



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES
DEBATES

59th Session

8th Assembly

Official Report

WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 1976

Speaker The Honourable David H. Searle, Q.C.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

The Honourable David H. Searle, Q.C.
P.O. BOX 939
Yellowknife, N.W.T. XOE 1H0
(Yellowknife South)
(Speaker of the Council)

The Honourable Arnold McCallum
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
XOE 1H0
(Slave River)
(Minister of Education)

Mr. Donald M. Stewart
Hay River, N.W.T.
XOE 0R0
(Hay River)
(Deputy Speaker)

VACANT
(Mackenzie Great Bear)

Mr. Mark Evaluarjuk
Igloodik, N.W.T.
XOA 0L0
(Foxe Basin)

Mr. Ipeelee Kilabuk
Pangnirtung, N.W.T.
XOA 0R0
(Central Baffin)

Mr. William A. Lafferty
P.O. Box 176,
Fort Simpson, N.W.T.
XOE 0N0
(Mackenzie Liard)

Mr. William Lyall
Cambridge Bay, N.W.T.
XOE 0C0
(Central Arctic)

The Honourable Peter Ernerk
Site 18, Box 16,
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
XOE 1H0
(Keewatin)
(Minister of Social Development)

Mr. Thomas H. Butters
P.O. Box 1069,
Inuvik, N.W.T.
XOE 0T0
(Inuvik)
(Deputy Chairman of Committees)

Mr. Dave Nickerson
P.O. Box 1778
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
XOE 1H0
(Yellowknife North)

Mr. Bryan R. Pearson
c/o Arctic Ventures
Frobisher Bay, N.W.T.
XOA 0H0
(South Baffin)

Mr. Ludy Pudluk
Resolute Bay, N.W.T.
XOA 0V0
(High Arctic)

Mr. John Steen
Tuktoyaktuk, N.W.T.
XOE 1C0
(Western Arctic)

Mr. James Wah-Shee
P.O. Box 1514
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
XOE 1H0
(Great Slave Lake)

OFFICERS

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

Sergeant-at-Arms
Mr. F. A. Mackay,
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
XOE 1H0

Clerk Assistant
Vacant

Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms
Mr. J.H. Mackendrick
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
XOE 1H0

LEGAL ADVISOR
Mr. J. R. Slaven
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

26 May 1976

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	306
Questions and Returns	306
Petitions	308
Notices of Motions	309, 392
Motions	311, 325
Tabling of Documents	320
First Reading of Bills:	
- Bill 10-59 Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance, No. 1, 1976-77	320
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Bill 9-59 Liquor Ordinance	320, 328
- Bill 1-59 Territorial Hospital Insurance Services Ordinance	346
- Recommendations to Council 1-59 and 2-59	348
- Motions 3-59, 4-59 and 5-59	355
- Inuit Tapirisat of Canada Land Claim Proposal Nunavut and Tabled Document 15-59	374
Report of Committee of the Whole of:	
- Bill 9-59 Liquor Ordinance	324, 346
- Bill 1-59 Territorial Hospital Insurance Services Ordinance	347
- Recommendations to Council 1-59 and 2-59	354
- Motions 3-59, 4-59 and 5-59	373
- Inuit Tapirisat of Canada Land Claim Proposal Nunavut and Tabled Document 15-59	392
Orders of the Day	393

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 1976

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Steen, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Lafferty, Mr. Lyall, Mr. Butters, Mr. Wah-Shee, Hon. Arnold McCallum, Mr. Evaluarjuk, Hon. Peter Ernerk, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Kilabuk, Mr. Pudluk, Hon. David Searle, Mr. Nickerson.

ITEM NO. 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

SPEAKER (The Hon. David Searle): Turning to the orders of the day Item 2, questions and returns.

ITEM NO. 2: QUESTIONS AND RETURNS

Mr. Parker.

Return To Question W8-59: Progress, Radio And Television

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, on May 20, Mr. Lyall asked Question W8-59 concerning scheduling by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation of Anik radio and television service for Spence Bay and Gjoa Haven. The following message was received May 25th from the director of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation northern service:

"Re your inquiry Spence Bay. We have examined a request from the community dated December 17, 1975, and verified that Spence Bay now qualified for coverage under the accelerated coverage plan. Television and radio have therefore been added to the corporation's accelerated coverage plan projects tentatively scheduled for 1977 implementation. We caution that this is a tentative schedule only. Actual installation will depend on the availability of facilities from Telsat plus our own internal demands. We will keep you informed. Gjoa Haven does not qualify for coverage under the accelerated coverage plan but is included in the northern broadcasting plan which will bring radio only to communities between 200 and 500 population. The northern broadcasting plan has not yet been approved and funded by the federal government." Signed Doug Ward, director of Canadian Broadcasting Corporation northern service.

Chain Of Office For Frobisher Bay

Mr. Speaker, I think it was on Tuesday of last week I received a written question from Mr. Pearson and I would like to have the opportunity to answer this morning. The question was that the council of Frobisher Bay is now accepting gifts. They agreed to accept used items such as used chains of office, or any items of value. That was received from the chairman. Now, as a demonstration of the ability to react very rapidly the administration is pleased to have a chain of office ready here and perhaps I could just detail the items on this chain of office because being an engineer, and being one of the co-designers of this chain, it seemed that it should be of a practical nature. The first item is a rubber stamp that says Yellowknife with an X on it and I am sure Mr. Pearson can use that to either veto or agree with items. There is a key which of course he can always use for opening the treasure chest. There is a symbol of the polar bear which is an animal he seeks to protect from time to time. There is a municipal vehicle here, small in size. There is a gavel which I am sure he will need to keep order. There is a bottle opener, double-ended for both cans and tins. There is a spoon for spoon-feeding his council should that ever be necessary. There is a pen for signing cheques should they have any money granted to them. There is a corkscrew because I am given to understand that he is a connoisseur of one of the finer things of life and a small lock, very small which he might use to lock up the treasury. Mr. Speaker, if I might be permitted to make this formal presentation now.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Let us hope it is suitably tarnished.

MR. PEARSON: I would just like to say on behalf of all I survey, thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any written questions? Any written questions? Mr. Nickerson.

Question W29-59: Request From Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question concerning the request by the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation for funds from the Northwest Territories. I am given to understand that the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation has, or is about to solicit funds from the Government of the Northwest Territories to either directly or indirectly subsidize its operations. Could this house have the assurance of the administration that no such funds will be authorized until this house has the opportunity to debate the matter and to assess the desirability of the Northwest Territories remaining within the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation rather than setting up its own marketing corporation as is presently being considered by the Government of Saskatchewan?

MR. SPEAKER: I assume you will take that as notice, will you, Mr. Parker.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further questions? Mr. Nickerson.

Question W30-59: Court Party Charter Costs

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker, a second question concerning court party charter costs. Could the house be given a breakdown of air charter costs, on a company by company basis, incurred by the supreme court party travelling throughout the Northwest Territories during the past three years for which the figures are available? Do we have a formal agreement with the federal government regarding the sharing of these costs? Is the charter company providing these services chosen by competitive tender or is it selected solely by the supreme court judge?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, I think I will take that question as notice and file a return.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further written questions? Mr. Lyall.

Question W31-59: Funds For Road Conditions In Spence Bay

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, last year Spence Bay did not use their road construction moneys because all their equipment was being used to build pads for houses and build their tank farm. So, I would like to ask the administration whether or not they will be getting moneys for upgrading the present very bad road conditions.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, I will obtain an answer and file a return.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further written questions? Mr. Evaluarjuk.

Question W32-59: Coral Harbour's Hamlet Council Wages

MR. EVALUARJUK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question which I will direct to the administration. I asked some questions last year, but have not heard an answer concerning Coral Harbour's councillors' wages. All councillors wanted \$15 per member and the chairman \$20. I want to know if this has been looked into.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, I will seek the answer to Mr. Evaluarjuk's question and hopefully have it for tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further written questions? Mr. Pudluk.

Question W33-59: Vehicle For Resolute Bay

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker, concerning snow removal vehicles. I would like to ask if Resolute Bay is getting a snowplow this summer through the sealift.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, I would have to check our budget forecast and respond to Mr. Pudluk's question tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Further written questions. Are there no further written questions? Mr. Stewart.

Question W34-59: Fish Prices, 1975-76

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I am having difficulty trying to relate the answer that we received relative to the fish prices paid on Great Slave Lake for this summer. My information is these prices are substantially lower than they were last year. This paper indicates that they are higher. I was wondering if there has been any change in the freight rates or what actually the comparison of the price per pound paid at the lake rather than Winnipeg would be, whether the six cents a pound mentioned in the answer would be the same for 1975 and 1976 or whether indeed there has been a decrease in freight rates so the fishermen are actually receiving this year less money than they were last?

Could I be advised what the difference is between summer fish prices 1975-76 for the Great Slave Lake production f.o.b. Hay River?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, I will check into the matter and respond tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there further questions? Mr. Evaluarjuk.

Question W35-39: Financial Assistance For Garage, Coral Harbour

MR. EVALUARJUK: Mr. Speaker, I have an additional question regarding Coral Harbour. The hamlet of Coral Harbour was destroyed recently by strong winds and they have requested additional funds to get the garage back together which was destroyed by the wind. They have approached me to speak to the administration regarding this. I want to know if the administration has given them any assistance to date.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that there is a plan to assist Coral Harbour with this building but I will have to check on the details of it and answer before the end of the session.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there further written questions? Item 3, oral questions, Mr. Lyall.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, I have another written question. Can I go back to it?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, proceed.

Question W36-59: Airport Upgrading, Spence Bay And Gjoa Haven

MR. LYALL: I would like to ask the administration if they received definite plans from the Ministry of Transport when they are starting work to upgrade the airports at Spence Bay and Gjoa Haven?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, I will file a return on that question.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further written questions?

Item 3, oral questions.

Item 4, petitions.

ITEM NO. 4: PETITIONS

Mr. Kilabuk.

Petition 2-59 From Broughton Island On Additional Classrooms

MR. KILABUK: Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from the community of Broughton Island requesting the following. I will be reading this letter and it goes like this: "Regarding the principal or education heads in headquarters. We are requesting additional classrooms for this community because the present school space in Broughton Island is inadequate. We are looking ahead and we are also requesting additional space from 1976 to 1977. We have received requests from the education committee that the present school space will be inadequate for next year or the year after. We have been utilizing the gymnasium or the small space that is considered to be a gymnasium which is not a gymnasium.

At present the classroom spaces in the school are not enough to meet that requirement to date and we would like to submit a request for additional classrooms to meet our requirements."

The requirements came from the deputy chairman of the education committee and I would like to, if I may, add my comment on Broughton Island. If there will be government officials visiting Broughton Island in the future, I would like to accompany them myself to see the situation in this community. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further petitions? Mr. Kilabuk.

Petition 3-59 From Pangnirtung About The Community Freezer

MR. KILABUK: Mr. Speaker, I will read the additional requirement coming from Pangnirtung: The requirement for Pangnirtung is an additional freezer or community freezer. The present community freezer is too small to meet the needs of the community. We have been using this community freezer for muktuk, frozen char and a number of other perishable goods and, therefore, this community has discovered that this community freezer is not large enough to meet the requirements. It is therefore important for this community to keep frozen goods in this freezer because the game is getting scarce from year to year and we would be very happy if we could get an additional community freezer for the community. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there anything further under Item 4?

Item 5, reports of standing and special committees.

Item 6, notices of motions.

ITEM NO. 6: NOTICES OF MOTIONS

Mr. Nickerson.

Notice Of Motion 19-59: Gill Net Sizes, Great Slave Lake

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on Thursday, 27th of May, I will introduce a motion dealing with the sizes of gill net in use on Great Slave Lake.

MR. SPEAKER: Further notices of motions? Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice that I will introduce two motions on May 27th. Here are the resolves.

Notice Of Motion 20-59: Recommendations, Carrothers' Commission

The first one is:

NOW THEREFORE, I move that the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories request the Commissioner to provide this house with executive, administrative and technical assistance to

(a) review the social, economic, and political development of the Northwest Territories since the publication of the Carothers' Commission report and

(b) review, in keeping with the recommendation of Dr. Carrothers' Commission the matter of territorial division and

(c) examine the future development of the Northwest Territories over the next ten years including territorial, political, economic and social evolution in relation to the elements of the northern native land claims, large scale petroleum development and the territories' place in Canadian Confederation.

Notice Of Motion 21-59: Brief On Berger Inquiry

The resolve to the second motion I will move tomorrow is:

NOW THEREFORE, I move that the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories request the Commissioner to provide this house with executive, administrative and technical assistance to develop with all reasonable haste a comprehensive brief containing a series of recommendations related to the terms of Mr. Justice Thomas Berger's Mackenzie Valley pipeline Inquiry for presentation to Justice Berger in Yellowknife before he completes his examination and hearing of evidence related to the application for construction of a Mackenzie Valley natural gas pipeline and/or energy corridor.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further notices of motions?

Item 7, motions for the production of papers.

Item 8, motions.

ITEM NO. 8: MOTIONS

It appears we have Motions 12-59 to 18-59 today. Motion 12-59, Mr. Pearson.

Motion 12-59: Sports Hunting Of Polar Bears

MR. PEARSON: Mr. Speaker, Motion 12-59, sports hunting of polar bears:

WHEREAS the sports hunting program of polar bears is not meeting with any great success;

AND WHEREAS Canada is the only country still allowing hunting of the polar bears;

AND WHEREAS great criticism is expressed at the territorial government;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that the sports hunting program of polar bears currently in operation throughout the Northwest Territories, cease forthwith.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Evaluarjuk seconds the motion. Any discussion? Mr. Pearson.

MR. PEARSON: I bring this motion back, Mr. Speaker, with some reluctance after having attempted at previous other sessions to stop this pointless, and what I consider detrimental business. The territorial government has chosen and we the residents have chosen the polar bear as the symbol of the Northwest Territories. Everybody, practically every person around this table has one in his lapel. Canada is now a member of the international organization that recognizes the need for protection of the bear, as do the Americans, the Russians, and in fact all of the Scandinavian countries lying on the Arctic Ocean, and yet Canada still remains the last country to ratify the agreement. Canada is the country which still allows the sports hunting of polar bears to continue. Restrictions are imposed by this government, by this Legislative Assembly on native people, native communities across the Northwest Territories, and that prohibits the number of bears taken traditionally by the native people.

The effect of southern Canadians coming into the North and paying a few dollars and with all their wealth being able to hop on an airplane and fly to a remote community, to pay some native people to take them out and shoot the very symbol of this country, not in what I would consider a fair match of man and beast but a matter that has been shown in photographs where the hunter is taken right up practically to the bear's front door, his gun is pointed for him in the direction of the bear, in most cases they are so feeble and ancient, these great white hunters, they are unable to fire the things for themselves. The Eskimo points the gun for them and the great white hunter then pulls the trigger, hopefully hitting the bear. In many cases that have been documented, bears have been severely wounded by these great white hunters, wherever they come from, bears have been shot in the behind, have attacked the hunting party and have had to be dealt with by the Eskimo hunter himself to save the lives of the people on the trip.

Culture Of The Native People At Stake

In this day and age where the very culture of the native people of the Northwest Territories is at stake, where the very basis of this country, of this northland is being eroded by southern Canadian infringement of all the things that are holy to the Eskimo people, they are gradually being lost, the language is eroding and disappearing. The way of life is disappearing, and now we find southern Canadians coming up and shooting polar bears. I think it is a disgrace, I think it should be stopped and it should be stopped by this Legislative Assembly and this Legislative Assembly can do it. If anybody wants to shoot a polar bear the native people should be the only people allowed to do such a thing. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any further discussion? Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member from South Baffin said this is an old argument that has been before this house in previous sessions. The words are the same but they are confusing and they are just as confusing to Members on this occasion as they were on past occasions. What I mean is that Mr. Pearson draws this picture of the encroaching white man from the South with his cameras and guns taking out the polar bear. We heard as the Deputy Commissioner told us yesterday, out of I think, and I did not total them up, but out of 20 bears, or rather 20 permits, licences issued or granted, the hunters got the bear only ten times or so, or half the number, and in those cases these men hunted with licensed guides, Eskimo guides who are trained in stalking the bear and living off the land.

Taking Decision From Hunters' And Trappers' Associations.

Now, if we support this motion what we are doing is taking away from the local hunters' and trappers' association their right to determine how they wish to use their polar bear quota. At the present time people in Paulatuk and in other communities determined they wanted their options to remain open. That was if they wished to use their permits so that members of their community could take all the bears themselves they would do that. If they wished to set up a situation where they would allow two or three bears to be taken by outsiders, whoever they may be, or from wherever they may be, then it is up to the community and that is the way it should be.

The former Council recognized that the resource, the bear, is a resource belonging to the people who live where that animal lives, and it is those people who should make the decision as to whether or not bears should be taken and how they should be taken and if we pass this motion what we will be doing is taking away from them the option and right to make that decision as is presently the case.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion? Mr. Steen?

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I can not support this motion. The people in my area are in favour of hunting polar bear with big game hunting. They support the people coming in because I think every licence that they receive the community or the trapper gets \$2000 for every bear, every hunt that they make. They do not necessarily get a bear every time but the hunter, or the trapper, or the community receives I believe it is \$2000 for every hunt, so that is regardless of whether he shot a bear or not. As Mr. Butters, the Hon. Member from Inuvik has stated, if we support the motion we are taking away this chance for them to get some extra funds for the trapper. He has a hard time getting funds, white foxes, not trying to make a living entirely on the white fox or seal so any extra money for the trapper or the community is a welcome thing. Therefore, maybe what I should say is that I have spoken to the people of Tuktoyaktuk and Sachs Harbour and Paulatuk and they support sports hunting of polar bear. As Mr. Butters has said, we are not in a position, I do not believe we are in a position to take this right away from the community. Therefore, I can not support the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion? Mr. Lyall.

Option Of The Hunters' And Trappers' Associations

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, just a very small comment that I would like to make. I have been to a couple of hunters' and trappers' association meetings in my constituency and they would like to have the option of whether to take people out from the South and on the comments that both Mr. Steen and Mr. Butters have stated I would not support this motion also.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion? Mr. Evaluarjuk.

MR. EVALUARJUK: Mr. Speaker, I support the motion. As Mr. Pearson said, I do not want it to be connected to all the settlements. I want the settlements to do their individual thinking and do what is best for them. If there was a person from southern Canada coming up here to go to Igloodik and get a polar bear or just to take a picture of a polar bear as I have noticed happen before, I knew that the Igloodik residents never agreed to it. If somebody wanted to go into the other settlements, go to the council and ask their permission first, I think it would be up to the council to decide what to do. It is entirely up to the council of the settlement to decide what they want the people coming from down south to do. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Peter Ernerk.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, in some ways I think the intent of the motion is good but I would also tend to take the view of the previous speakers indicating the fact that I do not think we should take the right away, at least that should not be the intention of the administration, that we should take the right away from the local communities. I know there are a number of sports hunting programs in the Northwest Territories. I think Holman Island is one of them. So far we do not have any sports hunting programs of polar bear in the Keewatin district. We have not had that experience yet but I do believe that one of the things I would tend to take as an approach is to seek the advice of the communities that are affected by this program and see if they feel that this program has not worked to their best interests. I would personally think that would be the best approach.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. Mr. Pearson, do you want to conclude the debate?

MR. PEARSON: I would just like to make some points very clear to my colleagues who feel that this is such a wonderful program and such a benefit to the community and such a fantastic money earner for their so-called constituencies. The total number of bears taken by southern Canadians, according to my figures over the past three years, are nine bears. Nine bears shot by southern Canadians, nine times the native people have sold their birthright for a few pieces of silver.

MR. BUTTERS: Shame!

Criticism Of Conservationists

MR. PEARSON: To the southern Canadian civilization, to the greed of southern Canadians and foreigners who can for a few pieces of silver go into a native community, buy off the rights of those people and go out and shoot polar bear, nine in three years, a total of \$18,000. Big deal! But, for \$18,000 that you are earning it is costing you a hell of a lot more in criticism by every conservationist in Canada, in the United States, Russia, Norway, Sweden and Finland who have criticized Canada for allowing this ridiculous program to continue, the only country in the world -- the Eskimo people I represent are continuously complaining that the quota that is issued to them for polar bear hunting is not big enough and yet the decay is setting in, the erosion of the last vestiges of something which makes the Eskimo people in this country unique, not only their ability, not only their right but their ability to kill a polar bear. There are many millions of people throughout the world who would pay gladly and willingly for the right to go and photograph the bear in his natural habitat, to be taken out with a group of native hunters, to be shown the areas that the bear inhabits, and to photograph -- you can photograph a polar bear one million times and it does not hurt the damn thing but you can only pull the trigger once.

Think very carefully about this, this symbol, it is on most of your lapels, the symbol of the Northwest Territories, the great bear that we splatter across the frozen waste with great big bullets. It is idiotic! Stop it! Cut it out! Preserve the culture, preserve what is left.

MR. SPEAKER: The question being called. On the motion and I will just read the resolved clause: "Now therefore, I move that the sports hunting program of polar bears currently in operation throughout the Northwest Territories, cease forthwith."

Motion 12-59, Defeated

On that motion, the question being called. All in favour? One. Contrary? Six. The motion is defeated.

---Defeated

Motion 13-59, Mr. Nickerson.

Motion 13-59: Rules And Procedures For Boards And Committees Having Judicial Type Powers.

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS there are many boards and committees in the Northwest Territories having judicial and quasi-judicial powers;

AND WHEREAS this house is concerned with the rights of persons appearing before such authorities and is desirous that such authorities conduct their affairs in accordance with the principles of natural justice.

NOW THEREFORE, I move that the administration be requested to bring forth a paper containing recommendations pertaining to certain overriding uniform rules and procedures to be adopted by the authorities having judicial powers.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Butters. Any discussion? Mr. Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker, this motion arises because of discussions which have taken place in the standing committee on legislation, and on a number of occasions we have had to deal with certain types of boards and committees. Examples of these would be maybe in two categories, first boards appointed for governmental purposes and these would normally have members appointed by the Commissioner. Boards of this nature are the Labour Standards Board, hospital boards and Liquor Control Board. The second set of authorities would mainly be such committees as disciplinary committees within professional organizations such as the Bar Association, the dentists and nurses and here generally speaking members of these boards would be selected by the professions with which they were dealing and not by the government. The type of judicial powers we are referring to would be the power to compel the attendance of witnesses, the power to question and examine witnesses under oath, the power to compel the production of evidence and possibly the power of inspection of premises. These are all types of powers and there is a chance that they might be misused. Very often members of these boards and committees are not people well versed in the law, they are laymen and there is always the possibility that they might unknowingly overstep their powers. We are concerned that people appearing before such boards and committees might not get a fair hearing because of this reason and we are also concerned that improper procedure on the part of these boards might nullify their findings in the eyes of a court of appeal.

Guidelines With Rules And Procedures

What we are doing with this motion is requesting that the matter be looked into and that certain uniform rules and procedures be laid down. We are not suggesting that there be one standard set of rules and procedures for every committee, board or authority. What we are trying to say is that there possibly should be a framework or guidelines with rules and procedures fairly uniform governing all cases, and within this framework the individual boards and committees would be able to make their own rules and regulations pertaining to the particular case and the matters they would be dealing with.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any further discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. G. ...

Motion 13-59, Carried

MR. SPEAKER: The question being called. All in favour? Contrary? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Motion 14-59, Mr. Nickerson.

Motion 14-59: Release From Escrow Of Stock In Northrim Mines Ltd. Held By N.W.T. Citizens Who Received Such Stock In Consideration Of Unpaid Wages

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS certain Northwest Territories citizens were employed by Federated Mining Corporation Ltd. (NPL) in 1972 and were not paid wages for the work they performed;

AND WHEREAS under and by virtue of a scheme of arrangement and reconstruction of Federated Mining Corporation Ltd. (NPL) made pursuant to the Companies Act of British Columbia and sanctioned by an order of the Supreme Court of British Columbia the said unpaid workmen received shares in Northrim Mines Ltd. in consideration of the wages owed to them;

AND WHEREAS by virtue of an escrow agreement made between Federated Mining Corporation Ltd. (NPL), Northrim Mines Ltd. and the Crown Trust Company the said shares are held in escrow and can not be released without the consent of both Northrim Mines Ltd. and the Alberta Securities Commission;

AND WHEREAS the Alberta Securities Commission has in writing stated that it would agree to the release from escrow of the said shares should they be requested to do so by Northrim Mines Ltd;

AND WHEREAS the release from escrow of the said shares would not be detrimental to the legitimate affairs of Northrim Mines Ltd.;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories be requested to take positive and immediate action to secure the release from escrow of unpaid --

There would appear to be a typographical error as a line is missing and I would assume it should have read something like this:

--immediate action to secure the release from escrow of the shares in Northrim Mines Ltd. issued in respect of unpaid wages of Northwest Territories citizens and to report to this house at the next session of the Legislative Assembly as to what action he has taken and what the results have been.

MR. SPEAKER: You want the words added after the word "escrow"?

MR. NICKERSON: The full text I gave yesterday to the clerical staff, Mr. Speaker, and I presume they have it somewhere.

Motion Stood Down Temporarily

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I suggest in that case we simply stand the motion down until we can check up what words there are that are missing because I do not think we could deem ourselves to know what they are. Mr. Clerk, would you see, if you can, the original text? Motion 14-59 will be stood down temporarily and going on to Motion 15-59, Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: I think another motion has been a little mixed up but I think that Motion 15-59 is correctly reproduced. Mr. Speaker.

Motion 15-59: Powers Of Municipalities.

WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly through the medium of the Municipal Ordinance has delegated increased powers to Northwest Territories municipalities for self government under their respective municipal bylaws;

AND WHEREAS frequently such intentions and objectives are subverted by the overriding prerogative associated with the Crown's presence and programs in such municipalities;

AND WHEREAS such prerogatives of the Crown are frequently opposed to the efficient management or provision of equitable standards, administration and controls;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that the administration examine this anomaly, particularly in the areas:

- (a) grants in lieu of taxes,
- (b) responsibilities delegated to the Municipal Ordinance and/or other territorial ordinances to the municipalities, which can not be effectively managed or administered owing to conflicts between municipal bylaws and the special constitutional position of crown holdings and interests, and
- (c) recommendation for reducing or overcoming such conflicts when legislating the delegation of powers to the municipalities such as in the Municipal Ordinance, the Dog Ordinance, the Fire Protection Ordinance, etc.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Lafferty. Discussion? Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: While I did not say so in the motion, what I really am asking for here is a paper from the administration which would examine the problem where we have seen a situation develop in the last ten years of very greatly increased powers being granted to the smaller communities and hamlets to manage their own affairs and in many cases in attempting to manage their own affairs they run smack into the Crown.

I have mentioned the first one, the reason for grant in lieu of taxes, I would like some indication of the historical background to this grant in lieu of taxes, how it came about, what the early municipalities traded off with the Crown for this grant, to get some idea of the historical background of this grant in lieu of taxes.

Restrictions On Crown Property

The others I think are self-explanatory. My colleague from the Western Arctic raised a point about the matter of when a dog is running loose in a community, how can you stop it? Also how can you stop it if it is on crown property? The dog, as I understand it, can not be touched as long as it is on crown property so the dog officer is helpless. There is also the situation, sir, with the fire marshal who has been appointed in the community to provide a protective service and a preventative fire service and many times I believe that it is true that this individual can not effect entrance to any crown structures or buildings to determine whether or not the structures and buildings are safe as regards fire prevention but if the alarm rings and that building is on fire you can be damned well sure that the person who has to put it out is that same fire chief and his volunteer fire fighters.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion? Mr. Pearson.

MR. PEARSON: Mr. Speaker, I find this motion rather difficult to understand. The English used in it is a little above me. However, I get the gist of it and I find that it is in conflict with a motion that was made or a recommendation by this Legislative Assembly just recently that a completely new look be taken at local government and the Municipal Ordinance and that it be in effect redrafted and brought back to the house within the next year. I would think at that time this whole matter could be dealt with.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion on Motion 15-59, further discussion? Mr. Butters has the right to conclude the debate. Mr. Butters, do you wish to speak?

MR. BUTTERS: Just to disagree with the Hon. Member. I do not think the motion is in conflict with the previous motion to redraft the Municipal Ordinance but it really complements that ordinance or that motion.

Motion 15-59, Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Question on Motion 15-59. Question being called. All in favour? Six. Down. Contrary?

---Carried

Motion 16-59 apparently has some incorrect typing and we will therefore have to stand down Motion 16-59. Is that correct, Mr. Butters?

MR. BUTTERS: Yes, sir, with your permission.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, do we have back Motion 14-59 correctly typed? Mr. Wah-Shee, you would like to withhold Motion 17-59 for just a few minutes I take it. Motion 18-59, Mr. Stewart.

Motion 18-59: Alteration Of Sitting Hours

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, Motion 18-59:

WHEREAS the 59th session of this Assembly is scheduled to prorogue on Friday, May 28th;

AND WHEREAS much business must still be dealt with;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that the Speaker be empowered to extend -- correction there, it is the wrong word -- the hours of sitting as he deems necessary to conclude the business of the house by Friday if possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The word "intend" in the first line should be "extend", is that correct?

MR. STEWART: That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Members make the necessary correction? Moved by Mr. Stewart. Is there a seconder? Mr. Lyall. Is there any discussion? Mr. Stewart.

MR. STEWART: No, Mr. Speaker.

Motion 18-59, Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any discussion by anyone else? Question. Question being called. All in favour? Down. Contrary? The motion is carried.

---Carried

You do not get a vote, Mr. Slaven. Gentlemen, can we leave motions on the understanding that when the two are reproduced correctly we will come back to them after coffee, shall we? In the meantime we will go on to other items.

---Agreed

Item 9, tabling of documents. Mr. Butters.

ITEM NO. 9: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table Tabled Document 18-59 entitled Local Government Representation in the Northwest Territories, 1976.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further documents to be tabled?

Item 10, first reading of bills.

ITEM NO. 10: FIRST READING OF BILLS

Bill 10-59. The Hon. Arnold McCallum.

First Reading Of Bill 10-59: Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance, No. 1, 1976-77.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 10-59, An Ordinance Respecting Additional Expenditures for the Public Service of the Northwest Territories for the Financial Year Ending the 31st Day of March, 1977, be read for the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Stewart. The question, there is no discussion on first reading. The question. All in favour? Contrary? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Item 11, continuing consideration in committee of the whole of bills, recommendations to Council and other matters.

ITEM NO. 11: CONTINUING CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS, RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL AND OTHER MATTERS

Bill 9-59, the Liquor Ordinance. I would like to suggest, gentlemen that we go into committee of the whole for this and then at 10:30 o'clock we can break for coffee and then go back into formal session after coffee break and we can complete the three motions. Is that agreed?

---Agreed

Legislative Assembly will resolve into committee of the whole for continuing consideration of Bill 9-59, the Liquor Ordinance, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into Committee of the Whole for consideration of Bill 9-59, Liquor Ordinance with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL 9-59, LIQUOR ORDINANCE

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The committee will come to order to continue its discussion on Bill 9-59, An Ordinance to Amend the Liquor Ordinance. When we left off with this bill yesterday I had an indication that Mr. Steen, Mr. Butters and Mr. Pearson wished to speak. So, in that order, Mr. Steen, are you prepared to proceed?

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, it is kind of difficult for me to remember what I was going to say yesterday, so I think I will withdraw at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: I share the Member's difficulty in picking up one's train of thought. I wished though to comment on the aspect of the total prohibition option. My colleague from Great Slave

North argued eloquently as he always does that when communities exercise their local option it should be the full range of options open that is, to them, and that includes the option of total prohibition in a community. But it is that one option that I can not accept responsibility to delegate to a small community. The reason being that I believe that the whole argument with regard to total prohibition is still out. We are still not sure but that total prohibition may be the worst type of medicine we could apply to a small community. It might kill the patient.

I have not examined the ramifications, but with the total prohibition option effective I would see that if I went down to the post office and picked up a parcel that had a bottle in it and a policeman stopped me on the way home and said "What have you got there? Come on in, I want to examine the contents of the package." He could do so and if it were found to be alcohol I would have committed an offense. I could see the possibility of a traveller coming into the community unwittingly carrying a bottle in his bag. I do not know with regard to the wine that the church uses whether that is called alcohol or defined as such under the act and whether it would be prevented from being used in a community even after it has been blessed, or whatever is required. I see the possibility where you have a total prohibition situation in a small community which is a satellite to another community where there is no prohibition, people would establish travelling parties "Let us go to town" and a whole carload of people would take to the highway and have a party in the "wet" community and return in an intoxicated condition and create a terrible accident on the road.

I see, and this is a very real possibility in permitting this option -- for example, if I were a resident in the community where total prohibition were in force and I was illegally drinking a beer and my son was smoking grass and the police entered the house he would take me to jail, arrest me and let my son go because the current attitude towards grass, soft drugs, in the Northwest Territories is that you can use them without being charged for using it. I would fear that we might be substituting one drug which we know a little about for another which we know nothing about and our communities would become a target for everybody who wants to push grass, hash, hard drugs or whatever.

Prohibition Would Open Many Doors

I could see that there would be a very great increase in the use of potions which have an alcohol base, as the Hon. Member from Mackenzie Liard pointed out. Some people like to drink hair spray because they like to smell pretty. You could foresee cases of the stuff being bought and cached away, legally under the ordinance within a person's house. It opens so many doors which I would be afraid of. God knows what exists behind those doors. If I could approve the clause as it exists here I would do so, or could only do so with a type of reservation that the Hon. Member from Mackenzie Liard has suggested. That is for a community which is really dead set on establishing prohibition, going totally dry, that it be on an experimental basis so that if they find out after a period of time that they have created a monster with the legislation that they could request and receive ease from the legislation. Because I do not know what lies in store for the community that goes totally dry and, therefore, because of that one aspect of the whole clause I do not support it as it presently exists.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Clause 7, Mr. Pearson. You are a carryover speaker from yesterday.

MR. PEARSON: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. I was in two conversations at once. I was rather surprised to hear Mr. Butters' views on total prohibition and the fact of local option. If the people in the community wish to have prohibition, then we have to give them that right. The same as Mr. Butters insists that if they want to kill polar bears, they have that right. If they want to bring in white hunters, they have that right, so why the hell should it not apply to liquor? That does not kill polar bears. That kills people. It is called being inconsistent. I think that prohibition if the community so wishes is entirely their decision and any community that so wishes should be given every possible encouragement by this government and this Legislature to do exactly that.

I did not plan to talk about prohibition, Mr. Chairman, but what I would like to do at this time is to present a motion calling for the equalization of prices across the Northwest Territories. I will get it right in a minute. To remove the equalization process that now applies, to allow the prices in the communities to reflect the true cost to that community and I quote from the blue folder that Members have on their desks, "The Philosophy and Objectives for the Availability and Sale of Alcohol." This was produced for the Assembly by the Alcohol and Drug Co-ordinating Council and on the page under the heading "Preventive Measures" which is unnumbered: "The price of alcohol should reflect the concept of encouraging people to drink in controlled environments, therefore it would be wise to reconsider the present pricing policy. Ideally the price to each community, regardless of circumstances, should reflect the real cost plus the standard mark-up. It is not suggested the prices in the southern Northwest Territories outlets should be lowered."

Motion To Remove Equalization Of Liquor Prices

I wish to move that this recommendation be adopted by the administration immediately. This is further to the very strong request made by each individual Member of this Assembly by the co-op federation when it met here last January. Whilst Members are thinking about that, Mr. Chairman, I would also like to elaborate very briefly on a proposal that I made last week with regard to the provision by this government of beer parlours...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Just one moment please. We have a motion on the floor. Basically we have to either speak to the motion...

MR. BUTTERS: On a point of order, sir. Mr. Chairman, on a point of order I suggest that the motion is pertinent under this discussion but it is not pertinent under this section which is clause 7 of the legislation. I would suggest let us complete discussion on clause 7 and then we will go on to Mr. Pearson's motion.

MR. PEARSON: Agreed, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BUTTERS: Under clause 7 I have a short comment.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): If we are going to defer the motion at this time, Mr. Pearson, you have the floor to continue your statement.

Provision of Beer Parlours

MR. PEARSON: I put the motion aside and we will continue with the other item. I proposed an idea, Mr. Chairman, that I think has merit and the more I think of it, the more I think that it may be worth putting up the flagpole and seeing if anybody salutes it. The provision of a beer parlour in a community such as Cape Dorset, for example, a small building, brightly lit, heated, visible, where beer would be available to people of drinking qualifications run by either the administration or the community government itself, providing both beer, coffee, tea, sandwiches and coke so that if the community through plebiscite approves of such a measure, this could be provided in lieu of mail order from the nearest liquor store. It could be, as I say, managed by the community and I think this would go a long way to reduce the tremendous number of unfortunate deaths, particularly in Cape Dorset, which now has a total of nine from drinking methyl hydrate, a very unpleasant death, I might add. There are two or three cases of total blindness and I believe that if a program such as the one I have outlined were established in that community it would go a long way to improving the lot of the people. It would encourage a more civilized approach to drinking as opposed to the present method of

mail order, a case of whiskey arrives on the plane and everybody gets stuck into it and chaos ensues until it is all gone. If the administration were to give this option and make this option available to some communities, or a community, on a test basis, perhaps two or three communities. I do not think that one would be a good enough chance to see whether it would work but a couple of communities I think it would be worth while looking into. That is all I have to say on the matter.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Butters.

Total Prohibition On An Experimental Basis

MR. BUTTERS: Just to say that my honourable colleague from South Baffin was awfully good at talking but no hell at listening. I said that I was not against total prohibition but I made an exclusion. I said that if the committee wished to try prohibition, total prohibition, that it should be done on an experimental basis and it was on that basis that I would as a Member of this Assembly approve the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Clause 7. Mr. Lafferty.

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing here, as I indicated yesterday, with the very lives of people. I am still not convinced that prohibition is the answer, although I indicated yesterday that if need be we should give the right to individual communities to have a dry town or community if they wish. However, going back over my own comments last night and having made several telephone calls, those people to whom I have talked feel that prohibition is not the answer, reconfirming what I have always said. The answer lies somewhere in tighter regulations to control the person who abuses drinking and again I sought legal counsel to introduce a motion but I found that there are provisions under the Criminal Code which can be used. I think personally that the onus to drink or not to drink lies with the individual and if that individual abuses that right, then I think he is actually abusing his privileges and when he begins to abuse, or molest, or induces others to drink while in a state of intoxication or in an intoxicated state and is found drunk in public places causing unnecessary disturbances, then I feel that this man should be hauled off to jail and charged. He is an individual and he is disturbing the majority of people and the rights of others.

Drinking Is An Individual Choice

Just examine things that have been said over the last year and we find that we are proposing to spend substantial sums of money rehabilitating and treating those people who abuse their rights and these people again, as my honourable colleague for Inuvik points out, quoting myself, they will drink mostly anything. Some prefer to drink hair spray, rubbing alcohol and so on and even use drugs. I can not see a Liquor Ordinance. We should have a drug ordinance. I maintain that alcohol is not the problem. For that matter drugs are not the problem. It is the individual himself. You could have a bathtub of it and swim in it but you do not have to drink it. I know many people across Canada and within the Northwest Territories here who are recovered alcoholics and many of these people are prominent in society and they understand very well that you do not have to drink if you do not want to. For that reason alone my argument is that I do not believe in prohibition. It is not the answer.

In the case of northern people which consists primarily of native people who have not been exposed to alcohol or drugs for any length of time and who do not know how to use alcohol there should be tighter controls by those -- directed at those people who do and are aware of using alcohol and inducing others. In this regard and looking at the establishment, the creation of rehabilitation centres, counselling centres, detoxication centres, I tend to view them as meaningless when we allow people to get drunk, to bother people in public places. You can hardly have a comfortable meal or walk around the street unless somebody puts the bite on you and these people should be provided for under the Criminal Code or even the Liquor Ordinance where they should be charged.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Lafferty, we are off schedule. We have passed the hour of coffee. I do not like to interrupt you but there is a possibility you may like to continue at quite great length and if this is the case I would suggest we report progress at this time and we will be coming back to this.

MR. LAFFERTY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Do I have permission of this committee to report progress? Is it agreed?

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: The Legislative Assembly will come to order. Mr. Stewart.

Report of the Committee of the Whole of Bill 9-59, Liquor Ordinance

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been studying Bill 9-59, An Ordinance to Amend the Liquor Ordinance and I wish to report progress at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Legislative Assembly stands recessed for 15 minutes for coffee.

---SHORT RECESS

MR. SPEAKER: This Legislature will come to order, there being a quorum. Returning to Item 8, motions.

REVERT TO ITEM NO. 8: MOTIONS.

Now, the motions that were outstanding were Motion 14-59, Mr. Nickerson, and Motion 16-59, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation control and that is Mr. Butters, and Mr. Wah-Shee's motion, Motion 17-59. Motion 17-59, Mr. Wah-Shee, you will stand down until tomorrow morning I take it.

MR. WAH-SHEE: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 14-59, is that in a form now, Mr. Nickerson, that makes sense?

MR. NICKERSON: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Would you then proceed?

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker, would you wish me just to read out the resolved clause?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

Motion 14-59: Release From Escrow Of Stock In Northrim Mines Ltd. Held By N.W.T. Citizens Who Received Such Stock In Consideration Of Wages

MR. NICKERSON: "NOW THEREFORE, I move that the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories be requested to take positive and immediate action to secure the release from escrow of the shares in Northrim Mines Ltd. issued in respect of unpaid wages of Northwest Territories citizens and to report to this house at the next session of the Legislative Assembly as to what action he has taken and what the results have been."

MR. SPEAKER: Does everyone have that in their book, the corrected one? Everyone it seems does but me. Is there a seconder? Mr. Butters. Any discussion? Mr. Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker, the whole sad and sorry sequence of events has outlined itself in this motion and I do not really want to pursue it too much. Basically what has happened is that people were employed by a small mining company in the Camsell River area and were not able to collect their wages and to cut a long story short they had to take, as consideration for the debt due to them, a certain amount of stock. This is not an uncommon occurrence in the Northwest Territories where people are employed and not able to collect wages and I think that the department of, I guess it is, consumer affairs, Mr. Trent's department are trying to make a real effort to do something about it. In this particular instance the shares are held in escrow pursuant to an escrow agreement which, as far as I can find out was made without the consent and knowledge of the people who received this stock, and I think it would be a very simple matter to get the stock released from escrow so that people could sell it should a certain amount of pressure be brought upon Northrim Mines Ltd.

Co-operation With Government Of Alberta

The Alberta Securities Commission have said that they would willingly consent to the release from escrow and there seems to be no real legitimate reason why Northrim Mines would refuse to ask the Alberta Securities Commission to do this. I think what is required here is just a matter of one or two phone calls from people in the correct positions in this government to their counterparts in the Government of Alberta. It would not require a great deal of work, but it must be made known to the Government of Alberta and the people involved that this government is concerned with this type of thing and it does not like to see what has happened here and would not like to see this same thing happen in future.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any further discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

Motion 14-59, Carried

MR. SPEAKER: The question. The question being called. All in favour? Contrary? The motion is carried.

---Carried.

Motion 16-59. Mr. Butters.

Motion 16-59: CBC Control

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, in the last half hour I received a request by one of the Members for me to circulate sections 14 to 20 of the federal business development Bank Act referred to in the "whereas" clauses. I could do this, sir, but the document is in my room and I would have to get it and have it circulated for tomorrow. If Members would wish this document and I were permitted to raise three motions tomorrow I could do this, sir, otherwise I will proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters, I think that the decision essentially as to whether you proceed today or tomorrow has to be yours based on your assessment of the support that you have today or, on the other hand, may have tomorrow if you delay it until tomorrow. So, it is really up to yourself.

MR. BUTTERS: Thank you, sir, on the basis of your remarks I think I will proceed with the motion as it is presented. The words "CBC control" I do not agree with, I think it would be more like the establishment of advisory committees to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: Excuse me, but you moved the motion and I am not so sure I called for a seconder.

MR. BUTTERS: No, you did not.

MR. SPEAKER: Because we got into a discussion of the correctness of the resolved clause and I do not believe that you even got through the resolve clause, did you?

MR. BUTTERS: No, sir, I did not move the motion or read the "whereas" clauses.

MR. SPEAKER: Would you do that then?

MR. BUTTERS: Yes, sir.

WHEREAS the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is the sole effective medium licensed for broadcasting radio and television signals throughout the Northwest Territories;

AND WHEREAS such licences granted the corporation amounts to a monopoly in, and control over, northern electronic communications;

AND WHEREAS the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is financed, in the main, by the public purse, yet there does not appear to be an effective and available means by where public suggestion, comment and recommendations may be made to the corporation by northerners;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that the Commissioner communicates to the federal minister responsible for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to Wally Firth, MP for the Northwest Territories and to the chairman of the federal standing committee on communications (a) the concern of this Assembly regarding the increasing, all-pervading influence of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in the territories, and (b) our desire that some mechanism be created to allow for input and recommendation from northern people, and (c) that consideration be given to amending the CBC act to include legislation

similar to that contained in the federal business development Bank Act, sections 14 through 20 which in part describes the creation of regional advisory council "which shall from time to time review the results of the activities of the corporation in the region for which the council is established and, through its chairman, may advise and make recommendations to the board regarding the activities of the corporation in that region."

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Lafferty. Any discussion? Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, Members will have noticed the response to the request by I think it was a motion by the Hon. Member from the Western Arctic relative to a suggestion regarding CBC programming and the Anik satellite and we were told very clearly that we have little say in that programming or how it is carried out. This just attempts to have established through legislation under the CBC act, setting up regional advisory councils on communication within the particular area where the radio station has influence and produces programs and broadcasts.

Regional Advisory Councils

For example, I could foresee that there would be an advisory, a regional advisory council in the Frobisher area and if there is a station established in the Keewatin, in the Keewatin area, a station for Yellowknife and for Inuvik, and that these advisory councils, and it is in the act I refer to, sections 14 to 20, which suggests how the council would be developed from a community. These councils would examine problems, examine recommendations, examine criticism made from the community and then would turn these over to both the local station managers and the director of the northern service of CBC. It is an advisory council and would have no control or direction of the CBC. It would in no way diminish the CBC's responsibility to provide objectively the service which it is required to under legislation, but it would I think, set up a mechanism whereby the people of the North could become more a part of CBC programming and the CBC communications activities than they are now, or have been in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any further discussion? Is there any further discussion on the motion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

Motion 16-59, Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The question is being called. All in favour? Contrary? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Now, with the exception of Mr. Wah-Shee's Motion 17-59, which he has asked be deferred until tomorrow those appear to be all the motions for today. Returning therefore to Item 11, continuing consideration in committee of the whole of bills, recommendations to Council and other matters.

REVERT TO ITEM NO. 11: CONTINUING CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS, RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL AND OTHER MATTERS

The Legislative Assembly will resolve into committee of the whole for continuing consideration of Bill 9-59, the Liquor Ordinance with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into Committee of the Whole for consideration of Bill 9-59, Liquor Ordinance with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL 9-59, LIQUOR ORDINANCE

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Committee will come to order to continue its study of Bill 9-59, An Ordinance to Amend the Liquor Ordinance. We are on clause 7 and when we reported progress, the Chair had interrupted Mr. Steen or pardon me, Mr. Lafferty and we would recognize him at this time.

MR. LAFFERTY: I would continue briefly and then close my remarks. As I indicated I feel very strongly that prohibition is not the answer and also I would mention my conversations with several people over the telephone and their viewpoint was very similar. Now, to refresh your memory I have stated in my previous comments that I feel that a person who is that drunk, it should be an offence. Due to my inexperience I do not know whether this

would fit into the Liquor Ordinance or not, and I feel that it should. I think that for the amount of moneys we are prepared to spend in assisting those people who abuse, who become addicts that we should also examine ways and means by which they can be directed to these rehabilitation centres or detoxication centres and so on.

This drinking of alcohol and drunkenness and/or addiction is so complex that it is difficult to deal with without the individual looking at himself. In this instance I feel that we should not direct the kind of legislation which will look at the over-all picture, at a total society, but rather, at individuals. I would move that any prohibition at the local levels be on an experimental basis only not exceeding two years.

MR. PEARSON: Oh!

Prohibition On Experimental Basis

MR. LAFFERTY: Or until maybe even less, for a year. I feel that total prohibition might result in creating more problems and looking at the different communities and the structures in these communities they differ greatly. For instance, Jean Marie River and Trout Lake where there is a lot of drinking is an isolated community way out in the bush and the only way you can get there is by plane and there is a lot of drinking there. These people live entirely differently than the community of Fort Simpson, so to come to some kind of regulation which will result in an equal application across the territories I do not think would work. Rather look at the individual community we are dealing with and if some communities desire prohibition, that should be on an experimental basis only just for a limited time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Mr. Lafferty. Mr. Lyall.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, just a comment of a general nature.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I am sorry, Mr. Lyall. I can not hear you.

MR. LYALL: I beg your pardon, sir. A comment of a general nature, Mr. Chairman. If this piece of legislation does not go through, I just hope that this administration would look at it very strongly, at least giving Pelly Bay a chance to try it out on their own because of the fact that they have asked for it on their own. They feel very strongly that they should prohibit liquor in the settlement because of the fact that this is the only community that I know of in the Central Arctic that does not have the problems that we have in the other communities.

MR. PEARSON: Hear, hear!

MR. LYALL: I should not say it is the only community. Gjoa Haven is another place where you do not see this type of drinking that you see in the other communities. I hope if this piece of legislation is not put forward that they would give Pelly Bay a chance to try this on their own.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Pearson.

MR. PEARSON: I gather that is a motion that is on the floor, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The Chair did not recognize it as such.

Time Limit On Prohibition

MR. PEARSON: I see. The concept in itself is completely in conflict with what this Legislative Assembly is trying to do. The suggestion of Mr. Lafferty's that we allow people to introduce prohibition into their communities but only for a limited period of time, I mean that is utterly idiotic. It is in conflict with the wishes of this Legislative Assembly that we give people in the communities the right to choose what they want. Local option, that is what it means. If we take what Mr. Lafferty suggests, the suggestion that we restrict it after we have done it, it makes absolutely no sense. If people want prohibition, they have prohibition until such time as they do not want prohibition but to say it should be for a year or two years or one year is utterly foolish and in direct conflict with anything that this Assembly has done.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Evaluarjuk.

MR. EVALUARJUK: Mr. Chairman, you have been talking about this for a long time. Are we going to fix it up? The Members here I do not think will fully fix that motion and I talked about it enough to think about it also, to talk about it. I know the settlements and I think they also think that way. If they want to make that I can not fully say about it as I am not the authority. I say what they want me to say to you in the settlements themselves and they should fully do their own thing and I do not think we can do anything about it to really fix it up. The settlements, if they vote for what they want, they should do their own thing. They have a

council and a board of directors for the liquor thing and if they want to order liquor, those who make trouble should not order it and they know that from their council. If they do want to order booze, as I said before, I do not know if I see that liquor is a good thing. It can be used as a bad habit or it can be used for good in the settlements. The settlements should do their own thing.

This ordinance, if we should try and do it ourselves, maybe we can do it. If somebody kills somebody, let us just not wait for something to happen. This ordinance, it seems that it is a bad thing and if anybody is a troublemaker nobody can really fully deal with it or help them. It seems we are just waiting for somebody to kill somebody using alcohol. If somebody makes trouble, even though they do not kill anybody, if they were to imprison them for almost a year or just fine them, if they would stop the liquor I think it would be a lot better than using alcohol.

Problem Of Increasing Fines

If somebody would be fined and make the fine larger, the money can be gone just like that. If we increase the fine for somebody we could hurt a lot of people. If I were to be fined \$2000 and I do not have any money I would be helped by somebody else who did not make any money and I would sort of hurt his feelings by using his own money. You see? Stop this liquor business. I think we should do this ordinance properly. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Clause 7. Are we agreed to clause 7? There is one change in clause 7 where "qualified voters" is to be changed to "persons resident". Agreed to clause 7?

--Agreed

I believe clause 2 at the beginning of the bill was set aside. Does the committee wish to deal with this at this time? Mr. Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, if I remember correctly, clause 2 was referred to the standing committee on legislation who were to look into the prescribed penalties and to recommend changes. As I mentioned at that time the committee will meet tonight and we will have the recommendations ready for tomorrow.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Then I presume that we are ready to report progress on this bill? Hon. David Searle.

Motion That Definition Of "Public Place" Be Tightened

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, in that we are in committee of the whole on the Liquor Ordinance, I would like to make a motion that does not deal with any of the sections in question. It is quite outside the bill. The motion would be that I move that the definition of "public place" in section 2, subsection (20) be tightened to include all lands within municipalities. I would like to speak to that motion in view of the fact that I do not need to have a seconder in committee.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Proceed, Hon. David Searle.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: We are having, in view of the recent amendments to the Liquor Ordinance and in view of the exception in the ordinance that says in effect that places off highways out of the way shall not be public places -- we in Yellowknife are having quite a serious problem with people going to the liquor store, buying cheap wine and then just drinking in the bushes behind and around the residential areas. There are many parents, mothers particularly, whose children are reporting to them that they are being asked to come along and accompany these people and they are very much afraid for their safety. You just have to stand and look out any room in this hotel and see the activity going on on the rocks surrounding here to appreciate what I am saying. There was a petition circulated which ended up in this Legislative Assembly on the subject.

The police say that in view of the reading of the "public place" part of the ordinance they are not able to do anything. I have looked at it and I think it is a simple matter of including land within municipal boundaries as a public place, all land within municipal boundaries with the exception obviously of private homes and then any such activities can simply be enforced by the police having the persons identified who are doing this and having them picked up and incarcerated under the ordinance. That is the reason for the motion. I am not going to propose exact wording. That is for the Legal Advisor if the motion passes, but I think this is what has to start. This new definition of "public place" should come back to the next session of this Legislative Assembly probably in November for enactment. That is really all I feel I want to say about it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to endorse my colleague's concern. This has given us a great deal of trouble in Yellowknife and I would assume it has caused an equal amount of trouble in other communities.

Municipal Boundaries Extend Great Distance

There is one thing however that I would like to bring to the attention of the committee and that is that in Yellowknife, as in other places, the municipal boundary extends a great distance away from the actual built-up part of the city. For instance, the Yellowknife boundary goes up to just south of Vee Lake to the north. It goes as far west as the seismic array and I do not think it would be necessary to include all these areas within the definition of a public place. What I would like to see done, Mr. Chairman, is to give the municipality authority to designate any place within the municipal boundary as a public place.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Hon. David Searle.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I do not disagree with what Mr. Nickerson says and I think we are both concerned with achieving the same result but the question is how do you do it? Do you amend the Liquor Ordinance and delegate the authority or do you change the Liquor Ordinance and change the definition of public place? I do not know. It is really a question for legislative drafting people to consider and it is that question that I would like them to consider and come back with the appropriate amendment, whatever it may be. That is why I did not in drafting my motion attempt to propose a new wording for "public place" because I appreciate that it may not be that section necessarily that needs changing, it may be some

other section. However, we know the sense of what we are trying to achieve and I would suggest we leave it up to Mr. Slaven's section and his legislative drafting people to come back with whatever fits the requirement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I wonder if I could ask a question? I imagine it is not your intent to prohibit the consumption of alcohol on private property, such as in a person's backyard or that sort of thing, that is not the intention I take it?

HON. DAVID SEARLE: No.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): There is a motion on the floor. To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The question being called. All those in favour of the motion? Opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

I believe that Mr. Pearson had indicated that he had a motion of some type he wished to introduce when this legislation was on the floor. Are you ready, Mr. Pearson?

Motion That The Administration Sell Liquor Products At True Actual Cost.

MR. PEARSON: Mr. Chairman, I have a motion that I would like to present to the Assembly for their consideration. Whereas the Legislative Assembly has received requests in the past year from various groups throughout the Northwest Territories; and whereas the alcohol and drug co-ordinating committee recommends that the price of alcohol, regardless of circumstances should reflect the real cost; now therefore I move that the administration be asked to sell its liquor products at the true actual cost, to include freight etc.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I have a motion on the floor. Mr. Legal Advisor as I would understand this motion it does not affect legislation as such but rather policy. Is this correct?

LEGAL ADVISOR (Mr. Slaven): That is correct, Mr. Chairman, section 10 of the ordinance provides that the general manager under the direction of the Commissioner shall determine the classes, varieties and brands of liquor to be kept for sale in liquor stores and the prices to be charged therefor.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): So this then does not deal with legislation but policy. To the motion. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I can not support the motion even though I do not think it would very greatly affect the community of Inuvik if it were implemented providing that the government ensured that all the alcohol products carried into that community were carried by barge and stored over the winter season to meet the demand. I would like to have some indication from our expert witnesses of just what the amount of increase Mr. Pearson is recommending here might be. I would assume without having grounds, without having any evidence to base my remarks on that if liquor were sold in the outlet in Frobisher Bay say now for \$1 per bottle, what he is asking for, if it were implemented, would require that patrons of the liquor outlet in Frobisher Bay could be paying \$1.50 a bottle. That is a guess but I think they could determine, the administration could determine, just what the increase in cost would be to the various people. Some communities in the Central Arctic who in the more distant communities as the Member from Foxe Basin said, can handle liquor in a positive way, I think that their cost would be probably three times as much as they are presently paying. I would like to know, if the motion is approved, that they can identify the individuals and Members who have recommended that liquor receive such a great hike in cost to consumers in these small settlements.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Lyall.

Effect On Small Settlements

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, I can not support this motion because of what I said about the same motion when it appeared before the last session. It seemed to me that even though the rest of the Assembly did not agree with a lot of the motions which come on and on all the time that they keep coming up and I think maybe it would be appropriate for that person to make his motion with the next Assembly Members that get elected. Maybe then he could get some support, but the thing is if I were to back this motion the people in Spence Bay would have to pay about \$19 for a case of beer shipped out of Yellowknife and I do not think that is doing justice to the people in my constituency. I feel that they have just as much right as everybody else to pay \$6 a case and for that reason I can not support this motion.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. To the motion, Mr. Lafferty.

MR. LAFFERTY: Speaking to the motion, Mr. Pearson's remark when referring to my reply, saying idiotic, the same applies here, I think this is an idiotic motion. On the one hand Mr. Pearson says that we must have local control and direction from the local people and I am certain that if we were to go to the local people they would not favour such a move as this. Mr. Pearson has shown me two viewpoints on one hand, and I disagree entirely in looking at the motion and looking at the intent behind it. It is a way to force people to reduce their consumption of alcohol and that is not hardly giving them any right to decide for themselves whether they will drink or not.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): To the motion. Are you ready for the question? Mr. Steen.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, I am just curious as to how the people in Yellowknife here feel, or the Members from Yellowknife, how they feel on this motion because it would tend to lessen the cost of theirs and make it easier for their people and would they tend to have more of a liquor problem and us we would have less of a liquor problem.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Hon. David Searle.

Views Of Member From Yellowknife

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I like to think I do not have a liquor problem but being serious for a moment, this is the sort of motion I suppose if we were just being selfish over here, Mr. Nickerson and I, and maybe I could even speak for the chairman because he is even further south on the highway system where the transportation cost would be less and I suppose we should -- oh and the Hon. Arnold McCallum, he is in the same boat, all of our prices would be cheaper. We from these areas would not be supporting, that is our constituents would not be supporting and subsidizing, if I can use Mr. Pearson's word, we would not be paying the cost of liquor in the higher Arctic areas.

The only problem is, if you look at what Mr. Pearson is looking at, which is this report of the Alcohol and Drug Co-ordinating Council and the pages unfortunately are not numbered but it would be the second page in the recommendation under "Preventive Measures" at the bottom and it says: "The price of alcohol should reflect the concept of encouraging people to drink in controlled environments, therefore it would be wise to reconsider the present pricing policy. Ideally the price to each community, regardless of circumstances, should reflect the real cost plus the standard markup."

And I think that is where Mr. Pearson -- what he was referring to, but what he did not say is the next sentence which says: "It is not suggested the prices in the southern Northwest Territories outlets should be lowered."

Greater Profits For Liquor System

In other words, this recommendation essentially says that for all of the places say on the Arctic coast, or north of the highway system they should pay whatever the actual true cost is and as you said, Mr. Lyall, maybe it will be, this \$18 for a case of beer, but we in the lower southern area should continue to pay whatever we are presently paying because the prices should not be lowered. Now, if that were to happen the only winner out of the whole deal would be the Government of the Northwest Territories who would have vastly increased sums of money and I am sure they would know what to do with them but we would have our liquor system producing even a greater profit. So, getting back to Mr. Steen's question, what do I think from my constituents' point of view, if the price here is not going to be lowered and not going to be raised, it does not particularly bother me from a constituency point of view.

However, thinking of the Northwest Territories as a whole, not just my own constituents, I have always opposed using the pricing as a tool to control liquor consumption. I very much regret to say that if beer is going to cost \$18 a case in Cambridge Bay, and if there are people there who have serious liquor problems, I think those people with serious liquor problems will pay \$18 a case. I think what will happen is that their family will not be as well clothed and their family will not be as well dressed. It is only the people who do not have a liquor problem and should not hence be paying the higher prices who will cease drinking after a certain price. There will come a price where people who are very controlled moderate drinkers will not drink any more because they do not need this stuff anyway. It seems to me, if you price something too high those people will cease to drink but that is no accomplishment because they do not have a problem anyway. The people who have the serious problem for the most part will pay whatever they have to pay to get it and if they can not get it, if you go through with your bill and make the area totally dry then I think they will drink substitutes, they will make it themselves.

Substitutes Will Be Used In Dry Areas

When I was prosecuting we had people who were drinking hair spray in areas where there were no liquor outlets. They would spray it into a glass and gobble it down. At Fort Resolution in a store there, it was a grocery store, but it had its liquor section. You went in, there was this shelf with the brown sugar, the hops, the malt and the Aqua Velva, all conveniently together. Now, gentlemen it is not going to work, you will not make it work by high prices, you will not make it work by trying to make areas dry in my humble view. However, have at it if you want as long as it does not affect Yellowknife. I suppose I should not be that concerned, but all of these things, there is a lot of good authority that says they are not going to work.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): With all due respect Hon. David Searle the motion is not worded in the manner you have interpreted it. You went back to the book and included a section which is not in the motion. The motion merely states to sell its liquor products at its true and actual cost. So, the motion itself as I read it is not to be interpreted in the manner in which you have stated it.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, that may well be the way the motion is stated, but I am anticipating the way it will be interpreted.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. The Deputy Commissioner indicated he wished to speak a while ago. Mr. Deputy Commissioner.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, I think it has pretty well been said. I do not agree entirely with the Hon. David Searle that there is not a relationship between consumption and price. I think there is a relationship. I do not know how strong that relationship is. I appreciate that if something is very cheap there will be more of it used. I think we have all had the occasion perhaps when we have been able to buy liquor on a trip in a tax free situation. There is generally a tendency then to buy a little more than you would if you were paying the regular price for it.

Policy Of The Government

The policy of the government has been to equate in some small measure the price of beverage alcohol with the cost of living. Certainly I think it would be very difficult for the administration to accept a recommendation that would foresee any reduction in price. I think that would be inconsistent. By the same token what is being charged now could be considered as a sort of an average price since it is well known that with the markup the income to the government, the net income is in the neighborhood of \$5 million per year. It is a source of revenue but that is not the important feature. That is not the important feature at all. I think the important feature is that the price be maintained at such a level that people are not encouraged to drink, that they in fact are to some extent discouraged.

Were we to carry out what I believe to be the intent of the motion, it would have some effect in the store at Norman Wells, a very minor effect I should think, a minor effect at Inuvik, perhaps a more major effect at Cambridge Bay and perhaps a more major effect in Rankin Inlet. However, as you will see from the report that has been presented to you, there are virtually no losses being incurred and in fact there is a very high level of mark-up in most cases. In Frobisher Bay there is none for sale anyway, so it does not matter.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Any new speakers to the motion? The Hon. Arnold McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I agreed with Mr. Lyall when it came up in the last session and I think everybody spoke on it and to add more words to it would not serve much of a purpose but nevertheless, in my opinion, I do not think that this is a motion that will serve the purpose for which it is intended. I, as well as the Hon. David Searle, of course, for my constituents would be pleased to note that it will not affect the cost of alcoholic beverages for them but I do not think that it is fair in terms of other areas and I would be opposed to it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Does anybody else wish to speak to the motion who has not spoken? Mr. Pearson.

Liquor Is The Only Product Subsidized

MR. PEARSON: Mr. Chairman, I am alarmed by some of the views I have heard, the most recent one expressed by the Hon. Arnold McCallum. I am alarmed by the views I hear expressed by the Hon. David Searle. I can appreciate that Mr. Lyall voted against it last time and I must admit the motion has not changed very much. The intent of the motion has not changed one bit. The motion basically is to eliminate this very wrong subsidy or equalization, call it what you will, that applies to the provision of one product across the Northwest Territories, one and one only, booze. Mr. Lyall does not mention once that he disagrees with the people in Spence Bay paying exorbitant prices for food, but he objects, as does Hon. David Searle, that the price of beer should be subsidized, it should be low. They should be able to have access to beer. To hell with food and to hell with everything else, but not once during this discussion has anybody mentioned the price of food in those communities and if the people in Spence Bay want to take in a case of milk. A case of beer, subsidize it. No sweat, Jesus, they have got to have the beer!

Now, I do not believe that we can allow this kind of subsidy. It is morally wrong and the Deputy Commissioner has pointed out that there would not be a great cost increase to the communities that he mentioned. He did say that there would be a reasonable increase in prices. In fact the word he used was "major increase." I do not have the figures. We could perhaps get them from him or Mr. Robinson who I see is in the Assembly. My concern is reflected in this report which was produced for us at our insistence, the Northwest Territories Alcohol and Drug Co-ordinating Council is a creature of this Legislative Assembly I understand, a group of people

who we have as experts from across the Northwest Territories, a very fine group of competent people who meet and discuss alcohol problems and produce a paper for us in a very smelly plastic cover.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: It was soaked in wine.

MR. PEARSON: We ignore the thing, completely and utterly ignore it. They have sat for months and gone over this thing and presented a paper to us. I do not know how many Members have read it. I do not know if it has been translated into Inuktitut. It has. I know it says one thing and it makes the recommendation that I think is very pertinent.

Recommendation From The Federation Of Co-ops.

It is very important in light of a recommendation that came from another very august body last year, the federation of co-ops which had a conference here in Yellowknife approximately during the time this Assembly sat and strongly recommended to this Assembly that this subsidy or equalization be dropped. They sent every Member of this Legislative Assembly a letter. It was translated into the native languages and it was made very, very clear. They in fact said that this Legislature should further recommend that the subsidy be taken off the liquor and put onto food. That is a very sound and very good suggestion, subsidize food like they have in Greenland. They equalize the freight rates in Greenland for food. We do it in Canada for liquor.

I am sensible enough to realize that I could not suggest such a thing in my motion because it would smack then of the British North America Act and the fact that this Assembly can not say where the government can spend money or should spend its money. We can recommend but I have left that aspect of the motion out. I think that it is morally wrong for this government to be in the business of subsidizing freight to any person in the Northwest Territories who wants to buy booze and that is all the motion says. That is all the intent of it is and it is made from a recommendation by this organization that we funded at a great cost and we do not heed their recommendations one iota and also to the federation of co-ops who wrote to every Member of the Legislative Assembly last year.

Recorded Vote Requested

If you advocate special prices for booze and not special prices for food, then vote against this motion but if you feel that people should pay for what they get, building materials, food, liquor and every other damned thing, then support this motion. I call for a recorded vote please.

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

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, just a general comment. I think in the first Legislative Assembly session I mentioned or I asked a question of the administration whether they would subsidize food or not and the answer I got from them was that they do not sell food so they do not subsidize food. I think that the motion that Mr. Butters made, the Ministry of Transport motion, was that what it is trying to do is to have the federal government actually subsidize the freight that we are paying on food.

MR. PEARSON: Question. Recorded votes, please.

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

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of Mr. Pearson. I am really getting lost. Is the motion only for booze or for all the other things like food?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The motion as I understand it is to take away not the subsidy because actually it is not a subsidy, the equalization of the cost of liquor in the Northwest Territories and it is only directed to liquor. Mr. Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: That was my point, Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask you if you could repeat the motion in the correct wording. Presumably Mr. Pearson feels it is important enough to request a recorded vote. I think we should have the exact true wording of what the motion really is.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The motion as I have it reads as follows: "Now therefore, I move that the administration be asked to sell its liquor products at the true actual cost to include freight, etc." That is the motion that I have.

MR. NICKERSON: True actual cost?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): "True actual cost to include freight etc."

MR. NICKERSON: Presumably, therefore, there would then be a decrease in the liquor prices because now the costs in all settlements are the same price, are they not?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I would read into it that the southern areas would have a decrease in price, yes.

MR. NICKERSON: And from what Mr. Parker has told us I would assume that would be the case in the other settlements also and we would lose the \$5 million in revenue. We would not make any profit. Is that what the motion would really mean, sir?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): That is a legal-type question and everyone would have their own interpretation but that is the way I would interpret it.

MR. PEARSON: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, would you like to repeat that, please?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The motion as recorded reads: "Now therefore, I move that the administration be asked to sell its liquor products at the true actual cost to include freight, etc."

MR. PEARSON: Right.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Period.

MR. PEARSON: I know what the motion is, I wrote it but I am asking you to tell me what Mr. Nickerson said to you, please. I did not hear what Mr. Nickerson asked.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): If you would listen then possibly Mr. Nickerson could repeat what he said.

Motion Interpreted To Mean Decrease In Prices

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, there is some confusion in my mind. The way this motion is written it would mean to me that liquor prices throughout the whole of the Northwest Territories would be decreased because we are not subsidizing liquor, what we are in effect doing is making less profit in the northern settlements with high transportation costs than the profit we are making in the south. So, what this motion means to me by strict interpretation would be that the liquor prices throughout the whole of the Northwest Territories would be decreased and the Government of the Northwest Territories would undertake not to make any profit at all on the sale of liquor and that is what a strict reading of the motion means and I do not think that is what Mr. Pearson has in mind, and therefore if Mr. Pearson feels it is important enough to ask for a recorded vote on this motion I think he should word the motion in such a way that the meaning is clear and it says exactly what he wants it to say.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, that is what Mr. Nickerson said.

MR. PEARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not agree with Mr. Nickerson's interpretation of the motion. I must admit it is not one of my great motions...

---Laughter

...but I think...

HON. DAVID SEARLE: I think we could have a recorded vote on that.

MR. PEARSON: But I do not think it is as ambiguous as Mr. Nickerson says it is. I think it is clear that the equalization payments would be removed and the price would not go down, the price would most certainly go up, except perhaps I do not think that the liquor commission would likely reduce the prices currently in Yellowknife, Fort Smith, Simpson or anywhere at this end, but they would certainly increase them in the more remote areas. But, if you absolutely insist we could hold it over for a few minutes, Mr. Chairman, so that we can rephrase it if Mr. Nickerson insists. However, the intent of the motion would be exactly the same, semantics aside.

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

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Chairman, could I make a general comment?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I am sorry, I did not get that.

MR. PUDLUK: Can I make a general comment?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Yes.

High Costs In The Far North

MR. PUDLUK: Thank you. I would just like to understand what we are really trying to do right now. Now, I was talking with Mr. Pearson, and I am not sure I understand. But I think I do have it now. However, I can not support this motion because I am from the High Arctic, and it would be a high cost to buy things, or things that come from the South. For instance take Grise Fiord that is the most expensive place to buy anything, from either Yellowknife or Frobisher Bay. I figure that a half a dozen bottles of beer would cost about \$30 if this motion passed. You see, we who live in the North when looking at things in the stores, the things we bring to the North, we should be trying our best to bring prices down as much as possible and not to increase them. That is what I would like to say. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Pearson.

MR. PEARSON: Mr. Chairman, please allow me if you would a moment to try and put this correctly. If a constituent of Mr. Pudluk's in Grise Fiord wrote a letter to the Frobisher Bay liquor store for a bottle of whisky he would pay the price at the liquor store, he would also pay the price of freight for that bottle of booze to Grise Fiord, whatever Nordair or whoever it is flies it in there for. There is no subsidy there at all, and God forbid that there ever will be, or if somebody in Resolute or Repulse Bay orders from Churchill the person who has ordered the freight -- ordered the goods pays the freight on the airline to that community from Churchill, and that is simple. What we are concerned with is the ...

MR. LYALL: Point of privilege, sir.

MR. PEARSON: What we are concerned with...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): One moment. We must answer a point of privilege. Mr. Lyall.

MR. LYALL: I would like to ask Mr. Pearson if there is a liquor outlet in Grise Fiord and if there is no liquor outlet then you would have to order your booze and if there is a liquor outlet then they would be paying the same price that we are paying.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Sorry, you are out of order, Mr. Lyall, that is not a point of privilege it is a question. Mr. Pearson, you may proceed, please.

Explanation Of Freight Costs

MR. PEARSON: I would hope that Members appreciate that if they buy liquor from the Frobisher Bay liquor store they pay the regular Nordair price of freight. If it is to Pangnirtung, or Cape Dorset, or Grise Fiord, or Lake Harbour, but the price of the liquor, landed in the liquor store, in Frobisher Bay, or Churchill, or, I guess there is a beer store in Rankin Inlet, the cost of freight to that community is subsidized, is equalized, call it whatever you want. So, the cost of freight between Frobisher and Grise Fiord would not increase one cent unless Nordair decided to put the price up. The cost of liquor available in the stores will increase, the basic cost of the liquor, and it may even get somewhere around the cost of a quart of milk in Grise Fiord because you know how much that would cost to buy from Montreal and to deliver to Grise Fiord. It would cost you probably more than a bottle of whisky.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Wah-Shee.

MR. WAH-SHEE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a comment on this. Although within my constituency the liquor prices I do not think would be affected by this motion, I do believe that as far as liquor being subsidized is concerned that is something I do not agree with. I agree with the point of view that essential goods should be subsidized like food, and so therefore, I would have to say that I support the motion and it is not because of the fact that I would like to see other areas pay more for their liquor, but based on the principle that other goods should be subsidized which are essential like a case of milk or whatever. I think that as far as liquor is concerned we are all aware that there are a great number of problems in that area and I think probably the government should get out of the liquor business altogether. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The motion: "Now therefore, I move that the administration be asked to sell its liquor products at the true actual cost to include freight, etc." Are you ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The question being called. All of those in favour of the motion?

MR. PEARSON: A recorded vote, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): A recorded vote.

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, if we are to have a recorded vote could we have the motion worded in such a way that it reflects the intention of what Mr. Pearson is getting at?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Pearson has indicated to me that he feels the motion is adequate as it is and wishes to proceed on this basis. A recorded vote. Now, against the motion?

MR. PEARSON: Have you called for the vote yet, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I have.

MR. PEARSON: It is very confusing. Could you do it again?

Motion That The Administration Sell Liquor Products At True Actual Cost, Defeated

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Those in favour of the motion?

MR. PEARSON: I did not hear my name called.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I am sorry. Mr. Wah-Shee, Mr. Evaluarjuk and Mr. Pearson are in favour. Opposed?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Mr. Steen, Mr. Lafferty, Mr. Lyall, Mr. Butters, Hon. Arnold McCallum, Mr. Pudluk, Hon. David Searle and Mr. Nickerson.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The motion is defeated.

---Defeated

Are there any abstentions?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Hon. Peter Ernerk and Mr. Kilabuk.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I am sorry for that oversight. What is this committee's direction with regard to this bill? Shall I report progress?

Motion To Examine The Possibility Of Deleting Section 79(2)

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, just one other point. I have a motion I would like to put before the committee and I will speak to it briefly afterwards and it reads as follows: I move that an examination of the possibility of deleting section 79(2) of the ordinance be made and should this appear to be desirable appropriate amendments to the Liquor Ordinance to be introduced at the next session.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): To the motion? Mr. Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: Section 79(1) of the Liquor Ordinance deals, or is included in the part dealing with public drunkenness and 79(1) says: "No person shall be in an intoxicated condition in a public place." And 79(2) which was put in there in 1970 says: "No prosecution in respect of an offence under subsection (1) shall be instituted except with the approval of the Commissioner."

The idea of possibly deleting section 79(2) would be to enable the RCMP to charge people with public drunkenness and the idea behind this is the same as the idea behind changing the definition of "public place". It is to tighten up on the type of situation we have on the rocks at the back of the Explorer Hotel. I think this matter was discussed in the standing committee on legislation and I think there is a good deal of approval for this being done, not only by Members of this house but also by the administration. Also, when this was looked into I think you would have to look into some very minor changes, wording changes, in section 80 too.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. To the motion? Mr. Butters.

Recommendation Of The Morrow Report

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, while I appreciate the Member's position I think this is a very backward step in the development of liquor legislation. I would suggest that cleaning up the rocks back of the hotel is very adequately done by the provision that has been requested by the Hon. Speaker so anybody therefore could be charged with illegal possession. But, subsection (2) of 79 was, as I recollect it, stems from one of the major recommendations that came out of the Morrow Report on the Administration of Justice in the Northwest Territories. Prior to that time anybody who appeared to be intoxicated or was intoxicated could be hauled off down to the pokey and charged and maybe lodged with the result that I think two things happened. I think a lot of drinking which was public in the open went underground and, because of the heavy workload that could result for a member of the force, possibly some people who should not have got home, got home, with the result that we had a lot more mayhem and assault and violence in the homes.

When Judge Morrow recommended that this restriction be removed from the Liquor Ordinance at that time, he also requested that people found in an intoxicated condition on the streets be lodged overnight in the cells with no charges being laid, that in effect they were put out of action. They were taken off the streets, or, if they had a reputation of being a happy drunk, as a number of people are, they would be permitted to go home. The idea here was that the police could stop these people and could put them in the cells overnight to protect them from themselves or by putting them in the cells overnight may have prevented an assault or a very grievous situation occurring in the home when that drunk got back into the house. I think that to remove this provision would be to develop the situation that existed before the Morrow Report on the Administration of Justice in the Northwest Territories was made public six or seven years ago, ten years ago. I will vote against it and I will vote against removing that section. I do not think it is productive or in any way conducive to ameliorating, or reducing, or diminishing the problem of alcohol abuse or alcohol use in the Northwest Territories.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Butters, as I understand this motion it is to seek advice of the committee, not a directive to change it but rather to check whether or not it should be changed. Is this correct, Mr. Nickerson?

Power Of Discretion To Peace Officer.

MR. NICKERSON: This is correct, Mr. Chairman, that it would allow the legal services people to look into the question and maybe discuss it with the RCMP and that type of thing. In all fairness to Mr. Butters, I think he has a good point but what can happen here is that a peace officer can, depending on the circumstances, should section 79(2) be deleted, he could proceed in either one of two directions. He could proceed under section 79 and lay a charge of being drunk in a public place or he could proceed under section 80 which is the mild approach, so to speak. What we would be doing here is giving the peace officers the power of discretion. I think this is something that they should have. Undoubtedly in most cases, as Mr. Butters suggests, they would proceed under section 80 and take the guy home or lock him up and let him out again.

There are a number of cases where things are so bad that it is necessary to take the culprits out of circulation for a while and I think one good thing that could possibly happen would be to take people who are chronically drunk before a court and allow the court to make a ruling such as a mandatory stay in the detoxication centre. Right now they put them in the detox centre and they are out the next morning back at the same game again. This way it would allow the courts to use a great deal of discretion and to be able to sentence mandatory stays in the detoxication centre or something of that nature. In my opinion that would be very desirable.

Example Of A Prosecution Under Section 79

Right now the hands of the police officers are tied. An instance that occurred in Yellowknife last winter, to the best of my knowledge was the only time the RCMP have gone to the Commissioner to ask for authority to prosecute under section 79. One particular person was drunk continuously throughout the winter and they would lock him up for a few hours and he would be out again. Every night, day after day, week after week, they would pick him up in a snowbank and it is a wonder the guy never got killed. It was just a matter of luck that he did not freeze to death. This happens not only with this one particular person but it happens with a lot of people and for their own protection I think it is necessary that police officers and peace officers should have the discretionary power to deal with them under section 79, although in the majority of cases section 80 should suffice.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. I will read the motion: "I move that an examination of the possibility of deleting subsection 79 (2) of the Liquor Ordinance be made and should this appear to be desirable, an appropriate amendment to the Liquor Ordinance be introduced at the next session." That is the motion. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: I can support the motion made along those lines.

Motion Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Ready for the question? Question being called. All those in favour of the motion? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

What are the instructions of this committee? Should I report progress?

---Agreed

To whom should I report?

MR. NICKERSON: The Deputy Speaker.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I can not be in two places at the same time. Mr. Wah-Shee.

MR. WAH-SHEE: Mr. Chairman, what do you do in a case like this?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I looked toward the door hoping he should appear and he did appear.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Stewart?

Report of the Committee of the Whole of Bill 9-59, Liquor Ordinance

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been studying Bill 9-59, An Ordinance to Amend the Liquor Ordinance and wish to report progress at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Mr. Deputy Commissioner, I understand your wish is that we now go into committee of the whole on Bill 1-59?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Legislative Assembly will resolve into committee of the whole to consider Bill 1-59, the Territorial Hospital Insurance Services Ordinance. Mr. Stewart, are you ready to resume the chair?

MR. STEWART: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into Committee of the Whole for consideration of Bill 1-59, Territorial Hospital Insurance Services Ordinance with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL 1-59, TERRITORIAL HOSPITAL INSURANCE SERVICES ORDINANCE

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The committee will come to order to study Bill 1-59, An Ordinance to Amend the Territorial Hospital Insurance Services Ordinance. The purpose of this bill is to delete provisions of the Territorial Hospital Insurance Services Ordinance that refer to charges to be made directly to patients for in-patient insured services. The Territorial Hospital Insurance Services Board would be increased from three to five members. Any general comments on Bill 1-59? Mr. Legal Advisor, I understand you have a direction.

Explanation Of Changes.

LEGAL ADVISOR (Mr. Slaven): Mr. Chairman, I apologize. The explanatory note re clause 4 is incorrect. The membership, of course, was increased from three to five in June, 1975, by this Assembly. The change here is the Legislative Assembly at that time also stated that the appointments would be made by Commissioner in Council. The change now being made is to have them appointed by the Commissioner. If clause 4 is correct, then the words "not less than five" should not be underlined. At the direction of the Assembly I have filed with the Speaker and copies have been distributed regarding appointments in general. You will recall that advice was that we could not make appointments by Commissioner in Council. The Clerk informs me that the document is Tabled Document 13-59.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Any comments of a general nature on Bill 1-59?

Clause 1, agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 2, residents entitled to insured services. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 3, agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 4, board established. Agreed?

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, in clause 4 the standing committee on legislation recommended that there be a general discussion on appointments made by the Commissioner or the Commissioner in Council or some other kind of designation. This is a problem that is going to recur time and time again. What we have here is a test case so to speak. What we do in this particular instance will undoubtedly affect what we do with a lot of other legislation of a similar nature.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Clause 4, any further discussion? Agreed to clause 4?

---Agreed

Clause 5, agreed?

---Agreed

The bill as amended?

---Agreed

Shall I report that this bill is now ready for third reading?

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Stewart.

Report of the Committee of the Whole of Bill 1-59, Territorial Hospital Insurance Services Ordinance

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been studying Bill 1-59, An Ordinance to Amend the Territorial Hospital Insurance Services Ordinance and wishes to report that this bill is now ready for third reading with one amendment. That is the deletion of underlining the words "not less than five".

MR. SPEAKER: May the Chair have some indication of what the Executive want to deal with next?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, I would recommend to you for your consideration to proceed either with the recommendations to Council at this time or the motions which were referred to committee of the whole.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions? Recommendations? I see. Since there is disagreement, we will take them in the order they appear.

Recommendations to Council 1-59 and 2-59. Mr. Stewart, do you want to continue in the chair or do you want a breather?

MR. STEWART: I would appreciate a breather, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters, would you take Recommendations to Council 1-59 and 2-59?

MR. BUTTERS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: This Legislature will resolve into committee of the whole to consider Recommendations to Council 1-59 and 2-59.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into Committee of the Whole for Recommendations to Council 1-59 and 2-59 with Mr. Butters in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL 1-59 AND 2-59.

Recommendation To Council 1-59: Adoption Of HMCS Mackenzie By The Northwest Territories.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): The committee will come to order. Members who are looking for the specific recommendations will find them in this thin book with the yellow binding. We will proceed to the first recommendation which deals with the adoption of HMCS Mackenzie by the Northwest Territories. The recommendation to Legislative Assembly is contained on pages one and two in the first section.

The recommendation itself is that the administration therefore recommends to the Legislative Assembly that HMCS Mackenzie be adopted by the Northwest Territories. Mr. Deputy Commissioner in view of the fact that it is a recommendation of the administration could you orally provide background.

Background To Idea Of Adopting HMCS Mackenzie

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, I think that the recommendation is fairly complete in itself. The former commander of the Mackenzie visited the Northwest Territories one or two years ago and made this proposal and it seemed like a rather nice idea. If there is to be any financial implication in the spending of any money it then would have to come back to this Council. However, it is not anticipated there would be any expenditures beyond a minimal amount, perhaps the supply of a flag or two and a plaque, that sort of thing.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Have we adopted anything else of like nature or handled anything else in a similar manner previously?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Comments with regard to the administration's recommendation. Any comments of Members? Mr. Nickerson and then Mr. Pearson.

MR. NICKERSON: When we have adopted it can we sell it?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Clever, clever. The Hon. Member from South Baffin.

MR. PEARSON: If we have one called the Mackenzie are we liable to have one called the Baffin or the Eastern Arctic or something very similar very soon. I can not get too choked up about a ship called the Mackenzie.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Thank you, sir. Are there any other comments?

MR. PEARSON: Do we as Members having once adopted this ship would we be adopted by the ship ourselves so that we may travel on it and have at least one cruise per year preferably to the Caribbean or the Mediterranean?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): As an able seaman, probably.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, I certainly think a Member of the Executive should be detailed to investigate and do a dry run -- I should not say a dry run, but a wet run of any such trip. However, with regard to the Eastern Arctic adopting something I think perhaps we could have the proposed territory adopt the new Orion fleet since the name of the new territory as used by Mr. Nickerson, "None-of-it" might be very appropriate, if you use the English side of it in the Orion fleet hassle.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): I realize Members seem to be giving this a rather jocular approval but you must remember we have time to catch up on things but of course every Member is allowed his time to speak. Mr. Lyall.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, I personally would approve of us adopting a ship because of the fact that I went to Sir Alexander Mackenzie in Igloodik.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Any other comments? The Hon. David Searle and then Mr. Steen. Hon. David Searle.

Responsibilities Of Sponsors

HON. DAVID SEARLE: I find it interesting, Mr. Chairman, as it says here that the adopter or sponsor, who I would assume to be the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories or the Government of the Northwest Territories, it says here usually provides certain comforts for the ship's crew such as musical instruments, books, special treats and of course maintains a certain level of communication. Surely we are not serious in peacetime when we talk about that. That is on the first page.

MR. LYALL: Read the next page.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: I realize it says in peacetime that is not as much so but goodness me it seems to me that the Department of National Defence is better able to provide musical instruments, books, special treats, and I wonder what is included in that.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: The rum ration.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Surely, essentially all we are doing is approving of the use of the name I should think and would provide suitable coats of arms, flags and things like that, but as far as the rest of it that has got to be a lot of gilding the lily, is it not? So, on that sort of basis, I am prepared to go along with it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Mr. Steen.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, just a query, I just wanted to know where the ship is, where is it stationed at the present time?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): I believe it is based at Esquimalt at the present moment. Mr. Pearson.

MR. PEARSON: What kind of money are we talking about with all these fancy treats and things for Her Majesty's Royal Canadian Navy? I think it is now called the wet element.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Did you hear the question, Mr. Deputy Commissioner?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: I am sorry, I did not get the question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): The amount of money that may be required to provide treats, etc.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: I think perhaps \$100 per year limit might be something we could consider.

MR. PEARSON: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): There may be some reason for including the income tax for the Northwest Territories in the same folder.

MR. PEARSON: As long as the musical instruments do not exceed a kazoo and a harmonica, or possibly a comb and toilet paper, right. There are schools and day care centres across the Northwest Territories who could also use some sponsoring from this Legislative Assembly.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Thank you, sir. Then, do I have the general support of Members to accept and approve the recommendation of the administration which is to so adopt the HMCS Mackenzie and request that they look around for one called the HMCS Baffin?

MR. PEARSON: Mr. Chairman, I think it should stipulate no more than \$100.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): I think the administration will be examining the debates and will have your proposal. Do I have acceptance of this?

Motion To Add "No More Than \$100 In Any One Fiscal Year".

MR. PEARSON: I would like to amend the proposal so it reads \$100. I move that there be an amendment to it to add "no more than \$100".

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): In any one fiscal year?

MR. PEARSON: In any one fiscal year.

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, instead of stipulating the maximum amount could we not agree at the next October session of the Legislative Assembly to send Mr. Pearson down to the HMCS Mackenzie to give a recitation of speeches one through 296 for the delight of the crew.

MR. PEARSON: With my chain or without it?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): We have a motion --

MR. PEARSON: With a sign on my hat saying "Fool".

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): As I understand it, the motion is that we accept the recommendation made by the administration that stipulates that in any one fiscal year such special treats not to exceed \$100.

MR. PEARSON: I am not sure if the Members are aware of it but the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories is also known as the Admiral of the Fleet of the Northwest Territories and has in fact that as part of his title.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Speaking to the motion, Mr. Stewart.

More Money Needed To Do Job Properly

MR. STEWART: To the motion. With all due respect I can realize that we are in an inflationary period and money is of great concern but in my opinion if you are going to do the job do it properly or do not do it at all and I do not know the \$100 is anywhere near adequate and I think it makes the whole thing a chintzy-type of operation. We either adopt them or we do not adopt them and this is like adopting a baby and saying you are not going to provide diapers for it. I can not agree with that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): I can appreciate your speaking against the motion. Mr. Lafferty.

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, I would agree with Mr. Stewart. I think this type of thing is good for northern people and I would be in favour of adopting it as it is or throw it out. The amount of money that is involved here is not that much.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Mr. Lyall, to the motion.

MR. LYALL: I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Stewart and I think that if you adopt a baby you just do not say you will spend \$100, you will spend whatever you have to.

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

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if Mr. Stewart could repeat what he was saying because I did not hear what he said at the end of his speech.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Would you repeat your remarks, Mr. Stewart?

MR. STEWART: Basically Mr. Chairman, I oppose the motion of Mr. Pearson's on the basis that I do not think that we should put that type of a restriction of \$100. It would appear to me to be like putting strings to the adoption type of thing. If you are going to adopt a ship do it properly or do not do it at all and I think when you restrict the money to \$100 which is an awfully paltry amount in this day and age that really you are half-heartedly doing something. So, I can not at all agree with the motion. I would prefer not to adopt it at all rather than do that.

MR. PUDLUK: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Any further discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

Motion Defeated

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): The question on the motion. All those in favour of Mr. Pearson's motion, would they raise their right hand. None. Against?

---Defeated

Recommendation To Council 1-59 Accepted

It looks like it is unanimous, a unanimous vote of disapproval. So, I take it from Members that the recommendation of the administration is wholeheartedly accepted by this body. Agreed?

---Agreed

Mr. Deputy Commissioner if you would so advise the commanding officer of the HMCS Mackenzie.

Recommendation To Council 2-59: Territorial Income Tax_

Now, may we move on to Recommendation to Council 2-59 and, if Members would permit maybe we could ask Mr. Nickerson to speak to this, to introduce the material contained herein and provide background since he is chairman of this Assembly's revenue and taxation committee.

MR. NICKERSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think on several occasions the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories has made known its view that we should be moving towards a territorial income tax and that we should be undertaking negotiations regarding resource revenue sharing. A number of meetings have been held, meetings of the revenue committee, meetings with various people in administrative positions and things seem to be developing very much along the lines that this Assembly wished them to develop.

With regard to resource revenue sharing, it appears to be largely an administrative matter in that the administration or the government can undertake discussions with their federal counterparts regarding resource revenue sharing and this I believe they are doing and they have said they are doing.

In the matter of taxation, if we wish to proceed with it, which I imagine we do, there would be a number of ordinances to be passed by the Northwest Territories Legislative Assembly, the most important of which undoubtedly will be the income tax ordinance. So, at this time, the administration have deemed it advisable for them to come to the Assembly and make sure that they have the advice of the Legislative Assembly and that they are undertaking the work involved with the approval of the Legislative Assembly. They would not like to get into the situation where they draft up an ordinance and then reject it out of hand. So, in order for them to be able to proceed with what we have requested them to do in the past, it will be necessary for us to approve this recommendation.

Yukon Territorial Income Tax

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Mr. Deputy Commissioner, in view of your knowledge of this matter, is there anything that you wish to add to what the chairman of the revenue committee has said. I notice that the Yukon Council will be establishing a territorial income tax in 1977. Is there anything related to what they are doing, is it similar to what your administration might be developing as to what is going on in the Yukon?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, almost exactly the same. The advantage in going ahead now, if Council is in favour, is that the federal act will only need to be amended once, or can be amended at the same time. It is a simple amendment which deletes references to the Yukon and the Northwest Territories in one section of the Income Tax Act.

We have not yet received certain assurance that the act is going to be amended but it appears very likely and, therefore, if Council takes this action at this session, this can be done at the same time as for the Yukon's.

With regard to the legislation that we would place before you, it is a very standard ordinance. In fact it will be copied practically word for word from the appropriate act that is used in the provinces to establish an income tax and the wording will be practically the same as the one for the Yukon. Therefore drafting of the ordinance presents no problem.

We recommend this to you as an administration very strongly because we think that it is a step in the direction of further local territorial control. In the years to come the amount of money collected as income tax will grow as the country develops and it will tend to reduce the reliance of this area on a deficit grant thereby putting us a step closer to independence, or a degree of independence. I think it is a very important step to take.

No Plans For Increased Taxation

In the initial year or years, it is not the administration's intention to ask Council for an increase in the level of taxation. In other words, it must be well understood that we are not at this time proposing an increase in taxation. We are just proposing a different means of approaching it. It will be the prerogative then of Council in years to come, should it so desire, to use this as an avenue for raising additional revenue, that this avenue will be open to it but that will be very much a decision that Council would have to take.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Thank you very much, sir. Are there any general questions either of Mr. Nickerson or the Deputy Commissioner or general comments?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): The Hon. Arnold McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Just in agreement, sir.

Recommendation To Council 2-59, Accepted

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butters): Do I have the approval of this house that the recommendation as provided by the administration is accepted?

---Agreed

Thank you kindly. I will report the two recommendations to the Speaker with your permission.

---Agreed

Report of the Committee of the Whole of Recommendations To Council 1-59 and 2-59.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been examining Recommendations to Council 1-59 and 2-59 and in both cases have accepted the recommendations of the administration, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Butters. Gentlemen, in view of the fact that it is ten minutes to 1:00 o'clock it would seem appropriate to adjourn. There is a meeting of the Canadian Parliamentary Association, that is our branch, an executive meeting only, in Room 303 at 1:00 p.m. The people you may recall whom you elected to that executive are Mr. Stewart, Mr. Butters, Mr. Wah-Shee, Mr. Steen and Mr. Lafferty and of course there is myself on it, so would those Members please meet at 1:00 o'clock p.m., in Room 303. Lunch is being provided.

Legislative Assembly stands recessed until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

---LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

MR. SPEAKER: Gentlemen, the Legislature will come to order. I believe that just prior to the lunch break we had concluded recommendations to Council 1-59 and 2-59. What is the Executive's wish now?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, it seems in looking at the order paper from the standpoint of this house's Members' priorities perhaps the motions might be one of the highest priorities. In addition, the discussion on the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada land claim might be appropriate some time today because I believe that Mr. Arvaluk is in town and perhaps later today or tomorrow morning would be appropriate for that item.

MR. SPEAKER: I assume, Mr. Parker, we have determined what Mr. Arvaluk's travel plans may be, have we? Mr. Remnant has. This Assembly will resolve into committee of the whole to consider Motions 3-59, 4-59, 5-59 and 9-59 and 10-59. Mr. Evaluarjuk.

MR. EVALUARJUK: Mr. Speaker, concerning the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada perhaps Inuit Tapirisat of Canada officials could present their items if they should be leaving tomorrow. It would have to be today. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Members of the Legislative Assembly, I asked Mr. Remnant to determine for us just exactly what Mr. Arvaluk's travel plans are and once I know that then we can schedule his appearance here before Council. In the meantime I thought we would go on with those motions and once we know his travel plans then we can either hear him later this afternoon or tomorrow morning. Is that acceptable?

---Agreed

Mr. Stewart, do you see any problems with me putting all of the Motions 3-59 to 10-59 in committee of the whole at the same time with you in the chair? Are there any of them there that you would want to speak to?

MR. STEWART: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Legislative Assembly will resolve into committee of the whole for consideration of Motions 3-59, 4-59, and 5-59, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into Committee of the Whole for consideration of Motions 3-59, 4-59 and 5-59, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER MOTIONS 3-59, 4-59 AND 5-59

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The committee will come to order to study Motion 3-59, Sale of Reindeer Meat:

Motion 3-59: Sale of Reindeer Meat

WHEREAS reindeer meat is being sold to cities outside the boundaries of the Northwest Territories;

AND WHEREAS the cost of beef or other meats imported into the Northwest Territories is beyond the reach of most consumers;

AND WHEREAS reindeer meat is the cheapest commercial meat in the Northwest Territories;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that no further reindeer meat be sold outside the Northwest Territories until the requirements for meat of all communities in the Northwest Territories have been met or satisfied.

This was moved by Mr. Steen. Mr. Steen, would you like to kick this committee meeting off?

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The reason I brought this motion forward was that some of the communities in the territories are not being supplied with reindeer meat. Fort McPherson and Arctic Red River have not been approached and I understand that in other areas in the Northwest Territories there is a quota on caribou meat to communities. With that in mind and other reasons such as the reasons the reindeer meat or the reindeer herd was brought

into the territories from Alaska was to help people, mainly native people in the territories but not necessarily confined to the native people. They sell it outside the territories without giving the communities a chance at what the reindeer were brought there for. They were brought here for use of the people of the territories.

As I understand, when the reindeer were turned over to the fellow there who is running the herd, Silas Kangeana, who is in charge of the herd, it used to be the government had the total control over the reindeer and they had tried many ways, giving contracts to outside contractors to run the herd and they developed a number of problems so they decided to sell the herd to Silas, but they kept back ten per cent. In other words, ten per cent of that herd belongs to the federal government. With that in mind you can not call that private enterprise if the government has some control in it. The territorial government, the Economic Development people are the people who are selling this meat in the South. It is not Silas himself. The territorial governments' Economic Development wants to get their money back from the loan that Silas got. They want their money immediately and the faster they can get it -- they can get it faster by selling reindeer meat in large lots. A bigger cheque comes from one or two cities than would come from smaller places in the territories. Listening to the radio yesterday we heard that they are selling the meat outside as a specialty and for kicks. They are selling it for kicks. I do not think that that is the purpose of the herd, what it was supposed to be used for. The herd was supposed to be used for the people in the territories or to create jobs and fresh meat. I think maybe that the Deputy Commissioner, he could probably elaborate a little bit further on what is happening in the department.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Would the administration care to comment, Deputy Commissioner Parker?

Another Point of View

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, the history of the reindeer herd is very much as Mr. Steen has outlined with possibly one exception. I do not believe that there was any ten per cent hold back in ownership retained by the government when the herd was sold to Silas Kangeana. He is the owner of the herd, subject to the fact that he borrowed the money necessary to make the deal and he borrowed the money from the Eskimo Loan Fund. He may have had some grant money. I can not just recall but mostly he borrowed the money to make the deal. He is running the herd and perhaps he is getting some advice from Economic Development but not particularly much.

There is a second business that has been set up in relation to this by Victor and Bertha Allen. I do not think they will mind me using their names because I have named Silas, in Inuvik and they are selling native meats. Basically I believe that they are acting as the retailer for Silas in the reindeer business and it is my understanding that the sale was made in the South was made by the Allens. I would have to get confirmation of that but I am reasonably sure. It is true that the Allens were assisted, that is, from the standpoint of advice in the business by officers of our Department of Economic Development which I think is their proper role. They also set up their business with a loan from the Eskimo Loan Fund. I could not answer the questions that were raised earlier about any waste of the animals when this major sale of meat was made. I would hope that there would not be any but I could not give any guarantees in that regard. The intention is to certainly try and sell the meat where it makes good economic sense, but I think you also have to bear in mind that both Silas Kangeana and the Allens have their livelihood tied up in this business and therefore I think they deserve the right to make a few fairly major sales if they can each year.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Lafferty.

Privately Owned Reindeer

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, my question is directed to the Deputy Commissioner. A question arises in my mind or I understand the comments to me mean that the reindeer are owned privately by these people, or are there any reindeer which are roaming free or wild?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Deputy Commissioner.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, the entire reindeer herd was sold to Silas Kangeana. Now, whether or not they could all be identified or in fact if you could sell or buy a free roaming herd I guess you just have to say "rots of ruck", but that is where it stands. The herd belongs to Silas.

MR. LAFFERTY: Thank you.

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

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, when the decision was made to sell the herd to the people of Tuktoyaktuk and Tuktoyaktuk recommended Silas Kangeana to buy the herd, the agreement with the people of Tuktoyaktuk was that the government would keep ten per cent of the value of the herd so in case something went wrong they would have something to start another herd. So, I think in that sense, I still believe that the federal government still has ten per cent.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Deputy Commissioner, do you have any comment?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, I would have to look into that. I might very well be wrong and Mr. Steen might very well be right and I will be glad to look into that, though.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Deputy Commissioner, if we went on to other motions could you get that information for us this afternoon?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes I certainly can, Mr. Chairman. I am not sure that it will make any real change to the decision or direction that Council may want to give in this matter but I certainly will get the information.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Motion 3-59, are there any further comments? Mr. Pearson.

Restrictions Placed On The Meat

MR. PEARSON: Now, whether the government owns ten per cent of the herd or not has very little bearing on the contents of the motion. The motion is that there be a restriction placed on the meat to be sold outside of the Northwest Territories. In fact, that it be prohibited. I would like to know, in fact I would like the Deputy Commissioner to find out while he is finding out that information whether this man can sell all his meat in the Northwest Territories and make a living by doing so or is he forced to sell it in southern Canada simply because there is not a sufficient market in this area for it? There is no point in us imposing restrictions on people which will cause them great financial hardship to the point where they are forced to go out of business because government has legislated some action which makes life for them unbearable.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Deputy Commissioner.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: I could attempt to find that out for you but I suspect that it is a straight business deal that the meat does not move perhaps as quickly as the two parties would like and when the opportunity for a more major sale came along they sold it. It might be a marketing problem in the other communities, I do not know. I do not know what possibilities exist for setting up outlets. I am not just sure how far advanced that is.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Steen.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, all this motion is asking for -- it is not really a restriction to prevent completely the sale of meat to the outside, it is asking that the communities be given a chance or to have them approached to be sure their needs are satisfied and then they can sell to the South if they want. That is what it says.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Deputy Commissioner.

Meat Should Be Sold First In The North

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: On that basis -- and I think it is a perfectly reasonable request Mr. Steen is making of the administration -- in other words he has softened his actual words here a bit to ask us to see if we can not work with the owners of the business to ensure that the meat is offered first in northern communities so that the northern people can take advantage of it. I think that is a perfectly reasonable request, I think it is something that our officers in Economic Development should turn their attention to and I can promise that if it is the wish of this group that they certainly will do that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Is it agreed?

---Agreed

So, has this committee completed its study of Motion 3-59? Is it agreed?

---Agreed

I direct your attention to Motion 4-59 and this is Deferral of Consideration of Any New Game Ordinance.

Motion 4-59: Deferral Of Consideration Of Any New Game Ordinance

WHEREAS it would appear that the majority of the people of the Northwest Territories do not desire a new Game Ordinance at the present time and indeed are suspicious that any new ordinance might attempt to curtail their traditional rights;

AND WHEREAS hunting and trapping rights are a legitimate area of concern to the indigenous peoples of the Northwest Territories in their land claim negotiations with the federal government;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that no new Game Ordinance or major amendments to the existing one be introduced to this house until native land claims in the Northwest Territories have been settled, or until the January, 1979, session of the Legislative Assembly, whichever is the earlier.

This motion was moved by Mr. Nickerson. Mr. Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to go through the arguments in favour of this motion that I gave the other day. I think most people can remember what they were and to a great extent the motion is self-explanatory. It would seem to me that if a lot of work were put into the drawing up of the new Game Ordinance we might be getting ourselves into the same situation as with the Education Ordinance where the basic principles underlying the legislation are not agreed upon by the Members of the Legislative Assembly and I would not want to see the game department and the legislative people do all this work to no avail and just tie up the Assembly during the time in which it was brought before them.

Game Under Aboriginal Rights

It would seem to me that out of all the things that this Assembly has deferred, mainly on account of negotiations being conducted in respect of the land settlements, game is probably the only one or by far the most reasonable one to defer because obviously that is a matter which does properly come under aboriginal rights. Therefore, what I am looking for mainly by presenting this motion to the Assembly is an idea from them, right now, whether if such an ordinance was presented whether it would be proceeded with or not, I think that if there is any great likelihood that people could not agree to the basic premise behind any new Game Ordinance then we might as well forget it and defer it now before all the work is done. There is one other point to make at this time and that is in reply to Mr. Evaluarjuk's comments when we were discussing this motion previously.

Mr. Evaluarjuk rightly pointed out that it might be necessary between now and the time any new ordinance is brought into being to make changes in quotas for various species of animals, to make minor changes to the ordinance and there is no reason why this should not be done. This motion would not prevent minor amendments to the existing Game Ordinance being made and it would not prevent any changes to the regulations and regulation is where the various quotas are specified. So, I think we can assure Mr. Evaluarjuk that his concerns are taken care of in that respect. I think that should he need further clarification on this point the Legal Advisor would be pleased to advise him as to the difference between the ordinance and the regulations made thereunder.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Does the administration have any comments on this particular motion? Hon. Arnold McCallum.

Protect The Rights Of The Natives

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I think that the members of the game advisory council which in effect are people from all over the North, it is my understanding that there is general agreement among members of this advisory council that there can not be a delay to a passage of a new ordinance while the land claims issues are being discussed. They have agreed to work now towards a new ordinance that protects the rights of the Dene and the Inuit because of the urgent need to cope with the northern development and exploration that is going on.

The division of wildlife, fish and game, have been getting this message as they go from community to community as well. So, I would think in terms of the administration, that we would want to take into consideration the request, or at least the view of the game advisory council. There are eight members on it with representatives from the Metis Association, the Indian Brotherhood, the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, from Committee for Original Peoples Entitlement and the Northwest Territories Outfitters Association. They have in effect said or agreed to work towards this new ordinance and not delay it until the land claims issues have been discussed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, just to say that there may be some misunderstanding of Members with this motion, the same misunderstanding that is associated with the deferment of the political development paper. Although this Assembly deferred it by motion, that it would be brought up in 1978 or 1979, however we could change that and bring it up at this sitting if we wanted to and discuss the political development paper right now. It is just a matter of the Assembly changing its mind under different circumstances. So, all this motion does if it were approved would be to defer in reality any consideration of a Game Ordinance until the end of this session because should something of import arise between now and the October session we would just take the motion of the Assembly to bring it back before Members for approval to do so.

Consultation With Hunters' And Trappers' Associations.

What this motion is saying is that the consultative process that has been going on with the hunters' and trappers' associations in the territories should cease if this motion is passed. The administration would no longer encourage the man that they have hired to carry out these consultations and I think that would be a mistake. I know that the Inuvik body is still expecting him to be returning and discussing with them at length some of the provisions and proposals that are contained in the draft ordinance. I believe that if he showed up tomorrow they would sit with him, so I hate to see that discussion and consultation process discontinued should this motion pass.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Mr. Butters. Mr. Lafferty.

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, my question here is addressed to the Hon. Minister, Mr. McCallum. He left me hanging here with an indecision as to what he is indicating when he speaks of the Dene land claims. It raises a question in my mind whether he is in support of the Dene land claim per se or is he really examining the hunters and trappers who are greatly affected by this ordinance. Going on with my own comments to this motion, I do not know how many of you are aware that there is an annual conference being held by the hunters' and trappers' association shortly. I think it is during the month of June at Hay River. I believe that these people should have sort of a role in the drafting of the new ordinance. It is not only -- this ordinance does not only affect sports hunters and so on but it affects mostly those people who have general hunting licences and those who are trapping for a livelihood and these are the people who constitute the hunters' and trappers' association.

With all due respect to the Hon. Members, I would support this motion simply because I feel that to most people who are not hunting and trapping to leave the present ordinance as it is, rather than going to the general community and seeking or designing such legislation on behalf of the total population, I think it affects only a small group of people who are actively engaged and who are holders of general hunting licences.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Motion 4-59, any further comment? Hon. Arnold McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I had better let Mr. Lafferty down. I do not mean to leave him hanging. I was replying to a question posed from the chair re administration's comments on the motion which I read to be that no new game ordinance or major amendments to the existing one be introduced in this house until native land claims have been settled. I did not speak nor intend to speak of whether I supported Dene land claims or not. I simply said that there is a game advisory council made up of eight people throughout the territories who have been meeting and they have agreed that there can not be any delay in passage of the proposed ordinance while the land claims issues are being discussed. The advisory council agreed that work should begin now toward a new ordinance that protects the rights of Dene and Inuit because of the urgent need to cope with northern exploration and development. The division of fish and wildlife service also recommends against any delay and is in accord with the game advisory council on this for a number of reasons.

Existing Game Ordinance Inadequate

We feel that the existing Game Ordinance is inadequate to cope with the present human activity that is in the North and the majority of these complaints originate from indigenous people. There has been an increase in population and in industrial activity in the Northwest Territories and we would anticipate an even greater rate of increase. It would, therefore, in our opinion be disastrous to delay improvement in laws designed to protect wildlife. The present wildlife ordinance -- I am sorry, the proposed wildlife ordinance we would hope would be better designed to protect the hunting and trapping rights of indigenous people than the present one. The proposed ordinance again hopefully will reflect the wishes of native northerners to the greatest practical extent due to the long period of consultation that will precede its final drafting. Those are administration's comments, Mr. Chairman. I did not mean nor intend to get off on a further tangent such as Mr. Lafferty indicated that I did. If I did to him, I apologize. I did not mean to do that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Hon. David Searle.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, of extending my personal thanks and gratitude to Mr. Nickerson for raising what I think is one of the most important issues that this house has to face between now and the time its life comes to an end and there is a new election and that is how much do you defer? I would hazard a guess and it is only a guess because I have not looked at the statistics, but I rather guess we have deferred more than we have enacted. It seems to me every time we come along to an issue of any importance at all it somehow is worked around to being an essential element in any land claims settlement and we end up deferring it. For my part I think that you can legislate from time to time and satisfy the needs of the people through amendments to legislation and still at the point in time when a land claim settlement is made then put forward further and additional amendments to your Game Ordinance and other legislation which enshrine at that time the terms of any settlement that you know then apply.

The Mark Time Philosophy

What bothers me is the mark time philosophy and mark time is what you do in the army when you stand in one spot and walk. The mark time philosophy that is being developed here to do nothing for fear you will do something wrong. I think if you try and do what is right all the time knowing that if you ever do anything wrong you can always put an amendment in to revoke it and always appreciating that whenever a land claim settlement is made you can then, when you know what its terms and conditions are, enshrine it in legislation. Then it seems to me you are doing that which is honourable and fair and proper both for today and in the future but just to defer everything -- you know, I was suggesting to Mr. Nickerson that we should probably entertain a motion to adjourn this Legislative Assembly until January of 1979.

MR. PEARSON: Agreed.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: And of course along with it forfeit the stipends and indemnities. If you are not going to do any work, do not collect the cheques and come back then and see what has happened in your absence. Really, you know, as humorous a suggestion as that is we must really examine whether that is what we are doing bit by bit by bit.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Lafferty.

Ordinance Affects Those With General Hunting Licences

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the reply of the Hon. Minister. It got my thinking on the ball for a change. The remarks of our Hon. Speaker, I too am in agreement with the fact that we should be doing some work. As I have indicated continuously in this Legislative Assembly in session, I think we are afraid to take action, to be decisive in matters that are of prime importance to people in the North. Nonetheless, I feel very strongly on legislative matters that affect our total population. I feel that the hunters and trappers in the Northwest Territories are not the only indigenous people to the North. Many of them are our fathers and mothers who have decided to take root among the northern people and who are holders of general hunting licences and their descendants are also such people. When I hear comments directed exclusively at indigenous people or aboriginal people, then it creates much fear in my mind as well as much doubt as to the intent of the statements. I think that the Game Ordinance throughout the Northwest Territories is applicable to any person who qualifies to hold and have a general hunting licence and any ordinance will affect those persons who have such licences.

With that view I accept the comments of the Hon. Member for Inuvik, that we could reintroduce any motion almost at any session dealing with items, item by item. I think that is the best approach because it allows us to be flexible enough to give fair treatment and equal treatment to every resident in the North who qualifies to hunt and trap in the Northwest Territories.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Wah-Shee.

Relating Mainly To Native People

MR. WAH-SHEE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a general comment on the proposed motion here. It is my understanding that the native organizations are prepared to have changes made within the Game Ordinance, between now and when the claims are settled. Also, as you are aware, the majority of people who live off the land, hunt and trap and fish primarily are native people. I do believe in equality but I think when you are dealing with a particular ordinance that relates mainly to the native people then there is nothing wrong with making specific reference to the indigenous people of the Northwest Territories. That is not to say that it is discriminatory because when you are dealing with various occupations like the Legal Ordinance, the Teachers' Association Ordinance, plumbers or whatever, then these are various occupations. In this particular case we are dealing primarily with the occupation of native people, and I do agree with the motion as outlined but I think perhaps it should be done with the understanding that changes can take place between now and when land claims are settled, I think that would be the reasonable approach. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): On the basis of the discussion to date, Mr. Nickerson, do you feel you have the feeling of this committee, as it would seem to me that you may wish to withdraw this motion?

MR. NICKERSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, but if I could make one or two comments first. As you are probably aware, the reason why I brought this motion up was not because of any particular strong feeling one way or the other myself, although I must admit that some of my constituents are really concerned about this and do feel that they are threatened. The reason for my bringing it up was to find out what the feeling is amongst Members of the Legislature so we would know how to deal accordingly with this matter. As I said before, the last thing I want to see happen is a new Game Ordinance presented to the Legislative Assembly and then have it ignominiously booted out, the same as happened with the Education Ordinance.

There are two or three points I would like to make in reply to some of the items that Members have brought up. One is that the Hon. Arnold McCallum seems to think that the position of the Metis Association is that they would now be prepared to work with the department in drafting a new ordinance. From correspondence I have had with the Metis Association, admittedly the last exchange between us was several weeks ago, but that was not the position that they then had. The position that they then had, which may have changed now, I do not know, was that they were completely against any new Game Ordinance. In reply to some of the points Mr. Butters brought up he is of course quite correct in saying that we could, today, should we choose to proceed with a political development paper we can, there is nothing stopping us, and I was aware of that

when I brought this motion up. The very point that Mr. Butters was bringing out, the need for a great deal of consultation, that is precisely what I was trying to say. Mr. Chairman, that there should be a great deal of consultation made with not only the official hunters' and trappers' associations, but also with settlement councils, with operators of sports establishments, with organizations such as the Metis Association, with chiefs and band councils, there should be a very wide distribution of information and everybody should be allowed to have a say.

I would strongly recommend, Mr. Chairman, that once a substantially finalized new Game Ordinance has been drafted that efforts be made to have this translated into the various languages, possibly a simplified English language version should be made and distributed and then these be circulated to all interested parties in the Northwest Territories, well in advance of them being presented to this Legislative Assembly, otherwise we will find ourselves in the same position as we did with the Education Ordinance. If this is not done, the same arguments will be used.

Motion 4-59, Withdrawn

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the feelings of the Members, a consensus has come to surface. and with the permission of the seconder of the motion I would withdraw it in that circumstance.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Who was the seconder of the motion?

MR. BUTTERS: May I get one comment in before it disappears?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Yes, Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: I compliment the Member for his excellent summation of what we have discussed with reference to this matter, but I would just like to come back to one thing that has been repeated I think about three or four times during the last hour which I feel is not quite correct and was contained in the Member's term that the Education Ordinance was ignominiously booted out. It was not deferred, it was set aside and I am not quibbling over words, it was set aside so that Members of this house can understand what it is they would be approving, thoroughly understand it, and secondly so we can be sure that every parent or adult in the communities would have an opportunity to realize what is going into the Education Ordinance. Really I do not see us failing to face up to our responsibilities as much as I see us being responsible legislators by setting aside that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Lyall, you were the seconder of Mr. Nickerson's Motion 4-59. He is prepared to withdraw this motion if you as the seconder agree. Are you agreed to withdrawing Motion 4-59?

MR. LYALL: I agree, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. The matter of Motion 4-59 is therefore concluded.

I would direct your attention to Motion 5-59, Amendment to Commissioner's Order 17-76:

Motion 5-59: Amendment To Commissioner's Order 17-76.

WHEREAS a provision of Commissioner's Order 17-76 has aroused a good deal of consternation and complaint and does not appear to have been ordered for any good and valid reason;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this house recommends that provision 3(1) of Commissioner's Order 17-76 be amended by adding after the word 'residents' the following words '...five barren ground caribou, non-residents two barren ground caribou...' in order that the provisions of former paragraph 8(c) of the game regulations not be altered in respect to residents of the Northwest Territories.

This motion was moved by Mr. Nickerson and, Mr. Nickerson, do you wish to speak to this?

MR. NICKERSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. What is at issue here is a regulation change which would restrict the number of caribou taken by people in the Yellowknife area from five and would put it down to two. This has caused a very great deal of complaint amongst my constituents. I have a good deal of correspondence here from various people and because most of the people who this order would affect are people who are not able to read or write too well, I have had a great number of more people coming to see me personally about it. I can assure you that people are very, very concerned over this matter. I think it would be in order for me to read out here a fairly short letter which I sent to the Commissioner when this regulation change was first promulgated, and the letter to Mr. Hodgson reads as follows:

Mr. Nickerson's Letter To The Commissioner

"It came as a complete shock to me to read the enclosed changes in the game regulations which would restrict the caribou kill for resident holders of big game licences in the Yellowknife area to two animals per year. I am surprised that changes in this sensitive area were made without consultation with the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories and equally surprised that no consultation took place with organizations such as the Metis Association. I have checked with your game officials and find that there is no danger of depopulating the caribou herds, and in fact, the number of animals taken by

big game licence holders is insignificant compared to the number taken by holders of general hunting licences. The game department advises that the changes were made to prevent the wastage of meat. Surely the correct way of dealing with this problem would be to enforce the regulations already on the books.

"Although it would be naive to suggest that there is no wastage by big game licence holders, it is nothing to compare with recent excesses at Coppermine or Snowdrift. There seems to be confusion in the game department in thinking that resident big game licence holders are strictly hunting for sport. This is generally not the case. Although there may be certain recreational aspects to hunting, the prime purpose of residents in hunting caribou, which is not really a sport animal, is to secure meat and, in Yellowknife where it is necessary to travel 50 to 100 miles to find the herds it is not practical to go for only two animals. The position of most caribou hunters is presented very well in a recent press editorial in the Yellowknifer, a copy of which I enclose.

"In addition there are a number of my constituents who, although they might not be eligible for general hunting licences have adopted, to a great extent, either through intermarriage or otherwise, the lifestyle of the people who generally do hold such licences and these people would be sorely oppressed by the restrictions you have proposed. Although the actual number of people affected and caribou likely to be taken is very small, and they do not have a strong political voice, I trust you will see fit to protect their interests."

I did, Mr. Chairman, receive, some two months after that letter, a rather lengthy reply from the Commissioner, presumably prepared for his signature by someone in the game department. I really do not want to read it out because it is really quite long and most of it really does not concern this particular question. However, from this letter it would appear that the reason why these restrictions have been imposed is that it is just in order to get people used to the idea of being restricted. Apparently there are an increased number of big game licences being issued and in future it might become necessary to impose restrictions.

Licence Holders Need The Meat

As far as I can see, if these restrictions were just put on people who were hunting for sport, I do not think it would have very much effect at all, you could have just as much fun going out chasing two caribou as you can five. That is not the point at issue at all, the point at issue is that most of the resident holders of big game licences in the Yellowknife area are people who need the meat, and are people such as -- in fact a lot of the native people who have come into this area from Alberta or Saskatchewan and Manitoba and these people would find it very difficult to make a livelihood under the proposed changes. In fact I know they would not keep to the proposed changes, they would be obliged to break the law. Those, Mr. Chairman, are the main points of the argument as I see them.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Mr. Nickerson. Motion 5-59, are there any other comments? Does the administration wish to make any comment relative to Motion 5-59? Is the administration with us, Mr. Minister? Mr. Deputy Commissioner.

Populations Of Animals.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, I understand the very legitimate concerns that Mr. Nickerson has outlined, particularly with regard to those people who have adopted, as he has said, through marriage or just simply adopted the lifestyle of supporting themselves to some extent from a life on the land. However, the experience that our wildlife officers have in the game business is particularly strong and well supported in the matter of caribou. In other words we feel that their count on numbers and so forth is pretty good in that area and in two or three areas they are very, very much concerned with the populations of the animals. So it comes right down to this. Just what are Council's priorities for the protection of these animals? You can shoot them all off, you can protect breeding stock or you can go a step too far. We hope that we are not proposing to go a step too far but we do think that this is a resource and we have taken it from past Councils that it should be a resource basically protected in so far as it is reasonably possible for the native people. In the Arctic Islands there was a very severe winter-induced mortality of caribou there and that is the reason why you do not see any -- am I on the wrong subject?

MR. NICKERSON: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. My motion, the way that I have intended to reword it would not apply to those areas where there are good reasons for such restrictions being put on such as the Arctic Islands. It would refer just to the remaining areas where there are abundant caribou herds.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: I have come to the end of talking about the Arctic Islands anyway. The same thing applies in South Baffin and you may not be talking about South Baffin. I can not discern it from the motion but the same thing applies there. There are more people taking caribou than there are caribou available. The other area is out of Yellowknife and that is where they have about the same concern, that there are not enough animals to go around and that is the reason that they recommend the numbers be cut down. We know that that is not going to save a large number of animals but, as I said, the administration feels that we have to start somewhere. Frankly we would like direction from Council in this area of setting priorities and we would be glad to continue to hear your views.

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

Concern Among Native People.

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Deputy Commissioner's reply and also the direction coming from the officers. I have heard these comments in my own constituency of Fort Liard, Simpson and Providence where there is a lot of concern among the native people who are primarily dependent on wildlife for their meat. A lot of these types of remarks by the native people are that the game officers in my area anyway have responded to it because I was at such a meeting of the hunters' and trappers' association before I came here. I believe we have to have some restrictions on the taking of big game such as caribou, moose and so on. We must have a breeding stock. In some instances there are people who are abusing the privilege of their right to hunt. Seemingly the white community has always kept their nose out of it simply because of rebuttal, fear of rebuttal. Now in the last year or so this concern has been expressed by native people who are hunters and trappers, as Mr. Wah-Shee indicated.

For instance, there are some people who are taking a lot of caribou and a lot of moose but great numbers of these people do not get out to hunt at all unless it is an organized hunt which, as many of you know, are arranged on an annual basis and in these cases the meat is equally distributed. That is good, but what I am concerned about is the person going out and taking more than what he needs. In that sense I would say that we should have control so we do not deteriorate the breeding stock.

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

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, maybe we can offer the Hon. Member from Yellowknife North some reindeer meat. What I wanted to say was that that motion that he has there deals with all of the Northwest Territories as it is written and as I understand it.

MR. NICKERSON: No.

MR. STEEN: It does not say "Yellowknife area" on it, so unless he changes it I will tend to disagree and vote against the motion.

Definition Of Non-Resident

Another point that he brought up was, what is the definition of "non-resident"? A non-resident is somebody who comes into the territories and is not a resident. You could have a lot of these people coming into the territories. If you have a major development and you offer five caribou to each one of them, then you are going to deplete your caribou population. On the question of people marrying into native people from the South, maybe they can bring their wives along to shoot. Bring their wives, how about that, Mr. Nickerson? That is my comment.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Motion 5-59, does anybody else wish to speak before I start on the second round? Mr. Evaluarjuk.

MR. EVALUARJUK: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask if the motion is only directed to the white men or is it to the native people up here? Does it also involve Eskimos? If it is only directed towards Eskimos I will not agree with it. If it is only directed to white men -- thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): As I understand the motion it would only affect those people who are not holders of a general hunting licence.

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, the regulation change applies to holders of big game licences. I do not really like to get into a big discussion on what type of ethnic people hold them and that type of thing. To me that is not really important but if Mr. Evaluarjuk wishes me to do so, I will. Most of the indigenous population of the Northwest Territories and most of the Indians or Eskimos in the Northwest Territories and most but probably not all, but a substantial number of the Metis people will hold general hunting licences, in which case they will not be affected by this.

There may be a few Eskimo people from Quebec or Labrador or some place like that who would not be eligible for a general hunting licence. I am not particularly sure but the people to whom this particular regulation change is causing the most interest and who stand to lose most by it are generally people in the Yellowknife area anyway who usually are Metis people who have come from Alberta or who have come from Saskatchewan or Manitoba. I am sure there are a number of people in this category in Fort Smith and Hay River. These people, because they were not born in the Northwest Territories, are not eligible for a general hunting licence although undoubtedly they would be eligible for the equivalent type of licence had they stayed in Alberta, Manitoba or Saskatchewan. Those are the people who are really concerned about this. There are also a number of more or less 100 per cent white people in this particular area, the southern Great Slave Lake area who were born here and whose families have lived here for several generations and these are also affected. These people are also affected and they generally adopt a very similar lifestyle to the people whom I have mentioned previously. They are the people who would be affected.

No Danger Of Depopulating

In reply to Mr. Steen's comments, I am afraid that when I worded it I did it in a particular fashion to make it very specific and in doing so it would appear that I maybe confused people. The application of this would not be on a territories-wide scale. If you would like to look into the regulations, you will find that it will only apply to certain areas. It certainly will not apply to areas where caribou herds are limited such as Victoria Island which the Deputy Commissioner referred to. It would apply to other areas such as the Yellowknife area where there are abundant caribou herds and there would be no danger of depopulating the herds.

I must point out that in the Yellowknife area, for instance, commercial hunting is encouraged by the government, by the Department of Economic Development. I do not know if it is Economic Development or game but there is a great deal of commercial hunting encouraged and I personally know hunters who just last winter sold in excess of 250 animals. These are obviously people with general hunting licences and this is going on. I feel that the herds can stand it. There is no danger of depopulating the herds and I would really like to see people get out there and do something and make some money.

You know, you can not argue both sides of the coin as the administration are trying to do. On the one hand they are saying there are lots of caribou so that we can engage in these commercial hunting programs and on the other side saying there are not enough so the poor guy because he happens to have been born in Fort Fitzgerald, Alberta, or Fort Chipewyan can not get a licence and he is going to be stuck with two caribou instead of five. Even before, the limit was five, which is you know a reasonable amount. A small family can live on five caribou over the wintertime and there are none in this area in the summertime anyway. What we are asking here is just to keep to that reasonable limit which was imposed before.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Motion 5-59. Mr. Deputy Commissioner?

Hunting Of Barren Ground Caribou

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, it is true that the hunting in the nature that Mr. Nickerson has outlined does not result in the taking of a large number of animals. I would just like to draw one thing to your attention though and that is at the present time the ordinance does not allow non-resident hunting of barren ground caribou and I think it may be just a technical error in his motion. I would wonder if Mr. Nickerson really intended that non-residents should be able to take two caribou because they are not now, and my understanding is, they were not licensed to take them before this change went into effect either.

MR. NICKERSON: As far as non-residents are concerned I would leave that entirely up to the discretion of the game department because as far as I know there are no non-residents in my constituency who are likely to vote for me. I do not mind whether non-residents are restricted from hunting caribou, sport hunting caribou anyway. As far as I know there are very few of them and caribou are not really a sport animal so I do not think it would be any hardship on them.

What I am trying to get at here is that in the Yellowknife area and very similar areas where there are lots of caribou and a number of people in the category to which I have referred, that their quota is to be five each and not limited to two.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Then do I understand that Mr. Nickerson is prepared to strike out that part of his motion that says "non-residents two barren land caribou"?

MR. NICKERSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The seconder of the motion. Mr. Butters, would you agree. I am sorry, Mr. Pudluk seconded this motion of Mr. Nickerson's. Would you agree to striking the words "non-residents two barren land caribou" out?

MR. PUDLUK: I did not understand but I do now.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Do you agree with that removal?

MR. PUDLUK: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Is there any further discussion on Motion 5-59?

Survey To Determine Caribou Population

MR. PEARSON: Just to use the motion as a means to an end we have a similar problem in the Eastern Arctic, an arbitrary decision made by the Commissioner in this case, to restrict the number of caribou that may be taken by non-native people, but done so on information which in my opinion was inaccurate. There has never been a proper survey ever taken in the Eastern Arctic of the game population, or the caribou population. I wonder how they could come to these conclusions and my question is, of the administration, when do you plan to carry out an extensive survey to determine how many caribou live on Baffin Island and other areas?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, I guess as soon as we can get the Hon. Member's approval for an increase in the travel budget.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The ball appears to be in your court.

MR. PEARSON: That is a great answer. Now without any facetious comments, possibly the administration could inform me as to when they do plan to carry out extensive studies of the population of animals that we are supposed to be protecting. We do not know even how many damned things there are.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: I will withdraw the facetious comment. There has been some survey work done two years ago, there was a pretty extensive survey done of South Baffin but I do not believe it went beyond South Baffin. Certainly our game and wildlife officials are anxious to conduct further surveys and I think they have them as a pretty high priority. I am afraid that I can not right now tell you what the likely timing is but these surveys do form a pretty high priority.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Deputy Commissioner, would you also like your chain of office back?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: No.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Motion 5-59. If there are going to be further speakers I would request your permission to report progress to the Speaker as coffee has been ready for the last 25 minutes in error. I believe the Speaker wishes to get on immediately following with somebody from out of town, so we will get off motions.

MR. PEARSON: Can we finish this first?

MR. NICKERSON: I think it would only be five minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Since when is Mr. Lafferty only going to speak for five minutes. I have a list of names here and...

MR. PEARSON: The question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I have two people who indicated that they wished to speak and I would have to grant them that right. Mr. Lafferty is first.

Support For Metis People

MR. LAFFERTY: I have become aware through some of the comments by Mr. Nickerson, of his intent behind the motion and also by the remarks made by the Deputy Commissioner. The idea of many of our native people who are Metis people, and in most instances these people in the provinces are recognized under an act dealing specifically with that ethnic group as Canadian people. In the north they seem to be the most prejudiced, the most oppressed, the most under-privileged and they are excluded by resolutions of native organizations whether they be Metis or otherwise. These people I feel should have some kind of legislative support because they make up a large number of our population in the Mackenzie region.

Offhand I could give you a rough estimate presently as to the non-resident Metis population in the southern Mackenzie area and they make up about 50 per cent of the Metis population in this area, in Yellowknife, Hay River and Fort Simpson. In most instances these people are regarded as local natives, simply because they have lived here for many, many years and some of their children are born here, and many of these people are married to native local women. However, when we come to deal with native rights and so on they are excluded and they are also the low income groups in these communities.

I feel that this should have been brought to our attention earlier in the comments of Mr. Nickerson instead of beating around the bush. We have to do something for these people, as I am quite certain that some of us, representing the southern Mackenzie and in the Delta region are chosen by such people. I think somewhere along in the legislative matters dealing with Game Ordinances and so on I recommend that the administration seriously look at the kind of legislation that would best serve the needs of our most oppressed people in the North.

I think that many of these people in most instances who are regarded as being Indian, by right are being used and exploited by organizations in the North to gain their own means while these people do not receive the benefit of these policies that we are arriving at. There is an injustice being committed here. I indicated to you that I would try my best for any person who is a native, and I mean everyone. We should not get into the hassle of non-resident and resident people without paying close attention to the type of people we are dealing with, who they are. Some of these people have legislative protection at the national level such as the Metis people but they do not have such protection in the North.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Mr. Lafferty. Mr. Steen.

MR. STEEN: I withdraw what I was going to say.

Motion 5-59, Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Is Motion 5-59 then ready for the question. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Do I have permission then of this committee to report progress to the Speaker?

MR. NICKERSON: What about the question?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I thought these motions had to go back into formal session and that this was just a matter of committee work. Can they be approved here?

MR. NICKERSON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I am sorry, I stand corrected. All those in favour of Motion 5-59, a show of hands? Opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

MR. PEARSON: Mr. Chairman, on the motion that was before the committee a few minutes ago, that was withdrawn, was it not?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Yes, that one was withdrawn. Do I have permission then to report progress?

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: The Legislative Assembly will come to order. Mr. Stewart.

Report of the Committee of the Whole of Motions 3-59, 4-59 and 5-59.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, your committee has dealt with Motion 3-59, Sale of Reindeer Meat, in committee, and this motion was carried. Motion 4-59, Deferral of Consideration of Any New Game Ordinance was withdrawn. Motion 5-59, Amendment of Commissioner's Order 17-76, was voted on and carried. The other two motions have not been dealt with.

MR. SPEAKER: Members of the Legislature I propose to recess briefly for coffee and then come back and deal with the item on the order paper, Inuit Tapirisat of Canada Land Claim Proposal, Nunavut, and Tabled Document 15-59, Dr. Ward's Analysis of Nunavut, because we do have for this afternoon Mr. James Arvaluk. You will recall Mr. Pudluk's amendment to the motion asking that he be available and apparently he is. Is that acceptable?

---Agreed

Council stands recessed for 15 minutes for coffee.

---SHORT RECESS

MR. SPEAKER: The Legislature will come to order. Item 11, continuing consideration in committee of the whole on bills, recommendations to Council and other matters and under the heading of "other matters" would be the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada Land Claim Proposal, Nunavut, and Tabled Document 15-59, Dr. Ward's Analysis of Nunavut.

The Legislative Assembly will resolve into committee of the whole for consideration of the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada Land Claim Proposal, Nunavut, and Tabled Document 15-59, Dr. Ward's Analysis of Nunavut with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into Committee of the Whole for consideration of Inuit Tapirisat of Canada and Tabled Document 15-59, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER INUIT TAPIRISAT OF CANADA LAND CLAIM PROPOSAL NUNAVUT AND TABLED DOCUMENT 15-59

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Committee will come to order. This committee is to sit and study the Nunavut proposal, and the report prepared for the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories by Dr. Norman Ward. I understand that Mr. Arvaluk is present. Is it the wish of this committee that Mr. Arvaluk be called? Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Mr. Clerk, would you call Mr. Arvaluk please. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Chairman, John Amagoalik, director of the land claim proposal is here.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): You are asking to call another witness and his name is?

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. John Amagoalik.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Is it agreed that we should call a second witness. I am sorry, I still do not have the name.

MR. PUDLUK: Amagoalik.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Is it the committee's desire that we ask Mr. Arvaluk to give us a basic rundown of the proposal or how do you wish to handle this matter?

Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Mr. Commissioner.

The Part Of Administration

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Chairman and Members of Council, before Mr. Arvaluk and Mr. Amagoalik speak, and before the Council gets into a discussion on this subject, I think perhaps I should explain from the administration's point of view that as the territorial government's point of view, we have been invited by the Minister of Indian Affairs to participate in meetings for clarification with the Inuit Tapirisat and after some discussion with the Minister, the administration, that is myself and Mr. Parker and Mr. Mullins and his staff, but not Mr. Ernerk or Mr. McCallum, have decided to be a part of the departmental discussion and any input that we would have, or anything that we would have to say we would make it through that vehicle. In other words, it would not be made public and therefore, we would not be offering any comments today and we would be more or less bystanders.

Secondly, the study of Dr. Norman Ward, is being funded by the administration, but it has been funded under the authority of Mr. Chrétien who authorized several years ago that Council had, or could employ staff for specific purposes. So this presentation is Council's material and it does not come through the territorial administration or -- the only way the territorial administration receives copies of it is when it is released by the territorial Council.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Arvaluk, would you care to present to this committee your position?

MR. ARVALUK: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether you wish me to speak in English or in Inuktitut. This has to be clarified, whichever you think is most comfortable, especially to the interpreters.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): It is your choice, sir, whichever language you feel most comfortable in. We have translation ability in this chamber so we will take whichever language you decide to speak in.

MR. ARVALUK: Thank you. Respecting the territorial Legislative Assembly, I think it would suit to try to speak English. On short notice I am happy to appear before you in your 59th session of the territorial Legislative Assembly. You know, since the Inuit have devised and agreed to this proposal for the settlement of Inuit lands at the Pond Inlet conference we have met with oil companies, pipeline companies and the mining industry and of course government agencies. It has been my pleasure to speak to you and discuss with you your concerns regarding this proposal so that you may be able to inform your constituencies in a more accurate and acceptable way.

The Inuit Philosophy Of Environmental Protection

You already are aware that your Inuit Members are discussing as to how they can help implement this proposal in their area. It is a responsibility of all northerners, including yourselves, to make the federal government understand the Inuit philosophy of environmental protection, hunting rights and other protection that the Inuit could receive through this land settlement because it is not only in the best interests of the Inuit to make a fair and acceptable settlement. It is also in the best interests of all Canadians because no Canadian has anything to lose through this proposal. It is only that the Inuit including other Canadians has something to gain in terms of respect and admiration of the right direction that Canadian history could take. So, for your benefit, I think the simple, basic goals of the settlements we are trying to achieve are to preserve the Inuit identity and the traditional way of life so far as possible and to enable the Inuit to be equal and meaningful participants in the changing North and in Canadian society. We are trying to achieve fair and reasonable compensation or benefits to the Inuit in exchange for extinguishment of Inuit claims and in a form which serves to better achieve the first two goals that I have mentioned. We are trying to protect and preserve the Arctic ecology and environment.

It is rather difficult, how you can achieve those goals without disturbing or making other Canadians misunderstand as to how you want to achieve those goals that I have mentioned. It is also a responsibility of the federal government to clarify with the Inuit the rights that have not been broken through treaties or surrenders or sale of those rights on the land. We will try to make an attempt to clarify some questions which the Members may wish to ask because it has to be really interpreted so that the actual meaning, the actual objective of the proposal is not mistaken. In the language that is spoken in parliament it is so difficult for us to translate the Inuit philosophy on the Inuit lands, especially hunting rights which are very important to all Inuit. So in this respect we are happy to have received about 15 minutes ago a report prepared by Dr. Ward. We have glanced through it very quickly. However, it became apparent that the report only stated that he does not know. He can not tell you what he feels about the proposal. It is about seven pages saying, "I do not really know". I will then try to make an attempt to explain the idea behind those sections of the proposal if you wish.

The People Who Run Inuit Tapirisat of Canada

MR. AMAGOALIK: If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words. Right at the beginning, right at the front of this document under the section called "Summary" it is very clear what this proposal is trying to do. It states the four basic goals of the settlement as Mr. Arvaluk pointed out and following that, these are the suggested ways that the four goals may be achieved. These are the ways in which the Inuit people feel that these goals can be achieved. I think a lot of times people get the impression that these ideas come from our consultants. They do not. We run our show. The Inuit people run the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada. These are the ideas and suggestions from the communities. They do not come from Ottawa. They come from places like Grise Fiord. - I just want to make that very clear.

I think it would make things a lot more clear in everybody's mind if people just read through the first three pages of the proposal and I think it will become very clear to you what exactly this proposal is trying to do. Mr. Arvaluk can go through each section and explain the principle behind each section. We have gone through this document over and over and over again trying to figure out what the principles of this proposal are and it has become very clear to us in recent months.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Arvaluk, would you like to proceed?

MR. ARVALUK: I can not hear you very well.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Would you like to proceed, please?

MR. ARVALUK: Yes. I think the simplest way of doing this very quickly is to look at the contents. On the very first page it says, "Contents" of this proposal. I do not think I need to, Mr. Chairman, elaborate on the first three items or sections such as interpretation, general matters, eligibility and enrolment. I think we could start from Part 4 on page 14 under the item called "Nunavut". The Nunavut idea is to promote leadership amongst the Inuit and to start giving responsibilities to the Inuit rather than having them receive services and to deal with ideas without their actual implementation. In this respect what we are trying to say is let the Inuit plan their future. If it is going to be difficult, then let them have a difficult time. By creating a new territory it will also be in the best interests of the northerners because it is very difficult to administer a large area, especially with different ethnic backgrounds and at the same time the philosophy of creating Nunavut is to grow so that the political system can grow from the people, not implanted from the South like we have in Yellowknife. I am not saying Yellowknife headquarters is useless. What I am saying is the government system has to grow from the residents.

Hunting, Fishing And Trapping Rights

On the next part, Part 5, hunting rights, we are trying to make a better conservation system in the Nunavut territory because in the federal government, in the Department of Northern Development, it is also responsible to the game regulations on marine mammals and most of the provincial governments have their game departments in the provincial development departments. What we are trying to say is if we could create better hunting, trapping and fishing rights, we may be able to make a good conservation system, a good quota system and at the same time the Inuit living for subsistence use on their lands will be feeling more comfortable rather than afraid of being prosecuted for the laws they do not know. The hunting and trapping rights do not necessarily mean that the Inuit will be able to hunt all they want at any time, as much as they can, whatever species. Inuit have a very good history of conservation system. If that can be incorporated through hunting, trapping and fishing rights systems, then the Inuit feel it can be practical.

Part 7, which deals with Inuit lands, I think this is the most important if the hunting rights will have to be achieved. These 250,000 square miles of land are a very, very small portion of the traditional hunting, trapping and land use and occupancy of the Inuit. The idea behind this, I know Inuit do not agree. They say this is too small, but the idea we are trying to get here is to be able to become participants in Canadian society. If we could obtain 250,000 square miles, even though it is too small, we think that may give us -- and we are not sure yet -- but that might give us enough land to protect and to preserve the ecology and the environment, if the North has to be destroyed. So, in future we will be able to set enough land aside for generations to come.

MR. AMAGOALIK: On the top of page 32 it says the Inuit would be able to select at least 250,000 square miles of land and the important words are "at least". We are guessing that the 250,000 square miles will be the absolute minimum. When it comes to land selection it might turn out that the Inuit need a lot more than 250,000 square miles.

MR. ARVALUK: Under part 7...

MR. AMAGOALIK: While we are still under Inuit land and it might be well to point out that the present day use of the Inuit people in total area is 1.3 million square miles and that includes land and water. The present day use is 1.3 million square miles.

Existing Alienations

MR. ARVALUK: Part 7, "existing alienations" this is where we almost got killed by our own people. However, it says "Subject to sections 702 and 704, any owner of valid oil and gas, coal or mineral rights issued before February 27, 1976, and which provide for rights under or upon Inuit lands will be entitled to continue to enjoy all rights contained in the exploratory licence, permit or lease."

The idea behind this is that we are not necessarily opposed to development, we have been complaining about how it has been handled. Now, at the same time, I do not think it is in the best interests of the Inuit to stop development if the procedure or if the alternatives for the procedure of development can be achieved. However, I think it is only reasonable that when the permit or licence or lease expires, after 15 years or before, I think it is only right that the Inuit and their lands will be able to say if this particular area of land should be developed or not. However, we are giving or providing a section there so that oil companies, mineral companies, will be able to continue even after land settlement is achieved.

Inuit Development Corporation

I do not think I really need to explain about Part 8, the Inuit Development Corporation. However, perhaps it should be emphasized that the Inuit has to have some economic base if they want to be self-sufficient in their own communities. It has been proven over and over again that most of the communities do not have economic control or an economic base. It is becoming rather embarrassing for the able person to be able to have to live on welfare because there is no economic base in the community other than the Hudson's Bay Company, the government, the co-op or the carving industry. So, by creating a new development corporation you will be able to initiate business opportunities that the Inuit can handle, at least on the large scale that the Inuit will be able to participate in at a competitive level of private enterprise system.

Royalties

Now, the royalty system I think is also very important to northerners and that is Part 9. The reason behind the royalty system is that the Inuit are no longer comfortable receiving Canadian income tax payments for their enjoyment of livelihood. The Inuit do not need handouts that the income tax payers of Canada provide. So what we are saying is that we are not prepared to accept a cash settlement before the eyes of the Canadian taxpayers. However, our northern land is going to be developed, if it is economically viable and why should we not benefit from this development through the collection of royalties so that the Inuit Development Corporation could operate, so that better housing programs could be initiated and, at the same time giving more monetary responsibility to the Inuit who have not had it before.

Inuit Social And Economic Program

Now, Part 10, the Inuit social and economic program: "The Government of Canada acknowledges that the health, education, housing and physical standard of living for the Inuit are inadequate as compared to accepted national standards and that it is a common goal of the government and the Inuit to both preserve the Inuit culture and life style within a changing society, yet also afford the Inuit true and meaningful equality of opportunity as Canadians."

In other words, if we could get an Inuit social and economic program on their own initiatives it might be possible for the Inuit to again take responsibilities that they could accept, that these programs such as housing, education are not received by the Inuit for granted, these are Canadian rights, therefore they should be prefaced in a democratic system. Now, if we could make some plans, those Inuit social and economic programs, then we could participate in the Canadian society as much as they do in Alberta, British Columbia and in the other provinces.

Public Lands

Now, Part 11, public lands there will be still a large mass of land and water that would be considered public land under the Canadian government. However, it has been proven to a lot of communities that the administration of these lands have not been managed properly. For example,

Bathurst Island, the traditional hunting ground of the Inuit people, today there are four caribou left. The Tuktoyaktuk area, there have been witnesses that dead whitefish have been floating to the surface. So, what we are saying in this system, in this idea of our system is to create land use planning and management commissions that can be constituted from all interested parties, not just from the bureaucrats in Ottawa. The 13 members of the board of directors of the Land Use Planning and Management Commission would consist of the Canadian government, the Council of the Nunavut government, the national environmental and conservation associations in Canada and from the Inuit Tapirisat. This is the only way that a fair input can be received and the fair management of land can be achieved because it would consist of all interested groups as much as there are Members here from different interested groups.

What we are saying under the "public lands" part is even if there were no Inuit land claims settlement this idea of public land should be initiated. So if there are any questions Mr. Chairman I will attempt to answer them but otherwise I will stop there.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Mr. Arvaluk. Are there any questions?

---Applause

Mr. Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank on behalf of us all Mr. Arvaluk for his comments and his summary of the proposal. As you are probably aware, Mr. Chairman, I personally have a great many disagreements with the proposals but they do not really include those things that Mr. Arvaluk has said already. His summary now and the summary contained in the proposal are generally all motherhood issues with which everyone would agree, and his aims and objectives are very much a reiteration of the aims and objectives of this government.

Proposed Social System, Economic And Political System

I have a number of comments and maybe I could make one now and if no one else, or after everyone else has had their say I perhaps will have one or two more comments.

Mr. Arvaluk, when I read the details of your proposal I find it very frightening and the reason for this is because I am very, very concerned with the liberty and freedom of the people who live in what may well become Nunavut. At this moment specifically I am thinking of the Inuit people. In going through the details of your proposal, sir, I find that it would be the intention to impose a very rigid and monolithic system of economic and political controls on the people of Nunavut, especially the Inuit people. I have been drawing all kinds of little diagrams of the various organizations which would control the lives of the people there and I find that it would be very possible for just a few people at head office, so to speak, to control the lives of just about everybody living in Nunavut. Your proposed economic and political system, or social system are all interwoven and I can see the possibility that just a few people might be able to control the whole thing. It is my understanding that at present we have capable people and people who can be relied upon to have the interests of just about everybody at heart but I think in future this might not possibly be the case and such a system would invite interference.

My concerns are really that the flow of money always comes downward from the top, and the people at head office would control the money. They would collect royalties, for instance, which would presumably be the biggest source of revenue to the Inuit Tapirisat and the Inuit Development Corporation and royalties, leases etc., etc., do not accrue to the community development corporation at the low level, they accrue to the organizations at the peak of the pyramid and then these would be able to control which each individual community corporation was able to do.

Similarly I note that in your land selection process, head office or Inuit Tapirisat will negotiate with the government for the various lots of land and then they will dictate to the local communities which lots are to be placed under their jurisdiction. Actually it is not their jurisdiction because head office would still retain a very, very great interest in what was able to be done on these lands.

These are matters of great concern to me. If you could say anything that would help to dispel some of my fears, I would be most pleased to hear it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Would either of you like to field that question?

Explanation Of The Monetary System

MR. ARVALUK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps I would like to clarify the domination over the monetary system by the Inuit Development Corporation which has just been indicated. If I recall, during the annual conferences we have talked about these ideas, how everybody was Tuktoyaktuk Inuit who refused to have national, rather, a royalty system collection because the Tuktoyaktuk area is a rich area as far as non-renewable resources are concerned, the thinking is if they do that what would happen to Repulse Bay? Would they always be poor just simply because they do not have any natural resources? In that respect what we are saying is the Inuit Development Corporation will administer funding and distribute these funds to the local corporations, community corporations. The community corporations are the bodies that will be able to make decisions as to what they do with that revenue in their own community. The Inuit Development Corporation has no control over those. The Inuit Development Corporation is

responsible only for the collection and distribution of these fundings.

MR. AMAGOALIK: I think the system which has been suggested here adopts a very important part of the Inuit culture and that is the concept of sharing. No community wants to get all the benefits while others suffer. That is the idea behind this sharing philosophy.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you.

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to monopolize the conversation at all but maybe while other Members are thinking of some questions I could ask another one. I am concerned about what is going to be the role of the government of Nunavut under this proposal. I see from the submission that the Inuit social and economic fund, which will be financed mainly from grants and non-interest bearing loans from the Government of Canada, will be responsible for housing, health and food, transportation, education, communications, marketing of fur and other similar types of resources, administering hunting and trapping. There are a number of other various councils and commissions to be set up which would undertake nearly all of the work generally undertaken by the present territorial government or what might become the territorial government of Nunavut.

Government Of Nunavut.

I for one am unable to see any real reason for having a government of Nunavut. Undoubtedly there will still be a need for the presence of the federal government but everything else will presumably be done by one of the Inuit organizations and maybe we could have some explanation as to what would be left for the government of Nunavut to do, especially seeing that all the royalties and all the revenues would accrue to the Inuit Tapirisat or other organizations or the federal government and the government of Nunavut would have no source of money whatever.

MR. AMAGOALIK: First of all on the role of the government, once that government is formed that government can decide what it wants to do. We can not tell it what it has to do. We will make suggestions as to how the government should be. We will be going to the communities, we will be going to the people. The people will decide what the government will do. The Inuit Tapirisat of Canada will not tell the government what it will do. The government will decide, the people will decide.

On the social economics program we all know that the Department of Economic Development and the Department of Social Development can not handle the heavy responsibilities they have. They try, but because of funding restrictions they are unable to achieve all the goals that they set out to do, so this social and economic program is a supplementary program to the government on top of the government programs. We all know that housing is insufficient in the North. This is something that we are suggesting could make the necessary changes a little faster.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I can congratulate both gentlemen appearing with us at this time on their very complete presentation of their objectives, I certainly agree with my colleague from Yellowknife North that with one's eyes closed listening to the comments being made one could almost believe that they were hearing the Member on one's left or the Member on one's right outlining what are the objectives that we see for the people of the North, all the people of the North. Certainly we agree wholeheartedly I think with the objectives that have been presented to us this afternoon. I likewise congratulate Mr. Arvaluk on his recent election victory in Tuktoyaktuk as continuing President of the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, I think serving his second or third term on that organization now.

Land Sharing Proposal

My question, sir, is relative to a comment he made just recently in Yellowknife when he addressed the Northwest Territories Chamber of Mines and I will just quote in part to give him an opportunity to remember the phraseology, the way he worded the statement in his speech. He said "You will notice I refer to it as a land sharing proposal, not a land claim. As we see it we are not claiming anything. Rather, we are offering to share with the rest of Canada what we already own by virtue of unbroken occupancy and use over the centuries" and it is in this area of the attitude of the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada to this concept of ownership as a result of occupancy over the centuries. Am I correct in believing that when the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada negotiates with the Government of Canada do they feel that there are two sovereign entities talking back and forth? That is, that the Inuit entity, if I can explain myself, and the Government of Canada, and that there is, over this negotiating table, no roof where there is the Crown, the Crown having overriding control and the last say?

Why I say this is that I am quite sure both gentlemen are familiar with Judge Morrow's caveat decision. Though I am no legal expert, it seemed to me that the Morrow decision which I believe is the first in Canada to recognize the existence of aboriginal rights, seemed to recognize also the overriding control and responsibility of the Crown, that is, the Government of Canada and that really when Dene people negotiate in Judge Morrow's definition, they would be negotiating under the umbrella of the Crown and not as two sovereign entities. I do not know if I make myself clear but how do Mr. Arvaluk and Mr. Amagoalik see the negotiation proceedings now taking place between the Government of Canada and the Inuit?

MR. ARVALUK: Mr. Chairman, as we indicated in our Nunavut proposal, it is a proposal for the settlement of Inuit lands in the Northwest Territories. What we are saying is the government has a right to the land in Canada as much as the Inuit have the right to the land in Canada. In other words, those two nations have not settled or made an agreement, legal agreement in their history to settle these lands, so it becomes very important that both the federal government and the Inuit recognize that this is a good argument but we recognize at the same time the Canadian government can do anything through acts of parliament. There is no act of parliament stating that the Inuit do not own these lands, yet there is no act of parliament saying the Inuit own these lands.

The Responsibility Of Government.

Mr. Chairman, if I may I would like to re-emphasize what John Amagoalik has said and the answer regarding the government of Nunavut, what they will do. I think what we are trying to say is government, any government in any province or territory should act as a government, not as a corporate structure. They still will be responsible to legislate laws, ordinances and regulations for the public use. This is the government responsibility. I do not think the government's responsibility is to buy houses and to sell the houses and buy trains and sell trains or have commercial passenger flights, etc. These are the private entities. The government of Nunavut will still have lots to do, to legislate and to regulate their territory.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I wonder if the Chair might be permitted a question. I understand that you recognize the government of Nunavut to do the legislation. However, I was wondering. We know here that you can legislate all you wish but certainly you must have money to carry forward the direction that you wish to go. Where would the government of Nunavut obtain its money other than through the federal treasury?

MR. ARVALUK: I am just looking through the actual funding sources that you are asking about. At section 407 "The Government of Canada will continue to provide the same kind of support to the government of Nunavut, with the necessary changes to account for population and geographical differences, as is given to the Governments of the Northwest Territories and Yukon Territory, such financial support to Nunavut to be according to the same criteria for those governments for the said other territories, unless the government of Nunavut, after it has been legally constituted and fully operational, and the federal government agree on another basis for determining these funds."

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Then basically what you are saying is that royalties and profits from your corporate body would not be used for governing purposes or to supply housing or these type of things for the people, but would be used for other purposes, is this correct?

Political Development Of Nunavut Territory

MR. ARVALUK: Mr. Chairman, I think you are confused between Inuit rights and the political development of Nunavut territory. What we are saying is let us collect the royalty system for the compensation of the land we are giving up. This has to be very clear, or made very clear. The Nunavut government is for everybody who is a Canadian citizen or who is not in jail for example. Anybody who wants to live in the Nunavut territory is entitled, as well as any other citizen who is in that Nunavut territory. So, it would be up to them to find funding to run this government, but when we are talking about royalty systems, when we are talking about social economic programs, the Nunavut Development Corporation, these are the compensations for the lands and waters we will be giving up. These are compensations.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): One final question and then the Chair will recognize another speaker. I notice that you used the depth of 1500 feet as relative to the depth of the surface rights. Is there any particular reason for 1500 feet to be used?

MR. ARVALUK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, 1500 feet vertically below the surface of the land. The idea behind this is that there is no oil or gas above 1500 feet, but at the same time there are enough precious minerals that the Inuit may be interested in such as gold placer or soapstone or other small mines that could be initiated by the Inuit through their Inuit Development Corporation. But, we did not want to be unfair to the oil companies, if we made it below 1500 feet.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Hon. Peter Ernerk?

Definition For Non-Inuit

HON. PETER ERNERK: Sorry, Mr. Chairman, I got excited here. Mr. Chairman, firstly, looking at the interpretation, I wonder if Mr. Arvaluk could tell me why first, and I will have other questions after this, but why there is no definition for non-Inuit, unless I missed it?

MR. ARVALUK: That is a very good question. I think the precise answer to that is that we are talking in terms of positive proposals rather than -- it does not indicate what we will not do, it indicates what we will. So, if we do not mention anything at all about non-Inuit they would automatically be able to participate unless we say "Inuit". If there is no mention of Inuit then they can participate, rather than non-Inuit will also be able to participate. Is that clear?

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, going over to page 10 under eligibility and enrolment it says: "For the purpose of this agreement 'Inuk' means a person (a) who is (i) a citizen of Canada; (ii) alive as of the date of the final agreement; (iii) is one-fourth degree or more Inuit blood; and (iv) is now a resident of the Northwest Territories, or was born in the Northwest Territories, or has been a resident of the Northwest Territories for a total of at least ten years during the person's lifetime; or..."

Now, jumping over to page 11, section 302 reads: "Every person who claims to be an 'Inuk' within the meaning of section 301 (a) or (b) and makes such claim to the Minister within four years after the signing of the final agreement, and who is found to come within section 301 (a) or (b) as determined by the Minister, shall be enrolled by the Minister..." etc., etc., etc.

Now, my question here, Mr. Chairman, firstly if I may be permitted to make a statement, unless I read it wrong here, you have one-fourth degree or more Inuit blood and in the case of an individual whose parents are Inuk and Kabloona, and as it stands presently, that half Inuk and half Kabloona, he is considered to be an Inuk, is that right?

MR. ARVALUK: Right.

HON. PETER ERNERK: The half Inuk has not lived in what you will call Nunavut territory, or who is not living presently in the Northwest Territories, the half Inuk would not be considered as an Inuk, is that right?

MR. ARVALUK: Yes.

HON. PETER ERNERK: You would consider him an Inuk?

MR. ARVALUK: Under (a) part (iii) "who has one-fourth or more Inuit blood." Now, perhaps it would be easier to explain, Mr. Chairman, that you have to be a Canadian citizen and qualify under any of these items underneath. I think that is the easiest way to explain it. I did not say all, but any of these after (a) (i), and that includes a person who is accepted by the community as an Inuk, no matter what he is. So, it is (a) (i) and any of those underneath down to (d).

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

Individual Status Within Communities

MR. PEARSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of Mr. Arvaluk similar to the question by Hon. Peter Ernerk, the eligibility and enrolment under part (iii). I am trying to determine where I would fit into this whole scheme of things, I was under the impression until I reread this and had a few things explained that I could in fact qualify as an Inuk.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: I am sorry.

MR. AMAGOALIK: That is correct, if the Frobisher Bay residents decided you are an Inuk then you are an Inuk.

MR. PEARSON: But in the interpretation of this, if we may go over it for a moment, a citizen of Canada, alive as of the date of the final agreement -- well, that could be -- has one-fourth degree or more Inuit blood and is now a resident of the Northwest Territories, or was born in the Northwest Territories and it seems than one can not be according to this, if one interprets it correctly, the word "and" after "Inuit blood" states quite clearly that one must be part Eskimo to be an Inuk, but you say that the communities have the right to determine the status of an individual within their community?

MR. ARVALUK: Yes, yes, Mr. Pearson.

MR. PEARSON: Whereabouts in the book is that?

MR. ARVALUK: I am looking for it.

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, I think that is included in section 303.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Section 303?

MR. ARVALUK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. "Any person who becomes a member of any such corporation later than five years after the signing of the final agreement is not entitled..." I am sorry, it appears I am wrong, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I think we got a bum steer from Mr. Nickerson. Would you show us the section you were referring to, Mr. Nickerson?

MR. PEARSON: It is on page 12, Mr. Chairman, subsections 1, 2 and 3 deal with the matter.

MR. ARVALUK: That is right, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PEARSON: I have no further questions at this time, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Have we decided whether you are or are not yet?

MR. PEARSON: I suppose it is up to the Minister and if the Minister happens to be the wrong one, I think my future is very shaky.

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

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I realize that Mr. Arvaluk has other commitments and I would like to just ask another general question as we have been getting into specifics. This has to do with the fiscal arrangements and financing. Looking at Nunavut, and I am thinking of the total territory in which the royalties would be demanded, that is 750,000 square miles of land and approximately 800,000 square miles of water. The royalties would amount to, in that area, and I am excluding Inuit lands as designated, the royalties there would amount to three per cent at Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries prices delivered, plus another two per cent which is under Section 9 or 10 which the federal government would contribute to the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada and Inuit Development Committee. So, really the total would be five per cent at OPEC royalty prices, and I am looking now only at petroleum reserve underlying Nunavut land.

Sharing Among The Inuit

I suggest to you, sir, that if the proposal as laid out here gives to the Inuit, as Mr. Arvaluk says, freedom from being a recipient of handouts, freedom from receiving from the Canadian taxpayer the moneys required to provide the goods and services that are people's right in this land, and it enabled the Inuit to no longer receive handouts, can Mr. Arvaluk and Mr. Amogoalik not see that it puts the remainder of the Northwest Territories on the welfare rolls for the rest of eternity because in reality the wealth Mr. Amogoalik spoke of sharing, and that is the Inuit way, sharing, but it seems the sharing is among the Inuit and not with the remainder of the people of the Northwest Territories. We are broke and if Nunavut is set up along the lines of proposal here, we are broke and the Dene are broke for all time because to date the inventory that has been done by the federal government shows that there are no resources to speak of in what is left. I wonder if either of our guests wish to comment? Maybe they could send bundles to the remainder of the Northwest Territories, fiscal gifts.

MR. ARVALUK: Mr. Chairman, we all have short memories. I have tried to emphasize that I was trying to clarify, that this royalty system is for the compensation of lands and waters which equal approximately 1.7 million square miles. This is a trade-off. What we are saying is, "Okay, if you have northern development under the Crown of Canada, this is what we are willing to compensate for", and these social economic programs are programs being carried out right now under education, housing, etc., except that we are trying to put it through more local control, local initiation, rather than from the headquarters of the government, but the royalty system is for the compensation of the lands that we are losing. I do not know how you can say that in simple words but it is a trade for the land that the Inuit are giving up, I guess that is the easiest way.

Money Derived From Royalties

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): If I may be allowed one further question, what will that money that is raised in this manner be used for if the government will be funded by the federal government to look after all of the normal government functions including housing, welfare and all the rest, what will the money derived from the royalties that are in payment of the land that is being given up, what will this funding be used for?

MR. ARVALUK: You mean what will the royalty system be used for? It says under the Inuit Development Corporation, the social economic programs, there are pages and pages of the general principle ideas of how they can be used, but most of the detailed programs will have to come from the communities. So I can not say to Spence Bay this is a program or project you should carry out. The whole idea is trying to give the Inuit a choice as to what they should, what they should initiate, what they think is best for the community.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Hon. Peter Ernerk.

Inuit Social And Economic Program

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask another two questions? On page 53, Part 10, the Inuit social and economic program down about the fifth line you say that: "The Government of Canada acknowledges that the health, education, housing and physical standard of living for Inuit are inadequate as compared to accepted national standards, and that it is a common goal of the government and the Inuit to both preserve the Inuit culture and lifestyle within a changing society..."

I wonder if you could explain to me what you mean by Inuit culture? When I think of Inuit culture I think back about unaaq, harpoons, these type of things. That is my first question. My second question, Mr. Chairman, if I may, Mr. Arvaluk, you stated during your opening speech that you want to set up a quota system. Later on you said that on different kinds of animals. I want to take a particular example here on polar bears. The polar bear situation as I understand it is an international law. I stand to be corrected on that but I believe that is between the Danish government, the Canadian government and other governments, I believe the United States and so forth. Can you elaborate on this particular subject as to how you would approach the situation?

MR. ARVALUK: On your first question, Mr. Chairman, regarding culture I think you are mixed up with culture and history which is completely different. In other words, if we are not living like we used to live, that does not mean that we do not have any more culture. The culture in terms of this respect is how the Inuit or how human beings behave by the pattern of society. In other words, if there is a very poor standard of living in the society, then the Inuit are not happy. They are living in hardship so we would like to have the preservation and protection of good Inuit culture and lifestyle and then we will have to accommodate them with a good standard of living.

Culture Is Concepts

MR. AMAGOALIK: I think people have to realize that culture is not just physical things, it is not just harpoons, it is not just dog teams, it is not igloos. Culture is concepts like the concept of sharing and it is also the language so culture is not just physical. It is many different things.

MR. ARVALUK: As to your question regarding a polar bear quota system I did not specifically say there would be a quota system on polar bears. Maybe we could set up a quota system for caribou. For instance if there is an international agreement for the conservation of polar bears, okay, the federal government is responsible for setting up the over-all quota system but the territorial government implements those quota systems. When I say setting up a good quota system I am talking about research that has to be initiated. The research may be in a different method. Maybe research can be done through local hunters and trappers. Maybe that will not be a very good idea. Maybe a combination of both, scientific research and experimental research such as through the hunters' set-up.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you.

MR. AMAGOALIK: I might just add to that, Mr. Ernerk mentioned international law, international agreements. If this agreement was signed the way it is, it would break a lot of international laws and international agreements so it will have to be worked out. People should not regard this document as a Bible. It will have to be worked out.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Lafferty.

Eligibility And Enrolment

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, you realize I am getting awfully hungry. I am getting a stomach ache sitting here and I am getting nervous. There are a few disturbing factors here when I hear the remarks from my colleagues and the answers that are coming forth. Going back to Part 3 of the proposal, page 10, eligibility and enrolment, and the remarks that I have heard, the preservation of identity and rights in a changing northern society, at the same time the answers coming forth to some of the questions that Mr. Arvaluk, to whom I wish to address my question that disturb me a little bit is how could you be giving up the land as you say when you are actually creating Nunavut through the seeking of Canadian citizens to become Inuk? To quote from your proposed eligibility paper which says in part: "Inuk means a person who is (i) a citizen of Canada." And part (iii) of that says: "Has one-fourth degree or more Inuit blood, and (iv) is a resident of the Northwest Territories." What is the intent behind this? Is it the intent to have, once the province or whatever has been created or this government has been created, that any Canadian citizen who becomes resident in the proposed province or territory must become an Inuk? What happens to the guy, has he not got a choice in what he will be?

MR. ARVALUK: Mr. Chairman, I stated earlier that you will qualify under (a), (b), (c) and (d). You can not break up (a). If you like, for example, if a child living in Toronto and has never lived in the Northwest Territories for ten years he qualifies under (b) and (c).

MR. AMAGOALIK: This eligibility and enrolment is not to qualify as a resident of Nunavut. These conditions for eligibility are for the benefit of a settlement, not to qualify as a resident.

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

Community Development Corporation

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of questions in my mind pertaining to the Community Development Corporation and the Inuvik Development Corporation. I note in Inuvik that they have just received or have given a contract to build a large apartment building and that the people who are going to build it are people from the South. That is kind of backwards I would say because I think you said a little earlier that the Community Development Corporation would use all or as much local input as possible or even consider the existing businesses that they could use.

The second question is it seems that we are going to build or going to have a Community Development Corporation in each community which will be a business. How do you feel that this will clash with the existing businesses?

MR. ARVALUK: Mr. Chairman, there is not yet a Community Development Corporation in the communities but there is now a new development corporation formed under the temporary board of directors. This Inuvik apartment building which you are talking about, if Inuvik Inuit want to work there it is fine under those qualifications. However, we are trying to promote a management training program under the new Frontier College. In other words, there is no objection. This is what we are trying to get, Inuit involvement in the communities. I think when we are talking about corporations we are mostly talking about management. It does not matter who actually hammers those nails. I think if there are people, Inuit, who want to work there, this is fine and maybe it is important that Inuit manage that apartment building when he becomes qualified because it is no good to start a business if you think, just keeping in mind that an Inuit might manage it and fail. Like, for example, it is no good just to say, "Fellow members must be Inuit," if they can not handle the job. You must try to get away from the tokenism system. You are elected because you are qualified.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. I wonder if I could get direction from the committee. The hour is getting late. Is it the desire of this committee to continue this discussion? If so, I would suggest that we report back to the Speaker and he can rule then on sitting this evening and we can continue the discussion after the supper break. Could I have direction? Are you agreed to that approach? I will at this time report progress to the Speaker at which time he can extend the sitting for today.

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would assume that the discussions are not going to go on for much more than another 30 minutes or so. Maybe a better way of approaching things, rather than have a break in the discussions, is to set a time limit now at which time we will adjourn, probably 6:30 p.m. which will give us another 40 minutes or so. That, Mr. Chairman, would be my suggestion.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Lyall.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could ask Mr. Arvaluk if he has other commitments and maybe he has commitments close to this time or whatever.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): We wonder, Mr. Arvaluk, which would you prefer to do?

MR. ARVALUK: I did not get it very clearly. Could you repeat that, please?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Basically we are trying to decide how much longer this may go and whether we should adjourn for supper and return for an evening sitting or continue now.

MR. ARVALUK: I do not think there is that much more. The questions that can be answered in terms of over-all general questions, it is more rough going into details. Later we will be providing to the industry, and to the government agency and the political parties some information on the background of what I was talking about in short terms, and perhaps the fellow Members may be more interested in that or perhaps sometimes at a future session we could have a detailed discussion if you wish for clarification purposes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. I presume then that we are assuming we will not continue much longer and will therefore proceed. Are there any further questions. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: I agree that probably most of the general questions have been asked but I would hope that even though our guests were not available and other business took them away, that we will still be examining this during this session.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): That would be my understanding and if we report progress the paper is still open for further discussion. Hon. Arnold McCallum.

Territorial Council Of Nunavut

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask possibly two brief questions. The first would be, would the territorial council of Nunavut be a government, what then, or why then the need or how do you see a need for the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada and as a subsequent question to that, and hopefully allied, would the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada then be responsible to the territorial council of Nunavut or would it be the opposite?

MR. ARVALUK: Mr. Chairman, the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada hopefully will not be in existence. However, I think we will be looking at more of the cultural, the recreational programs ourselves, the non-political organizations as much as there is an Inuit cultural institute trying to promote the history of the Inuit and the cultural programs. Inuit Tapirisat of Canada would still be an independent organization, more as I said into the cultural or recreational programs, and that is stated in the proposal.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Hon. Arnold McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: A further question, Mr. Chairman. The proposal of a Nunavut territory, do our guests then see the present territorial Assembly, this Assembly, becoming extinct? Are they in fact, if you like, ringing the death knell of it?

MR. ARVALUK: I am afraid I do not understand this, Mr. Chairman.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I could rephrase it. With the establishment of a Nunavut territory and subsequent council and government do our guests then see that there would be no need for this present Northwest Territories Legislative Assembly, or in fact, by the establishment of a Nunavut territory and government, are they leading to the dropping of this present Assembly?

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

MR. ARVALUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It will take a long time to form this government since our objective is to have the government created from within the residents of the Nunavut territory. So, I would presume that it would be immature or rather premature to dissolve this Legislative Assembly when agreement is accepted because the political system has to be created. So, I think what I am talking about is eventual political development, because what we are talking about is right here, there will be established as soon as possible a new territory called Nunavut comprising the following general described areas shown on the map.

MR. AMAGOALIK: I think everybody knows, I know and you know that the creation of Nunavut and the creation of a government and council will not happen overnight and it is impossible and we all know that. It will take time, there will be phase-in periods and phase-out periods. It is up to this Legislative Assembly if they want to disappear tomorrow, it is up to you.

MR. ARVALUK: Also, Mr. Chairman, if I may clarify this, this would be written in the final agreement, it is not mentioned in the agreement in principle proposal.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Hon. Arnold McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: One further question I just wanted clarification. I recognize I think what has been said that the eligibility concerns itself only with residence, that if I were in a Nunavut area I could become an Inuk if I were living there for ten years and were accepted by the Inuit community.

MR. ARVALUK: As far as Nunavut residency is concerned to participate in the government you do not have to be anything.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Fine.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Hon. Peter Ernerk.

Commissioner Of Nunavut

HON. PETER ERNERK: I have one very simple question in case you approach me as the new commissioner of Nunavut. If not, I will settle for president of Nunavut.

MR. PEARSON: Or of the United States.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Anyway, your commissioner or the commissioner of Nunavut, would he be a federally appointed person or a person appointed by the council members, the government of Nunavut?

MR. ARVALUK: This is up to you.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Thank you.

MR. ARVALUK: In other words, I have been emphasizing that the Nunavut government has to be created through the residents of this territory and has to be established according to the wishes of the residents, what kind of political system they wish to achieve. So, it is not up to the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada or anybody to create a government, that is why it is not detailed in the information here about the Nunavut territory.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Shall I report progress?

---Agreed

I would like to thank Mr. Arvaluk and Mr. Amagoalik on behalf of this committee for your presence here today. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: The Legislative Assembly will come to order. Mr. Stewart.

Report of the Committee of the Whole of Inuit Tapirisat of Canada Land Claim Proposal, Nunavut and T.D. 15-59, Dr. Ward's Analysis of Nunavut

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been considering the Nunavut proposal and at this time wishes to report progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Any announcements? Hon. Arnold McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a telegram received from the Hon. Robert Andras, the Minister of the Department of Manpower and Immigration, a telegram addressed to provincial ministers responsible for Manpower.

Telegram From Minister Of Manpower And Immigration

"I WISH TO ADVISE YOU THAT THE GOVERNMENT HAS JUST ANNOUNCED IN THE BUDGET SPEECH ITS PLAN TO INTEGRATE THE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION AND THE DEPARTMENT OF MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION. I HAVE DIRECTED MY REGIONAL OFFICIALS TO COMMUNICATE WITH YOUR OFFICE SO THAT YOU COULD BE GIVEN FURTHER INFORMATION ON THE INTEGRATION PLAN."

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wah-Shee.

MR. WAH-SHEE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the unanimous consent of this house to return to Item 6, so that I can give proper notice for my motion to be brought up tomorrow. I ran into some difficulty with regard to the wording of the resolution so I have rewritten it. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent requested to return to Item 6, notices of motions, is it agreed?

---Agreed

REVERT TO ITEM NO 6: NOTICES OF MOTIONS

Notice Of Motion 17-59: Ten Years Residency To Be Eligible As An Elector_

MR. WAH-SHEE: There has been a change in my proposed Motion 17-59. I have taken out the following words in my motion "to amend the ordinance respecting the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories as follows" and this section has been deleted and instead I have inserted: "This Legislative Assembly requests the administration to present bills at its October 1976 session to provide as follows" and that is the only change I have made, thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Wah-Shee. Do you have copies, Mr. Remnant, yet?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, not yet.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further announcements? Mr. Nickerson and then Mr. Steen. If it is on the same subject...

MR. NICKERSON: I do not think so.

Notice Of Motion 22-59: CBC Radio Signal, Paulatuk And Sachs Harbour

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give notice that on the 27th, tomorrow the 27th of May, 1976 I will present Motion 22-59 relating to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation Radio signal in Paulatuk and Sachs Harbour.

WHEREAS the communities of Paulatuk and Sachs Harbour are unable to receive adequately the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation radio signals;

AND WHEREAS the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has the responsibility to provide adequate service to all people in the Northwest Territories;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this Legislative Assembly request the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories to request the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to provide adequate radio signals to the communities of Sachs Harbour and Paulatuk at the earliest possible date.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Steen. Any further notices of motion? Are there any further announcements? Mr. Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker, there will be a meeting of the standing committee on legislation at 7:30 p.m. this evening in the Executive boardroom of the Laing building.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Nickerson. Any further announcements? In compliance with the motion we passed yesterday permitting the Speaker to set the hours of sitting may I suggest for your consideration starting at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow?

---Agreed

Orders of the day, Mr. Clerk.

ITEM NO. 12: ORDERS OF THE DAY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Orders of the day, 9:00 o'clock a.m., May 27, 1976, at the Explorer Hotel.

1. Prayer
2. Questions and Returns
3. Oral Questions
4. Petitions
5. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
6. Notices of Motions
7. Motions for the Production of Papers
8. Motions
9. Tabling of Documents
10. Second Reading of Bills: Bill 10-59
11. Continuing Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills, and Other Matters: Bill 9-59, Bill 7-59, Bill 6-59, Bill 12-59, Bill 2-59, Bill 11-59, Bill 10-59, Motion 9-59, Motion 10-59, Tabled Document 15-59, Inuit Tapirisat of Canada Land Claim Proposal, Information Items 4-59, 5-59, 12-59, 16-59, 18-59 and 24-59
12. Third Reading of Bills
13. Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER: This Legislature stands adjourned until 9:00 o'clock a.m., May 27, 1976 at the Explorer Hotel.

---ADJOURNMENT

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