



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

5th Session

9th Assembly

HANSARD
Official Report

MONDAY, MAY 25, 1981

Pages 320 to 376

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Speaker

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

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

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

Braden, The Hon. George, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 583
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0
(Yellowknife North)
Leader of the Elected Executive and Minister
of Justice and Public Services

Butters, The Hon. Thomas H., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1069
Inuvik, N.W.T.
X0E 0T0
(Inuvik)
Minister of Finance and of Economic
Development and Tourism

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

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

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

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

Kilabuk, Mr. Ipeelee, M.L.A.
Pangnirtung, N.W.T.
X0A 0R0
(Baffin Central)

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

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

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

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

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

Patterson, The Hon. Dennis G., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 262
Frobisher Bay, N.W.T.
X0A 0H0
(Frobisher Bay)
Minister of Education

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

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

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

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

Tologanak, The Hon. Kane, M.L.A.
Coppermine, N.W.T.
X0E 0E0
(Central Arctic)
Minister of Government Services

Wah-Shee, The Hon. James J., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 471
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2N4
(Rae - Lac la Martre)
Minister of Local Government and of Aboriginal
Rights and Constitutional Development

Officers

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

Clerk Assistant
Mr. D.M. Hamilton
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0

Law Clerk
Mr. E. Johnson
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0

Editor of Hansard
Mrs. M.J. Coe
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0

Sergeant-at-Arms
Mr. Jim Miller
Hay River, N.W.T.
X0E 0R0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

25 May 1981

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	320
Questions and Returns	320
Tabling of Documents	322
Notices of Motion	322
Motions	323
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Report of Standing Committee on Legislation	328
- Bill 1-81(2) Co-operative Associations Ordinance	328
- Bill 2-81(2) Extra-Territorial Custody Orders Enforcement Ordinance	329
- Bill 3-81(2) Fire Prevention Ordinance	330
- Bill 4-81(2) Home-Owners' Property Tax Rebate Ordinance	331
- Bill 5-81(2) Maintenance Orders Enforcement Ordinance	336
- Bill 6-81(2) Public Trustee Ordinance	338
- Bill 7-81(2) Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance, No. 4, 1980-1981	340
- Bill 8-81(2) Liquor Ordinance	346
- 10th Report of Standing Committee on Finance	360
Report of the Committee of the Whole of:	
- Report of Standing Committee on Legislation	373
- Bill 1-81(2) Co-operative Associations Ordinance	373
- Bill 2-81(2) Extra-Territorial Custody Orders Enforcement Ordinance	373
- Bill 3-81(2) Fire Prevention Ordinance	373
- Bill 4-81(2) Home-Owners' Property Tax Rebate Ordinance	373

	<u>PAGE</u>
- Bill 5-81(2) Maintenance Orders Enforcement Ordinance	373
- Bill 6-81(2) Public Trustee Ordinance	373
- Bill 7-81(2) Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance, No. 4, 1980-1981	373
- Bill 8-81(2) Liquor Ordinance	373
Third Reading of Bills	
- Bill 1-81(2) Co-operative Associations Ordinance	373
- Bill 2-81(2) Extra-Territorial Custody Orders Enforcement Ordinance	374
- Bill 3-81(2) Fire Prevention Ordinance	374
- Bill 4-81(2) Home-Owners' Property Tax Rebate Ordinance	374
- Bill 5-81(2) Maintenance Orders Enforcement Ordinance	374
- Bill 6-81(2) Public Trustee Ordinance	374
- Bill 7-81(2) Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance, No. 4, 1980-1981	374
- Bill 8-81(2) Liquor Ordinance	375
Assent to Bills	375
Orders of the Day	375

HAY RIVER, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

MONDAY, MAY 25, 1981

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Appaqaq, Hon. George Braden, Hon. Tom Butters, Ms Cournoyea, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Kilabuk, Hon. Arnold McCallum, Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. MacQuarrie, Hon. Dennis Patterson, Mr. Pudluk, Mr. Sayine, Mr. Sibbeston, Mrs. Sorensen, Hon. Don Stewart, Hon. Kane Tologanak, Hon. James Wah-Shee

ITEM NO. 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

SPEAKER (Hon. Don Stewart): I would just like to draw your attention to...

Message To Mrs. David Lewis And Family

I believe we have sound now. Members would, I think, wish to be informed of the death, on Saturday, May 23rd, in Ottawa Civic Hospital, of David Lewis, Q.C., a former national leader of the New Democratic Party. Born in Poland, Mr. Lewis was educated at McGill University, and was a Rhodes scholar at Oxford University. He was long associated with the NDP and its predecessor, the CCF party. He was first elected to the House of Commons in 1962, and re-elected in 1965, 1968 and 1972. I have sent a message of condolence on behalf of this Assembly to Mrs. Lewis and family members, which I assume Members would want me to do.

The orders of the day, Monday, May 25th. Item 2, replies to the Commissioner's Address. There are to be no replies today.

Item 3, oral questions. Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

---Applause

Item 4, written questions and returns.

ITEM NO. 4: QUESTIONS AND RETURNS

Written questions? There are to be no written questions. Are there any returns for today? Pardon me, Mr. MacQuarrie.

Question 64-81(2): Statistics On Corrections Service

MR. MACQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is for the Minister of Social Services. Since the Minister's earlier answer to me did not include an assessment of the effectiveness of the corrections service, other than the Minister's opinion that the service was doing a credible job under difficult circumstances, will the Minister inform this House whether his department does not have statistics which indicate whether inmates are rehabilitated as a result of the Northwest Territories corrections programs? If there are such statistics, will the Minister provide them to this House? If there are none, what steps will the Minister take to ensure that statistical evidence of this nature is gathered so that a proper appraisal of the corrections system can be done?

Further, considering the objectives of the corrections service, as cited to me in the earlier answer, will the Minister indicate whether deliberate, specific and organized measures to reform the attitudes of inmates are carried out as part of the corrections program? If not, why not?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. On another question, proceed, the honourable Member for Yellowknife Centre.

Question 65-81(2): Formation Of A Regional Government In Western Arctic

MR. MacQUARRIE: This one is for the Minister of Local Government. Motion 66-80(2) called for the Department of Local Government to begin discussions with COPE, community councils and the MLA for the Western Arctic, aimed at recommending a form of regional government for the Western Arctic. Will the Minister indicate what resources of the Department of Local Government, manpower, money and time, have been committed to this project, and what progress has been made thus far?

MR. SPEAKER: Written questions. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Question 66-81(2): Taxation Of Home Heating Oil

MR. MacQUARRIE: This is for the Minister of Finance. In return to my Question 89-81(1), the Minister indicated that his department is looking at some alternatives for taxation, if the tax on home heating oil for private residences were to be removed. What progress can the Minister report in this area? Further, does the Minister have any evidence to indicate that home heating oil, with its relatively small tax, might be being used in mobile Diesel engines to avoid the higher tax? What measures does the Government of the Northwest Territories take to prevent such abuses?

MR. SPEAKER: Written questions. Would you please stand closer to your microphone, Mr. MacQuarrie? We are having difficulty picking you up. Proceed.

Question 67-81(2): Costs Involved, MLA Licence Plates

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My last one is for the Minister of Justice and Public Services. Will the Minister please indicate what additional cost and effort is involved in providing special licence plates for Members of the Legislative Assembly?

MR. SPEAKER: Written questions. Returns. Mr. Butters.

Return To Question 2-81(2): Price Increase For Arctic Char, Rankin Inlet Fishery

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I have a return to oral Question 2-81(2), asked by Mr. Curley on May the 14th, 1981. I notice that the Member is not in the House at this moment, but I would like to make the reply at this time.

The marketing of Arctic char is the responsibility of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. However, the Department of Economic Development and Tourism has continuously pressed the corporation to secure higher prices for char. During the past year, the corporation succeeded in establishing new markets in the United States and obtaining the highest wholesale price ever, of \$3.25 per pound. This translated to a first payment of \$2.25 per pound f.o.b. Rankin Inlet to the Issatik fish plant, from which the fishermen received one dollar per pound. It is also very likely that the plant will receive a second payment of 60 cents per pound later this year. The FFMC continues to explore new markets in Canada, the United States and Europe. However, markets in eastern Canada have declined, due to the availability of the cheaper Labrador char. The reduction of the commercial quota at Rankin Inlet is not price related, rather, it is the result of a decision taken by the residents of that community to allocate certain rivers for domestic use which previously were designated commercial.

I have informed Mr. Curley, Mr. Speaker, that I will be travelling to Rankin in July, and we will discuss this matter on the ground, and I hope maybe move toward resolving the Member's problem at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: If I may, sir, I have just a short statement relative to the Lancaster Sound green paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Proceed, Mr. Minister.

Minister's Statement Re Lancaster Sound Green Paper

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, the government has prepared a position paper on the Lancaster Sound green paper. Members will recall that I spoke on this subject during the February session in reply to a question by the Member for Yellowknife Centre. Since then, there have been meetings in the communities of Pond Inlet, Arctic Bay and Resolute Bay to discuss the draft green paper, and a northern workshop was held in Resolute Bay. The territorial government was represented on all occasions by the Baffin regional director and members of his staff. Today in Ottawa Mr. Britton is presenting this government's position to a southern workshop at which representatives of government, industry and other interested groups are discussing the draft green paper. Our position has been very much influenced by the views of the communities, and, as Members will see, Mr. Speaker, we have taken the position that the people who live in the area should play a full part in planning the future of Lancaster Sound. I will be tabling this paper this afternoon at the appropriate time.

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

Item 5, petitions.

Item 6, tabling of documents.

ITEM NO. 6: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the year of our census, 1981, I wish to table Tabled Document 15-81(2), Population Estimates, Northwest Territories, December 1980, prepared by the bureau of statistics, Government of the Northwest Territories. Thank you.

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

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table Tabled Document 16-81(2), Lancaster Sound Regional Study, Position of the Government of the Northwest Territories.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Tabling of documents.

Item 7, reports of standing and special committees.

Item 8, notices of motion.

ITEM NO. 8: NOTICES OF MOTION

Mr. McCallum.

Notice Of Motion 14-81(2): Appointments To NWT Housing Corporation Board

Notice Of Motion 15-81(2): Appointments To The NWT Water Board

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give notice that on Wednesday, May 27th, I will move two motions to recommend people to the board of directors of the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation and a second motion to recommend appointments be made to the Northwest Territories Water Board. I will be asking, when we get to motions, Mr. Speaker, obviously, for unanimous consent to do that today.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. McCallum. Notices of motion. Item 9, motions.

ITEM NO. 9: MOTIONS

We have Motion 10-81(2). Mr. Pudluk.

Motion 10-81(2): Widening Of Road Between Nanisivik Mine And Arctic Bay

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS the highway between Nanisivik Mine and the community of Arctic Bay is wide enough for only single vehicle traffic;

AND WHEREAS the present construction of the road has left many curves and hills that reduce the driver's visibility causing numerous accidents;

NOW THEREFORE, I move, seconded by the Member for Hudson Bay, Moses Appaqaq, that this Legislative Assembly recommends to the Executive Committee that they have the Department of Public Works take measures as soon as possible to widen the road between Nanisivik Mine and the community of Arctic Bay on the curves and the hills.

MR. SPEAKER: Your motion is in order. Proceed, Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) The motion states clearly -- I was consigned to take the Governor General recently over there. The curves are very narrow and if you are in a hurry, it is very dangerous, and more than once there has been an accident on those curves. I want the curves and the hills to be widened out. I think it would be a lot better for the traffic that way. Apparently dignitaries are coming to Arctic Bay and Nanisivik, and I think we should get it fixed. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Pudluk. Seconder, Mr. Patterson, do you wish to speak -- Mr. Appaqaq, rather? That was a change on your motion. I will get by. Mr. Appaqaq.

MR. APPAQAQ: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Would you try to get a little closer to your microphone? I am picking you up, but not very loudly. Mr. McLaughlin, point of order. I wonder if, in the interpretation booth, you would flick the right switch in there. We are having this trouble. There we go. Now we have it. Proceed, Mr. Appaqaq.

MR. APPAQAQ: (Translation) Thank you. I am sorry for the trouble. I will be in favour of the motion even though I have never seen Nanisivik and Arctic Bay. I believe they have a problem of the roads being too narrow and it is probably very dangerous. I know this because we have had the same problems in our community. It is a very important thing and they are going to be using the roads for quite some time so I just want to speak in support of the motion. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Appaqaq. Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, having travelled that road myself, and found it to be quite a frightening experience, I am rising to speak in favour of the motion. It is probably one of the most beautiful scenic roads in the world, but I know that it is very hazardous. In fact, this year alone, there have been two serious accidents, one of which involved a head-on collision when due to the narrowness of the road, a vehicle proceeding downhill was unable to stop on glare ice. Fortunately there has been no loss of life, but we cannot expect that to last much longer, unless the road is widened.

Also, Mr. Speaker, this is really quite a modest proposal in that as I understand it the road would not need to be blasted. It is wide enough now. It is just a question of filling in the ditches beside the road with gravel, especially on the corners. I understand that the maintenance crew who are maintaining the road have hopes of doing some widening work this summer. This motion will encourage them and make sure that they have the resources, financial resources, necessary to get the job completed in time for next winter, so I support it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

Motion 10-81(2), Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Before I call question, I would just like the record to show in this motion the words "the Hon. Dennis Patterson" to be replaced by "the hon. Mr. Appaqaq" and at the bottom, the second line, "Mr. Appaqaq". We will accept that. You changed your seconder on your motion, so let the record show that it has been changed. Are you ready for the question? All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Motion 12-81(2). Mr. Patterson.

Motion 12-81(2): Honorariums To Compensate Uranium Witnesses

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

WHEREAS due to unfortunate delays, some witnesses invited by this Assembly for the uranium debates had to wait for days and return again later to be heard;

AND WHEREAS some of those witnesses are self-employed, and thus incurred loss of income during the time in which they travelled and waited to appear;

AND WHEREAS it is most desirable that this Assembly encourage the hearing of all points of view from all interests, including those persons or groups which may lack financial resources;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this Assembly recommend to the Members' Services Board that certain witnesses who the board is satisfied were not otherwise compensated beyond expenses for their appearance during the recent uranium debates be provided with a daily honorarium.

That is seconded by Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is in order. Proceed, Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The uranium debate, which had a total of nine witnesses appear to give the Assembly advice on this most important question, is now concluded. I think I can speak for all Members in saying that we have now a lot to think about as a result of hearing those witnesses.

Unfortunately because it is not always possible to predict the business of the House and the progress that we will make on a given day, and because of contingencies like the visit of the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs, there were delays caused, both during this session in Hay River and at the last session in Yellowknife. One witness who testified this week spent five days away from his work to appear, and while I do not think that witnesses should make money, necessarily, out of appearances like this, I do think that it is important that they not lose money. When we have people coming partly out of a sense of public duty, it seems to me unfortunate that they should actually end up paying for the privilege of appearing, and one witness, as you will recall, Mr. Speaker, specifically addressed this problem in his presentation, and prompted me to make this motion for that reason.

It is a matter of fairness as well, Mr. Speaker, because whenever these sorts of issues are debated, there are some interests such as industrial interests and perhaps in this case the Atomic Energy Control Board and Atomic Energy of Canada Limited who could afford to send their witnesses, pay them, and even send executive assistants with their witnesses to aid the witnesses. However, other individuals who are associated with non-profit groups or who are self-employed, could not afford the cost necessary when they had to be away from their ordinary work and were not otherwise compensated.

Evaluation Of Claims

So I have tried to make the motion as reasonable as possible so that our own Members' Services Board, whom I know are very good at watching dollars will evaluate each claim on its merits and will award honorariums on reasonable financial criteria. So I have moved that we put the matter in the hands of the Members' Services Board, but that the House gives its support to honorariums being paid within the financial resources of the House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. The gremlins are at your microphone continually, with your volume going up and down. If there is anything you can do at that board to straighten out the matter, we would appreciate it. Mr. MacQuarrie, as seconder of the motion, we will try you and see how the gremlins treat you.

MR. MACQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the mike on? There is nothing coming through. There it is now. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I seconded the motion and of course, therefore, support it, perhaps with some reservations, which I will explain. I am not entirely happy that there may be some cases where certain witnesses were asked by other organizations to appear and in which case I really feel it would be the responsibility of those organizations to ensure that the witnesses who spoke on their behalf were reasonably compensated, but if that has not been done, then certainly I can agree that the testimony was of use to us and to the extent that it was useful to us and to the extent that these people sacrificed their personal lives, their time and time away from family, I certainly support the idea that we take reasonable steps to compensate them.

The only other qualification that I would have is I certainly would not want this act, the act of the Assembly paying honorariums, to be seen as paying for a consultation service. In other words, I would think they still would not have the right to assert, then, that they are, or were consultants to the Legislative Assembly, but rather that they appeared as witnesses at an Assembly hearing. With those qualifications, I do support the motion and I would ask other Members to do so as well.

MR. SPEAKER: To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Just to respond to Mr. MacQuarrie briefly, Mr. Speaker, I do recognize that there may be situations where organizations who had invited people to appear have some responsibility, if they have the resources, to pay those witnesses honorariums. However, I do not think the motion would prevent the Members' Services Board from determining that such should be the case with a particular witness and that is why I suggested in the motion that it would be dealt with by the Members' Services Board.

Finally, I used the word "honorarium" because I do not see this as being a matter of consultation, but rather a matter of them being witnesses. I did neglect to mention in opening, Mr. Speaker, that the payment of honorariums to witnesses who have appeared on the issue of uranium mining and exploration, for example, before other select committees of other legislatures in Canada has been done before, so we are, in a way, following in line with other legislatures if we do establish an honorarium for these debates. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Are you ready for the question?

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

Motion 12-81(2), Carried

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Mr. McCallum, I believe you had a request of the Assembly.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, yes, I would like to have unanimous consent to deal with the motions for appointments to both the Housing Corporation and the Northwest Territories Water Board.

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent being requested. Are there any nays? Would you treat each one separately, Mr. Minister?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, may I have unanimous consent to proceed with the motion for the appointment of people to the board of directors of the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation?

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent being requested. Do I hear any nays?

AN HON. MEMBER: Nay.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: God will get you for that.

MR. SPEAKER: A nay has been called. Do you have another one, Mr. McCallum?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I would request unanimous consent to move a motion for the appointment of members to the Northwest Territories Water Board.

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent being requested. Are there any nays?
Mr. McLaughlin.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister asking for unanimous consent to go back to motions in order to make a motion or is he asking for unanimous consent to have his motion dealt with?

MR. SPEAKER: He is asking for unanimous consent to proceed with his motion today, the one that he just previously gave notice of today -- not an uncommon request in this House. I have not heard any nays.

---Agreed

Proceed, Mr. Minister.

Motion 15-81(2): Appointments To The NWT Water Board

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS certain vacancies have occurred or are likely to occur in the very near future on the Northwest Territories Water Board;

AND WHEREAS certain appointments to the Water Board are to be made by the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs on the recommendation of the Commissioner in Council;

NOW THEREFORE, I move, seconded by Mr. Braden, that the following persons be recommended by this House to the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs for appointment to the Northwest Territories Water Board: Mr. G.B. Warner, Mr. D.E. Arden, Mr. D.J. Gamble and Father L. Menez.

Such appointments are to be for two years.

MR. SPEAKER: I have a motion on the floor. Do I have a seconder? The Hon. Kane Tologanak. To the motion.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order, I had indicated that Mr. Braden had seconded.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry. Mr. Braden, as seconder. To the motion. Mr. McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I have no further comments to make on it. I am proceeding with this motion on behalf of my colleague, Mr. Nerysoo, who is not here today. So, I have no further comments.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the seconder wish to speak? To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. All those in favour? Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes. Thank you. I will just take a very brief moment, but to me the Water Board is certainly an important body in the Northwest Territories and I would just like to underline that in supporting this motion I would like it to be impressed on the Minister that this is important to the Assembly of the Northwest Territories, that we have thought seriously about the people that we want to be on the board. We have thought seriously about the term of appointment being two years and we absolutely would like these people to be appointed for that length of time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

Motion 15-81(2), Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

I believe that completes motions for today. Item 10, consideration in the committee of the whole of bills, recommendations to the Legislature and other matters.

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

Bills 1-81(2) to 8-81(2) inclusive; 10th report of the standing committee on finance spending priorities for 1982-83, operations and capital, the report of the standing committee on legislation respecting bills to be introduced at the fifth session of the Ninth Legislative Assembly; and Sessional Paper 1-81(2), Principles for the Development of an Agricultural Policy. The committee will resolve into the committee of the whole, with Mr. Fraser in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into committee of the whole for consideration of Bills 1-81(2), 2-81(2), 3-81(2), 4-81(2), 5-81(2), 6-81(2), 7-81(2), 8-81(2); 10th Report of Standing Committee on Finance; Report of Standing Committee on Legislation, with Mr. Fraser in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILLS 1-81(2), 2-81(2), 3-81(2), 4-81(2), 5-81(2), 6-81(2), 7-81(2), 8-81(2); 10TH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE; REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATION

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The committee will come to order. We are first dealing with the bills for legislation and I just wondered if the chairman of the legislation committee would like to make some opening comments. Mr. MacQuarrie, do you wish to comment on the bills separately or give us one report for all of the bills and then we can go through the bills? Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Mr. Chairman, generally speaking there were no objections, particularly, to the bills and so I think that I will just reserve comment. As we deal with each bill, I will simply state what the committee's recommendation was, Mr. Chairman, if that is all right with you.

Bill 1-81(2), Co-operative Associations Ordinance

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. We will go on then to Bill 1-81(2), Co-operative Associations Ordinance. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I have no opening statement either. I believe that the purpose of the amendments are clearly defined in the statement on second reading. It provides (a) for the registration in our jurisdiction of co-operative associations incorporated in other jurisdictions and (b) for the amalgamation of associations where one or more of the amalgamating associations was incorporated in another jurisdiction. These matters, to my understanding, have been discussed with the Northwest Territories co-operative associations and have their support.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Butters. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In considering Bill 1-81(2), the committee understood that it was designed particularly to permit the amalgamation of the Canadian Arctic Co-operative Federation Limited and Canadian Arctic Producers. The amendment to the Co-operative Associations Ordinance seemed to be in order in every respect and the standing committee on legislation recommends that it be accepted as presented, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. I do not know about everybody else, but my earpiece here seems to be intermittent.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Is that right?

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Is it with everybody's? I do not know where the fault is. I can put up with it, if you can. It does not matter to me, but it is very, very frustrating when it fades away. Do you wish then that we go clause by clause on Bill 1-81(2)?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 1. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 2. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Short title. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Bill as a whole. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): That concludes Bill 1-81(2).

Bill 2-81(2), Extra-Territorial Custody Orders Enforcement Ordinance

We go to Bill 2-81(2), An Ordinance to Allow the Enforcement of Extra-Territorial Custody Orders. Mr. Braden, I believe.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The purpose of this bill is to allow territorial courts to deal with a child's custody orders from other jurisdictions. We are attempting to amalgamate into a system that is being put in place across Canada in this particular area and, as I indicated to the standing committee on legislation, it comes under the general category of uniform law. Mr. Chairman, I do not really have much further to say on this bill, unless there are specific questions.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Braden. Mr. MacQuarrie, Bill 2-81(2).

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The committee felt that this bill would contribute toward the orderly handling of custody orders and at the same time, it does not bind -- and that is particularly important -- it does not bind the Northwest Territories to custody orders that are issued elsewhere. The courts can vary custody orders. So, we recommend that this bill be accepted as it is presented, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. Is it the wish, then, of the House that we go through this Bill 2-81(2), clause by clause? Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 2. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 3, enforcement of custody orders. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 4, variation of custody order. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 5, extraordinary power of court. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 6, copies of custody orders. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 1, short title. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The bill as a whole, agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): That concludes Bill 2-81(2). Bill 3-81(2), An Ordinance to Amend the Fire Prevention Ordinance. Mr. Braden.

Bill 3-81(2), Fire Prevention Ordinance

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The purpose of the amendments to the Fire Prevention Ordinance are to change the title of inspector to fire safety officer. Secondly, Mr. Chairman, we require in the ordinance some provision for our fire marshal or deputy fire marshal, local assistant or fire safety officer to remove evidence from the scene of the fire in order that an investigation of the cause of the fire can be made and the evidence can be used in any proceedings or inquiries into the cause of the fire. They are basically housekeeping amendments, Mr. Chairman. That is all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Braden. Does the chairman of the legislation committee have any comments? Bill 3-81(2).

MR. MÀCQUARRIE: In reviewing the bill, Mr. Chairman, we found simply that the amendments would have the effect of enabling fire officials to carry out their jobs more efficiently, and we recommend that the bill be accepted as it was presented to us.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. We go through the bill then, clause by clause. Clause 1. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 2. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 3. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): There is no short title. Bill as a whole, agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Bill 4-81(2), An Ordinance to Provide for a Home-Owners' Property Tax Rebate. Mr. Wah-Shee. Thank you.

Bill 4-81(2), Home-Owners' Property Tax Rebate Ordinance

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Mr. Chairman, Members of the committee, I would like to make a brief remark regarding this bill. Members will recall that, on behalf of the Executive Committee, I announced to this House in February the government's intention to implement a home-owners' property tax rebate program in the Northwest Territories, to take effect this current taxation year. My announcement of the program, I believe, has the support of the Members of the standing committee on finance, which has been urging the Executive Committee to move in the direction of assisting and encouraging private home-ownership in the Northwest Territories. The program which this bill will authorize will certainly move a step in this area.

The program which this bill authorizes provides that the credit available to each individual home-owner will be 50 per cent of property taxes paid in a given year by taxpayers in the seven major municipalities, up to a maximum of \$200, and up to a maximum of \$50 on properties taxed outside the major municipalities. It is planned to increase the amount of the rebate in future years as economic conditions warrant.

Criteria To Meet Requirements

The proposed credit will be available to all individuals who meet the following criteria, and these are spelled out in the ordinance.

- (1) The individual must have been a resident of the Northwest Territories for at least 184 days, which is six months, during the year for which he is claiming a rebate.
- (2) The individual must be over the age of 16.
- (3) The property tax credit can only be claimed by the resident owner of a private dwelling.
- (4) Only property taxes paid in respect of an individual's principal residence may be included in determining the tax credit. Taxes paid in respect of a second residence or a cottage or vacant land cannot be claimed.
- (5) The property tax credit does not apply to land use for commercial ventures or businesses. However, if an individual resides at his place of business, the tax credit can be apportioned on the percentage of the building used for personal use.
- (6) The credit will apply to mobile trailer owners who pay property taxes on land owned or rented on which the trailer is situated.

The program will be administered by the Department of Local Government through the municipal affairs division. The costs of the rebate for this current taxation year, based on the \$200 maximum in tax based municipalities and \$50 maximum in taxation areas, is estimated to be approximately \$200,000. Anticipated administration costs, as outlined earlier, will be approximately \$50,000 annually. I will be bringing to this House, at our next budget session, a supplementary estimate to provide funds for this program. With these comments, Mr. Chairman, I recommend that the committee deal with the proposed ordinance.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Wah-Shee. Bill 4-81(2). Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MACQUARRIE: Mr. Chairman, the bill reflects a motion that was already adopted by the Legislative Assembly, and because of that, of course, we are generally disposed to accept the bill. There were a couple of concerns raised in committee. One of them was in noticing that the rebate would be administered by municipalities. We were concerned that municipalities be compensated for the time and expense involved, and, on inquiring into that, we are assured that, through the regulations and the agreement that would be made between this government and the municipalities, that an administration fee would be put in place to compensate municipalities.

Legislation Does Not Compel Minister

Another concern that was raised was that the legislation is permissive, and not compulsory. It allows the Minister to offer a rebate in any given year, and does not compel him to do so. At least one Member would have preferred compulsory legislation but again, on inquiring into that, the committee was advised that decisions respecting taxing and tax rebates are an Executive function, and to substitute "shall" for "may" in the first line of this clause would constitute dictation of fiscal policy by the Assembly, something which we are not able to do, and, consequently, the legislation remains permissive. Having said those things, Mr. Chairman, the committee does recommend that the bill be accepted as presented.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. General comments, Bill 4-81(2). Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members, of course, will remember that, as Mr. MacQuarrie said, the motion calling for a property tax rebate was introduced in this House less than one year ago when, I believe, we were in Baker Lake. Discussion and approval of the motion took place promptly at the Executive Committee level, and the Executive Committee made the decision to accept the motion in time to make the announcement during the February-March budget session, and while the Association of Municipalities was sitting in Yellowknife. Finally, of course, we now see -- again, as I said, less than one year later -- legislation enabling the motion to go ahead being introduced into the House.

A Quick Response To Legislature's Wishes

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Executive Committee, particularly Mr. Wah-Shee and his Department of Local Government, on their responsiveness to this Legislature's wishes. I think that this is a good example of how the Executive Committee can pull together and respond quickly to this Legislature when it wishes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Any further comments? Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Of course, I am happy to see this legislation. Members will recall the fairly eloquent presentations made by home-owners in Frobisher Bay at our session there last fall on the burdens of home-ownership in a remote community, and this is a quick response, and a very solid attempt to relieve the burden on home-owners in the Northwest Territories. I can assure the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that my constituents are much happier now than they were when they appeared before this House in Frobisher Bay.

In that regard, the Department of Local Government has taken some other measures which have made it easier for home-owners in Frobisher Bay, for which I am also grateful. I think this is in keeping with our overall desire to promote home-ownership in the Northwest Territories, in keeping with the general tenor of the recommendations of the housing task force report, and I think this is a very good direction for us to move. If we are concerned about self-government and responsible government, people should eventually be living in their own homes.

Encouraging People To Apply

One small bit of free advice for the persons who are going to be executing this program, Mr. Chairman, and that is that I see the bill requires an application form in accordance with section 4. Also, by section 4, applications not submitted for rebates before December 31st in the same tax year, shall not be credited to the taxpayer. This is reasonable, but I would just like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it would be advisable for the municipalities -- or, if it is the government who is responsible for taxation in a particular case -- to furnish the application forms with the assessment notice. I think that we should encourage people to take advantage of the rebate if they are entitled to it, and not pose any obstacles in their way by making it, perhaps, difficult, to have to write or otherwise receive application forms. So I would just like to suggest that the application forms should go out with the assessment notices, and perhaps it might also take a bit of the sting out of receiving a tax notice. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Any further comments on Bill 4-81(2)? Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I would question whether the tax rebate, once it is accredited to your personal income, would that be under the taxable benefits under personal income on the federal tax?

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

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Mr. Chairman, I have been advised that it depends on the federal moratorium. If it is not covered under the moratorium, then the benefits of the rebate would not be taxable. Otherwise, it would be.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Wah-Shee. Ms Cournoyea, does that answer your question? Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Did the Minister, when he was assessing this \$200, or maximum \$200, did he take an assessment to find out just how much of a break it is for the taxpayer in terms of it possibly not being a part which the moratorium covers on taxation? As well, that since many home-owners pay, I believe, about \$700 to \$1000 taxes on their personal property tax, at what level does the \$200, or the maximum \$200, become a burden on the private home-owners?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. Mr. Wah-Shee.

Increase In Future Intended

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Well, at the present time, the rebate has been decided upon \$200, but we intend to increase the amount in the future. I suppose there is a fluctuation in terms of the rates of property taxes home-owners have to pay, and it varies from different communities.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Wah-Shee. Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Before bringing the bill to the House, did the Minister get assurances from the municipalities that since the \$200 or maximum \$200 would be made available that they would not abuse the system by raising taxes to take up for the \$200 slack that is given to home-owners as a benefit?

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

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Well, I would hope that the municipalities will not take advantage of the situation and increase the mill rate unless they have to for their own reasons. I think at the present time we intend to carry out the program at this level but I can assure the honourable Member that we would look at the increases, say a year from now, just to see basically what sort of benefits this particular program would create for the home-owners. If it appears that it is not sufficient or other arrangements have to be made, then certainly we would take that into consideration when we do a review of the program.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Wah-Shee. Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Then I take it, Mr. Wah-Shee, that assurances from the municipalities were not sought?

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

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Well, I do believe that when this particular program was being considered and being put together that municipalities were indeed consulted and they are aware of this particular program which we were considering.

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

MS COURNOYEA: The question was, Mr. Chairman, were assurances sought from the municipalities most affected that they would not be increasing the tax burden on the home-owner because in fact, the territorial government was going to give a rebate?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. Mr. Wah-Shee.

No Assurance From Municipalities

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: I cannot assure the honourable Member that the municipalities will not raise their mill rate, because really what we are talking about is local autonomy and the various elected municipal councillors really will have to make their own decision. I think what we are trying to do here is to provide some sort of incentive to support home-owners, but I cannot assure the honourable Member that the various municipalities will not increase their municipal taxes for whatever reasons.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Wah-Shee. Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: I wonder Mr. Chairman, if Mr. Wah-Shee would answer my question. The question was, did he seek assurances or did his department officials seek assurances from the municipalities, which requires a straight yes or no answer.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Mr. Wah-Shee.

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: The answer is negative.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Any further comments on Bill 4-81(2)? Do you wish then that we go through the bill clause by clause?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 2. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 3, home-owners' property tax rebate. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 4, when rebate will not be credited. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 5, application for rebate and appeal. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 6, only one rebate per person and per residence. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 7, no assignment. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 8, where owner dies. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 9, when residence is a portion of building. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 10, remission to municipalities. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 11, recovery of amounts improperly paid. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 12, regulations. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 13, offence. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 1, short title. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Bill 4-81(2) as a whole. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): That concludes Bill 4-81(2). Bill 5-81(2). I believe, Mr. Braden, Bill 5-81(2), An Ordinance to Amend the Maintenance Orders Enforcement Ordinance. Mr. Braden.

Bill 5-81(2), Maintenance Orders Enforcement Ordinance

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, the amendments are designed to allow the courts to make a decision on a method of ongoing payment of the maintenance orders. At present individuals seeking maintenance orders payments have to go to the courts on an ongoing basis. This amendment will allow the courts to make a decision concerning a longer length of time in which payments can be made under maintenance orders. That is all I have to say on this.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Braden. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MACQUARRIE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, under the present system, those who have legitimate maintenance claims are simply burdened by the need to return again and again to the courts to enforce the maintenance orders. This amendment eliminates that need and does not seem to pose any disadvantages, and so the committee recommends that the bill be accepted as presented, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. Any comments on Bill 5-81(2)? Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, I recognize that this is a very frustrating problem for many single parents in the Northwest Territories and I am strongly in favour of making it easier for them to collect. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, in the ordinance or suggested ordinance, it mentions "a sum made payable for the maintenance of a wife or former wife...." Why does that not also allude to the fact that perhaps at some period of time a female would pay alimony to a male as well? In certain circumstances in our area, there are a number of men who are looking after children. The wives have deserted them and they are trying their very, very best to look after those children. I feel that the wife who is working full-time should be contributing to the payment of the child as well. I am wondering why the male was omitted in this section.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Chairman, the intent of the amendment is to seek a method by which women can more easily collect, as my colleague, Mr. Patterson, indicated. We did not, in this amendment, seek to change the whole principle, or one of the major principles, underlying the bill. I do not...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I wonder if Ms Cournoyea could point out the clause she is referring to. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Chairman, could I just take a couple of minutes and consult with our lawyer on this?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you very much, Mr. Braden. We will take a 15 minute coffee recess.

---SHORT RECESS

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The Chair recognizes a quorum and I believe we broke for coffee to allow Mr. Braden some time to consult with his legal adviser. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In response to the Member's question, under new subsection 2(a), you will note that alimony includes a sum made payable for the maintenance of a wife, former wife, husband, former husband. So I believe the question is covered in that clause, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Braden. Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: My question is answered, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you very much. Shall we go through the bill clause by clause?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 1. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 2, service on employer binds salary. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Bill as a whole. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): That concludes Bill 5-81(2).

Bill 6-81(2), Public Trustee Ordinance

Bill 6-81(2), An Ordinance to Amend the Public Trustee Ordinance. Mr. Braden, I believe.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The purpose of the amendments in this bill is to increase the value of an estate that can be distributed without probate from \$2000 to \$5000. Secondly, Mr. Chairman, the intent of the amendments is to allow the public trustee to administer the estate of a person who is not mentally incompetent, which is the case with the existing ordinance, but rather will allow the public trustee to administer the estate of a person who suffers from what we call mental infirmity arising from old age, disease, alcoholism, or some other cause. That is all I have to say on this, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Braden. Bill 6-81(2). Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MACQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The change in amounts simply corresponds with changing financial circumstances in the world today and seem to be reasonable. As Mr. Braden mentioned, the range over which the public trustee may administer has been widened, and your committee felt properly so, to include such things as alcoholism or compulsive and excessive use of drugs. The committee also learned that estates are protected by an assurance fund against any errors in distribution that might be made by the public trustee. So, Mr. Chairman, your committee was satisfied with this amendment and recommends that it be accepted as presented by the administration.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you very much, Mr. MacQuarrie. Is it the wish that we go through Bill 6-81(2) clause by clause? Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister of Justice could explain the justification and reason for inserting subsection 12(1).

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I did not get the question. I wonder if you did, Mr. Braden.

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister of Justice and Public Services could place a reasoning for this new subsection 12(1).

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. Mr. Braden.

Incapacity Through Mental Infirmity

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Chairman, this is a new clause in the ordinance. It is one that has been inserted in provincial legislation in the South. At the moment we have three cases pending where the assets of the estate are being squandered, if I can use that term, and the claimants to the assets really do not have sufficient cause because the individual involved is not mentally incompetent. There do arise, Mr. Chairman, cases where an individual, because of age, senility, use of drugs or alcohol, finds it impossible or very difficult to effectively manage his or her affairs. What we have done with this new clause is to broaden the authority of the courts and the public trustee to step in and handle the affairs, or handle the estate of an individual.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Braden. Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, in terms of determining mental infirmity from disease, age, or other cause, habitual drunkenness, who would do that? What would the process be for that?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Chairman, this is done through an application to a court. Claims of habitual drunkenness, senility or disease would have to be substantiated by reports from doctors or the relevant authorities and all this information would have to be placed before the courts.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Mr. MacQuarrie, have you any comments on that?

MR. MACQUARRIE: Yes. The committee had considered that very problem as well, and after discussion were satisfied that the public trustee, on behalf of a claimant, would have to satisfy the courts with evidence that there was incapacity as a result of alcoholism or whatever the cause. The committee felt that for the protection of families that this is sometimes necessary, and particularly in light of the particular cases that were cited by Mr. Braden.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. Bill 6-81(2), An Ordinance to Amend the Public Trustee Ordinance. Any further comments? Is it the wish we go through it clause by clause? Agreed?

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 1. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 2. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): There is no short title. The bill as a whole. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you.

Bill 7-81(2), Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance, No. 4, 1980-1981

We will go to Bill 7-81(2), An Ordinance Respecting Additional Expenditures for the Public Service for the 1980-1981 Financial Year. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, the supplementary requirement here reflects year end adjustments to our expenditures. The money that we are seeking will come from unspent allotments or the working capital of this government. The reason that this situation occurs at the end of each year is that it is extremely difficult to predict and control the accounts during the final days of the government's fiscal year. The change in projection and expectation occurs as a result of regional office spending which one may not be aware of and from billings by other agencies which were unanticipated.

I would be hopeful that with the implementation of the FIS, financial information system, that our projections will be much tighter since a lot of this data would be available to headquarters managers and the Executive. Each of the items for which there is a supplementary requirement is identified and the explanation for that requirement provided.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Butters. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MACQUARRIE: Mr. Chairman, my answer is that we voted to refer it to the standing committee on finance to review it.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you very much. Mrs. Sorensen, chairman of the standing committee on finance.

MRS. SORENSEN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am afraid your finance committee has not done its duty this time.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I do not know what the problem is. We are having trouble with the console. How is the system working? Can everybody hear this? I have a brief announcement and maybe I can do it while they are looking over the system.

Immediately before the next coffee break, we will have a brief caucus meeting in the caucus room. It is very important that all MLA's present attend, so before we break for coffee the next time, there will be a caucus meeting in the caucus room.

Can you hear the system now? Is it okay? It is still very weak. I am on now. Is it coming through? Okay, do not touch anything until we get through here. Where were we? Mrs. Sorensen, I believe.

MRS. SORENSEN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am just saying that I am afraid your finance committee has not done its duty this time. Due to unforeseen circumstances, we have not reviewed the supplementary bill and we apologize to the House for this.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Is the wish then that we go through the bill clause by clause? The finance committee has not had a chance to go through it and the legislation committee never touched it, so we will go through it clause by clause. Is that agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Bill 7-81(2), An Ordinance Respecting Additional Expenditures for the Public Service for the 1980-1981 Financial Year. Clause 2. On the schedule, you will find -- I think it is on the third page of the bill -- there is a scheduled summary of supplementary appropriations, and the amount is mentioned for the different departments. Mrs. Sorensen, have you any comments on this?

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, just that I would prefer if we would go through each of the programs that are outlined. For instance, start with the Executive and then move on to Personnel and Social Services and Economic Development. Members may have questions under each of the program departments. I think that begins at the back of the bill on page one.

Executive, O And M, Commissioner's Office, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): We have to go, then, to page one. On the eighth page down from the first page -- and it gives you the program and the subject. Executive, O and M. Main and supplementary estimates No. 1, 2 and 3. Commissioner's Office, supplementary estimate No. 4, \$6000. Agreed? Totalling \$730,300. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

O And M, Ministers' Offices, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Ministers' offices, \$14,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

O And M, Land Claims Secretariat

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Land claims secretariat, \$5000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: This suggests that there is a provision for a shortfall in contracts and travel. Considering that basically not too much has been happening in the development of land claims up to this point of time, where would this \$5000 be needed for contracts and travel?

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

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I regret that I do not have the detail on this particular item. I could obtain it for the Member if she requires. Possibly my colleague, Mr. Wah-Shee, might know specifically, but I do not have the detail on this particular item.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Butters. Mr. Wah-Shee.

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Yes. Mr. Chairman, I do not have the information at the present time, but I will get it right away.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): When you say "right away", does this mean that you will get it before we finish with the bill?

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Well, I just do not have the answer right now, that is all I am saying.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, we could come back to the matter a little bit later on, and then possibly that information could be obtained in the next few minutes.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Is that satisfactory to you, Ms Cournoyea, if we come back to it later on?

0 And M, Regional Operations, Agreed

We will just continue then, with Regional Operations, \$10,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Personnel, 0 And M, Directorate

Page two, Personnel, directorate, \$60,000. Agreed?

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, the stated expense is "negotiation consulting contracts". Would it be possible to get a description on what those negotiations were, and in terms of the contracts, that would not be otherwise included in the budget?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I see no problem in getting that information, but again I personally do not have it.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Does that mean we have to come back to this directorate? Is that agreeable with you, Ms Cournoyea, if they can get back on that one, too?

MS COURNOYEA: That is fine.

0 And M, Staff Training And Development, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Staff training and development, \$80,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

O And M, Personnel Services, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Personnel services, \$135,000. Agreed? Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: I would like the further explanation on why there was such a great shortfall, and, perhaps, why we had not anticipated that we would need the necessary funding for teacher removal. How does this reflect into the problems in securing teachers for the areas required in the Northwest Territories?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned when the estimates were put forward the estimated projection of the requirement is just that, a projection. If more teachers indicate that they will be leaving than was originally anticipated, a shortfall such as this could occur. I think it is not unnatural, not unexpected. Sometimes you make some, and sometimes you lose some.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Butters. Mr. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, the matter of funding of shortfall in teacher removal and travel is quite straightforward. We had, throughout the year, a very considerable increase in the cost of air fares. We have not had a particularly troublesome increase in the number of removals, but just simply the costs have gone up during the year and our estimate fell short of it. I think it can be appreciated that in a large budget, with prices changing almost every month for air fares, it is difficult for us to predict them that far ahead.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. Ms Cournoyea, does that answer your question?

MS COURNOYEA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That is all I really wanted to know. I wanted to know whether the \$135,000 increase was indicative of the problem that we have in retaining schoolteachers, or whether it was attributed to just the normal increase in fares. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Personnel services, \$135,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Social Services, O And M, Financial Assistance, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Page three, Social Services, financial assistance, \$500,000. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if we could have a brief outline of what areas incurred the higher need for social assistance during this past year?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I would ask Mr. McCallum to respond to this, as he probably has detailed information to assist the committee.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Butters. Mr. McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD MCCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, Members will recall that there was a motion to increase rates, that is, to increase the rate of social assistance, to increase the amounts of money that were paid to people, recipients of social assistance.

for clothing allowances, and for other expenses that they would incur. There has been, as well, as Members will know, an increase in the price of fuel subsidies that we provide in terms of assistance. What this amount reflects is the increase in the rate itself. The volume of the increase, to my knowledge, has been primarily the Keewatin area and in the Delta area, the Inuvik region, as it were.

We have, as I say, more people receiving assistance and the assistance is at a higher rate than it was in the past. We increased it, the Members will recall, on recommendation of this Legislature in committee, so, because of the lack of economic initiatives that have occurred in certain areas, and specifically within the Keewatin and the Delta area of the Mackenzie, these are the areas where we have seen the increase. We make an estimate of the amount of money that we would require, from year to year, based on previous years experiences, and we made a low estimate. That is in effect what it amounts to.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. McCallum. Financial assistance, \$500,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Economic Development And Tourism, O And M, Commerce, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Page four, Economic Development and Tourism, the activity is commerce, \$163,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

O And M, Manpower Development, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Manpower development, \$50,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Personnel, O And M, Directorate, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): We go back now to page two, in the amount of \$60,000, directorate. Have we any answers? Mr. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, Ms Cournoyea's question concerned the \$35,000 part of that \$60,000 supplementary. The \$35,000 represents an underestimation in our costs of consultants; that is, a negotiator, in negotiating for our two employee contracts, plus work that the negotiator does or I should say, his firm carries out throughout the year, in giving us advice on certain cases that go to arbitration.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. Does that satisfy your question, Ms Cournoyea?

MS COURNOYEA: Fine.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Executive, O And M, Land Claims Secretariat, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): We will go back to page one now, and the amount of \$5000, land claims secretariat. Mr. Wah-Shee, have you an answer for us?

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: First of all, I think we underestimated the requirements, and that is the reason why we are asking for \$5000. The other question related to no activity in negotiating, particularly with COPE. However, the Dene Nation has hired their own negotiator, and the federal government has also appointed a negotiator, so I expect that there will be a lot of activity. Also we have hired a person to be the government negotiator with the Dene Nation, and so I would say that the \$5000 is a shortfall for travel.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Wah-Shee. Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, the answer is a projected expense, and I believe what we are making a decision on is what has been spent already. Am I right or am I wrong?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, the money has been spent.

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

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Wah-Shee's explanation on the \$5000, I feel, is not an adequate explanation. However, I am willing to forego it until such time as he is able to provide the information.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): We go back to the bill now, clause by clause. Is that agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 2, interpretation. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 3, amount granted. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 4, purpose and effect of each item. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 5, lapsing of appropriations. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 6, transfer of money and accountable advances. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 7, coming into force. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Schedule in the amount of \$1,023,300. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Short title. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Bill as a whole. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Bill 8-81(2), Liquor Ordinance

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): We can go to Bill 8-81(2), An Ordinance to Amend the Liquor Ordinance. I believe, Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members will recall, in the March session, or the winter session, that we had amended the Liquor Ordinance to provide for granting of a licence to a private recreational facility for the sale of liquor by the licensee to members and members' guests.

At that time, we did not make additional amendments concerning the need to hold a plebiscite. In the Liquor Ordinance now, the Liquor Licensing Board can grant a licence without holding a plebiscite to an applicant for a number of classes of licence, which include canteen licences, guest room licences, special licences, special occasion licences as well as ship and aircraft licences, and we are amending the Liquor Ordinance to add "private recreational facility" to that list of classes of licences.

I should indicate, Mr. Chairman, that while the bill indicates that the board may, without a plebiscite, issue a licence, it is important to note sections 109 to 118 of the Liquor Ordinance, which do spell out the local option criteria, and also the need to hold plebiscites in communities where licensees are established. That is all I have to say on that, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Braden. Mr. Patterson, I would have to recognize the chairman of the legislation committee first, and then you can talk. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MACQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The standing committee on legislation understood that through the Assembly's previous vote, it had attempted to effect a particular type of licence and because of certain technicalities, that could not be accomplished and the committee understands that these amendments would allow that type of licence to be issued. Therefore, the committee recommends that the amendment be accepted as presented.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. The bill is now open for general comments. Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to state that since I am a member of the Yellowknife Racquet Club, which could obtain such a licence if this legislation is approved, I will not participate in the debate.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Mr. Sibbeston.

Private Recreational Facility

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I just want to know what type of organizations does the Minister have in mind under the provision of private recreational facility. Would he also give an indication, more or less, of the representations that have been made to him in the last few weeks or months warranting this amendment?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Chairman, the category basically includes private profit making recreation facilities that are established, where they sell memberships and members can come and play squash or tennis or whatever. The point to recognize, Mr. Chairman, is that these are profit oriented businesses and not something run by the Elks Club or the co-op or some non-profit organization.

I did receive representations -- I guess it goes back about eight months -- from a businessman in Yellowknife who was seeking a licence to sell liquor for the consumption of his members and the guests of his members. This businessman had established a recreation club in Yellowknife. I think it is important to be aware, Mr. Chairman, that the Liquor Licensing Board itself will be developing regulations which it would use in considering any application for a licence under this category. Say, for example, someone went to the board and said, well, I want to set up a dart club and I want to have a licence to sell liquor to my members and their guests. Well, I am sure that while the board may see playing darts as an honourable sport, they may question the applicant as to really how serious he is about establishing a business or whether he is just looking for another route to get a licence and establish an outlet. Mr. Chairman, although there is just the one applicant thus so far, the government thought that in order to accommodate this kind of application, we should establish a special category of licence.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: Right. I just want to say a number of things, I guess. I am surprised that Mr. Braden or the government have decided to react so positively and quickly to representations made, apparently by a private club in Yellowknife. I had made representations through this Assembly last year, at about this time, on behalf of more people, I would say, in my area, trying to amend the Liquor

Ordinance so that when a large meeting was held in a community involving large numbers of people in the community, that an application or system be established so that band councils, for instance, or the village council can make application to the Liquor Licensing Board to shut down all liquor outlets in the community. I have made representations to this Assembly and, in fact, had a motion passed last year, hoping that this amendment would be forthcoming and to date I have not seen it. I am, frankly, disappointed that the government thus far has not responded in bringing forth amendments. I just want to point this out.

It seems that you have the government responding very quickly and positively to a club in Yellowknife, which I can say is a high class type of group, a racquet club, and it is not the poor people of the North that are involved or take part or become members in such a club, and the government seems to be able to respond so quickly to that type of people. Whereas the poor people of the North, who are having liquor problems go through the proper channels, as it were, and seem not to be getting anywhere. So, I just want to state my objection and I will vote against the amendment on principle.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. Ms Cournoyea.

Being Subjected To a Plebiscite

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, just a point of clarification on a number of issues. In allowing this law to go through, how would that affect a small community, say -- let us pick it out of a hat -- Aklavik, and there were maybe eight or nine people who wanted to open up a dart club. They incorporated themselves to get a licence under this new provision and they received that licence. Then, on section two, once they have that licence, according to what I understand from this provision is that we would not be able to even go to plebiscite to remove that licence from them. So, therefore, I would assume that I can personally incorporate myself in Tuk and do the same thing and I would never be subject to a plebiscite or the constraint of the community.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Chairman, could I just take a minute and consult with my legal adviser on that?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Chairman, what the Member has pointed out in a hypothetical case is technically true. However, I would assume that the Liquor Licensing Board would, pursuant to these provisions, establish regulations to ensure that there is a facility being developed and that there is adequate money being put into providing the facility and a recreational service.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Braden. Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, all things being equal and the desire of everybody to be equal, I cannot see how that technical argument and decisions based on the technical aspects of law can be manipulated later on to allow certain functions to take place in one community and not the other one. Would...

INTERPRETER: We are having a problem hearing.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I think they are having problems now, in the ice cream booth there.

MS COURNOYEA: Have you got that now?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I do not think they heard you, Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Are they hearing me now, and can I proceed now?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Okay. Carry on.

MS COURNOYEA: It appears to me that all things being equal and the desire of everybody being equal, and taking the technical aspects of law, I wonder, perhaps, if we can just deal with it in terms of the technical aspects of law, for the simple reason, I do not believe that we can establish a legal way of obtaining a licence and then say, well, we are going to allow that to apply to one thing and not the other or one community and not the other. How can the Minister of Justice or the Liquor Licensing Board, for example, deny the private dart...

INTERPRETER: We are having problems here, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I realize they are having problems again. It was working good and it just cut right off. How is it now?

INTERPRETER: Something is -- I think you have to put this plug in, in order to get the floor.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Do you want to try it again then? Try it again.

MS COURNOYEA: At what stage did I get cut off? I do not know if I can remember to repeat myself exactly the same way? Private dart? Can you hear me now?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Yes.

MS COURNOYEA: Okay. Is the translator able to hear me in the booth?

INTERPRETER: Yes. It is okay now.

Reluctancy To Open Liquor Laws Further

MS COURNOYEA: Okay. So, how can we have a double standard once something technically is put into place and put forth an argument that the Aklavik dart club cannot be treated the same way as the racquet club in Yellowknife? I just cannot see that, morally. We can always judge and make those provisions morally, but we do not have the regulations here that are going to determine what the working ground rules are going to be. I am very reluctant to open up the liquor laws further, that will allow many of the communities that I represent to possibly be abused by a group of people, say the Inuvik businessmen, who see an opportunity to create private clubs. So, how can we be assured that their arguments, their professional and technical arguments to have equality there, will not overcome the primary objective, really, which is a simple thing, I understand? We are in a difficult position from where we are.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to point out that in recommending the passage of this amendment as presented, the standing committee on legislation did so, only because an amendment trying to accomplish this was passed by the Assembly in the last session. We understood that the principle had been accepted but I would like to point out that the concerns that Ms Cournoyea is expressing now were the very first concerns that I and the committee expressed when we dealt with it initially. They were pointed out at the last session, I thought to the satisfaction of Members, and hence the vote in favour. I agree that they are very real concerns. I would like to underline them and I will be listening very carefully, again, to hear the answers that are provided by the administration.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Chairman, we can deal in hypothetical cases, resulting from putting into place these particular clauses. I would, however, indicate that I am sure the Liquor Licensing Board itself would look seriously at the kind of proposal that is being advanced by an applicant. The board would certainly take into consideration, in developing regulations, various provisions which would allow the board a certain amount of flexibility in determining the intent of the applicants, and the impact that granting a licence would have in a particular community or region. I have not seen any regulations and I am not sure if the board has in fact started drafting them yet. It would seem that without having the legislative approval to go ahead they would not start preparing the regulations yet.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: To comment on the first instance of general approval and principle for something like that, I agree that many of us felt that from instance to instance, perhaps an institution of this type would be desirable to a community. However, in terms of the final draft of legislation, I feel that Bill 8-81(2) is a little loose and would provide a lot of problems that will be promoted within the community area.

Amendment May Hinder Fund Raising Activities In Communities

The second concern I have with this is that in my experience in community affairs for many many years, I believe it would also encourage a number of people who would possibly contribute their time to a community activity, to move more and more in the direction of special privileged private recreation facilities for themselves or small clubs of that sort, and not to say that that is undesirable from time to time.

However, how does that affect communities that we have, such as Inuvik, and who raise much of their funds for young people's baseball and hockey teams, if these people are holding a more desirable private event where you would not have to deal with the undesirable people who might take part in a drinking festivity, raising money to go to general community events? I believe the way the bill is written encourages people not to say what they feel is wrong, but it would encourage many more private groups to form with a select clientele, and using alcohol as a means to raise funds.

I believe the legislation was in particular to help the particular group of people to raise the necessary funds to keep their club going, but I cannot support the bill. I do not think it is tight enough. I am not against the Yellowknife Racquet Club getting a licence, but I think that the way the legislation is worded is much too loose, and the regulations are not there to give the protections that are required. So I would like to see even if possible that there be a tightening up in this legislation to protect communities other than Yellowknife.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Chairman, what the government is doing is adding another category to the existing list of licences that can be granted by the Liquor Licensing Board. In this particular case, it is not intended to undermine the activity of community organizations who, from time to time, hold dances or have a beer garden at a ball tournament in order to raise funds for whatever function they perform. What we have here is a case where there is a private businessman who wants to establish a recreational facility for use by members. This category of licence would allow the private businessman to sell liquor to the members. I do not see that it would undermine the good work of various community organizations. I might suggest to the Member that she may want to consult with the Law Clerk to see if there is a possible amendment that could be proposed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Braden. Ms Cournoyea.

Future Applications For Private Clubs

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I realize that the only additional thing that was added to the legislation was (f) private recreational facility licences. I understand that and I believe that is what we are talking about, and coupled with clause 2, it just seems that it is opening up a lot of protection for that particular kind of facility. It seems to me that when you get into a private kind of recreational facility, just how big can that grow and what are the constraints of issuance of licences, because once you give one club a licence -- I cannot see the Liquor Control Board not treating another establishment with the same due respect.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Member in this hypothetical situation that in the future the board would give due respect and due consideration to an applicant. They are bound by law to do that. If it is the judgment of the board that the applicant is establishing a recreational facility where by and large all the revenues that are required to operate that facility or that club are going to come solely from the sale of liquor as opposed to the sale of memberships, then, I would assume that in this case, the board would have some very serious reservations about whether or not to grant the applicant a licence.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Braden. Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the only argument they can have is on a technical basis, because if legislation is in place, then people have to be granted the licence according to the legislation, and I feel very afraid of granting licences to private recreational facilities. It may be that in a place like Yellowknife, you feel that you can have adequate control over that, but we have a growing community in the Western Arctic and I do not know how others would feel in the East. This would give the Liquor Control Board the right to grant such a licence and it will not be in the hands of the community.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Chairman, given the legislative changes that were made last February or March, this class of licences is already in place in certain parts of the Liquor Ordinance. Although we neglected to put it in other categories, the class of licence is basically already there.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Braden. Mr. Sibbeston.

Liquor Laws In The North Should Be Tightened

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that Members seriously consider not passing the amendment, as I said, on the basis of my principal objection that something that I had brought before this Assembly has not yet been dealt with by this government, and I understand that a great or a large massive review is being considered or is being undertaken in regard to the Liquor Ordinance. Perhaps this matter can be dealt with then. Perhaps it will put a little onus on the government to also deal with things that I think they ought to rather than simply respond to some private person's request in Yellowknife.

The other matter is that I agree with the arguments made by Ms Cournoyea that it perhaps would open up to other persons in other parts of the North and they would also seek private recreational facility licences. Under this provision with this amendment, it means that now anyone in any part of the North -- in Simpson, for instance, you could have a ping-pong club or a private person

wanting to set up a bit of a hall for the purpose of making money and having ping-pong in there, or pool tables, can now apply to the government and get a special licence even though there is, great concern about liquor in a community. I think the times have passed in the North when government, or the Liquor Licensing Board, can make subjective decisions about granting licences. The time has come when, if there are legislation or certain regulations in place, persons are becoming more sophisticated and if a licensing board does not comply with their request, they can go to the court and seek in this case an order of mandamus, ordering the government, or ordering the Liquor Licensing Board to give it a licence if they have complied with the requirements.

So I do think that having this provision in here is opening up the whole area of liquor licensing. I think that this is happening at a time when generally there is, certainly in the rural parts of the North anyway, a move toward tightening up of liquor laws. So I will vote against the amendment firstly on principle, and secondly on good sound arguments as stated by myself and Ms Cournoyea.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Just to get further clarification from Mr. Braden, he said that certain parts of the legislation were, in fact, in place already. Can you compare then if that is a fact, and why are we adding this one if these people are able to move ahead? Maybe I am misunderstanding what you have said, but I always found that when a person invests his own money and he is a private businessman, he certainly has a lot at stake to maintain that facility, unlike a community non-profit organization. So to put something in place such as a private recreational facility licence and a local businessman running it, if in case these things are in place already, where are they and how can you compare that?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Chairman, last March we amended section 29 of the Liquor Ordinance to add this category of licence. What we are doing here now is amending further sections 119 and 120 to add this category of licence along with all the others.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Braden. Are we ready to go clause by clause? Ms Cournoyea.

Regulations For Private Recreational Facilities

MS COURNOYEA: I must be thick-headed today, Mr. Chairman, because I do not seem to understand. It seems to me that we are making a somewhat major revision to put in a special category of licence and then in subclause 2 we are protecting them so that the community cannot really do anything once they are in place, and that is what concerns me. We have a lot to deal with in a day to day basis, and the possibility of setting up a private recreational activity institution is much more probable than say, a dining lounge, you know, because dining lounges have all the regulations to govern what you can do within a dining lounge. You have to have proper facilities, you have to have bathrooms for men and ladies, you have to have a flush toilet or whatever it is, but say, we have not really got a criteria or rules to govern a private recreational facility that I know of. So what would stop me from going to a small community and opening up a private recreational facility, say, darts, you know, with a couple of honey buckets and a couple of wash basins in the back? Where are the rules for that?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Chairman, could I have the consent of this committee to have Mr. Stien Lal appear as a witness to explain some of the technicalities in the area of the relationship of this category of licence to other club-type licences, and the various provisions that apply to them?

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Is it agreed that we have Mr. Lal, then? Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Nay? Did you say no?

MR. SIBBESTON: I said no.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): All in favour of Mr. Lal coming in, a show of hands, please. Down. Opposed? Thank you. Sergeant-at-Arms, see Mr. Lal in to the witness table. Mr. Braden, do you want to join him in case there are some questions for you? We have Mr. Lal now, to answer any further questions. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MACQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. All right, there is a very real concern that, if we add this category, "private recreational facility licences", that it could be abused, that people who do not have a sincere intent of providing a recreational facility for a community, which would form the essence of their business, but who rather might see an opportunity to set up a kind of phoney recreational business but actually have the aim of selling liquor. Now, what guarantee can the Members of this Assembly have that that sort of abuse would not take place if this amendment were passed?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. Mr. Lal.

MR. LAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, if I could just refer to section 29 of the Liquor Ordinance, which sets out the various categories of licences, that particular section gives the board the authority to issue licences for taverns, for cocktail lounges, for dining rooms, etc. None of those categories go beyond simply naming the categories. That is, the decision is left to the board as to whether or not a particular applicant has met the necessary conditions to get a cocktail lounge licence, to get a dining room licence or any other type of licence.

The concern that Ms Cournoyea raised earlier about the protection that is available under a dining lounge licence category as opposed to a private recreational category can be explained on the basis that, even in respect of the dining lounge licence, the legislation simply states that the board would have the authority to issue a dining lounge licence. The board, in turn, makes regulations to ensure that, unless it is a genuine and a bona fide dining lounge, it would not be entitled to obtain a licence.

I do not see any reason at all why the board would not have similar conditions in respect of private recreational facilities. The board, presumably, would also require flush toilets for a private recreational facility, exit signs, four doors, proper signs, and all other requirements that are needed in any other category of licence. I trust that answers your question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Lal. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MACQUARRIE: If, then, we passed the amendment, and also a motion instructing the board that its regulations should reflect the desire of this Assembly that such licence not be granted unless it is obvious that the provision of a recreational facility would be the main point of the business, the board, presumably then, would frame the regulations in that way and we could be guaranteed that there would not be abuse, would you feel, Mr. Lal?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Mr. Lal.

MR. LAL: Mr. Chairman, unless that requirement is specifically set out in legislation, the board would technically be not bound by it, though I am sure that if the motion were adopted by this House, the board would give it its due credence.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Lal. Mr. McLaughlin.

Difference Between Private Club And Private Recreational Facility

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a question for the legal adviser as well, or the Minister's legal adviser. I would like him to explain the difference between a private club, for example, like the curling club in Pine Point or somewhere else who are able to get licences right now, -- what regulations govern them, and a private club such as this, where an individual person owns the facility? What would be the difference in how they were looked at under the ordinance? I am not clear on that.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. McLaughlin. Mr. Lal.

MR. LAL: Mr. Chairman, there is no distinction at all in the type of facilities that are being offered. The distinction is in the type of ownership of that facility. Under a club licence, you cannot have a profit oriented facility. Under a private recreational facility, you can run it as a business and take the profit out of that business, though the facility provided could presumably be recreational in both categories.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Lal. Any further questions? Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: I wonder if either Mr. Braden or the legal adviser can advise me what types of recreational facilities would fit in this category. Would the bowling alley in Yellowknife, for instance, be one which would fit under that? How about pool halls that are owned in various places in the North? Would those be private recreational facilities which could perhaps apply under this provision and get a licence?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Lal.

MR. LAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the bowling alley in Yellowknife has a cocktail lounge licence. The private recreational facility we are talking about, the Yellowknife Racquet Club, is at present a holder of a cocktail lounge licence. It is not that the facility cannot offer alcoholic beverages today. The distinction is that, under a cocktail lounge licence, the consumption of liquor is open to the public, whereas under a private recreational facility licence, it would only be open to the members and the guests of the members. Therefore, in effect, you are restricting the number of people who would be able to consume liquor on those premises.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Lal. Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: The statement is made that the racquet club already has a cocktail lounge licence, and, in fact, cannot restrict to anyone else. Then, could Mr. Braden or the legal adviser clarify, what does the Royal Canadian Legion have, and what does the Canadian Forces base have? What kind of licence do they have, because they are restricted to members and guests?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Lal.

MR. LAL: Mr. Chairman, I believe they have club licences, because they are registered as charities and not as profit making businesses.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: So in fact the Yellowknife Racquet Club could hold a licence and have restrictions on membership, if they went under the club licences.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Lal.

MR. LAL: Mr. Chairman, the private recreational facility in question could not apply for a club licence because it is a profit making organization. I should also inform the House, I have just been advised that the Armed Forces have canteen licences under the ordinance.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Ms Cournoyea.

Rationale For Liquor Ordinance Amendment

MS COURNOYEA: In the provision of this legislation, on subclause 2, it says the ordinance is further amended by repealing another section, which says that a plebiscite could not be held to do away with this private recreational facility licence if, in fact, there was one that was issued. Is that true?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Lal.

MR. LAL: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask this of the Minister of Justice and Public Service, what complications or ramifications does he see in not passing clause 2 to give clause 1 the protection?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): You are talking about clause 1 and clause 2, Ms Cournoyea?

MS COURNOYEA: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Minister.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Lal will answer that.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Mr. Lal.

MR. LAL: Mr. Chairman, the rationale for amending subsection 120(2) which is, in effect, clause 2 of the bill, was to include private recreational facilities with the other categories of licences where there is generally a business or capital investment and profit motive, that is, a tavern licence, a cocktail lounge licence or a dining room licence. If clause 1 of the bill were passed, and not clause 2, it would entitle a private recreational facility to obtain such a licence without the need of a plebiscite. However, by a plebiscite, under clause 2, such a licence could be rendered ineffective if the community decided to bring in prohibition or restrictions.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Lal. Do you wish to proceed with the bill, clause by clause?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 1. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 2. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): You have a point of order, Mr. Sibbeston? Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: I believe Mr. Sibbeston and myself would like to be on record as not supporting this bill, and if it is possible, if you want to get support, we would like it done in a fashion so we know we -- I am not calling for a recorded vote, but I think we should vote on it and say who is for it and who is against it to see if, in fact, it will go.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. It is agreed on, clause 1 and 2? Bill as a whole. Mr. McLaughlin.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I was wondering if this problem could not be overcome by asking for a recorded vote when we are voting on the bill as a whole, at the end. That would accomplish...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): That is exactly what I was trying to do. If you will call for a recorded vote, that is what it will be.

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

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes. I understood that Ms Cournoyea was requesting that we show hands so that those who do not approve can register that in that way. I believe that is what she wanted and I certainly agree to that.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Ms Cournoyea.

Motion To Withdraw Clause 2 Of Bill 8-81(2), Carried

MS COURNOYEA: You know, we seem to slip through these bills very quickly and I know we are discussing this at great length, but the thing is that perhaps some people could not agree to giving the kind of protection in clause 2 to private recreational facilities if they did not have a community power to close it down; if they want to go to prohibition in a community, if they want to go to a plebiscite. So, perhaps some people would feel uncomfortable with clause 2, but would be comfortable with clause 1. So, I cannot see what other process we can do, unless you feel it would be best to go in motion form, to reject certain parts of this legislation.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think, given the quality of the debate this afternoon, the government would be prepared to amend this particular bill by withdrawing clause 2 altogether. This would provide the kind of check that the Member for the Western Arctic was talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Braden. Is it agreed then, that we drop clause 2 of Bill 8-81(2)?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Carried

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 1. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Bill as a whole. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for you, as chairman, to have a system of giving people an opportunity to vote. I appreciate that often times bills go through and clauses go through the House pretty fast, but I think in this case, because there are some of us who are not for clause 1 even, you ought to give a chance for Members to vote in favour and then, once that is done, then ask those who are against it to also indicate. Because you ask if people are in favour and everybody says, more or less, yes, and then when I raise my hand to state my indication of no, you ask me if I have a point of order. So, there is some uncertainty and I think you should establish a clear way of dealing with the clauses.

Clause 1 Of Bill 8-81(2), Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Sibbeston, I am told there are no rules for a voting procedure. There is no motion to vote on, but we could use a show of hands, if that would satisfy you. So, all agreed with clause 1, raise your right hand please. Opposed. Three opposed. Thank you.

---Agreed

Bill as a whole. Agreed?

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Agreed.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, if you could again indicate those that are in favour and those that are against.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Bill as a whole. Please raise your hands. We will try that again. Down. Opposed? Down. The bill went through, as eight to three.

---Agreed

Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering, now that the bill is through, if it will be in order for people to apply for this recreational facility. I am wondering about the concerns that I have expressed and Mr. Sibbeston expressed, perhaps not as eloquently as we could have, because it appears that many people do not realize the kind of frustration and concerns that we have with alcohol within the communities. I realize as well, that we do have to try to accommodate the larger centres, who appear not to have those same kind of concerns. I am wondering if the Minister can, perhaps, explain what protection now we have within the community and what he is willing to do in terms of setting up the criteria of what that facility could be? What is he willing to do now, or what kind of protection have we got? Once these licences begin rolling in, which I assume they will be in the next two or three weeks, who is going to take the responsibility of the ramifications of what may happen?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I think we were having trouble there, again. Can you hear now? Try the mike over there, Mr. Braden.

MS COURNOYEA: What is happening is it is shorting. It was going out the other day as well. Can you hear me now?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): We can hear now.

MS COURNOYEA: Maybe it is something no one wants to hear or think about.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Well, we will take a 15 minute coffee break. There is a caucus meeting in the caucus meeting room and it is very important that all Members be present. We will break for coffee.

---SHORT RECESS

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): This committee will come to order. Is the sound there now? Yes, it is okay now. Go ahead, Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Chairman, in response to the Member's question, again I reiterate that the Liquor Control Board would presumably act in a responsible way in making decisions on the granting of recreation facility licences. I think that when we look at section 119, it indicates that notwithstanding sections 109 to 118, which cover off a lot of the local option liquor control provisions, the board may, if it sees fit, grant a licence. So, there is that factor. I think as well the government, in particular with respect to the Western Arctic region, has been giving serious consideration to placing, in the Inuvik region, an official to work in the alcohol education area. Further, I think that just because of the kind of debate we have had here today, the Liquor Control Board and presumably people thinking of applying for a licence are going to be aware that the Legislature takes this very seriously. Finally, Mr. Chairman, I think that it would be in order for the committee to pass a motion of some sort, indicating their concern in this particular area and that the examination of applications and the issuance of licences be taken seriously.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mr. Braden. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Motion To Ensure That Recreation Is Main Thrust Of Licensed Recreational Facilities, Carried

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I do have such a motion and I will move it now, with your permission. I move that the Liquor Control Board be requested to frame its regulations in respect of private recreational facility licences to ensure that any such licence is not granted unless it is satisfied that the main thrust of the business is to provide a recreational facility and not to sell liquor.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): The motion is in order. To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Did I hear question? Question has been called. All those in favour of that motion, please raise your hands. Down. Opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Chairman, I think that in this particular case we should indicate that the record will show that this vote was unanimous and I will give the committee and the House an undertaking to provide Members with copies of the regulations as soon as they are available. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. I would like to thank the witnesses. Is this House agreed now, from Bill 1-81(2) to Bill 8-81(2), are ready for third reading?

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Is that agreed now?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you.

---Agreed

10th Report Of Standing Committee On Finance

Now we are going to go on to the standing committee on finance's 10th report on spending priorities for 1982-83, operations and capital. I wonder if the chairman of the standing committee on finance has opening remarks? Do you wish to make an opening remark?

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, the report itself, which has been distributed to all Members, contains much of the justification and back up for the recommendations that the standing committee is making today and since I have already read the entire report into the record, I will not proceed with a long and drawn out opening statement. I would prefer to go to recommendation one, which is contained on page two of the standing committee's report and I will move it as a motion, if that is all right with you Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Proceed, Mrs. Sorensen.

Motion That Constitutional Development Be A Priority Of The House For 1982-83, Carried

MRS. SORENSEN: Very well, then. On behalf of the standing committee on finance, I move that the Legislative Assembly recommend to the Executive Committee that constitutional development be a priority for 1982-83.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): To the motion.

MRS. SORENSEN: I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is fairly clear why the standing committee feels that constitutional development should continue to be a priority of this House and a priority of our government spending. We found that we were not able to fulfil, with the 1981-82 budget, all the things that this Legislature wished to do during this year and we are hopeful of receiving some funding under the B level submission. However, there are other things that, as a result of this fall session on constitutional development, may cause additional funds to be sought for the year 1982-83 and in anticipation of that, your finance committee feels that constitutional development should be a priority for next years budget. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. To the motion. Are you ready for the question?

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Question has been called. All those in favour of that motion, please raise your hands. Down. Opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

On page three, Mrs. Sorensen.

Motion That Economic Development Continue As A Major Priority For Government Spending 1982-83

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On page three there is recommendation two. On behalf of the standing committee on finance I move that the Legislative Assembly recommend to the Executive Committee that economic development, particularly as it affects responding to resource development, continue as a major priority for government spending for 1982-83.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. To the motion. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that I wish to make very clear with all the priorities that we are presenting today and that is that we do not mean, for instance when we say we wish economic development to be a priority, we do not necessarily mean the Department of Economic Development. Rather, we are talking about the function of economic development as it occurs within any of the departments. In other words, within Local Government, you will find money that would be given to municipalities for infrastructure. Under this priority, we would wish that Local Government would make the money that they give to municipalities for infrastructure, with respect to responding to resource development, a priority. Likewise you will hear later that we wish to make education a priority and have specified areas within education that we wish emphasized. You will find that we do not specifically mean the Department of Education, but rather functions of education that are found in other departments, as well as within the Department of Education, such as, within Personnel you will find that there is on-the-job training. We would like that area emphasized within Personnel. So that, I think that it should be clear to the Executive Committee that we are not talking, when we talk about economic development, particularly about the Department of Economic Development, but rather that part of economic development that refers to responding to resource development.

The reason that we have continued to encourage the Legislative Assembly to put economic development as a high priority is the fact that we are progressing very quickly into a boom-type of economy. We are already in that type of economy, if you are aware of what is going on in the Beaufort Sea, and should the Norman Wells pipeline go ahead, then the whole valley will be in a boom economy as well, and there will be considerable stress and strain upon our government with respect to infrastructure and social requirements.

In addition, we feel very strongly that our government should have the ability to make representation on behalf of the people before the regulatory agencies such as EARP, Environmental Assessment and Review Panel, the Lancaster Sound hearings, the National Energy Board and various parliamentary committees which are coming through and passing through the North so frequently these days. Therefore, I would hope that Members of the Legislature will support the standing committee's recommendation and make economic development, particularly as it affects responding to resource development, a major priority for 1982-83 spending. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. To the motion.
Mr. Tologanak.

Encouragement Of Small Business Enterprises

HON. KANE TOLOGANAK: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the chairman of the finance committee. What about the renewable resources and the local crafts like handicrafts and things like that, that the people do themselves, especially in the summertime, when there are tourists that are coming? Should those not be encouraged as well?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you Mr. Tologanak. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Very definitely, Mr. Tologanak. While we did not discuss to any great lengths the supporting of the renewable resource sector as a priority, I know it is the feeling of the Members of the standing committee on finance that that area certainly needs to be supported and emphasized. There is work, I know, being done within the Department of Economic Development. I am not sure whether that is adequate. You, as the Minister, would know more than I would on that. There is money, I believe, within the General Development Agreement to support small business enterprises in the renewable resource area. I guess it is a matter of responding to an immediate need as a government and the finance

committee felt that we had to be prepared in the area of impact to non-renewable resource development and that is why we put our emphasis in this area. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Member for Mackenzie Liard.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the chairman of the committee in this case, whether in coming up with recommendations, whether they had considered the way that this government ought to deal with this whole area of resource development. The Members of this committee will know that I had raised, in February or March, the concern that I had regarding the Norman Wells pipeline and other projects like Cadillac Mines. Just generally I thought that this government was too anxious, as it were, to have development without taking into consideration the local concerns, and I am just wondering whether the committee, when it makes its recommendation, intends that this government simply respond positively to any economic projects that are being started or being proposed without consideration of what the local people or what some of the local concerns were?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Mrs. Sorensen.

Responding To Non-Renewable Resource Development

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, the committee spent a great deal of time all last year developing a paper which we tabled during the last session and which was discussed during the last session, entitled, "The Development of a Developing Zone Policy", and so we did choose to emphasize responsiveness on the part of this government to renewable and non-renewable resource development that was obviously going ahead. We also discussed and dealt with the whole regulatory process of which Mr. Sibbeston has talked at great length about, and felt that the role that this government could take before regulatory agencies could indeed be improved.

We have heard time and time again, over the past year, that there are not the resources nor the expertise within our own government to make the kind of representation before these regulatory agencies that this Legislature has called for, although I believe the presentations that we made before the National Energy Board concerning the Norman Wells pipeline were fairly strong and were widely publicized, but good representation takes dollars and it takes expertise which must be purchased, because what we have, within our own government, are generalists and with some of these regulatory agencies we need specific experts and therefore must purchase them.

So, that is part of what we are talking about when we chose economic development as a priority. We were cognizant of Mr. Sibbeston's wish for a strengthening in this area. We were also very cognizant of the fact that communities need assistance to deal with large corporations and industry that come into their areas, and we felt that this was another area that could be addressed by having economic development as a priority for government spending. Communities would, under this priority, receive the kind of assistance under the General Development Agreement perhaps, or by special grant, for the kind of planning and preparation that they will need to do should economic development go ahead in their area. Now, we certainly by this do not mean to say that we accept certain projects, but on the other hand, I think that this government has to take the point of view that if these projects go ahead then we have to be prepared for them, and that was another reason why we chose economic development as a priority. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Member for Mackenzie Liard.

MR. SIBBESTON: All right. Mr. Chairman, I just want to state a few general comments again. I am glad that this whole area of economic development has been emphasized because I do think there are some very good recommendations. I think basically it is a good recommendation. I think the important thing is that the government, like Mr. Butters, who is responsible for Economic Development, does not now take this recommendation and say that he or this government has a mandate to support and do all they can to make it possible for large projects that are going on in the North to happen. I was afraid that this was his position when we discussed the whole matter this past winter. I think that generally this government is too anxious to see big projects occur in the North without real consideration for what people in the area feel about their aboriginal rights.

Meetings In Fort Simpson Re Opening Of Cadillac Mines

I am glad that this recommendation has come forward because I do feel that when a project is being planned or being proposed that this government has not done really very much in terms of helping the people make representations before boards and so forth. I would state to you the case of the Cadillac Mines as an example. The company that wants to open up Cadillac Mines has been in the Fort Simpson area for the last year or so. They have held one or two meetings with the village council, and earlier this spring there was a Water Board hearing, and then just a few days ago another one, but throughout this whole thing, I did think that there was not a government presence on the spot in Simpson.

During the time that the company was trying to get all the paperwork done in order that they can get approval from various government agencies, I am aware that they had gone to Yellowknife to deal with the federal government in respect of land use permits. Also I am aware that they have dealt with the territorial government and eventually signed some kind of a socio-economic agreement. They eventually came back to the Water Board and were hoping to get carte blanche or approval without a great deal of thought, but the people in Simpson and in fact the whole area were concerned about a number of things about the project. Things like their aboriginal rights, how was this mine going to affect their aboriginal rights? How was the mine going to affect the environment; whether the local people were able to get any jobs; whether the businesses in Simpson were going to get any jobs?

Eventually when the Water Board met in Simpson in April, all of these concerns were expressed, and this government was not present, but the company could say and could hold out a document and say, look, we have this agreement with your government, the territorial government. I must say that in looking at the document, it is a very general type of document which says the company will do certain things. I just felt that it was not a very good document. I felt that the company probably went over to Yellowknife, went to the government offices, and dealt with some government officials and in a sense convinced the government officials that they were going to do certain things and this would result in local people being happy. But to the time of the Water Board hearing, the people in Simpson and area were generally against the company coming into the Simpson area, and so I did notice the lack of presence of this government.

I often say that this government is yet not the government of the people because in instances like this where people are really concerned, the government is absent. Of course, I am there trying to voice or trying to emphasize the concerns of the people, but then the government is not there at the hearings, so it is left, in a sense, to the concerned people to make their own case, and it is a very difficult task sometimes.

Concerns Of Local People

I will state again that I think this government, when there are certain projects being planned or proposed, must be concerned with the concerns of the local people. Otherwise, they are seen as a government that just supports big business, just supports white people, white businesses, and really not concerned about the people in the area that raise real concerns.

To show you the type of thing that happens as a result of the Water Board meeting in April, where a number of concerns have been raised, and again reiterated just last week when the Water Board met in Simpson, just in the last few days Cadillac Mines has taken steps. For instance, they have hired about half a dozen people from Simpson and they have started hiring the local air charter companies to do some work for them. I understand they are also buying some produce, fresh meat, milk and fruits and so forth from a local store.

So, all of this occurred just in the last couple of days, not because this government was at the hearing voicing concerns and really fighting for the people, as it were, it was because the local people themselves raised concerns, and so in this case, the company responded, probably hoping to get people's good favour, hoping that by doing this, people's criticism will be allayed or put aside. So I just think that it is good that this recommendation is here. Hopefully, it will make this government present where projects are being proposed, and that I would not want this recommendation to be taken by the government to mean that they must now support all projects without any great consideration for what the local people think.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. A point of order, Mr. Butters.

Socio-Economic Agreement Re Cadillac Mines Not Signed

HON. TOM BUTTERS: A point of privilege, Mr. Chairman. I would ask the Member if he can table the socio-economic agreement that he says he saw that has been signed between the Cadillac Mines and this government?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): To the motion.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: No, this is a point of privilege. I wish to correct to the honourable Member. I did not sign any socio-economic agreement with Cadillac Mines. I fulfilled the responsibility which I gave him last winter, that I would consult. I did not meet, because of other things, but my Deputy Minister met with Mr. Antoine and a number of other people, and they went over the socio-economic agreement, a copy of which I believe the Member does have. The way that was left, as I understand it, was that we were to be hearing from Mr. Antoine with regard to that agreement. To date, there has been no response from the community.

In responding to Members' concerns, I have been in touch with the economic development section of Fort Smith, and encouraged them to go into the community of Fort Simpson. In fact, I even offered to take the Member into Fort Simpson, to a Water Board meeting. This was a ride that he refused. The aircraft stopped at the tarmac here but he waved it on. So he does know that I have been responding to those concerns, and I would like the Member to correct the record.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mr. Butters. Honourable Member from Mackenzie Liard, to the motion.

MR. SIBBESTON: Now, Mr. Chairman, as regards the socio-economic agreement that I referred to, I do not have a copy of it, but certainly in Simpson the impression that was given by Cadillac Mines, as an official government document, was that this is the document that was agreed to between the company and the territorial government. It was just a general document saying that the company

would be doing certain things and, certainly, at the Water Board hearing when questions were raised, the company gave the impression that this was an agreement that was entered between itself and this territorial government. So I was led to believe that this government had already signed an agreement. If it is not the case, well then, this is the first time that I am aware of it.

Now, as to the representations made in Simpson last week when the Water Board reconvened again, I must say that I am aware that the superintendent of Economic Development from Fort Smith was on his way to Simpson and he was going there on my suggestion. He was not going there to make any public submissions on behalf of this government. He was going there perhaps to speak to some Cadillac Mines company officials. I had challenged, or suggested to him that he go there and make a public submission supporting the people in the area with respect to some of the things that they were concerned about, but he wrote to me saying that he did not have authority to, in fact, do so. So some government official was there, but not there to make a public statement, and also it was on my suggestion. Why should it be me that suggests this to them? Does the government not think it is good, or wise, or prudent, to be there without them being pressured to do so?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I note, Mr. Chairman, that the Member indicates that it was Cadillac Mines that made the statement, and that he recognizes that his original statement was not accurate, to wit, that there had been a socio-economic agreement signed between Cadillac Mines and this government.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): There was a motion on the floor. Ms Cournoyea.

Positions Represented By The Minister

MS COURNOYEA: Just a point of clarification in this regard, Mr. Chairman, directed to the Minister of Finance. I would like to be assured that his understanding of this motion put forth -- like Mr. Sibbeston -- that he does not take it as though it is a thrust that we are giving him to support the resource development that is being contemplated for the Northwest Territories. That is number one.

Number two, that when we begin talking about the resource development and impact, is it understood on his part that in many instances the development of our handicraft and our renewable resource areas can be very important, to provide the jobs in communities that are not directly in that area? Can we have his assurances that these understandings are compatible?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: The answer to question two is yes. I appreciate the balanced approach. The answer to question one is that any positions I represent are those that reflect the direction of the Executive Committee, which usually reflects the directions of this House.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mr. Butters. Ms Cournoyea.

Extraordinary Funding For High Impact Areas

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, another point with the Minister of Finance. In his dealings last year with the Government of Canada in the financial situation, I wonder if he could clear up a point for me? In a meeting that we had with Minister Munro, he indicated that he was not aware of the thrust of this government to seek extraordinary funding for impacted areas. I wonder if you could clarify, or make a statement and/or explain why the Minister of Indian Affairs would not be knowledgeable about this long-term thrust?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I have never, to my knowledge, suggested that there was no need for extraordinary funding. If the Member will check the record, she will see that the concept originally was advanced by me in 1972, because I recognized the need at that time, and two days ago before the standing committee of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, I responded that probably the most demanding challenge that faces this government and the communities of the North in the next decade will be to providing the infrastructure in those communities designated as high impact, that we need to live adequate and healthy and wholesome lives.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mr. Butters. To the motion. Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister of Finance would answer my question?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I have answered her question. Unless the Member can give me a specific time, place and date, and refresh my memory as to when I made such a statement, I cannot respond, but I do not believe this situation -- I am informed that the Member is discussing Mr. Munro's response, not mine.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mr. Butters. Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I have had my difficulties with Inuvik, but I was not talking specifically about what you said. I was talking about the statement that Minister Munro made in his last tour, which I believe at one meeting you were present. He said he was not aware that there was a thrust in the territorial government for community impact needs. I am wondering how, in your capacity, you feel that he could come to that conclusion, where, in fact, if you say what is true, that we have been trying to impress on the federal government the need for such funding.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I do not wish to respond on behalf of the Minister, but my understanding was that a major part of our B level was for planning to ameliorate the type of impacts which the Member and other Members of her committee have made known to us and has been made known to this government many years ago. I cannot respond for the Minister, but I think he must be aware of the needs of the impact.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mr. Butters. Ms Cournoyea.

Planning For Infrastructure Needs

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, when we were discussing the infrastructure requirements, and the Minister had looked to his assistant, and he was told that in the B level funding requirements, that there was no provision for any kind of capital or infrastructure, and that you then said that you were directed not to include any kind of capital in the B level funding, so therefore the need was not reflected. That was the gist of the conversation.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I think this was the suggestion I was going to make to the committee and to the Members with regard to this section. This section also ignores that very important requirement. If you look at the statement, it says, "We emphasize that money should be made available under a developing zone policy to communities for planning for infrastructure needs." Now I have written in here that we should not only put "for planning" but

"for planning and providing for infrastructure needs". This recommendation and this motion is weak, for the very same reason that the Member is criticizing me that in our B level that the planning would identify the infrastructure that would be required, so that the capital requirements could be pursued. But it has been a long time since we first entered our request for the B level moneys. I would like to see this, even though it is not the motion, but I would like to see that first paragraph amended to add the words "and for provision of infrastructure needs", so that not only can we pursue the planning requirement but the infrastructure as well.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mr. Butters. Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it known that I was not, in my attempts at asking questions, criticizing Mr. Butters about his ability to deal with a situation. Rather I was trying to clarify what kind of problems we do have in forwarding these requirements. We have been working on it for quite a number of years and more years than I am knowledgeable about, but it seems to me that we want to do a certain thing, but we have a problem and the Minister as well has a problem. It seems he has a problem in knowledge. So, I certainly would recommend that the Minister of Finance make this very clear statement and make the amendment to the motion.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. Mr. Butters, do you wish to respond to that?

Provision Of Capital To Develop Infrastructure In High Impact Communities

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I do not know why the federal government refused the request five or six years ago that the territorial government made for the provision of capital to develop infrastructure in high impact communities or rapid growth communities. I was not on the Executive Committee then and I do not know. I just know that the territorial government did recognize the requirement and moved in a couple of instances.

I feel that we have a much better chance this time to encourage the federal government to develop that type of money outside of our agreement. The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development over the last week when he was travelling through the North, heard of the need, the need in the communities, in Tuktoyaktuk and Inuvik and in Fort Simpson. I think that he will be very receptive to any approach we make to him, where particular capital requirements are identified in the rapid growth communities. With regard to this particular suggestion, maybe it is being unnecessarily...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Okay. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Yes. I would just like to respond to what Mr. Butters had to say with respect to the fact that infrastructure requirements were not included within this recommendation. That is not so, Mr. Butters. Recommendation number five of the developing zone policy, which was adopted by this House, concerns the Executive Committee dealing directly with the federal government for infrastructure funds and for extraordinary funds for infrastructure and it was quite clear that that was what recommendation number five was all about, under the developing zone policy.

We said that initially it would be under extraordinary funds and perhaps later, under a resource revenue sharing program, which I understand you are now doing some work in, and that was the money that we would get with respect to infrastructure requirements. If you will notice, in the body of the motion itself, we say that economic development, particularly as it affects responding to resource development, continue as a major priority. That, to me, includes not only planning, but infrastructure dollars as well. So, I believe that we have covered the whole area, from planning to capital dollars, within this motion. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Mr. Butters, to the motion.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Well, if it satisfies the chairman of the committee and its Members, I guess it satisfies me, but I think that a major initiative and a major departure is this request for extraordinary capital funding and I think it would strengthen the recommendation if reference were made again to it in the new recommendations of the committee. However, as I say, if the chairman is satisfied, I guess I am.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mr. Butters. Mr. Stewart, to the motion.

HON. DON STEWART: Actually, I am afraid I cannot speak to the motion. It was in reply to what Mr. Sibbeston had to say and I am afraid that at times he was not on the motion. So, I will have to wait for another opportunity.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. To the motion. Are you ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion That Economic Development Continue As A Major Priority For Government Spending 1982-83, Carried

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Question has been called. All those in favour, please raise your hands. Down. Opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Recommendation number three. Mrs. Sorensen.

Motion That Education Be A Priority For Government Spending 1982-83

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of the standing committee on finance I move that the Legislative Assembly recommend to the Executive Committee that education be a priority for 1982-83 government spending and that the following areas be emphasized: Training for employment; vocational training in schools; on-the-job training; adult upgrading and the needs of the special committee on education.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. To the motion. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, Members will remember that the House adopted a motion calling for education as one of its priorities for government spending during the budget session this winter and so, your standing committee is simply reflecting that motion. We have chosen to particularly emphasize areas which have been talked about, again, at great length, by Members such as Tagak Curley, Nick Sibbeston and several Members of our special committee on education. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. To the motion. Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since I am now responsible for Education, I do not want to appear to be wanting to feather my own nest in speaking to this motion, but I do feel compelled to say that all other priorities, in my view, such as constitutional development, economic development, hinge on education. Therefore, if we are to seriously prepare to respond to increased resource development, then we must train and educate people to meet the challenge. I am in favour of the motion for those reasons.

Specifically, I would expect that training for employment would include teacher training. There are a tremendous number of jobs available for northern teachers and I am happy to see that in there. I would particularly hope that if education becomes a priority, we can train even more teachers than we are now in the North.

Implementation Of Recommendations of Special Committee On Education

I notice that some of these matters really do not, strictly speaking, fall within education, such as on-the-job training, which now is dealt with largely outside the Department of Education. I also notice that really the special education committee is not a part of the Department of Education, but rather, of the Legislative Assembly. In that connection, I am wondering if the chairman of the finance committee could answer me this, when you refer to the needs of the special committee on education, were you not referring and do you not really mean to say something like implementing the recommendations of the special committee on education? As I understand their timetable, they may well come out with significant recommendations in the field of education. I think we can be fairly sure they are going to cost money. So, I wonder if the chairman might not consider, for clarity, putting in some words to that effect. Otherwise, it does not quite make sense. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: That is exactly what we did mean. I am sorry, Mr. Patterson. I agree with you. It is not sufficiently clear. We were referring to the recommendations. When we discussed this we realized, of course, that the recommendations probably would come out during the next budget session and it would be somewhat too late to implement within that current budget that we would be passing at the same time that we were passing or rejecting, I suppose, the recommendations of the special committee.

The problem, of course, is putting a dollar value now, in anticipation of what your recommendations might be and that is why we could not be any clearer than that, I suppose. I guess the Executive Committee would say immediately, well, when we are planning for the budget, we do not quite know what the recommendations of the education committee will be. Therefore, how can we plan for the expenditure of money in those areas and so I guess what would happen is we might have to go to supplementary estimates. In any case, we did feel that the Executive Committee should be aware that the recommendations will entail, probably, the additional expenditure of funds and that we should be prepared during 1982-83 to implement them as we can. So, if you can come up with some words that would further clarify, perhaps if we said the implementation of the recommendations of the special committee on education, amend it to say that, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. To the motion. The Member for Mackenzie Liard.

Encouraging Persons Of Dene Ancestry To Take Training

MR. SIBBESTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think all of this sounds pretty good, but I just want to provide some specific information or specific ways that I think all of these things could be accomplished. Like, training for employment, of course, is very broad and general. It could mean, really, anything, and so forth. Maybe the discussion today is supposed to be left just general, but I cannot help but want to provide detail and provide, maybe, some advice or information to Mr. Patterson, as to ways that he can bring about some of the things that are recommended here.

I had the good fortune to be in Fort Smith last week for a night and part of a day and during that time went to the Adult Vocational Training Centre. It was my first time I had visited the place and I was shown around by the principal and so forth, but in touring the establishment, particularly the various trades classes, I noticed that there were not very many persons of Dene ancestry registered or taking part in the various classes. It occurred to me that perhaps there are not enough people from our part of the North taking

advantage of the training that is offered in Fort Smith. I therefore had a discussion with the principal of AVTC and also with the regional director, suggesting ways that people from my area could be enticed or encouraged to go to AVTC. I am hopeful that something will be done.

I think basically it is a matter of people in my area not knowing fully about AVTC and not realizing the possibilities that exist for training. So, there is work to be done from the AVTC level to bring about an awareness of the various training programs and in addition, there is also need for some work to be done from the local level, be it from the teachers, be it from the local government officials, be it from the parents and the Dene leaders, to encourage persons of Dene ancestry to take training. So, there is some work to be done in this area. I will just be truthful with you, I saw a lot of white people and I saw a lot of Inuit people taking courses at AVTC but not very many Dene. It made me wonder why, and I appreciate it is not just the government's fault. It is, perhaps, the people's fault themselves.

I could go on at length, I guess, to talk about why I think people from my area are not particularly interested in taking courses, but it will take a long time and it will, perhaps, be repetition of some of the things I have said. Anyway, while in Simpson on the weekend, I also discussed the matter with the chief of the Fort Simpson Dene band and hopefully, as a result of all of this, something will transpire.

Problems With Hire North

The other thing I would like the government to be conscious of is Hire North which in our area is a mechanism for training people, and I can say that in Hire North, it is pretty well all Dene people that are being trained to become operators, but I can tell you that there are serious problems with the Hire North operation. Hire North has been in existence for quite a number of years, but it has never been successful as far as Dene people, for instance, entering the course and coming out of there as good outstanding operators.

Part of the problem is that the training, as it is presently offered by Hire North, is not that good. The selection of people that go to the course also is not that good. So it is not really seen as a serious undertaking, and the students that eventually arrive at Hire North camps to operate machines and so forth are not properly supervised. There is not an accountability factor, and there is not emphasis placed on a person's ability to be a good worker in the sense of working hard at his job or when he is off work to be a responsible person, and also when he is on time off to be responsible, and eventually return.

So there are many aspects of the training program that are deficient, and I would hope that whoever is responsible -- perhaps Mr. Patterson in this case -- can begin to be conscious of some of the problems, both in AVTC and Hire North, so that these general things do not become meaningless. You know, it is nice, I think, that these recommendations are passed, but they will mean different things to government people. I just wanted to make sure that as far as I am concerned, if they just did the things that I have suggested today, I think things will improve.

I take it this is why we are here, to provide advice to government officials and for government officials to take it seriously. We are being paid \$20,000 a year or so, and I suppose that is our contribution whenever we meet like this. So I would like to think anyway that what I am saying is truthful and that government officials will take these seriously rather than just think, oh, a citizen is griping or unhappy again and others know best.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Mr. Sibbeston for his comments and assure him that I would become very worried indeed if Mr. Sibbeston was not griping or complaining while we were in session. I would become very alarmed and disappointed.

Vocational Training In Schools

I would like to ask the chairman of the finance committee to explain, partly in light of Mr. Sibbeston's remarks, why the recommendation was made "vocational training in schools", because as I see that, you would be saying that vocational training in our school system as opposed to post-secondary vocational training, such as we find in AVTC or other institutions that may be developed, that the school training would be the first and perhaps the only priority. I am wondering if the chairman might consider that there is a lot of important vocational training going on outside the schools, that there is no question that we need to beef up the vocational training capacity of our schools, but I am wondering whether the chairman would agree that perhaps, rather than saying "vocational training in schools", the recommendation should simply state "vocational training", recognizing that a lot of training does occur after school in places like Fort Smith through its extension programs.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: You will have to understand, Mr. Chairman, that when we particularly emphasize one area we do not at the same time wish to de-emphasize another area, so what we are saying here is that we feel that there is a special need within our schools to develop a curriculum that is not entirely an academic curriculum, and I suppose, to a certain extent, you could title that a high school certificate program, which I guess is not necessarily vocational, but which will give a student a high school certificate, but not necessarily an academic certificate, and which would probably give a higher emphasis to the vocational training areas that we so badly need in the Northwest Territories. I think that might be part of, or one of the solutions to keeping children in schools who are not necessarily interested in an academic program for various reasons, but who are interested in staying in school.

We have a situation in Yellowknife with the 20 students whom I talked about earlier in oral question period, and I know that there are students throughout the system who, at a very early age, in grade seven, eight, and nine perhaps, are identified as students who are not necessarily endowed with the abilities or the interests for the academic program, and who would be well-served by the school program if we had a high school certificate program. The wording may be somewhat misleading, but I do believe the standing committee on finance was referring there to an alternative within the school system to the academic program. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. To the motion. Mr. McCallum.

Offering Vocational Education

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong it, but I guess I have some concern with the goals, as they were indicated by the chairman of the standing committee in terms of vocational training in schools. That is, to suggest that we would be able to retain people or students for longer periods of time by offering vocational education, which indeed means not just industrial arts or home economics, as I read this, because that just basically is a beginning to give a student some experience in a number of things.

I think the experience has been that once a student reaches an age whereby he would be able to obtain Manpower training to enrol in journeyman or apprenticeship programs, that student would much preferably want to do those things rather than to stay within our formal school system to get that kind of training. Because under Manpower they get paid for it and that has been a problem in some of the high schools, because students will drop out of the upper years of high school in order to enrol in programs whereby they can get paid under Manpower training rates.

I guess I have a further concern, and that is maybe again, from my own experience, in that in putting vocational training in schools, too often what has occurred in the past has been an identification of individual students too early within their years and put them in a particular area, and does not allow that great transfer back into a better formal schooling. In other words, we would put them into particular slots and not be able to allow for a lateral movement of students from one program to another. I think that they then become identified as being a vocational training student, if you like, at grade five, six, seven. That is the English system and I would not want to see our education system identify students that quickly, because I do not believe that any student, and I would expect that somewhere along the line most everybody would agree, that you do not really know what you would want to do that early in schooling.

Now, I recognize that there are students in the school for whom an academic, a commercial program, is not the thing that they would want to do, and they can be identified, but I would just not like to see it go that early in school. I would like to suggest as well that having increased vocational training within the high school is not going to stop students from dropping out and moving into other areas such as the facility in Fort Smith or at a later stage, anywhere else, when they can get Manpower training.

Now, I am not suggesting as well, Mr. Chairman, that this is, in effect, what the standing committee is trying to do. I am not looking at it in a negative way. I recognize that there must be a number of avenues by which an individual student can get training, but I would just hope that it would not be too much toward it, and that there would be some kind of recognition that a student would be able to move back and forth and we would not identify them and label those students too early in their school years, because I know that that has occurred. I know that it has occurred in the past, and I do not believe that everybody is going to be an academic student. I do not believe, by the same token, that even at 15, 16, and 17, that an individual knows what he wants to do, and I think there are some who will do that. By and large, the experience has been that students will take a longer period of time to determine what they want to do, and I would not want to see too many pigeon-holes and putting all the pigeons in particular areas too early in their school life.

Need For More Vocational Training Facilities

I agree that there has to be an increase in vocational training. I agree that there has to be more emphasis placed on that, and I would hope that there would be that kind of recognition that we need, not only the facility in Fort Smith, but we need other facilities in other parts of the Territories, to take into consideration that there would be various avenues by which students can begin to get into something that will prepare them to take on a responsible role in society.

I just have that kind of concern that if we start to go too much into vocational training in particular areas in the school that we will identify students too early in their lives. I think that it is better to give a student an experience in various areas and let them then choose as they go along, but simply, in my opinion, putting increased vocational training within the high schools, it will move down into the junior high, and I think that once there, you get a too early identification of students, and I would see that we would like to be able to do a little bit more.

Now, again, let me indicate, Mr. Chairman, that I am not voicing disapproval of the idea that there has to be an emphasis in vocational training, but I do not think it will retain students in our high schools for longer periods of time because if a student can get paid for going to school under Manpower rates, that they will go into that area, and you will have then a dropping out. It may very well be good. It may very well be something that they should be. If they want to drop out and move into another area, that is still education, but I would not like to see the identification of students too early within the school system on the basis of vocational training.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you, Mr. McCallum. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In view of the time and the intense debate which this motion has generated, and also in view of the fact that there are still some major items in the committee's report, I would move that we report progress now, and continue on with this tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Is that a motion?

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): All those in favour of that motion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Down. Opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Peter Fraser): Mr. Pudluk.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS 1-81(2); 2-81(2); 3-81(2); 4-81(2); 5-81(2); 6-81(2); 7-81(2); 8-81(2); 10TH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE; REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATION

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the mace is not on the table. That looks better. Mr. Speaker, the committee has been considering Bill 1-81(2) through 7-81(2). These bills are ready for a third reading. Your committee has also been considering Bill 8-81(2), a bill ready for a third reading as amended. Your committee has been considering the report of the standing committee on legislation. This matter is concluded. Your committee also has been considering the 10th report of the standing committee on finance, and wishes to report progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Pudluk. Turning to the orders of the day, Item 11, third reading of bills.

ITEM NO. 11: THIRD READING OF BILLS

Mr. Butters.

Third Reading Of Bill 1-81(2): Co-operative Associations Ordinance

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 1-81(2), An Ordinance to Amend the Co-operative Associations Ordinance, be read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Braden. All in favour? Down. Opposed?

---Carried

Bill 2-81(2). Mr. Braden.

Third Reading Of Bill 2-81(2): Extra-Territorial Custody Orders Enforcement Ordinance

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 2-81(2), An Ordinance to Allow the Enforcement of Extra-Territorial Custody Orders, be read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Butters. All in favour? Down. Opposed?

---Carried

Bill 3-81(2). Mr. Braden.

Third Reading Of Bill 3-81(2): Fire Prevention Ordinance

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 3-81(2), An Ordinance to Amend the Fire Prevention Ordinance, be read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Wah-Shee. All in favour? Down. Opposed?

---Carried

Bill 4-81(2). Mr. Wah-Shee.

Third Reading Of Bill 4-81(2): Home-Owners' Property Tax Rebate Ordinance

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 4-81(2), An Ordinance to Provide for a Home-Owners' Property Tax Rebate, be read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Braden. All in favour? Down. Opposed?

---Carried

Bill 5-81(2). Mr. Braden.

Third Reading Of Bill 5-81(2): Maintenance Orders Enforcement Ordinance

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 5-81(2), An Ordinance to Amend the Maintenance Orders Enforcement Ordinance, be read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Is there a seconder? Mr. Butters. All in favour? Down. Opposed?

---Carried

Bill 6-81(2). Mr. Braden.

Third Reading Of Bill 6-81(2): Public Trustee Ordinance

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 6-81(2), An Ordinance to Amend the Public Trustee Ordinance, be read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Butters. All in favour? Down. Opposed?

---Carried

Bill 7-81(2). Mr. Butters.

Third Reading Of Bill 7-81(2): Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance. No. 4, 1980-1981

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 7-81(2), An Ordinance Respecting Additional Expenditures for the Public Service for the 1980-1981 Financial Year, be read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Is there a seconder? Mr. Kilabuk, All in favour? Down. Opposed?

---Carried

Bill 8-81(2). Mr. Braden.

Third Reading Of Bill 8-81(2): Liquor Ordinance

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 8-81(2), as amended, An Ordinance to Amend the Liquor Ordinance, be read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Seconder? Mr. Wah-Shee. Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. A recorded vote being called. All in favour please stand. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Mr. Appaqaq, Mr. Tologanak, Mr. McCallum, Mr. Wah-Shee, Mr. Braden, Mr. Butters, Mr. McLaughlin, Mrs. Sorensen, Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Please stand.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Mr. Kilabuk, Ms Cournoyea, Mr. Sibbeston, Mr. Sayine.

MR. SPEAKER: Abstentions? Please stand.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Mr. Pudluk.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Bill 8-81(2) has been carried.

---Carried

Mr. Clerk, will you see that the Commissioner is ready to assent to bills.

ITEM NO. 12: ASSENT TO BILLS

COMMISSIONER PARKER: Please be seated. As Commissioner of the Northwest Territories, I assent to the following bills: Bill 1-81(2), Bill 2-81(2), Bill 3-81(2), Bill 4-81(2), Bill 5-81(2), Bill 6-81(2), Bill 7-81(2), and Bill 8-81(2). Thank you.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Item 13, Mr. Clerk, announcements and orders of the day.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): There will be a meeting of the special committee on impact at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow in the caucus room. At 11:45 a.m. tomorrow, a meeting of the constitutional development committee, room 201 of the Ptarmigan Inn.

ITEM NO. 13: ORDERS OF THE DAY

Orders of the day, 1:00 p.m. Tuesday, May 26, 1981.

1. Prayer
2. Replies to the Commissioner's Address
3. Oral Questions

4. Questions and Returns
5. Petitions
6. Tabling of Documents
7. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
8. Notices of Motion
9. Motions
10. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills, Recommendations to the Legislature and Other Matters: Sessional Paper 1-81(2); 10th Report of Standing Committee on Finance
11. Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. The House stands adjourned until 1:00 p.m., Tuesday, May 26th, 1981.

---ADJOURNMENT

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