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will vote against this recommendation. I had provided written comments to the committee on a number of the recommendations. This was one of them. Obviously my thoughts did not influence the majority of the Members of the committee. But I will reiterate them in the hope that there may be more reasonable Members sitting in the House at the present time.

The point that I tried to make was that as much as was reasonably possible, and I guess you have to keep in mind that this is coming from an inveterate talker, but as much as is reasonably possible, a House should remain action orientated. That is, when there is speech, it should be speech to some specific purpose. And I think that daily statements by Members simply do not contribute to that at all. Not only do they not contribute, I believe they are not really necessary. Members now have a number of occasions, many occasions, in which they can express to the House the kinds of concerns that they have. That includes a reply to the Commissioner's Address, the opportunity to put questions, both written and oral, to propose motions, to debate bills and policies. And on top of all of that, just as in this small NWT the media has reasonable access to politicians, it is true the other way around too, that politicians have reasonably easy access to the media. It seems to me that all of that together is sufficient.

It is obvious that each Member, occasionally, has good reason to announce something or to state something that is of particular concern to his constituents but which is of general interest as well. Under our present rules, with some flexibility, the Speaker has traditionally offered an opportunity at the end of the day for Members to make such announcements under an item "announcements from the floor". I think that that is adequate. If we were to go the step further and put this in, then if the statements that are made are argumentative in nature, I feel they should not be made in a context which would prevent further argument immediately. And if they are merely to be factual in nature, I think they can be made in some other way. I just think that it would not contribute to the effective work of this House every day on the order paper to make allowance for 24 statements from Members. So I will vote against the recommendation.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question has been called. All those in favour? Mr. MacQuarrie.

Motion To Amend Motion To Add Rule Allowing Members' Statements, Defeated

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, I had hoped to hear further discussion and if I thought that the recommendation might be defeated, I would have been happy and let it go at that. But a quick reading tells me that it might very well pass. So I will make an amendment to the recommendation, Mr. Chairman. I am looking at (3)(c). I will amend it to read "(c) shall allow every Member to make one statement once per week during each session".

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Your amendment is in order. To the amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question has been called. To the amendment. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The amendment is defeated.

---Defeated

Motion To Add Rule Allowing Members' Statements, Carried

To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

We will take a 15 minute coffee break.

---SHORT RECESS

The committee will come to order. We are on page 14. Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Those eight recommendations, or seven, I am sorry, conclude the recommendations that involve new rules. The following series of recommendations are recommendations that require amendments to existing rules of the Assembly. I know, Mr. Chairman, that Members are quite excited about all of these procedural changes, and I just ask that Members contain themselves because when we hit Recommendation 15, known as the "no smoking" recommendation, interest will hit a peak at that time.

---Laughter

MR. McCALLUM: It is not a "no smoking", it is a no coffee, everything.

Recommendation 8: Commissioner's Address

MR. RICHARD: But dealing with them in turn though, Mr. Chairman, Recommendation 8 deals with the Commissioner's Address. Our committee recommends that the title of the address be changed. The committee feels that the current title, Commissioner's Address, is misleading as, with the advent of ministerial government and with the role of the Executive Council being enhanced, the address in fact is an announcement of the Executive Council's legislative program and direction for the future, not that of the federally appointed Commissioner. This recommendation, then, simply supports the progressive assumption of responsibility by elected Members in a move toward fully responsible government. Our committee recommends that the Commissioner, however, continue to read the opening address at each sessional opening.

Motion That "Commissioner's Address" Be Renamed "Opening Address" And Be Read At The Beginning Of Every Session, Carried

I move that: (1) all references to the "Commissioner's Address" now contained in the rules be amended to read "Opening Address"; and (2) the following new rule be added. Every session shall begin with an "Opening Address" read by the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Your motion is in order. To the motion. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Chairman, I have a question. Are we talking about two opening addresses a year?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if there were only two sessions, because of Recommendation 6, there would be an opening address at the beginning of the February session and an opening address at the beginning of the October session and also an opening address at the beginning of any other session that was called by the Commissioner.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the motion. Do I hear question?

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question has been called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Mr. Richard.

Recommendation 9: Deletion Of Motion Of Appreciation

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, Recommendation 9 deals with the motion of appreciation and the following Recommendation 10 deals with replies to opening addresses. We are recommending a few changes here. Firstly, the committee felt and this was in response to some comments received by Members of the Assembly that the reference to the motion of appreciation in the rules should be deleted. It has been found to be very confusing. Rule 26 has not been treated as a motion in that it is never voted on, nor in recent times has it been treated as a Members' reply. The practice of the Speaker recently is to inform the Members who have moved and seconded the motion on opening day that they will have an opportunity on a subsequent day to give their reply in full. The current rule, then, indicates that the motion is to express appreciation to the Commissioner and ties it in with the Members' ability to give the reply. The committee is recommending that there be changes to delete that reference to a motion of appreciation.

This recommendation, Mr. Chairman, uses the rule numbers. If Members do not have their little green rule books to refer to, Mr. Schauerte, outside the ropes, has some extra copies for Members. Perhaps for myself. Rule 26(1) talks about a motion of appreciation; Rule 37(i) refers to the motion of appreciation and Rule 50 is the wording of the motion of appreciation. What we are recommending is that these be deleted.

Motion To Delete Rules 26(1), 37(i) And 50, Carried

I move, Mr. Chairman, that Rules 26(1), 37(i) and 50 be deleted.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Your motion is in order. To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question has been called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Mr. Richard.

Recommendation 10: Replies To Opening Address

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, the next Recommendation 10 deals with replies to the opening address. We are recommending that, with the new name "Opening Address", it be called "Replies to the Opening Address" so as not to confuse it with Members' statements. We are further recommending that replies to the opening address not be placed on the order paper for the opening day. Most Members do not have access to the opening address read by the Commissioner and would be unable to make any well-prepared comments in their reply with respect to the content of that opening address.

Also, our committee, after much consultation and discussion with other MLAs, is recommending that the replies to the opening address only be placed on the order paper for the first 12 days of the session, 12 sitting days. We are also recommending, Mr. Chairman, that there be a limit of 30 minutes on the length of a reply, for reasons that were discussed when we discussed this in caucus a few months ago. In recent years, the opening day has fallen on a Wednesday, and since this committee now has accepted Recommendation 6, the sessions would begin on a Wednesday and the 12 sitting days would include two weekends for Members to prepare their replies. Our committee felt that if we set the first 12 days only, this would prevent a problem whereby many Members leave their replies to the last few days just before prorogation. This, combined with Recommendation 7 about the new concept of Members' statements, that you can get up every day and give a short two minute statement -- in the South in one of the jurisdictions they are called short snappers -- you have that opportunity every day, we felt was not too much of a hardship, to say your reply had to be restricted to 30 minutes.

Motion To Delete Rule 26 And Replace With New Rule 26

Mr. Chairman, I move that Rule 26 be deleted and replaced with the following: 26(1) Every Member may make one reply to the Opening Address and may speak on any and all matters. (2) The item "Replies to the Opening Address" shall be placed on the orders of the day on the next sitting day after the speech is read. (3) The item "Replies to the Opening Address" shall appear on the orders of the day for the next 11 sitting days. Subrule (4) A Member's "Reply to the Opening Address" shall not exceed 30 minutes.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Your motion is in order. To the motion. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. T'SELEIE: Mr. Chairman, I do not agree that we need to reserve 12 days to make a reply to the opening address. I would like to see it the way it is right now, where Members are allowed to make the reply on a day of their choosing. So, I would like to move that as a motion.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. T'Seleie, you cannot move to delete the whole motion. I think what you can do, though, is make an amendment to the motion.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Point of order.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. MacQuarrie, point of order.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Based on an earlier ruling, I would gather that you are looking at this entire structure as a single motion on the part of the committee, and I would submit that it is in order to delete a part of that motion, that that would be an acceptable amendment. A Member could move that this motion be amended by deleting such and such a reference. I would submit that that is the case, but I ask your further consideration, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): The Member indicated that he disagreed with the whole thing, so what I indicated to the honourable Member is that he can make an amendment to the motion that we are dealing with here right now. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. T'SELEIE: Mr. Chairman, I am not against making replies. I am against putting a restriction of 12 days when you can make them, and that is the section of the motion that I would like to see deleted.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. T'Seleie, would you be prepared to make an amendment if that is the intent? Are you wanting to make an amendment to 26(3)? Is that the amendment you wish to make, Mr. T'Seleie? In that case, would you indicate to the committee what your amendment is?

Motion To Amend Motion To Delete Rule 26 And Replace With New Rule 26

MR. T'SELEIE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to amend Rule 26 by deleting the third part of Rule 26.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Okay, Mr. T'Seleie. Your amendment is to delete 26(3). Your amendment is in order. To the amendment. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, although I am a Member of the rules committee, I take exception to this particular recommendation and would agree to and will support Mr. T'Seleie's amendment. I do not feel that there is an abuse of the latitude which the Speaker now permits Members of this House, to speak throughout the term of the particular sitting. There may be a little congestion on the last day that such remarks are allowed, but I do not think it upsets the business of the House, nor does it impede the business of the House. I feel it would be important to give the Members as wide a latitude as possible.

We know how important free speech is. We know how many countries in this world do not have the ability of freedom of speech, and freedom of speech should be a major tenet of this House, or any Legislative Assembly in the free world. To restrict the opportunities of Members to speak freely on the behalf of their constituents is unacceptable, so I am very much in strong support of Mr. T'Seleie's amendment.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the amendment. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, I am absolutely sympathetic to the Member's intention and agree with the comments that were just made by the honourable Member for Inuvik. However, I would like to point out that the way this recommendation is structured, if it passes at all, Rule 26(2) is deleted entirely. The whole of Rule 26(2) would be deleted -- the existing Rule 26(2), and if you did not -- if Mr. T'Seleie's motion went ahead and you deleted item (3), there would be no other reference to when you could make Members' replies, and under what is written here it would appear that Members then would have the right to reply only on the day after the opening address is made.

So, all I am stating is that I agree with the amendment to delete this, but I would suggest to the Member that there must be another phrase to replace it, to describe exactly what we mean now and I, for one, am very willing to recess for a few minutes while the Member and the Clerk frame such an amendment.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): We have an amendment on the floor and we have to proceed with the amendment. The amendment has been ruled in order so really we are dealing with the amendment. To the amendment. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Could I make an amendment to the amendment, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): It depends on how it is worded. I will have to rule on it, but certainly you can proceed to make an amendment to the amendment. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, I will add an amendment to the amendment, Mr. Chairman. It is that once the item (3) is deleted -- can I do that? Well, I presume the existing amendment is "I move that item (3) be deleted." Is that correct? My words are following on that. I move that item (3) be deleted and replaced by the following (3). "The Item 'Replies to the Opening Address' shall be placed on the orders of the day for every sitting day following" -- okay -- "every sitting day thereafter" -- and that is referring back to (2) -- "except on the day designated for prorogation". For Members' information, that is essentially the wording of the existing clause.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. MacQuarrie, in regard to your amendment you are putting a condition...

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Point of order.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): ...in terms of the deletion. There is a condition attached to it so therefore it is not really in order. Your amendment to the amendment is not in order. Your point of order, Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that any Member wishes to obstruct other Members to improve rules or legislation, and I am quite sure that when the suggestion was made that we recess that this was not the intent or the case. But I am wondering, in view of the fact that no recess was permitted, whether we might have available to us our Law Clerk, who can listen to the points being made by some Members and provide for us an amendment which will do what Members wish it to do which is to remove this obnoxious...

MR. MacQUARRIE: ...needed by technicalities.

---Laughter

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible comments)

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Order, please. Mr. Butters, you have no point of order there. The ruling on amendments and motions is really the responsibility of the chairman of the committee and it is not really the responsibility of the Law Clerk. Mr. T'Seleie, to the amendment that you made. We are dealing with your amendment. Mr. T'Seleie.

Motion To Amend Motion To Delete Rule 26 And Replace With New Rule 26, Withdrawn

MR. T'SELEIE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to withdraw my amendment.

---Withdrawn

MR. MacQUARRIE: Point of order.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the motion. A point of order, Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Could I ask the advice of the Clerk of the Assembly as to the proper procedure for eliminating what is written in item (3) now and replacing it with the substance of what is in 26(2) in the existing rules?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MacQUARRIE: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Just so that we minimize confusion here. The motion was originally introduced, we considered an amendment to the motion, and then an amendment to the amendment was proposed, which was ruled out of order. Then we were dealing with the amendment to the motion, which was withdrawn. Therefore now we are back to the original motion. So really we have to address ourselves to the motion on the floor. Therefore we have to deal with the motion. On the other point that was raised by Mr. MacQuarrie, it is not within the tradition of the parliamentary system to have the Clerk have any voice in the chamber so therefore you can raise your concern to the chairman and the chairman can in turn take that into consideration. To the motion. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you very much for that advice, Mr. Chairman. In the meantime, I had advice from my private legal adviser...

---Laughter

...who is also the chairman of the special committee on rules and procedures, but he is objective and very fair and he has told me how to do it so I shall do it, Mr. Chairman, if it meets with your approval.

Motion To Amend Motion To Delete Rule 26 And Replace With New Rule 26, Carried.

I move that Subrule (3) in the motion be amended so that in the last line of Subrule (3) all of the words in it be eliminated and replaced by these words: "every sitting day thereafter, except on the day designated for prorogation". The whole subrule will now read, "The item 'Replies to the Opening Address' shall appear on the orders of the day for every sitting day thereafter, except on the day designated for prorogation." Does that meet with your approval, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Your amendment is in order. I am just trying to keep you according to the rules. To the amendment. Do I hear a question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question has been called to the amendment. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The amendment is carried.

---Carried

To the motion as amended. Mr. Butters.

Motion To Amend Motion To Delete Rule 26 And Replace With New Rule 26, As Amended.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that we delete 26(4). I move that the House delete 26(4), "A Member's 'Reply to the Opening Address' shall not exceed 30 minutes."

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Butters, your amendment is in order. To the amendment. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, again the amendment is placed for the same reason that the other one was raised and that is that Members have very few opportunities in which they can cover the whole spectrum of their community concerns. I do not think the current procedure or process is abused. Sometimes Members' responses take no more than five minutes. Sometimes they may take an

hour. I believe that until there is some way in which Members can have other opportunities to raise their concerns about their constituencies that we should not touch the response to the opening address. It is a very important opportunity for Members to indicate to the House what they, only, know and can communicate. I would hate to see this opportunity reduced and diminished by this rule.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. To the amendment. The amendment is to delete 26(4). Yes, to take it out. To the amendment. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MACQUARRIE: Yes, I would just like to speak to reinforce the remarks made by the honourable Member previous. I think that in the parliamentary system there has been a long tradition that there should be an opportunity for elected representatives to address any and all matters, and that is reaffirmed in the proposed rule change. Any and all matters that are of concern to that Member and the people he represents and not only in his own constituency but across the jurisdiction. That opportunity, if it is to address any and all matters, cannot necessarily be fitted within a specific time frame, nor should it be. I think that at least once in a session there should be that unfettered opportunity to say what is really on the mind of the representative, and I can only agree that in the past we have had, sometimes, some long replies. We have also had some short ones. I, for one, am willing, if it is on one occasion like that, to listen to what Members have to say. I do not begrudge that time and I do not think that granting it has unduly prolonged the sessions that we have had. It may be that other things do it but not that opportunity. I absolutely agree with the amendment.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. To the amendment. Mr. Wray.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would also support the amendment. One of the problems in being a Minister is the inability to be able to speak on constituency issues in the Assembly, and the reply to the Commissioner's Address is the one opportunity that we have to address a whole range of problems that we have in our constituency. I do not resent it as I think the intention was not to restrict this. I think it was just to try and bring some time limits to it, but I really feel that you cannot place time limits on constituency problems. There are some constituencies that may have much worse problems than others and it may take a lot more time to address those problems, like Mr. McCallum's or even Mr. Butters', whose region is in a very depressed state economically because of the pull-out of the oil and gas. He may need the extra time to address all the problems he has. I really think that we cannot start restricting the time that a Member has to speak about his constituents' concerns. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. To the amendment. Are we ready for the question?

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

Motion To Amend Motion To Delete Rule 26 And Replace With New Rule 26, As Amended, Carried

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question has been called. All those in favour of the amendment? Opposed, if any? The amendment is carried.

---Carried

To the motion as amended. Do I hear question? To the motion as amended?

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

Motion To Amend Motion To Delete Rule 26 And Replace With New Rule 26, Carried As Amended

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question has been called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion as amended is carried.

---Carried

Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Our committee is the servant of all of the Members. We are only here to do what the Members want and as long as we get through the recommendations, that is fine with me.

Motion To Amend Rule 32, Carried

Mr. Chairman, Recommendation 10. I have two other consequential recommendations. I am on page 17 now of the English version. Because we have changed the name to "Replies to the Opening Address" we have to make a change to Rule 32. So, I move that Rule 32 be amended as follows: "No Member shall speak for more than 20 minutes at any time in debate but this limitation does not apply to 'Replies to the Opening Address' and 'Members' statements'."

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Your motion is in order. To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question has been called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Mr. Richard.

Motion To Delete And Replace Rule 20(1), Carried

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, also as a consequence of changing the name to "Opening Address", we must make an amendment to Rule 20(1) which is the subrule which sets out the order of business for the opening day.

I move, Mr. Chairman, that Rule 20(1) be deleted and be replaced by the following: "The order of business on the opening day of each session will be: 1. Prayer; 2. Opening Address; 3. Ministers' Statements; 4. Members' Statements; 5. Oral Questions; 6. Written Questions; 7. Petitions; 8. Reports of Standing and Special Committees; 9. Tabling of Documents; 10. Notices of Motion; 11. Notices of Motion for First Reading of Bills; 12. Motions; 13. First Reading of Bills; 14. Second Reading of Bills; 15. Orders of the Day."

Orders of the day is the term used in some jurisdictions for the committee of the whole work. Mr. Chairman, for clarification delete 15, so that my motion stops in the printed version here at "14. Second Reading of Bills".

Mr. Chairman, if I might have a moment to consult with one of my resource persons.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): So, essentially you are not moving that motion right now.

MR. RICHARD: I am in the middle of moving it, sir.

---Laughter

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Okay.

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, on second or maybe third thought, my motion is as I first read it including Item 15, Orders of the Day. That is my motion, sir.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Your motion is in order. To the motion. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, may I just ask for an explanation. It is a little confusing but this is the opening day of the session, so do I understand that Item 15 would be an item where you explain what the orders of the day are for the following day? Is that why Item 15 is there? Could someone just clarify that for me?

MR. RICHARD: Correct.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.



CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question has been called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Mr. Richard.

Recommendation 11: Ministers' Statements

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, the next recommendation deals with Ministers' statements which is currently Rule 21. The committee had quite a discussion about Ministers' statements and since this report was prepared we have had many conversations with our counterparts in other jurisdictions.

Most Ministers in other jurisdictions have less flexibility and freedom than in our very liberal jurisdiction -- small "l" liberal. The committee is concerned that the Ministers' statements are becoming more and more frequent and lengthy. The committee does encourage Ministers to make statements of policy in this House before releasing the information to the public at large or to the media. These statements, however, in the view of the committee, should be short and factual.

In addition to this concern, the committee has been made aware by Members of this Assembly of the desire to be able to make comments and respond to ministerial statements. The committee is of the opinion that Members should have an opportunity to discuss and debate the statements. Having copies of the statement delivered to each Member before the routine proceedings would enable the Members to be better prepared to put questions to Ministers concerning these statements.

In some other jurisdictions, Mr. Chairman, they have recently implemented a provision on the orders of the day immediately after a Minister's statement where Members of the Assembly and the opposition can rise and for a limited time period respond to Ministers' statements.

Also, in other jurisdictions there is a very specific time limit on Ministers' statements. Our committee being very liberal and wanting to be very fair to the Ministers of this government are not suggesting that there be such restrictions on them but we do wish to streamline the process and make some requirements of the Ministers as in the following recommendations.

Motion To Delete Rule 21 And Replace With New Rule 21

Mr. Chairman, I would move that Rule 21 be deleted and the following substituted therefor. "Subrule (1) A Minister may make a short, factual statement of government policy. (2) A copy of each Ministerial statement, complete with translation, shall be filed with the Clerk one hour prior to the daily sitting of the Assembly that the statement is due to be given. (3) The Clerk shall transmit copies of all statements to the Members prior to the daily sitting of the Assembly at which the statement will be made. (4) In the case of an emergency, a Minister may make a statement without filing with the Clerk in accordance with Rule 21(2). (5) Any Member may, without notice, move a Minister's statement into committee of the whole for discussion. The motion shall not be subject to debate or amendment.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Your motion is in order. To the motion. Mr. Curley.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, without being too partisan about this rule, I think we are getting into a situation where we really are attempting to restrict the freedom -- we do not like the word "governing" but restricting the freedom to make appropriate or sometimes urgent -- something that is really necessary -- policy statements and to me this particular rule is infringing upon efficiency and therefore used not so much to try and create a fair debate in the House but rather to try and have advance information prior to opening of question period in that regard.

You are asking for, in my view, a copy of this ministerial statement translated and all that, into what languages -- official languages or any languages? That is a rule that if I were in that position I would want to be very clear about. Which languages do you want it translated into? That is number one. That is a weakness in that motion.

As well, if the rule is adopted, it will be one more bureaucracy that the government has to go through prior to making any major statement. We have already a very complex and difficult way of getting some of our statements through, even without many rules attached to the present practice. I would now like to ask a question of the chairman of the committee as to whether or not these kinds of rules are practised anywhere and if so, which provinces have that kind of requirement for ministerial statements, including the Parliament of Canada?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I hope I can answer that question. If the question is, "Are there other jurisdictions that require the advance copy?" the answer is, yes. In some jurisdictions, I believe the federal Parliament is one of them, it is a practice, not a rule, that the copies are tendered to the leaders of the various opposition parties. In the province of Ontario, Queen's Park, it is a rule that such be done, it is not just a practice, it is a rule, Mr. Speaker, in that jurisdiction that will not allow the Minister to speak or read the statement if the copies have not been provided to the leaders of, in Ontario, the two opposition parties. It so happens in this jurisdiction there are 16 opposition parties at present.

Mr. Chairman, just generally to address the Minister's, Mr. Curley's, concerns, the committee felt -- and you have to appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that our committee is simply coming back to the Assembly with a summary of what we perceived to be the majority views of the group of MLAs who form this Assembly at this time -- it was felt that it was not unreasonable to request Ministers to provide these statements ahead of time so that when the Minister gets up, as happened this week, as an ordinary MLA I can have that in front of me. I can follow it along when the Minister is speaking to it and under the new procedure immediately after Ministers' statements is Members' statements, so I can then rise in my place and comment very briefly for a maximum of two minutes on that statement. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, it would be difficult to do so if I had not seen the statement in written form and was relying on my memory of what the Minister is saying in his place.

As for the question about translation, Mr. Chairman, clearly the intent there with the current make-up of the Assembly is for the Inuit Members to receive that Minister's statement in Inuktitut and not in English so that it makes sense to them. They get the benefit of that rule in their circumstances and if the Minister feels there should be clarification that translation is into how many languages, well then, sure, let someone make an amendment and clarify it. But clearly that is the intent of the rule, that it be for the Inuit Members, to translate it into Inuktitut. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the motion. Mr. McCallum.

#### Government Policy Usually Made Available To Opposition

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I just want to indicate to Members that we have seen this in practice, as Mr. Richard has said, in jurisdictions where party politics are involved. The Minister's policy statement, because it is a statement and government policy is usually given to that Member of the opposition or Members of the opposition who are critics of a particular department so that they in fact can make comments. In practice and in areas where we have visited and from where we have received information, the critic is then able to stand up and make some comment on the government policy.

At the present time, Mr. Chairman, Members other than those who are Ministers have no knowledge or cannot get copies of the policy statement unless the Minister tables it. There is nothing in our rules now that says the Minister has to table a particular government policy. Unless a Minister gets up and says he is going to table it, he reads it and that is the end of it. As Mr. Richard says, you rely upon listening and hearing and trying not to put words in the Minister's mouth when you want to try to speak about it at another time because you can only refer to the policy during a question period.

After all, I think it only would be to the government's or the individual Minister's good to give Members a copy of the policy so that if it is a policy and they want to have it adopted and ratified by the House, then we would know and be able to speak intelligently about it.

As regards the business of emergency, there is a particular clause in here that where there is an emergency, a Minister can make a statement without filing with the Clerk, and there may be instances when that is necessary. We have had examples in this House during this particular session. Our particular reason for this is because we felt we deserve, as Members, an opportunity to make comments on the policy. We do not operate on party politics. We do not have particular individual critics of government departments. We may have critics of all government departments but not particular to that.

Again, as Mr. Richard has indicated, we are talking about the languages by which Members of this House can operate and that is English and Inuktitut. If there were Members who speak some of the Dene languages and they would want to have it translated into their language then that can be asked for as well.

Clearly, we are talking about the two languages for which copies are made here normally of information or policies, such as the rules, where we have English and Inuktitut. I think it is better for the government itself to make sure that Members are able to not only hear what the policy is but where that policy demands that some consideration of the House is made toward it, there has to be a way by which we MLAs can discuss it. Under the present rules there is no way I can, as a Member, get up and ask to have that tabled. Our rules do not allow it. If we are allowed to make a motion to move that into a committee then I think that is for the betterment of government as well. That is the reason for this. We have seen this practice in various jurisdictions across Canada. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the motion. Mr. Curley.

Increase To Workload Of Interpreters And Translators

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would certainly agree if there was party politics with this kind of rule but given the very small size of the Legislature as we are and there is, in my view, tremendously close interaction with the Ministers and ordinary MLAs, I do not think there is such a difficulty in getting various policy statements from Ministers when they do need them. To incorporate it into a rule, in my view at the moment is creating more backlog with the interpreters because surely you should consider the fact that you are going to increase the workload to the interpreters and translators and they lack resources as well. What I am trying to say is that if you really want efficiency, consider the logjam that you are imposing upon them, as well as translating legislation which they cannot keep on top of, and that is an area that you are putting pressure on.

The other thing is that I never, never once recall a Minister's statement moved into committee of the whole by motion because they normally are covering issues that the Members are familiar with that are debated through the supplementary estimates and budget process. In my view I can see what this is trying to do but I can also see that it is creating a more cumbersome way of operating in this very small sized Legislature. I am not going to oppose it by vote but I am just making a statement because I think if we want efficiency we could have covered a number of items. For instance, question period is not at all addressed because that is the only mechanism of the ordinary MLAs to raise however many supplementary questions they may wish to ask. In my view, I think there should be a limit as to how many supplementary questions you can ask because in some cases you are asking three different -- it is an unwritten rule in my view. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the motion. Mr. Wray.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I can see some major difficulties in this because it is very possible that what is going to happen is the interpreter corps is going to get landed with three or four or five major statements at 10:30 or 11:00 in the morning and be asked to have them translated and delivered to the Clerk's office by noon. Obviously we are going to be told that it is not possible so then the Minister is going to be restricted from making his statement. I do not know what the intent of this is. I guess the intent is to give the honourable Members on the other side time to look over the statements and prepare questions but I suggest that if they are on the ball and paying attention they should be able to figure out questions very quickly from the statements that we make. We do not have the benefit of having oral questions presented to us in written form one hour before they are asked and we are expected to make answers. I know we are

allowed a day to take them under advisement and give answers the next day but I would suggest that if every Minister here started to take every question under advisement then pretty soon the other side would start to get pretty jumpy. I think there has to be a little give and take on both sides. I just find this a little bit too restrictive. I can see problems occurring because of it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. To the motion. Do I hear question? Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MACQUARRIE: I have a question of clarification with respect to (1). I know in the past it has been restricted to statements of government policy but it seems to me that from time to time Ministers in a sense contravene that and provide information on a government program which I feel is a legitimate matter too sometimes. Sometimes I think it may be abused. Personally, I would not object if that were included but can I ask the chairman of the committee as to whether that was considered or whether they are reading policy to include that type of thing as well?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Richard, do you want to respond to that?

MR. RICHARD: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Very briefly, the committee did not really consider the interpretation of Subrule (1). It simply adopts the current wording in Rule 21 in our current rules and the committee therefore was content with the Speaker's current interpretation of Rule 21 in allowing the Ministers to do what they have been doing in terms of content of the statement. We did not feel that we should make any recommendations to change the current practice of content of Ministers' statements. That is really why we adopted the current wording.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the motion. Mr. Wray.

#### Content Of Statements Not Confined To Policy

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you. Mr. MacQuarrie's question has brought another point to mind. Now if in fact this rule passes, what is going to happen, I think, and what you are going to see is that in fact we will very closely then start to follow literally what it says here and we will make short statements only on government policy. That really to me is a problem for the Assembly because Mr. MacQuarrie is right. We do use the occasion to pass along information such as Mr. Curley's statement on his trip to northern Scandinavia. We feel it is important we share, sometimes, that type of information with the Assembly. I am a little bit worried that we are not going to be able to do that any more. If there was another area in the orders of the day to allow us to -- you might call it a Minister's briefing, if you want, on issues such as Expo or the trip to Scandinavia or things like that, then we might be able to do this but I am just afraid that what we are going to do is limit the amount of information that comes into the Assembly because of this rule.

MR. RICHARD: (Inaudible comment)

HON. GORDON WRAY: The problem though is that some of these statements are long statements and if we cannot get them translated and into the House in time, then we are not going to do it. Thank you.

Motion To Delete Rule 21 And Replace With New Rule 21, Carried

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the motion. Question has been called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Richard.

#### Recommendation 12: Returns To Oral Questions

MR. RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Recommendation number 12 deals with oral questions and Rule 54(3). This matter too was discussed in caucus, Mr. Chairman, and coincidentally the committee's thought here on the way the current rules should be enforced did come up earlier in this session, Mr. Chairman, when you yourself were in the Speaker's chair at the time. It involves the enforcing of Rule 54(3)(b), that the Minister when he takes the question as notice and answers it orally on a

subsequent day, he should be doing so under the same order of business which is oral questions rather than under returns. Our committee is recommending that that rule be enforced as it is written. One of the reasons is that it would then permit Members, presumably the Member who asked the original question, to ask supplementary questions on that following day because he would be precluded from doing so if the answer came back under returns and we have already passed oral questions in the orders of the day. So the committee is of the opinion that returns to oral questions should be considered under oral questions and before new oral questions are asked. To clarify and to make certain of that, Mr. Chairman, we are recommending that there be an item in the orders of the day entitled "Returns to Oral Questions" and that they be called by the Speaker as that.

Motion To Add "Returns To Oral Questions" To Daily Order Sheet, Replace Rule 54(3)(b) And Delete Rule 54(3)(c)

So I move, Mr. Chairman, that an item to be entitled "Returns to Oral Questions" be added to the daily routine of business. Further, that that item be placed between Members' statements and oral questions on the daily order paper and further that Rule 54(3)(b) be deleted and replaced with the following: "3(b) state that he or she takes the question as notice and answer it orally on a subsequent day under the item 'Returns to Oral Questions'", and finally that Rule 54(3)(c) be deleted.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Your motion is in order. To the motion. Mr. Curley.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, for all practical purposes, I could not quite really accept the justification for having separate items for returns. A question is a question whether it is written or not. You really are producing your reasons to allow us to go through another series of returns which in a sense is really having a double opportunity for question period. I can see what you are trying to get at. What you are trying to do is get every opportunity for ordinary Members, I can see that. Sure, but is it really absolutely required that you have a separate section for oral questions and their returns as a separate item altogether from written questions?

That has been the problem so far. I know you have done some checking around but to me what you are doing is obviously -- you know, we really want to try to hit them twice on these things and therefore these returns should be in a different category. In my view, a question is a question whether it is written or not, an answer is an answer. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. To the motion. Mr. McLaughlin.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with Mr. Curley that a return is a return whether it is a written return or an oral return. It may cause subsequent questions so why do we not have just one item of returns to come before the oral question period if that is what you want to do? So Ministers will give their returns from previous days before questions, so that Members can ask questions about returns given that day.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): To the motion. Mr. McCallum.

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, the rules now state that when an oral question is put forth and the Speaker determines whether it meets certain criteria, the Minister can answer the question because the question is asked knowing that the Minister must know something about it. But the Minister can also take it as notice -- our present rules say that -- and answer it orally on a subsequent day under the same order of business. That is what it says now. All we are saying is that when the response is being made to it, we are talking about oral questions, an oral return is not the same as a written return. They are not the same thing. We are talking about oral questions -- when you take my oral question as notice and you say you will come back another day.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible comment)

MR. McCALLUM: Only in your opinion. You do not want to get into an argument about -- I had better leave that one alone -- competence. Oral questions are determined as to whether they meet the criteria by the Speaker. If you take the oral question as notice I expect to get a return under oral questions as the rules say. If I feel that a question that I ask is better off written, then it is put down in the written manner and then you people get an opportunity to read that out under written questions.

Existing Rules Specify Oral Returns To Oral Questions

All we are saying here is going along with what the present rules are. If I ask a question and you do not feel you are able to make a reply, you say, "I will take it as notice" and come back at another or a shorter period of time. You do not have to write it out, you are supposed to answer it orally. That is what the rules say. It does not say that a written answer has to be made to an oral question. What we are saying is, simply, follow the rules. We do not believe that there is anything untoward being done here, we are not trying to do anything more than what is already in the rules.

The oral question is made, you are going to take it as notice, you give the oral response at the proper time. If the question is put in a written manner, it is not the same thing. All we are asking you to do is to do it as the rules state and if that oral response to a question you took as notice allows a Member to ask supplementary questions, so be it. That is the way it should be.

If you did not take the question as notice, if you answered, I would be allowed by practice or whatever to ask three supplementary questions on it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Five even.

MR. McCALLUM: Well, it depends upon whether you are going to answer them when I am sitting down.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

Motion To Add "Returns To Oral Questions" To Daily Order Sheet, Replace Rule 54(3)(b) And Delete Rule 54(3)(c), Carried

---

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question is being called. All those in favour? Thank you. Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Mr. Richard.

Recommendation 13: Returns To Written Questions

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, Recommendation 13 deals with returns to written questions. The committee has considered the necessity of Ministers reading out returns to written questions. This too, Mr. Chairman, was subjected to some debate during caucus and essentially we are leaving the decision to the Minister to read or not read the return.

Currently, Rule 55(2) instructs the Minister to read his or her reply in the Assembly and file it with the Clerk, who then transmits copies to all Members. Our committee is of the opinion that the returns to written questions need not always be read in the House under Rule 55(2).

Motion To Delete Rule 55 And Replace With New Rule 55, Carried

I therefore move, Mr. Chairman, that Rule 55 be deleted and replaced with the following: "55(1) Subject to Rule 54(1), all questions shall be in writing and filed with the Clerk who shall endorse the date of filing thereon and forthwith provide copies to all Members. (2) Where any written question is directed to a Minister pursuant to Rule 55(1), that Member" -- it should read "Minister" -- "that Minister shall, without any unnecessary delay, file the reply with the Clerk who shall endorse the date of filing thereon". (3) Upon the item "Returns to Written Questions" being called, the Clerk shall inform the Assembly of the returns received and cause copies to be transmitted to all Members and printed in the Hansard. (4) A Minister, if he desires, may read a return which has been filed in accordance with Rule 55(3), under the item "Returns to Written Questions".

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Your motion is in order. To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Question has been called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Mr. Richard.

Recommendation 14: Sitting Hours

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, the next motion deals with our sitting hours. This too was debated in caucus in our informal meeting.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Curley. Point of order.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Point of privilege I really believe it is. For my benefit, could you indicate to me that we now will have an opportunity to just table replies rather than reading the long responses? Would that also apply to Members when you ask a question...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): A point of order here. We are dealing with recommendation 14 dealing with sitting hours. That particular issue that you are raising, Mr. Curley, has been voted upon in a previous motion therefore we cannot really allow any further discussion on the previous motion. Mr. Richard, your sitting hours motion.

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, I do not think our committee would have any objection to us revisiting recommendation 13. If you in your wisdom, sir, could permit us.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): We have already dealt with the previous motion, previous recommendation. We are now on recommendation 14 dealing with sitting hours. That is what we are dealing with at the moment. Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD: Thank you, Herr Chairman.

---Laughter

Mr. Chairman, recommendation 14 deals with our sitting hours. Prior to the rules amendment in 1983 the sitting hours were five days a week from 1:00 until 6:00 p.m. We understand that at that time some Members had expressed the concern that those hours on Friday did not allow Members to make the best use of time available in Yellowknife. Anyway, as a result of the discussion in 1983, the Ninth Assembly chose the current hours that we have and everybody is familiar with our current hours. The changes to the Friday sitting hours enabled many Members to make weekend trips to their home constituency. Unfortunately, the airline schedules currently prevent weekend travel to most regions. Mr. Chairman, the out-of-town Members had a lot of input on this current recommendation. Our committee was told by many of the Members who live in areas far from Yellowknife that because it is too far to go home for the weekend those Members spend virtually a three day weekend in Yellowknife with very much idle time and they want it to be more productive or a better use of their time since they are in Yellowknife anyway. As a result of that, Mr. Chairman, the committee is recommending that the Friday hours be extended.

Motion To Delete Rule 3(1) And Replace With New Rule (3)(1)

I would move, Mr. Chairman, that Rule 3(1) be deleted and replaced with the following: The Assembly shall meet on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays from 1:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. and on Fridays from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon and 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. unless otherwise provided by order of the House.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): The motion is in order. To the motion. Mr. McLaughlin.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chairman, I posed this once before and have thought about it again and talked to a few other Members and one of the things I agree with is the suggestion of breaking up the day on the Friday so you do not have to sit the full five hours in a row.

Motion To Amend Motion To Delete Rule 3(1) And Replace With New Rule 3(1)

I would like to amend the committee's motion and replace it with the following Rule 3(1) instead: That the Assembly shall be convened by the Speaker at 2:30 p.m. on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays and at 10:00 a.m. on Fridays and shall adjourn after three hours. On Mondays, Tuesdays, and Wednesdays the chairman of the committee of the whole may adjourn until 9:30 a.m. the following morning for a committee of the whole meeting which shall adjourn at 11:30 a.m. Mr. Chairman, I guess I need a ruling on whether this is in order or not.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. McLaughlin, are you making an amendment to the motion? Mr. McLaughlin, your motion is in order. To the amendment. Mrs. Lawrence.

MRS. LAWRENCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not support the two recommendations, the amendment and the original recommendation. To the amendment...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. McLaughlin, your point of order.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: I thought by moving an amendment I would get to speak to it to explain it.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. McLaughlin, your point of order is correct. Mr. MacQuarrie, do you have another point of order? Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, my point of order which I would ask you to consider, Mr. Chairman, is that the substance of this motion put by the committee is to establish a particular regime of hours for the Assembly. I would agree that if there were a change in one item or another with respect to times that that would be a legitimate amendment. But I submit, Mr. Chairman, that what we are faced with provides not only changes in time but a different structure entirely and therefore I would ask you to find that what is submitted is out of order, Mr. Chairman. It is a different motion, not merely an amendment to this motion.

MR. RICHARD: Agreed.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: It still deals with Monday to Friday.

MR. McCALLUM: I move we report progress, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): I have a point of order here and I cannot really deal with another item. I have my hands full here. If you will just give me a few minutes. Well, I assume then it is not necessary for me at the present time to rule on that point of order raised by Mr. MacQuarrie. Right?

MR. MacQUARRIE: Sleep on it, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): We have a motion here to report progress. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

I shall report progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Mr. Wah-Shee.

ITEM 16: REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF FIRST REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON RULES, PROCEDURES AND PRIVILEGES

MR. WAH-SHEE: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been considering Bills 13-86(1), 5-86(1) and 7-86(1); Tabled Documents 37-86(1) and 42-86(1); the First Report of the Special Committee on Rules, Procedures and Privileges; the Report of the Standing Committee on Legislation on Bills and Other Matters, and wishes to report progress.

Mr. Speaker, your committee reviewed the First Report of the Special Committee on Rules, Procedures and Privileges and wishes to report that 14 motions were adopted and requests leave to sit again.



Motion To Accept Report Of Committee Of The Whole, Carried

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

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Wah-Shee. Members have heard the report of the chairman of the committee of the whole. Are you agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, announcements and orders of the day.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Announcements, Mr. Speaker. There will be a meeting of the Management and Services Board this evening at 6:00 p.m. There will be a meeting of the standing committee on public accounts tomorrow morning at 9:30 a.m.

ITEM 18: ORDERS OF THE DAY

Orders of the day for Thursday, June 12th, at 1:00 p.m.

1. Prayer
2. Members' Replies
3. Ministers' Statements
4. Oral Questions
5. Written Questions
6. Returns
7. Petitions
8. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
9. Tabling of Documents
10. Notices of Motion
11. Notices of Motion for First Reading of Bills
12. Motions: Motions 27-86(1), 28-86(1), 29-86(1)
13. First Reading of Bills
14. Second Reading of Bills
15. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills and Other Matters: Bill 13-86(1); Tabled Document 37-86(1); First Report of the Special Committee on Rules, Procedures and Privileges; Bill 5-86(1); Bill 7-86(1); Report of the Standing Committee on Legislation on Bills and Other Matters; Tabled Document 42-86(1)
16. Report of Committee of the Whole
17. Third Reading of Bills
18. Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Are there any announcements? This House stands adjourned until Thursday, June 12th at 1:00 p.m.

---ADJOURNMENT

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