



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES
DEBATES

61st Session

8th Assembly



MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1977

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

The Honourable David H. Searle, Q.C., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 939
Yellowknife, N.W.T. X0E 1H0
(Yellowknife South)
(Speaker)

The Honourable Arnold McCallum, M.L.A.
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0
(Slave River)
(Minister of Education)

Mr. Donald M. Stewart, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 310
Hay River, N.W.T.
X0E 0R0
(Hay River)
(Deputy Speaker)

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

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

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

Mr. William A. Lafferty, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 176
Fort Simpson, N.W.T.
X0E 0N0
(Mackenzie Liard)

Mr. William Lyall, M.L.A.
Cambridge Bay, N.W.T.
X0E 0C0
(Central Arctic)

The Honourable Peter Ernerk, M.L.A.
Site 18, Box 16,
Yellowknife, N.W.T. X0E 1H0
(Keewatin)
(Minister of Economic Development)

The Honourable Dave Nickerson, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1778
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0
(Yellowknife North)
(Minister of Social Development)

Mr. Thomas H. Butters, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1069
Inuvik, N.W.T.
X0E 0T0
(Inuvik)
(Deputy Chairman of Committees)

Mr. Bryan R. Pearson, M.L.A.
c/o Arctic Ventures
Frobisher Bay, N.W.T.
X0A 0H0
(South Baffin)

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

Mr. John Steen, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 60
Tuktoyaktuk, N.W.T.
X0E 1C0
(Western Arctic)

Mr. Richard Whitford, M.L.A.
Rae, N.W.T.
(Great Slave Lake)

OFFICERS

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

Sergeant-at-Arms
Mr. F. A. MacKay
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0

Clerk Assistant
Mr. Pieter De Vos
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0

Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms
Mr. J. H. MacKendrick
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0

LEGAL ADVISOR
Ms. P. Flieger
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

14 February 1977

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	863
Questions and Returns	863, 865, 940
Oral Questions	940
Tabling of Documents	864, 887
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Bill 11-61 Workers' Compensation Ordinance	866, 900
- Bill 2-61 Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance No. 3, 1976-77	887
- Bill 6-61 Financial Agreement Ordinance, 1977	894
- Bill 3-61 Appropriation Ordinance, 1977-78	894
- Tabled Document 6-61 An Integrated Housing Policy for the Northwest Territories	903
- Tabled Document 5-61 Report of the Task Force on Electrical Energy Costs in the North	915
Report of Committee of the Whole of:	
- Bill 11-61 Workers' Compensation Ordinance	887, 901
- Bill 2-61 Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance No. 3, 1976-77	894
- Bill 6-61 Financial Agreement Ordinance, 1977	899
- Bill 3-61 Appropriation Ordinance, 1977-78	899
- Tabled Document 6-61 An Integrated Housing Policy for the Northwest Territories	915
- Tabled Document 5-61 Report of the Task Force on Electrical Energy Costs in the North	940

	<u>PAGE</u>
Third Reading of Bills:	
- Bill 2-61 Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance No. 3, 1976-77	941
- Bill 11-61 Workers' Compensation Ordinance	941
Assent to Bills:	
- Bill 2-61, Bill 11-61	942
Orders of the Day	942

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1977

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Steen, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Lafferty, Mr. Lyall, Mr. Butters, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Whitford, Hon. Arnold McCallum, Mr. Evaluarjuk, Hon. Peter Ernerk, Mr. Kilabuk, Mr. Pudluk, Hon. Dave Nickerson, Hon. David Searle.

ITEM NO. 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

SPEAKER (Hon. David Searle): Item 2, questions and returns. Are there any returns? Deputy Commissioner Parker.

ITEM NO. 2: QUESTIONS AND RETURNS

Return To Question W35-61: Employment Of Northern Trained Equipment Operators, Mackenzie Highway

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 9, 1977, Mr. Lafferty asked what steps the administration is taking to employ northern persons and equipment on the Mackenzie Liard highway.

Approximately 20 miles of the Northwest Territories portion of the Mackenzie Liard highway has been completed, with the work having taken place in 1970. The contractors employed on this work were Mannix Company Limited and the clearing contract was awarded to Karl Mueller Construction in 1969. Every effort was made to employ as much northern labour and equipment as possible. There are no funds in the current federal budget for continuation of work on the Mackenzie Liard highway, and we are unable at this time to ascertain from the federal government a firm date when construction will be resumed.

Return To Question W42-61: Fire Equipment For Resolute Bay

On Thursday, February 10, 1977, Mr. Pudluk requested the administration to examine the possibility of providing a new fire truck and fire alarm system for Resolute Bay.

Funds for a new fire truck for Resolute Bay are provided in the 1977-78 budget, and the administration is actively examining the possibility of providing a new fire alarm system for Resolute Bay in the coming fiscal year as well.

Return To Question W17-61: Federal Civil Servants, N.W.T.

On Wednesday, February 2, 1977, Mr. Butters requested that updated information on the number of federal civil servants in the Northwest Territories be provided.

This information has been provided in the form of a table and similar information provided to this House on June 18, 1975 is also attached for comparison purposes.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any written questions? Mr. Kilabuk.

Question W43-61: Fire Truck For Pangnirtung

MR. KILABUK: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions. I would like to ask if there is any possibility of getting a fire truck for Pangnirtung? We have heard

that we were going to be receiving one and I would like to know if there is any money available in 1977? Did you get my question?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes.

Question W44-61: Heating Oil For People Of Pangnirtung

MR. KILABUK: My second question is: When we had our legislative meeting in Rankin Inlet, there was a motion made about the possibility of subsidizing heating oil. I would like to know when this will come into effect. This goes mostly for the home owners.

MR. SPEAKER: Deputy Commissioner Parker.

Return To Question W43-61: Fire Truck For Pangnirtung

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: The answer to the first question regarding a fire truck is that there is a fire truck scheduled to be purchased and shipped to Pangnirtung this year, on this years sealift.

On the second question regarding heating oil, there are no plans for the people paying for their own heating oil directly, as long as they are on either the rental, the house rental program or the house rental purchase program. In other words we have no plans for changing this system at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: I would just like to explain the question. I think what Mr. Kilabuk means is could they pay their fuel bills in the settlements. Thank you.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: I will have to check on the matter of paying the bills within the settlements and provide a response.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further written questions?

Item 3, oral questions.

Item 4, petitions.

Item 5, reports of standing and special committees.

Item 6, notices of motions.

Item 7, motions for the production of papers.

Item 8, motions. Motion 5-61, Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: I would prefer to defer, sir, until later in the session.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 5-61, deferred.

Item 9, tabling of documents. Hon. Arnold McCallum.

ITEM NO. 9: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the following document, Tabled Document 5-61, entitled "Report of the Task Force on Electrical Energy Costs in the North", and this report is being circulated to Members' desks today and possibly Members will recall having received the same in the mail.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Hon. Arnold McCallum.

Item 10, consideration in committee of the whole of bills and other matters. What is your wish, which bill? Hon. Peter Ernerk.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, we would like to continue with Bill 11-61.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Mr. Kilabuk.

MR. KILABUK: Could we go back to Item 2?

MR. SPEAKER: Is there unanimous consent to return to Item 2? Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Proceed, Mr. Kilabuk.

REVERT TO ITEM NO. 2: QUESTIONS AND RETURNS

Question W45-61: Landing Docks, Broughton Island

MR. KILABUK: I have a matter that the Commissioner knows about, this is a request from Broughton Island. They are asking for a landing dock. The approximate cost for construction of this would be \$9000. At the moment, the shore they use for a landing dock is much too rocky and when the sea is too rough it is very difficult to unload. When the ships come in to the community it would help a lot. They have also asked for someone who knows about landing docks to come to the community so that they would know for certain what they are asking for.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not quite sure whether that was a petition or a question. Can we treat it as a question and see if there is any response from the Executive?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: We will take the question and seek a response. We may be able to seek unanimous consent and provide the answer this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Deputy Commissioner Parker. Before we proceed into committee of the whole for continuing consideration of Bill 11-61, Hon. Arnold McCallum, would you like me to announce the caucus meeting for 1:00 o'clock p.m. in room 303? There is a caucus meeting in room 303 at 1:00 o'clock.

This House will resolve into committee of the whole for continuing consideration of bills and other matters. Bill 11-61, the Workers' Compensation Ordinance, with Mr. Fraser in the chair.

ITEM NO. 10: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS AND OTHER MATTERS.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into Committee of the Whole for consideration of Bill 11-61, Workers' Compensation Ordinance, with Mr. Fraser in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL 11-61, WORKERS' COMPENSATION ORDINANCE

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The committee will come to order. Bill 11-61, the Workers' Compensation Ordinance. I think we finished off on Friday last at clause 61, and I do not think clause 62 was agreed on, so clause 62, is it agreed?

Clause 63, statement of earned and estimated future. Clause 63. We are on clause 63 now. I thought clause 62 was agreed.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: You never saw me with my hand up.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 62.

Clause 62, Agreed

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: In subclause 62(2) it seems rather unusual here that someone shall be deemed to be guilty, and usually in law someone is given the benefit of the doubt. It would appear to me that it might be better to add the words, "unless proved otherwise," or wording to that effect at the end of subclause 62(2).

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Subclause 62(2), would you read it out?

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: "Any person who has control and direction of a worker ..."

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): That is the one in my book. "Any person who has control and direction of a worker and who directs him to do other work as mentioned in subsection (1) shall be deemed to have given the direction on behalf of the employer." Is that the one?

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: That is the one.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Where is the change?

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Perhaps we could inquire as to whether the expert witnesses would have any objection to this but it would seem to me that there has to be something in there to give protection to foremen and managers and people like that. As it stands, a person can kind of wander off and do something on his own initiative and the foreman would be blamed for it, and he would have to take the blame even though it was not his fault.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. MacLean.

MR. MacLEAN: There is no question of assessing blame in relation to this subclause. The reason for the subclause is to indicate that the employee is covered and has protection, even though the employer himself has not given the direction, but his immediate supervisor may have. "Any person who has control and direction ..." and if an accident takes place because the foreman or the agent of the employer has given a direction he is still covered.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Hon. Dave Nickerson, do you want to follow up on that?

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: It is not really an important point. If the general feeling is the wording should stay as it is then I am quite willing to see that happen.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Clause 62, is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 63, Agreed As Amended

Clause 63, statement of earned and estimated future.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: A question of a legal nature, what is meant by "corporation" in this context?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. MacLean.

MR. MacLEAN: Well, I would think that a corporation as indicated here would be a limited company, a company that is legally incorporated.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether we could be given the assurance of the Legal Advisor that this does not also include a society?

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): I can not give that assurance. Under the Societies Ordinance a society is created or incorporated.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Could you try that again?

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Under the Societies Ordinance I believe that a society is a corporation.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: So if this applied to a society, it would appear to me that what we are doing is using the Alberta terminology where perhaps, as I understand the Alberta Companies Act, a company there is called a corporation and what we call a shareholder is there called a member. Something is wrong with the wording. If it is the intention in the legislation that this particular clause should only apply to a corporation, or to a company, something is wrong there.

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

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that it is quite clear that it applies to societies as well. You just have to look at the words, "Every person rendering service to a corporation, wherever and however incorporated or constituted ..." I would suggest that means a society.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. David Searle. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Could I ask the witnesses, Mr. Chairman, whether or not they intend this to apply to bodies other than limited companies?

MR. MacLEAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we do.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacLean. Clause 63, agreed?

Clause 64, employers' records. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

Motion To Amend Subclauses 63(3) And 63(4)

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: The amounts in subclauses 63(3) and 63(4) are rather low and I assume they were put in there several years ago before inflation took place. I recommend, Mr. Chairman, that the amount of \$300 in subclause 63(3) be increased to \$1000 and that in subclause 63(4) the amount of \$50 be again increased threefold to \$150.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. MacLean.

MR. MacLEAN: The board has no objection to that. However, the reason for this figure was to make certain that we got notice of anyone who took out a building permit for anything of a fairly substantial nature. Increasing it in this day and age to \$1000 would probably take care of those employers of whom we would like to have notice.

Motion Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Subclause 63(3) from \$300 to \$1000 and subclause 63(4) from \$50 to \$150, agreed? I only heard one "agreed".

---Carried

Clause 63, Agreed As Amended

Clause 63 as amended, agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 64, employers' records. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

Commissioners Of Oaths, Powers

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I have a certain question concerning subclause 64(8), "Every member of the board and every officer or person authorized by it to make an examination ..." These people are automatically being given the power of commissioners of oaths empowered to take affidavits and I wonder whether or not this is absolutely necessary to put in here. To the best of my knowledge similar boards and people working for similar boards do not automatically have this power and they have to become commissioners of oaths under the Evidence Ordinance. I wonder if the Legal Advisor could enlighten us on this particular subject?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Ms. Flieger.

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): I think, Mr. Chairman, this is a limited power. It does not create every member or make every member of the board a commissioner for taking oaths to be used in the supreme court. This is strictly to allow members of the board to swear witnesses before the board or swear affidavits to be used by the board. I do not think that this is a very unusual thing and it would not in fact make a member of the board automatically a commissioner for taking oaths. It does not say that. It does not say that they are able to swear affidavits to be able to be used in court, just for the purposes of the board.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Legal Advisor could tell us whether any other similar body in the Northwest Territories is automatically given these powers, the powers to take affidavits, etc.?

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): I am not aware of any other body with such powers, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I wonder if the witnesses could tell us anything further?

Matter Of Convenience

MR. MacLEAN: The reason for the clause is simply as a matter of convenience to take notice of the jurisdiction of the board in some of the out of the way places. Albeit, if we wanted to have our employees apply to be commissioners of oaths, then they could be granted. If we wanted someone in one of the isolated communities to go in on behalf of the board, there would be a delay, of course, to get a commissioner of oaths for that place. It is strictly a matter of convenience.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Hon. Dave Nickerson.

Motion To Amend Clause 64(8)

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I think we are setting a rather dangerous precedent in doing this and I would move that subclause 64(8) be amended so that before a member or employee of the board was able to take affidavits he would have to comply with the Evidence Ordinance in the normal manner.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Could that be put into the law?

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): I just point out again, Mr. Chairman, that under this section the members and officers mentioned would not be commissioners for taking oaths under the Evidence Ordinance. They would be strictly empowered

to take affidavits for use by the board. I do not think that they would be commissioners in the general sense.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. MacLean, could you verify that?

MR. MacLEAN: That is my understanding and that is what we want this section to indicate. I believe that is what it does indicate. It is strictly a matter of taking an affidavit so that it can be brought before the board and the board can deal with the matter that may be before it.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I have not changed my mind, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): You are amending subclause 64(8)?

Compliance With Evidence Ordinance

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I do not know what the wording should be but I want members of the board and employees who take affidavits to comply in the normal manner with the Evidence Ordinance, that is, that they would have to get a commissioner of oaths certificate the same way, for instance, people taking affidavits, game officers taking affidavits have to have a certificate under the Evidence Ordinance to become commissioners of oaths.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. Dave Nickerson. The change now in subclause 64(8) will read, "Be amended before a member or employee of the board is able to take affidavits he would have to apply in the normal manner under the Evidence Ordinance." Is that right?

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: That is not how it would read. That is the intention of what I would say. I would leave it entirely up to the Legal Advisor to come up with the right wording.

MR. MacLEAN: Mr. Chairman, the effect of what Hon. Dave Nickerson wants to do, I believe, would be to delete the clause entirely because there is nothing to stop the chairman of the board or any member of the board to apply to become a commissioner of oaths.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I do not know whether it would mean having to delete the clause entirely. You could still have it to deal with an inquiry but for taking oaths you could put in that he would have to become a commissioner of oaths.

MR. MacLEAN: It says anyone who is making an inquiry has the power to take affidavits and so on. If you take away the power to take affidavits, you do not need that clause I would think.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in opposition to Hon. Dave Nickerson's motion. I see nothing inherently wrong or bad about giving officers or employees of the board the power to take affidavits in respect only of their work in the compensation field. As I see it that is one of their powers as set out here. I do not see any point in an increasing paper war and giving them wider authority under the Evidence Ordinance. I would support the section as it stands.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. David Searle. To the amendment? Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: One thing, Mr. Chairman, that bothers me. If I was the person under investigation and an officer of the board wanted me to make a statement under oath, how would I find out whether or not he was empowered to take such an oath? In a normal set of circumstances it would be easy to find

out whether a person is or is not a notary public or a commissioner of oaths, but how would a person go about finding out whether or not this person was fully entitled to take an affidavit?

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

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Simply by having the legislation brought to his attention.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. David Searle. To the amendment to subclause 64(8)?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion To Amend Subclause 64(8), Defeated

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Question being called. All in favour? Contrary? The motion is defeated.

---Defeated

Clause 64, Agreed_

Clause 64, agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 65, Agreed

Clause 65, basis of assessment where no statement. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: What is a supplementary assessment?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. MacLean.

MR. MacLEAN: A supplementary assessment is, of course, an additional assessment.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: How does a supplementary assessment in subclause 65(1) differ from a special assessment under subclause 60(12)?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. MacLean. Before you answer that, I have problems here, I go from page 72 to page 75. I seem to be missing about three pages.

MR. MacLEAN: Hon. David Searle.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: May I be included on your list of people who require the additional pages? I do not have pages 73 and 74.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Anyone else missing pages 73 and 74?

MR. STEEN: I have two copies of pages 73 and 74.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Have you any extras, Hon. Arnold McCallum?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: No, just the right number.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): I think there was a question on the floor for Mr. MacLean.

Supplementary Assessment Explained

MR. MacLEAN: It is my understanding that a supplementary estimate could in fact include a special assessment, and would be any form of additional assessment. Besides being a special assessment it could be a supplementary estimate to the extent that the assessable payroll had increased, for example.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I did not quite get the explanation as to these estimates. I was talking about a supplementary assessment and Mr. MacLean was talking about a supplementary estimate.

MR. MacLEAN: I meant supplementary assessment. This deals with the basis of assessment where there is no statement provided by the employer and it gives the board the power to make an assessment or a supplementary assessment. When the words "supplementary assessment" are used in this context, it indicates there may be an additional assessment because of further information we may receive on the payroll or for some other reason in relation to the assessable payroll, but a supplementary assessment could, of course, include a special assessment because supplementary means an additional assessment.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Okay? Clause 65, is it agreed? Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: In the penalty subclause, 65(3) it says "for the failure such percentage of the amount of his assessment as the board may determine or as prescribed by regulations" and why do you need the words "as the board may determine" in there?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. MacLean.

Penalty May Differ.

MR. MacLEAN: Well, in this subclause, the use of those words indicates that the penalty may differ from employer to employer, if in fact we do it by way of a determination by the board. If it is prescribed by regulation then the penalty would be applied to all employers. So, it gives the board an option as to which way it might want to go when it considers this.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: If the board determines a penalty which the employer thinks is unjust and unfair, what is his remedy?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. MacLean.

MR. MacLEAN: His first remedy is to go back to the board for a review. I do not think there is any additional remedy after that, unless it is a question, and Hon. David Searle is more knowledgeable in this field than I am, but unless it is a problem of a very grossly unfair penalty and then perhaps there would be some grounds for denial of natural justice or an exceeding of the jurisdiction of the board. In that case, he could go to the courts.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 65. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Liability of employer not assessed, clause 66. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Continuing liability to assessment, clause 67. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Duty and liability on commencing or recommencing industry, clause 68. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Security for payments of assessment, clause 69. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Mr. Steen.

MR. STEEN: Could I ask the witnesses, suppose a business just starts up, where would he get his security from?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. MacLean.

Concern About Security.

MR. MacLEAN: We are concerned about security on two grounds. One, where we may have a company that is a fly-by-night outfit, it comes into the territories and might leave at any moment but is carrying on business here. We may say to them: "Now, post a bond with us until we are able to assess you properly and do all the necessary work in relation to your assessable payroll and arrive at what you owe us," and this may be because of past experience with that company or reports on that company we have received from other jurisdictions..

The second point is in relation to a company, which is carrying on operations here, and with respect to expansion possibilities and so on, we may not know, or it may not be able to estimate correctly at the beginning of the year as to what its payroll may be. Instead of tying up part of its cash money in relation to putting a deposit down they could provide us with some other form of security and we would accept that. However, in relation to your question, Mr. Steen, with respect to new employers, we adopt a policy, if they are local employers who have been in the territories and are beginning to carry on business here but who have lived here, we adopt the policy of extending time for payment of their assessment fees in order to allow them to get on their feet and allow them to have an opportunity to have a certain amount of cash flow before we take all of their assessment from them. We make arrangements with respect to monthly payments, quarterly payments or, pretty well any other basis of payment of their assessment in order to help in this matter.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacLean. Any follow-up, Mr. Steen?

MR. STEEN: No, thank you, that was very well answered, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 69 was agreed. Liability to assessment, clause 70. Is it agreed? Clause 70. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Collection of assessments by instalments, clause 71, is it agreed?

---Agreed

Liability of employers, clause 72. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Additional penalty for default by employer. Clause 73, Hon. Dave Nickerson.

Clause 73, Agreed

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, I remember a little while back a certain clause that dealt with the payments, or the amount of assessment in respect to a year becoming due on the first of January, and in this particular section it deals with provisional amounts of assessments and instalments. I wonder if the witnesses could give some explanation as to how this provisional amount in instalments works out in fact.

MR. MacLEAN: Are we talking about clause 71?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 73, additional penalty for default by employer. Clause 73.

MR. MacLEAN: The question is with respect to quarterly payments? I am sorry, I do not follow.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I do not understand how these payments will be collected in actual practice, what is meant by provisional amounts of assessments and what is meant by instalments, how do you normally go about collecting this money?

Manner Of Collection Of Assessments.

MR. MacLEAN: Well, the manner in which we go about collecting the assessments, we invoice the employer, and from the date of the invoice, and we are now into, say, January, but if invoices were sent out in December and we advised him that payments must be made or other arrangements made with the board by the end of January of 1977. There are those who pay their assessment on time and, those who do not may come in and make arrangements with us.

For instance, we gave a 60 day extension to one of the mines because they had some difficulty with their computer operation. The arrangements with respect to instalment payments were also made at that time. Then, we have a follow-up after that time period has passed and we ascertain those employers who have not contacted us at all and we go out to them again and try to get some idea of what the problem is, why they are not paying their assessment or why they have not come back to us with respect to making arrangements to make payments. That is the way it is followed up, Mr. Chairman.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: So, normally, or quite frequently you would not collect the whole assessment in respect to any one year in one lump sum, but quite often you would collect this in a series of instalments, is that correct?

MR. MacLEAN: That is correct and we do it by way of a binding letter or binding agreement between the employer and the board as to what they intend to do.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 73. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Enforcement of payment of assessment, clause 74. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: In clause 74, Mr. Chairman, in subclause (4) it says "Notwithstanding anything in any other statute ..." and the circumstances that are most likely to give rise to default are surely when a company is going to go bankrupt. It is my understanding that the available funds after a company has gone bankrupt, how these funds are to be distributed is set out in the Bankruptcy Act. Surely we do not intend by way of this ordinance to supersede the Bankruptcy Act.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. MacLean.

MR. MacLEAN: The Bankruptcy Act is a federal statute and I guess I would have to look at it in order to see what effect -- I might put it to you this way, I am not certain just what effect the provisions of our ordinances have on a federal statute such as that. Perhaps the Legal Advisor could give an opinion in that regard.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Ms. Legal Advisor.

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Where there is a bankruptcy, the Bankruptcy Act would supersede any other legislation.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Hon. Dave Nickerson.

Priority Of Income Tax Act.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Would I also be right in thinking that under the Income Tax Act, taxes payable, or certainly, the revenue people might decide that taxes payable have a higher priority than workers' compensation assessment? Would I be correct in thinking that, Mr. Chairman?

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): I am not certain which would take priority in that case, Mr. Chairman. I think that the taxes would probably rank ahead of a workers' compensation assessment. Perhaps Mr. Laing can tell us something about that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. Laing.

MR. LAING: Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to get into legal matters but my layman's understanding of this is that workmen's compensation takes priority over taxes and after salaries. That is the intent in the provinces.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Laing. Hon. David Searle.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I have always been opposed to this kind of priority given to taxes, worker's compensation legislation, etc. The thing that bothers me is if you take, for instance, this legislation taking priority over a mortgage, you know, in the normal course of business people go to banks and other lending agencies and do give specific encumbrances for specific loans and things like that. I do not think that it is fair or proper for something like the Workers' Compensation Board to come ahead of a bank or some other agency which has taken a specific charge. I do not mind there being a priority over one's assets generally, except those that have been specifically encumbered for specific purposes. I do have some problem with that paragraph (b) which says, "has priority over all assignments by way of security, debts, liens, charges, mortgages or other encumbrances whatsoever ..." I think this is probably legislation common to what the provinces do.

Limit Priority To Unsecured Assets

I am not arguing with that for a moment, but I really do not personally agree with it and if there were some way of giving it priority over assets unsecured, then I would agree to that, but to give a priority over assets which have been properly granted as security in the normal course of business for probably very substantial sums of money I think is going a little too far, so my suggestion would be to limit that priority to unsecured assets. I do not know what other Members feel, but it seems incredible, for instance, giving an example, if I were to sell my house to an employer, if I were to take a second mortgage back or even a first mortgage back for the money owed to me and the employer has a company and is engaged in the construction business and he goes belly-up and does not pay the workers' compensation assessment. I have sold him my house in good faith. The Workers' Compensation Ordinance comes in and plucks off what is owed to them before I can exercise my security in foreclosing on my house that I just sold to him. I have taken proper security and given credit and everything and here I stand second in line. I do not think that is fair or proper because an ordinary citizen really does not keep legislation like this necessarily in mind so I do not know. What do other Members think? If you think that is fair, let us pass it but I think we could change this if we wanted to.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. MacLean.

MR. MACLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate Hon. David Searle's comments and I am quite certain that he is aware of why it is in here. It is in order to protect the fund. As I understand Hon. David Searle's comments, I believe he is talking about all secured debts and not just mortgages.

Public Stands Second To Government

HON. DAVID SEARLE: I am thinking specifically of legal things where the proper security can be given and taken and registered under land titles and there is a first charge, particularly of that, but you know, there are others. For instance, what about someone who is buying heavy equipment and there are chattel mortgages given properly to the bank or to the person supplying the equipment and he goes belly-up and the people who financed that operation are standing second in line to the Workers' Compensation Board. Again, is that fair and proper? I appreciate again that it may be done elsewhere but it does not seem right to me. After all, it was the person's equipment he was using and he should get the money first on the sale, after the initial sale.

I am just basically indisposed to put the public in the position of standing second to the government in everything. By the time the federal government gets its income tax, corporate tax, Canada Pension Plan and unemployment insurance and we get our workers' compensation insurance, you know, the poor people who actually sold the equipment or the guy who sold his house or property may end up standing second to government. That somehow does not seem fair. If you want to put the government before the individual, then do it but I always thought the individual was the most important and government came second.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. David Searle. Mr. MacLean.

MR. MACLEAN: I think there is one thing we should appreciate. If an exception is made for mortgages, real and personal, there probably will be nothing left for the Workers' Compensation Board if a person goes bankrupt because usually he is overmortgaged at that point in time prior to going into bankruptcy. However, be that as it may, I think Hon. David Searle may have a point. If it were just a question of making an exception for real and personal mortgages, that I think we could probably live with as long as we understand, as long as the committee understands that this is a trust fund we are administering and we are trying to obtain all the powers we can with respect to realizing unpaid assessments.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacLean. Hon. David Searle, would you like to amend paragraph 74(4)(b) then?

Motion To Amend Paragraph 74(4)(b)

HON. DAVID SEARLE: If I may, I would just use layman's language. I do not purport to draft the amendment but I would move that priority not be given over personal and real property that has not been specifically charged by the employer.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. David Searle. Mr. MacLean, do you see any problem in changing paragraph 74(4)(b)?

MR. MacLEAN: I see no problem at all. I think at the end of paragraph (b) or wherever the Legal Advisor wants to put it you could put that exception with respect to real and personal property mortgages to take care of it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacLean. Ms. Flieger.

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Yes.

Clause 74, Deferred

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Could we just stand down clause 74 and have the Legal Advisor draw up an amendment, agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 74(4)(b) is stood down for amendment.

Page 81, PART 9, general. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Some comments which would probably come under PART 9, general. This is my very great concern for the small employer, the three or four man business type of thing of which we have a number in the Northwest Territories which we are actively trying to encourage. In the past it has always been my idea that under much legislation these little guys get stuck. I wonder how the casual people are assessed by the Workers' Compensation Board, what special measures are taken with respect to small employers, people who do not employ workers on a continuing basis? I would very much like to see an employer just being able to walk into the workers' compensation office when he has a job, say he has one house to construct and he will be hiring five men for a couple of months or something like that, just to walk in off the street, easily pay a charge and not have to go through continuing paperwork for the next three years and this type of thing. I wonder if we could be made aware of the board's intentions in respect to these small employers?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. MacLean.

MR. MacLEAN: Mr. Chairman, when we talk about small employers we should first of all make certain of who we are describing. There are many cases where you might hire somebody to do something for you and there would be no employment established as far as we are concerned under this ordinance. It would be a case of the employer being an independent operator or a contractor who is an independent operator. The contractor himself, if he has employees, then he of course has coverage. An independent operator could apply for coverage. I think I understand what Hon. Dave Nickerson is saying. He is talking about a person who is trying to start a business and may have one job to do now and does not know when the next job is coming up. He does not really know just how many employees he might have over the course of a year.

Present Procedure For Small Employer.

Our procedure at the present time is this, he comes in to see us and we say "Well, what work do you know you will have now?" and he tells us and then "Give us an estimation of what you think your payroll will be" and based on the estimate he gives us we go ahead and make a provisional assessment. As soon as that job he has got is done or he hires more employees then he comes back to us to give us that information. In any event, we may also go back to him in six months time and say "What is your assessable payroll now, what in fact are you doing in relation to your business?" and that is the way we do it at the present time.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: That is very reassuring to know that. Another question in the same line, is there a minimum number of days where you could hire somebody and not have to approach the Workers' Compensation Board? Say you wanted to employ somebody for one day, would you still have to pay an assessment on that, one day per year?

MR. MacLEAN: Mr. Chairman, this kind of operation goes on all the time. For instance we have in town certain small moving firms and they may have one truck and this weekend they may have employees and next week they may have none. This is exactly what we do with them. All of their employees are covered whenever they work. For instance, the Bay, and that is a big employer, but they take on part time help and all that part time help is covered. It is not a question of how long you employ a person, it is a question of whether or not employment as such is established. Where you might hire someone to paint your house for you, that may not be employment and that person may not be a worker as such, he may be an independent operator. So, we attempt to work with these small businesses on the basis of saying "Tell us what you think you are going to be doing, tell us the number of casuals or part time employees you may have and we will make a preliminary estimate." Then we will keep a watch on it and they keep in touch with us.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Hon. Dave Nickerson.

Procedure In Remote Areas

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Has the board experienced any difficulty with respect to these very small employers when they are in remote areas? I can see if it is a case of somebody in Yellowknife for instance, it would be very easy to get around these things because you can just walk into the office and see Mr. MacLean, but what happens in Pond Inlet where a guy wants to hire two men for three days in Pond Inlet and does not want to break the law? How does he get a hold of you as quickly as possible, he must start work tomorrow, that sort of thing. How do you operate in those circumstances?

MR. MacLEAN: We will operate by telephone if it is necessary. He calls and says "Here is what we want to do" and we will give him the go-ahead on the telephone and confirm it by letter to him.

Clause 75, Agreed

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacLean. Clause 75, employer ceasing to be an employer. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 76, documents, etc. Clause 76. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 77, service of documents. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, this again presumably is copied straight out of the Alberta ordinance and I know in many of our other ordinances in the Northwest Territories we take account of the difficulty we have with mail between remote settlements, and we have there said that a document shall be deemed to have been served a number of days after the date of the post office receipt. I wonder if the Legal Advisor could tell us what figures we have used in the other ordinances?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Ms. Flieger.

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): I would have to check that. Is Hon. Dave Nickerson suggesting for example that a week after the post office date would be the day on which it is deemed to be served?

Motion To Amend Subclause 77(2)

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I vaguely remember us dealing with the Labour Standards Ordinance some time ago and I think we used a period of seven days but I am not sure and maybe we should keep it the same, whatever it was there, use the same number of days here.

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): I can check that, Mr. Chairman, if you like.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Mr. MacLean, could you enlighten us on that, clause 77?

Mr. MacLEAN: I can appreciate the difficulty where someone else may pick up the mail and sign for the registered letter and the person in fact may not receive it in his own hands until some days after. Seven days to me seems to be fair.

Clause 77, Deferred

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Hon. Dave Nickerson, the Legal Advisor would like to check into it and maybe we could come back to clause 77 and amend it. Is that agreed?

---Agreed

Regulations, clause 78. Mr. Steen.

Clause 78, Regulations, Agreed

MR. STEEN: Just a question on paragraph 78(a). Perhaps we could have some explanation on why employers, workers or industries are exempt. What would the case be?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. MacLean.

MR. MacLEAN: Well, there may be a number of reasons why certain industries should be exempted and that is the basis for putting it in the regulation, making powers. Our aim is to try and provide coverage for all workers in the Northwest Territories but, if for some reason or another administration was not possible with respect to one class or one specific industry, that would enable us to carry out the coverage the way it should be, and there is a possibility that it could be exempted from the ordinance, but we have no intentions at the present time to do so.

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

MR. STEEN: I think that is an answer to the question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Clause 78, I am missing one line right at the bottom and I do not know if anyone else is, but page 82, Ms. Flieger, can you read it out?

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): The missing line is paragraph (e) and the words are "prescribing amounts payable for subsistence and ..." and then it goes on to the top of the next page. It is "prescribing amounts payable for subsistence and travel expenses."

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 78, is it agreed?

---Agreed

Power of Commissioner, clause 79. Hon. Arnold McCallum.

Clause 79, Power Of Commissioner

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: What other ordinance would be assigned to the board or referred to the board here?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. MacLean.

MR. MacLEAN: One example I can give you might be in the field of safety. We have no reason to believe it might happen, but for instance the Commissioner could, if he wished to, assign the administration of the Safety Ordinance to us. He could assign the administration of the Mining Safety Ordinance to us and the board would administer the ordinance and that is the reason for that being in there. If it is necessary at the time for the board to become involved in some matter that is governed under another ordinance the Commissioner has the power if he wishes to assign the administration of that ordinance to us for a period of time, whatever period of time he may wish.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Only as it refers or relates to workers' compensation then but not the actual administration of the ordinance.

MR. MacLEAN: One other example and perhaps a better example might be the Criminal Injuries -- I do not know the correct name, but I think it is the Criminal Injuries Compensation Ordinance, could be assigned to us with respect to the administration of it. That is a far better example because we have the administrative set-up to handle an ordinance such as that if the Commissioner so wished to put it under our jurisdiction.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I would think that that may be a better example and I can see the relationship, that it would exist there to a degree, but not so much the others. So, that would only be then for a very limited period of time, would it, and only in relation to a particular incident?

MR. MacLEAN: Possibly, or possibly for a longer period of time, depending upon the views of the Executive, but I still have to go back to the fact that it is the Commissioner who must do this and I do not foresee him for instance giving us the administration of any acts to do with game or anything like that, I believe it would have to fit in to the compensation field.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: That would be my query, any other ordinance, and I guess that is what my concern is with the words "any other".

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. Arnold McCallum. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

Motion To Delete Paragraph 79(a)

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I think I share Hon. Arnold McCallum's concern on this matter. I can see where there might be instances where it would be desirable to

assign the administration of other ordinances such as the Safety Ordinance or the Criminal Injuries Compensation Ordinance to the board, I think that such assignments should be made by the Legislature. We have to protect ourselves against the board being given the authority to administer ordinances which we do not feel should be administered by the board. So, I would move, Mr. Chairman, that paragraph 79(a) be deleted.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): To the amendment. Ms. Flieger, can you see any problem in deleting paragraph 79(a)?

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): I do not think there is any problem and should it be decided that some other function be assigned to the Workers' Compensation Board it would be possible to do it more directly through the ordinance concerned.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. MacLean, can you see any problem with deleting paragraph 79(a)?

MR. MacLEAN: No, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Paragraph 79(a), "The administration of any other ordinance, or ...". To the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

Motion To Delete Paragraph 79(a), Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The question has been called. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

---Carried

Clause 79(a) "the administration of any other ordinance, or ..." will be deleted. Clause 79. Hon. David Searle.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: It may therefore be advisable to stand down clause 79 because I think there might be some consequential changes following such as in paragraph (c)

Clause 79, Deferred

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Hon. David Searle. Is it agreed that we stand down clause 79? Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 80, board orders, etc. not regulations. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Page 84, PART 10, offences and prohibitions. Offences, clause 81. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: What is the line that is missing from the bottom of the page, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): "Exceeding six months". It reads "to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months." Has everyone got that? Mr. Steen.

MR. STEEN: I am just curious. I find it hard to understand if an employer fails to comply with the provisions of this ordinance and goes to jail for six months. I do not think sending a person to jail would serve the purpose. Actually he may be the only person who is running the business and if he is in jail he is not going to make any money to pay off his debts to the board. I was wondering if there are any other ways, for instance, to go after some of his assets rather than sending him to jail?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Mr. MacLean, could you answer that?

Not Covered By Specific Penalty

MR. MacLEAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There is a provision in the ordinance where we can go ahead and get a judgment in court and obtain an execution order and go after the assets if the assessments are unpaid. This clause is in effect where there is no other penalty provided in the pertinent clauses and is sort of a catchall clause in relation to something an employer may do which is not covered by a specific penalty in another clause. I am inclined to agree with you with respect to the imprisonment part of the clause. It is the usual sort of thing in the statutes where a fine is stipulated and the maximum amount of fine is stipulated and also the maximum amount of imprisonment, but there has to be a contravention provision where the board can make a finding that there has been a contravention. To send a person to jail is not going to pay the amount of money that is owing, that is perfectly correct.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. MacLean. Mr. Steen, do you want to follow up on that?

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, I am not too concerned about having it removed. It is just after listening to Mr. MacLean I think if he is in agreement with me, I take it that we will, the board, will go in that direction before sending anyone to jail.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, Mr. Steen. I recognize the clock. It is 10:30 o'clock a.m. and the House will recess 15 minutes for coffee break. Agreed?

---Agreed

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The Chair recognizes a quorum to continue with Bill 11-61, the Workers' Compensation Ordinance, PART 10, offences and prohibitions, clause 81, offences on page 84. Clause 81, agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 82, unauthorized deductions. Agreed?

---Agreed

PART 11, amendment and repeal, previous ordinances, clause 83, agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 84, repeal. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 85, coming into force. Agreed?

---Agreed

Now, endeth the first lesson. Is it the wish of the committee that we complete the amendments to the ordinance?

---Agreed

Bill 11-61, paragraph 2(1)(v), agreed?

---Agreed

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I am just wondering if, since the amendments do not appear in the book, if for the record and saving reporting them all out later which is a practice which we have slipped out of doing so that there is a record of exactly what the changes are, I wonder if we could read the amendments into the record before you call for them to be agreed because otherwise my feeling is there would then be no record of exactly what the changes are.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Does not everyone have a copy?

HON. DAVID SEARLE: That is right, but once the copies are disposed of there is no record then of what the changes were. Do you follow what I mean?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Ms. Fliieger, do you see any problem?

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Fliieger): I think the suggestion is a good one, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you, will you read them out, please?

Motion To Amend Paragraph 2(1)(v), Carried

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Fliieger): Yes. The amendment to paragraph 2(1)(v), the definition of "remuneration" consists of adding to the words which appear in the book the words "but does not include clothing, materials or transportation allowance supplied to the worker because of the special nature or location of the employment."

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Agreed?

---Carried

Subclause 10(2). Ms. Fliieger, can you read that?

Motion To Amend Subclause 10(2), Carried

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Subclause 10(2) was amended to add some words after the word "application" in the second to last line. The words added are "or the board is satisfied that the actual rate of remuneration exceeds the years maximum assessable remuneration ...".

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Agreed?

---Carried

Paragraph 11(2)(b). Ms. Flieger.

Motion To Amend Clause 11, Carried

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Clause 11 is amended by deleting from subclause (2), paragraph (b) which is a reference to a correctional institution under the Corrections Ordinance. The consequent changes in that subclause would be renumbering the other paragraphs. The clause is further amended by adding a new subclause (6) at the end of the section which reads: "where a person is committed to a correctional institution under the Corrections Ordinance or is serving an alternative sentence other than incarceration and he is working outside the institution in any industry to which this ordinance applies, he shall, while so engaged, be considered to be a worker employed in the public service of the territories for the purposes of this ordinance, unless he is found by the board to be a worker otherwise entitled to compensation.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Agreed?

---Carried

Subclause 20(2), Ms. Flieger.

Motion To Amend Subclause 20(2), Carried

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Subclause 20(2) is amended to add after the word "hospital" "or other health facility". The words "hospital authority" are changed to "the administrator of the facility".

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Agreed?

---Carried

Paragraph 28(1)(b), Ms. Flieger.

Motion To Amend Clause 28, Carried

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Subclause (1) of clause 28 is amended in paragraph (b) by adding the words "or a child is born within nine months of the death".

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Agreed?

---Carried

Subclause 48(2).

Motion To Amend Subclause 48(2), Carried

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Subclause (2) of clause 48 is amended by striking out the words "social assistance" in the fourth line and substituting therefor "social allowance". I have got it backwards. Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. Striking out "social allowance" and replacing those words with the words "social assistance".

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Agreed?

---Carried

Subclause 52(9).

Motion To Amend Clause 52, Carried

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Subclause 52(9) is amended by changing the words which immediately precede the paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d) from "immediate conveyance and transportation" to "conveyance and transportation as soon as reasonably possible ...".

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Agreed?

---Carried

Clause 61.

Motion To Amend Clause 61, Carried

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Clause 61 is deleted. That was the minimum assessment clause. In its place is substituted a review procedure to allow for a review of assessments. Clause 61 now consists of three subsections. The first one, the first subsection reads: "Where an employer is dissatisfied with the amount of an assessment he may request that a review committee appointed by the board review the assessment. (2) Where an employer is dissatisfied with the decision of the review committee he may appeal to the board. (3) In considering a review or an appeal, the review committee or the board shall give the employer an opportunity to be heard and to present any new or additional information relating to the amount of the assessment."

---Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): That concludes the amendments we have written up, and there are three more still to be written up. What is the wish of the House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Report progress.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Is it your wish I report progress? Is it agreed?

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: The House will come to order. Mr. Fraser.

Report of the Committee of the Whole of Bill 11-61, Workers' Compensation Ordinance

MR. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been working on Bill 11-61, An Ordinance Respecting Compensation to be Paid as a Result of Injuries or Death Caused to Workers In the Course of Their Employment, and with three pending amendments we wish to report progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker, I would request the unanimous consent of the House to return to Item 9, tabling of documents.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Item 9, tabling of documents.

REVERT TO ITEM NO. 9: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I wish to table the following document, Tabled Document 13-61, A Comprehensive Nutrition Program for the Northwest Territories.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Returning to Item 10, consideration in committee of the whole of bills and other matters. What is the wish of the Executive, which bill?

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

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, we would recommend Supplementary Appropriation, Bill 2-61.

MR. SPEAKER: This House will resolve into committee of the whole for consideration of bills and other matters, Bill 2-61, Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance No. 3, 1976-77, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into Committee of the Whole for consideration of Bill 2-61, Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance No. 3, 1976-77, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL 2-61, SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE NO. 3, 1976-77

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The committee will come to order to study Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance No. 3, 1976-77, Bill 2-61, and you will find it in the small binder with the yellow binding. Mr. Chairman of the standing committee on legislation, has this bill been through your committee

and have you a report? I am sorry, this went through the finance committee. The finance committee, Bill 2-61. The chairman is not here today. Mr. Deputy Commissioner.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, the standing committee on finance met and considered these supplementary appropriations. There were two or three occasions on which they asked for additional information and if the questions were not answered during the committee meeting then I have one or two answers to give as we approach the items. Other than that my recollection is that the committee approved the supplementary appropriations as being appropriate to be brought forward to this committee of the whole.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Are there any comments of a general nature on Bill 2-61? Are you prepared to go through vote by vote?

---Agreed

Department Of The Executive, O And M - Activity 1010, Executive Offices, Agreed

I direct your attention to page three, Executive, operation and maintenance, activity 1010, supplementary estimates in the amount of \$227,000.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, this was one of the areas in which additional information was requested. We were asked to provide the breakdown as between Alberta Power which serves Fort Providence and Hay River and Plains Western Gas and Electric which serves Yellowknife on this matter of tax rebates. The \$227,000 is divided up this way: \$34,062 to Alberta Power customers, and \$192,746 to Plains Western. The total has been rounded upward by \$200 to come out to an even thousand.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Activity 1010, in the supplementaries, is it agreed?

---Agreed

O And M - Activity 1017, N.W.T. Housing Corporation, Agreed

Activity 1017, Northwest Territories Housing Corporation in the amount of \$381,000, under operation and maintenance. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Department Of Personnel, O And M - Activity 1440, Directorate, Agreed

Page four, Personnel, operation and maintenance, activity 1440, in the amount of \$68,000. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Department Of Natural And Cultural Affairs, O And M - Activity 1563, Fish And Wildlife, Agreed

Page five, Natural and Cultural Affairs, operation and maintenance, supplementaries \$197,000, activity 1563. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Department Of Local Government, O And M - Activity 2022, Municipal Affairs, Agreed

Page six, Local Government, operation and maintenance, activity 2022, supplementary estimates in the amount of \$520,000. Mr. Evaluarjuk.

MR. EVALUARJUK: Mr. Chairman, I was asking questions previously on what the Coral Harbour people wanted, and could I raise that right now?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Yes, proceed, Mr. Evaluarjuk.

MR. EVALUARJUK: Mr. Chairman, I have asked before, and I received an answer, and I will not repeat it again, but the people in Coral Harbour have asked me to ask on the things they wanted concerning what we are talking about for 1977, and they wanted to build a road, the road is rundown, and they wanted a grader and also they wanted a fire truck, a fire hall. When there is winter and there are blizzards, it would be pretty hard for them to fight a fire. Also the recreation committee asked for money, they get some money but there are not too many people living in Coral Harbour and they were given a capital grant following the population of the settlement and if you have seen what they have asked for, and also on the peterhead boat. They wanted to install a radio and they have asked me to tell you of this. I know they will ask me again if I have raised the things they wanted raised in the Assembly, and I will not say thank you right now, but if you can answer me I will thank you later on.

---Laughter

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

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, it does not look like we have a grader in the estimates for Coral Harbour for this year. However, I will look into the request and see if there is anything that can be done about it or, if there is a grader that is for airport use, that might be shared with the community.

With regard to a fire hall I can not tell you what the schedule is for a fire hall for Coral Harbour without seeking some information from the departmental officials, but it is my recollection that a hamlet office/fire hall is scheduled for Coral Harbour within the next year or two. The smallest item I suppose is the radio for the peterhead boat, and I do not see any difficulty in supplying a radio for the boat through our game branch. I think we can be certain of supplying that radio. Now, the other two items, I will try and get further information for Mr. Evaluarjuk before he leaves the session and give him a complete answer.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Would that be satisfactory, Mr. Evaluarjuk?

MR. EVALUARJUK: Mr. Chairman, yes, that is fine, if you could give me my answers before I go and I will be showing you this piece of paper concerning recreation. That is all I have to say and thank you for the part of the answers you gave me and I will thank you later on for the rest.

---Laughter

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Activity 2022, in the amount of \$520,000. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

0 And M - Activity 2024, Town Planning And Lands, Agreed

Activity 2024, under town planning and lands, in the amount of \$21,400. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Department Of Public Works, O And M - Activity 3033, Directorate, Agreed

On page seven, the Department of Public Works, operation and maintenance, directorate, activity 3033, in the amount of \$227,700. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

O And M - Activity 3032, Repair And Upkeep Of Buildings And Works, Agreed

Repair and upkeep of buildings and works, activity 3032, in the amount of \$145,800. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

O And M - Activity 3035, Power Services, Agreed

Power services, activity 3035, in the amount of \$7200. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

O And M - Activity 3037, Offices Leased, Agreed

Activity 3037, offices leased, in the amount of \$137,800. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Department Of Economic Development And Tourism, O And M - Activity 6029, Employment And Training, Agreed

Page eight, Economic Development and Tourism, operation and maintenance, employment and training, activity 6029, \$356,000. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

O And M - Activity 6060, Administration, Agreed

Activity 6060, administration, in the amount of \$50,000, at the bottom of the page. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

O And M - Activity 6064, Research, Development, Agreed

On page nine, Economic Development and Tourism, operation and maintenance, research, development, activity 6064, \$77,000. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Department Of Public Services, O And M - Activity 8080, Directorate, Agreed

Page ten, Department of Public Services, operation and maintenance, directorate, activity 8080, in the amount of \$111,000. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

O And M - Activity 8081, Court Services, Agreed

Court services, activity 8081, in the amount of \$55,000. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

0 And M - Activity 8087, Legal Aid, Agreed

Activity 8087, legal aid, in the amount of \$48,000. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

0 And M - Activity 8089, Workers' Compensation Board, Agreed

Page 11, Department of Public Services, operation and maintenance, Workers' Compensation Board, activity 8089, in the amount of \$150,000. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Department Of Planning And Program Evaluation, 0 And M - Activity 1226, Special Projects And Development, Agreed

Page 12, Planning and Program Evaluation, capital, activity 1226, in the amount of \$1,343,000. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Department Of Personnel, Capital - Activity 1448, Housing, Agreed

Page 13, Personnel, capital, housing, activity 1448, \$527,700. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Department Of Local Government, Capital - Activity 2023, Northern Airports And Facilities, Agreed

Local Government, capital, activity 2023, \$1 million. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Department Of Public Services, Capital - Activity 8084, Registries

Page 15, Public Services, capital, activity 8084, in the amount of \$35,000. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Department Of The Executive, Loan - Activity 1010, Executive Office, Agreed

Page 16, Executive, loan, Executive office, activity 1010, in the amount of \$750,000. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Department Of Economic Development And Tourism, Loan - Activity 6062, Industry And Commerce, Agreed

Page 17, Economic Development and Tourism, activity 6062, in the amount of \$82,160. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

These revolving funds, Mr. Deputy Commissioner, they do not have a vote number. Are they part of the previous vote?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: No, Mr. Chairman. It is true they do not have a number but I would ask you to call out the proposed amounts. As explained in standing committee, the request here is to increase the size of the revolving funds for purchasing goods either for resale or for manufacture of additional items for sale.

Revolving Funds, Agreed

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Program, Economic Development and Tourism, revolving funds, proposed, Rae Lakes, \$150,000. Mr. Whitford.

MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am just wondering in Rae Lakes, that \$150,000 when we were in a finance committee meeting I wanted to ask whether that was including fuel or is that just storage, stock?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, that would include fuel that was held for resale.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Rae Lakes, \$150,000, agreed?

---Agreed

Baychimo, \$100,000, agreed?

---Agreed

Nahanni Butte, \$100,000, agreed?

---Agreed

A total of \$350,000, agreed?

---Agreed

Department Of Finance, Revolving Public Stores Funds, Agreed

Page 19, Finance, revolving public stores funds, Fort Smith, \$150,000?

---Agreed

Frobisher Bay, \$400,000, agreed?

---Agreed

Inuvik, \$125,000, agreed?

---Agreed

Yellowknife, \$250,000, agreed?

---Agreed

Enterprise, \$125,000, agreed?

---Agreed

Rankin Inlet, \$150,000, agreed?

---Agreed

Cambridge Bay, \$50,000, agreed?

---Agreed

Total, \$1,250,000, agreed?

---Agreed

Department Of Economic Development And Tourism, Revolving Funds, Agreed

Page 20, Economic Development and Tourism, revolving funds, Fort Smith, \$140,000, agreed?

---Agreed

Inuvik, \$150,000, agreed?

---Agreed

Headquarters, \$1,500,000, agreed?

---Agreed

Total, \$1,790,000, agreed?

---Agreed

Could we have the final figure, Mr. Deputy Commissioner, for inclusion in clause 2?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, \$6,517,760.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The amount is \$6,517,760. That then we will include in clause 2, amount granted for 1976-77. Clause 2 with this inclusion, agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 3, purpose and effect of each item. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 4, lapsing of appropriations. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 5, transfer of moneys and accountable advances. Agreed?

---Agreed

Short title. Agreed?

---Agreed

The bill as a whole. Agreed?

---Agreed

Ready for third reading?

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Stewart.

Report of the Committee of the Whole of Bill 2-61, Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance No. 3, 1976-77

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been studying Bill 2-61 and I wish to report it ready for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. We will get to the actual bill itself re Bill 3-61, Mr. Stewart. I am wondering if to complete all those financial matters we could not put Bill 3-61 and Bill 6-61 in together and save me popping in and out of the chair. Is that all right?

---Agreed

This House will resolve into committee of the whole for further consideration of bills, Bill 3-61, the Appropriation Ordinance and Bill 6-61, the Financial Agreement Ordinance, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into Committee of the Whole for consideration of Bill 3-61, Appropriation Ordinance, 1977-78, and Bill 6-61, Financial Agreement Ordinance, 1977, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL 3-61, APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE, 1977-78, AND BILL 6-61, FINANCIAL AGREEMENT ORDINANCE, 1977

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I draw the committee's attention to Bill 6-61, An Ordinance Respecting a Financial Agreement Between the Northwest Territories and the Government of Canada. Mr. Deputy Commissioner, are there any other figures we need to complete this bill at this time?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, did you say Bill 3-61?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Bill 6-61.

Correction To Subparagraph 3(a)(iv)

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: I am sorry. We have to make a correction in subparagraph 3(a)(iv). If you will just give me a moment, I will ensure that I am right on that. I think it is \$5,700,000. Mr. Chairman, that is the correction on subparagraph 3(a)(iv). The subparagraph now reads, "as a loan for relending to third parties for the fiscal year 1977-78, an amount equal to \$6 million ..." and that should be changed to read "an amount equal to \$5,700,000 ...". You will recall that when we came to this item in Local Government I advised that we had made a mistake and that the proper figure was \$5.7 million.

Correction To Paragraph 3(a)(ii)

In addition, in that same paragraph 3(a)(ii) I have a corrected figure for the figure that appears there at the present time. The figure that is shown is \$22,738,000. That should now read \$27,517,000. The reason for this is there have been recent changes to the federal provincial cost sharing programs. The federal government has agreed to transfer tax points from the federal to the provincial levels of government. These tax points deal with both corporate and personal income taxes for the 1977 tax year. The impact on the territorial government is to increase the grant in lieu of income taxes available to the Northwest Territories under the financial agreement and to reduce the operating grant. I regret that I can not advise you that we have suddenly come into an additional \$5 million but this more properly reflects our financial arrangement with the federal government whereby we receive an additional \$5 million as a grant in lieu of income taxes and a reduction then of that \$5 million in our deficit grants. I am sure that is clear.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I am glad you are sure. With those two corrected figures then this bill is ready?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: That is right, Mr. Chairman. If I could just say, when we are able to enact our own income tax legislation which has been proposed and accepted by this Legislature and the proposal has been accepted, then instead of a grant in lieu of income taxes we will actually receive a transfer of the income tax although the dollar figures will not be different.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Any comments of a general nature? Are you ready for clause by clause?

---Agreed

Clause 2, definitions. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 3, Commissioner may execute agreement, as amended? Subparagraph 3(a)(ii), the corrected figure reads \$27,517,000. In subparagraph 3(a)(iv) the figure should be \$5,700,000. Clause 3 as amended? Hon. Dave Nickerson.

Commissioner May Execute Agreement

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: First of all, I should say with regard to clause 3 that the new agreement that we have with the federal government regarding distribution of tax points is good as far as the Northwest Territories is concerned in that it now makes our degree of self-sufficiency that much greater than what it was before. A number of provinces have not seen eye to eye with this new agreement in that it would place maximums on the amount of federal spending, especially in respect to health and other social services but from our financial point of view I think it is something to be desired.

Further on paragraph 3(b) I am determined, Mr. Chairman, to say the same now as I did at this time last year, that this type of thing is unacceptable to me whereby we give away our constitutional right to impose income taxes and similar taxes. We worked diligently throughout the past year and now have drafted an income tax ordinance which we should have been dealing with at this session. However, this thing is buried in the bowels of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development I would imagine and somebody in my opinion has deliberately tried to stop us from exercising this constitutional right. The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, when requested to do so by this House, agreed to at least give us a reason why they were withholding permission to go ahead with the income tax ordinance. Mr. Chairman, he has not at this time even gone so far as to give us the reasons. For this reason I will abstain from voting in favour of the passage of this particular ordinance when the time comes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Clause 3?

Correction To Subparagraph 3(a)(i).

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, since those figures have been changed, would it not of necessity change subparagraph 3(a)(i), the operating grant? My book says \$111,614,000. Should that not read then \$106,835,000?

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

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: I am indebted to Hon. Arnold McCallum, that is absolutely right. The figure that he gave you of \$106,835,000 is the correct one to appear in subparagraph 3(a)(i).

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Could you give us that figure again?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: It is \$106,835,000.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): There is another correction in subparagraph 3(a)(i). The figure there is amended to read \$106,835,000. So, we have three amendments. Are we agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 4, additional provisions of agreement. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 5, variation and amendment. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 6, ratification. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 7, no tax collections contravening agreement. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 8, taxes reduced. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 9, operations of sections 7 and 8. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 10, Commissioner may implement agreement. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 11, no borrowing after March 31st, 1978. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Short title. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

The bill as a whole as amended? Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Shall I report this bill ready for third reading?

---Agreed

Summary Of Amounts To Be Voted

The committee will turn its attention to Bill 3-61, Appropriation Ordinance, 1977-78. If you would turn your attention to page 0.01 there are several corrected figures on this page. Page 0.01 in the main estimates, the one with the blue binder. Right at the top of the page, item 1, where it says Executive office and region headquarters, that figure should read \$14,901,000.

If we go down on that page to item 6 page 9.01, Social Development, should read \$16,377,000.

Going down to item 13, the third one in the line, which is, Planning and Program Evaluation, the corrected figure is \$1,237,000.

Then, the subtotal at the bottom, where it reads \$48,937,000 should now read \$48,942,000.

Under loans, Local Government, it reads \$6 million and that figure should be changed to \$5,700,000. So, the subtotal should also be changed where it says \$6 million and that should also read \$5,700,000. Then, the total at the bottom of the page should read \$243,169,000.

On page 0.02, program, Executive, under item 10, operating expenditures for 1977-78, that figure should read, instead of \$14,926,000, \$14,901,000. Mr. Deputy Commissioner.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, I think the corrections on pages 0.02 and 0.02A, as well as 0.02B are simply repetitions of the corrections you gave for 0.01, and as such, unless you wish to they do not have to be called out.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): This is just to verify the changes on the other page, but perhaps the Members might want to know where the other totals were actually changed and this is where the changes are. Could I have direction from the committee? Do you want these figures, there are several of them? Are we agreed to go along with the total changes and leave the rest of them? Is it agreed?

---Agreed

So, I believe that concludes the corrections to the figures as far as the totals are concerned. I direct your attention then to -- Mr. Deputy Commissioner.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Could I have the opportunity to provide a piece of information that was asked for during the Finance debate?

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

Royalty Figures Collected By The Federal Government.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: This is in answer to a point your raised, Mr. Chairman, concerning the royalty figures which were collected in the past year by the federal government, and I have the following information:

The royalty figures for the mining industry for the Northwest Territories for the 1975-76 fiscal year, which is the last year for which the final figures are available, that figure is \$5,662,000. The oil and gas royalties, for that same year, that is 1975-76, amounted to \$4,352,000. The royalties from the forest industry, which in fact amount to stumpage, for that year were \$5,584,000. The personal and other income tax collected for 1976-77, and you will note this is not the same year but they are more recent figures, amounted to \$8,584,000, and the corporate income tax, from corporate operations, in 1976-77 amounted to \$5,895,000. I have not got a total but it is in the neighborhood of \$24 million.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Slightly short, Mr. Deputy Commissioner. I think you have made your point.

If I could direct your attention to Bill 3-61, clause 2, amount granted for 1977-78, you would put in at the bottom then \$243,169,000; \$243,169,000. Clause 2, is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 3, purpose and effect of each item. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 4, lapsing of appropriations. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 5, transfer of moneys and accountable advances. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

The short title. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

The bill as a whole as amended. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Shall I report this bill ready for third reading?

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: The House will come to order. Mr. Stewart.

Report of the Committee of the Whole of Bill 3-61, Appropriation Ordinance, 1977-78, and Bill 6-61, Financial Agreement Ordinance, 1977

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been studying Bill 6-61 and wishes to report this bill as amended ready for third reading.

Your committee has been studying Bill 3-61 and wishes to report this bill as amended ready for third reading. I have several motions that were filed and could I just have one moment please?

Bill 3-61, the following motions were carried: I move that this Legislative Assembly request the administration to consider ways and means of increasing the amount of money being spent on recreation both at the O and M and capital levels and that motion was carried.

The following motion: I move that the Executive consider an increase in the level of assistance given to the Northwest Territories Mental Health Association and that was carried.

I move that we request the administration to make appropriate grants to trappers' associations and other community groups representing trappers for administrative purposes. That was carried.

The territorial government policy as to pricing liquor be debated in committee of the whole and that was carried.

Moved that this House recommend that in future negotiations the territorial government seek funds on an ongoing basis for a program of paving of the Mackenzie highway and that motion was carried.

There was a recorded vote on activity 2021, Local Government, operation and maintenance, votes were seven for, two negative, and two people abstained. That was noted as requested.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Fraser.

MR. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, the amendments to Bill 11-61 are now being circulated with the exception of one and I think we could deal with Bill 11-61 at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: After that I believe you want to deal with the integrated housing policy. Has that been into committee before with anyone, either Mr. Stewart or Mr. Fraser? No? Can we again, just to save time, could we put the integrated housing policy in committee with you as well as your Workers' Compensation Ordinance, Mr. Fraser?

MR. FRASER: Well, Mr. Speaker ...

MR. SPEAKER: Is that all right with you?

MR. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, I will complete Bill 11-61 if Mr. Stewart ...

MR. SPEAKER: Fine. The House will resolve into committee of the whole for continuing consideration of Bill 11-61, the Workers' Compensation Ordinance with Mr. Fraser in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into Committee of the Whole for consideration of Bill 11-61, Workers' Compensation Ordinance, with Mr. Fraser in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL 11-61, WORKERS' COMPENSATION ORDINANCE

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): The committee will come to order. Clause 74 of Bill 11-61. What is the amendment?

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Mr. Chairman, clause 74 subclause (4), paragraph (b), the amendment has not been distributed and would it be in order, Mr. Chairman, for me to read it? I think the changes can be made simply by crossing out a few words.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Proceed.

Motion To Amend Paragraph 74(4)(b), Carried

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): The change reads "has priority over all assignments, debts, liens, charges or encumbrances other than mortgages or wages due to workers." Shall I read that again? "has priority over all assignments, debts, liens, charges or encumbrances other than mortgages or wages due to workers."

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

---Carried

Subclause 77(2). Ms. Flieger.

Motion To Amend Subclause 77(2), Carried

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Subclause 77(2) is deleted and the following words substituted "Where an order, notice or other document is served by registered mail, the seventh day after mailing shall be deemed the date of delivery to the person to be served."

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): There is one error possibly in the second word, you have "on order" and what have you got?

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): I have corrected it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Thank you. Is it agreed?

---Carried

Clause 79. Ms. Flieger.

Motion To Amend Clause 79, Carried

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): The change in clause 79 is to delete what was paragraph (a), "the administration of any other ordinance," and the words beginning at "notwithstanding anything contained in this ordinance" are moved out to the margin. It was wrongly indented before.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Clause 79. Is it agreed?

---Carried

That completes Bill 11-61. The short title?

---Agreed

The bill as a whole.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Just a moment. I have a question of the Legal Advisor, Mr. Chairman.

I know it is the intention to change the name of the ordinance from the Workmen's Compensation Ordinance to Workers' Compensation Ordinance which is probably very good but in certain other ordinances such as for instance the Medical Care Ordinance cross references occur wherein reference is made to the Workmen's Compensation Ordinance. Is it necessary, Mr. Chairman, to amend those various other ordinances on account of this?

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Mr. Chairman, the rules of interpretation would cover the change in that name so that it would not be necessary to make the changes until we are amending the ordinance in which the reference appears.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: That is fine.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fraser): Short title, agreed?

---Agreed

The bill as a whole, agreed?

---Agreed

That now completes Bill 11-61. Agreed?

---Agreed

Shall I now report the bill ready for third reading?

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: The House will come to order. Mr. Fraser.

Report of the Committee of the Whole of Bill 11-61, Workers' Compensation Ordinance

MR. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, your committee has now completed its study of Bill 11-61, the Workers' Compensation Ordinance. There were a number of amendments which are recorded in the proceedings of this House which were agreed to and the bill is now ready for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Mr. Stewart.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I am reporting Bill 3-61 out and there were moved two motions of appreciation on this bill, one to Mr. Bergasse which is carried unanimously.

I would also like to indicate during the debate there were 35 recommendations. Is it the wish of this House the recommendations be read into the record at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: Thirty-five recommendations? Are they not already in the record?

MR. STEWART: They are, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Gentlemen, do you wish the 35 recommendations to be read? They are already in the record.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Not to be read. It is too long.

MR. SPEAKER: Pardon me?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, because they have already been read into the record I do not see there is any need for us to go through 35 recommendations.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. On a show of hands how many wish them to be simply made reference to in that they are already part of the record? All in favour? Four. Down. How many want them read into the record? Three. There were four in favour and three contrary so they will be deemed to have been read in. Thank you, Mr. Stewart. Deputy Commissioner Parker.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, may I have your permission to deal with two matters, the first one an appointment to the board of the Housing Corporation and the second one appointments to the Northwest Territories Water Board.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed?

---Agreed

Reappointment Of Mr. Simeon Aklunark To N.W.T. Housing Corporation Board Of Directors

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, the term of one member of the board of directors of the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation expires March 7, 1977. That member is Mr. Simeon Aklunark of Rankin Inlet who was appointed March 7, 1974 and who also serves as vice-chairman. The Commissioner recommends that Mr. Aklunark be reappointed for a further three year term.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed?

---Agreed

---Applause

Appointments To The N.W.T. Water Board

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, due to the resignation of Mr. Joe Bergasse, chairman of the Northwest Territories Water Board, a new chairman must be named. In addition, the Minister has asked for three additional nominations of non-government people to replace members now serving from federal Department of Transport; Public Works and Energy, Mines and Resources. The Commissioner recommends the following persons to serve on the board for a one

year term and I should interject that that is a one year renewable term. One, Mr. Alex Gordon, director of Planning and Program Evaluation. Two, Mr. Fred Betsina of Yellowknife. Three, Mr. Tom Kudloo of Baker Lake. Four, Mr. Charlie Furlong of Aklavik. If Members agree with these recommendations, it is the Commissioner's intention to recommend to the Minister the appointment of Mr. Alex Gordon as chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: Gentlemen, is that agreed?

---Agreed

Thank you, Deputy Commissioner Parker. This House will resolve into committee of the whole for continued consideration of bills and other matters. An Integrated Housing Policy for the Northwest Territories. Mr. Stewart, do you mind taking the chair?

MR. STEWART: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: With Mr. Stewart in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into Committee of the Whole for consideration of Tabled Document 6-61, An Integrated Housing Policy for the Northwest Territories, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER TABLED DOCUMENT 6-61, AN INTEGRATED HOUSING POLICY FOR THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The committee will come to order to study Tabled Document 6-61, An Integrated Housing Policy for the Northwest Territories. Hon. Peter Ernerk.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the committee to agree to have Mr. Sig Dietze appear before us?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Dietze, agreed?

---Agreed

Would the committee like an opening statement from Mr. Dietze relative to this matter?

---Agreed

The Report Itself

MR. DIETZE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe the Integrated Housing Policy had been submitted to the Assembly at the Rankin meeting and was then deferred to this meeting with a number of comments which were expressed in Hansard.

The report itself was an outcome of a motion made by this Assembly a year ago and was put together during the summer of 1976 and was, therefore, completed by August. It was presented to the board of directors of the Housing Corporation and they approved it and forwarded it to the Commissioner. Since the report was originally made discussions have continued with the government, with Central Mortgage and Housing and other funding agencies who are expected to provide financial support. In addition to that, of course, a year almost has gone by since the initiation of the report and some changes have taken place because of the 1977 program which we discussed in this chamber about a week ago. As a result of many of the discussions that have taken place, we have submitted for your consideration a supplement which was circulated to the Members as well and the recommendations of the report itself as outlined in the first few pages should be read on the basis of this supplement.

We recommend to this Assembly the adoption of this report, realizing that a five year plan is not a finished and finite, chiseled-in-stone document but, rather, an approach to how things ought to be done. We realize that much more work has to take place, more consultation with senior governments on repair programs and home ownership programs. In essence the report has built on many of the present programs available throughout Canada and available in the territories. We, therefore, feel that if this is adopted the five year plan or six year plan as it appears now will ameliorate many of the shortcomings in housing that have existed so far. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, if I could just ensure that Members have the proper supplement, there was an earlier draft which had six points listed on its first page. That draft has been replaced by a new draft with seven points on its first page. I would just like to make sure that Members have the proper draft, the latest draft of the supplement.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The date of that would be January 12th, 1977 and on the first page it includes seven points. Does everyone have the right supplement? Any comments of a general nature? Hon. Dave Nickerson.

A System Of Socialized Housing

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: My main comment on this whole thing, Mr. Chairman, is that although this document purports to encourage home ownership, by the very fact that it tries to make available to people in the Northwest Territories housing of a comparable standard to that which they might have in southern Canada, it means that people will not be able by themselves to afford such housing. Therefore, what we are doing is setting up a system of socialized housing in the Northwest Territories. Whatever the pretences in this document that people will own their own homes, because of the high cost of operating homes and constructing them, especially in the areas out of the tree line, even if people have a document which gives them title to their home, they do not really own it in the sense that it is theirs to do with what they want or theirs to operate.

What it really means is that we have adopted this system in the Northwest Territories where the government will provide housing to people and it may or may not be a good thing. We have socialized medicine, we have socialized education, and to me it seems that this document is getting us into a position of socialized housing in the Northwest Territories and I think we should recognize and realize really what it says. It certainly in the long run is not encouraging home ownership and operation of the houses by the people who are living in them, it is not that at all, it is putting us irreversibly on the road towards the provision of housing to people by government.

The Goal Of Home Ownership

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: I can not argue with the statements that Hon. Dave Nickerson has made because what he has said is correct. The only modification might be that we have tried in this integrated housing policy to ensure that people knew that the goal of home ownership was one that would be reached by very few people under conditions prevalent in the North today, and considering the aspirations of people throughout Canada today.

The Housing Corporation board of directors does not have the answer to the question that Hon. Dave Nickerson posed. We talk about providing basic shelter but in fact we provide a bit more than that. By the same token it is not as elaborate as housing in other parts of the country, but the costs are at least as high, if not higher, for a lesser amount of accommodation because of the problems of water and sewers and the provision of electricity and the provision of heat due to the climate with which we must contend.

Hon. Dave Nickerson raises some very interesting points and I know that Mr. Dietze and I would be delighted to have a discussion along those lines, or rather to hear a discussion along those lines.

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

Need For Low Rental Housing

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, housing is a subject that causes me much concern. I see some things that are happening in communities where low cost housing -- to put it another way, I guess you could say that it will not be long before we can say that the communities, all the land in the communities will be owned totally by the Government of Canada, all their land. There is no real ownership of land because there is not enough home ownership instituted in the Northwest Territories. I do not think that we are pushing hard enough to get home ownership in the Northwest Territories and we see now that the people who are getting houses are the ones who are doing the most vocally in the affairs of the Northwest Territories, and in the development and so forth. They are the ones who are opposing development, more so than the ones who have home ownership or who own their own homes. They do not care if there will be any development in the country because they only have to pay the minimum rents on their houses. So, I understand, or I can say that I can understand that there is a need for low rental housing, but I think we are giving them too much.

I think we should go back, in places where feasible, like in the Delta, where they can get their own wood for fuel, and maybe in other places where they are burning coal, or they could burn coal, and if they want furnaces in these low rental houses then let them buy their own furnaces, and you could call it, I think you could call it a luxury if you do not have to stick wood in the stove all the time, let them burn their own fuel and buy their own fuel if they want a furnace. However, I think the responsibility of people, these people have everything handed to them on a platter in the low rental houses and I really feel that we are just giving them too much.

The Availability Of Land

Another concern is that now we see the Housing Corporation is applying to the municipalities for land on a long-range plan so that they can have land available for houses, but it has never been brought to the communities that you should reserve some land for the people, the best land for people who will build their houses, even if they had a better view of the surroundings, that should be the first choice. I do not think that the Housing Corporation,

or the communities even have realized that land is not taken into consideration, in giving it to prospective home owners, those people.

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

MR. FRASER: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to get clarification on one thing with the Housing Corporation. I see that they have different types of housing, there is low cost housing, low rental, public housing and integrated housing. Is there any difference in those types of houses?

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

A Historic Difference

MR. DIETZE: I believe that the difference between public housing and territorial housing is one of historic difference. Since the Housing Corporation was formed, we obtained funding for public housing purposes on a rent-year to income basis under section 43 or 40 of the National Housing Act. The old northern rental units were those built prior to the Housing Corporation but are administered by the corporation, and are under the jurisdiction of local housing associations or authorities. Did I answer your question, Mr. Fraser?

MR. FRASER: Yes, thank you.

MR. DIETZE: I wonder if I might respond to Mr. Steen's comments about land? It is true that the Housing Corporation is trying to obtain a little more land in advance of construction, in advance of house construction because we have found that if there is anything difficult concerning house construction it is the foundation. We feel that we need to prepare house pads and sites at least one year ahead of actual construction. In order to do that we have been lobbying with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to obtain funding under section 42 of the National Housing Act which is land assembly and indeed have received some loans for this purpose. We have been talking to a number of communities about doing a land assembly project in which we would be building the roads and preparing housing sites, one, two or three years ahead of construction.

We have indicated that whatever we do must be as approved by the municipality and finally approved by the Department of Local Government, under their planning jurisdiction. It will be zoned by the municipality and we will only do this if our procedures, practices and plans are indeed approved. However, should there be a requirement to make available some of that land for private purposes or indeed for government staff housing or for other accommodation, we will do that in every instance and have discussed that in each community so that land can in fact be made available for whatever purposes.

We do not in fact wish to impose our housing units on a community and, as you see the supplement addresses itself to the need to do a little more long-range planning and work with the communities. We would hope in years to come that we will in fact only provide public housing when the community wishes us to do so, and that is part of our long-range thinking.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Steen, did you want to pursue your line of questioning?

Payment Of Power Bills

MR. STEEN: Just one more aspect of this. I also think that perhaps the Housing Corporation should not be taking the power bills under their wings. I think individuals should pay the power bills and in that way it would encourage them to put in a wood cookstove or turn off their lights when necessary, and let NCPC -- instead of taking on the subject of cutting them off, let NCPC be the one rather than the Housing Corporation.

MR. DIETZE: Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Steen reflects the opinion that is prevalent within the Housing Corporation board of directors. In fact, it has been expressed in this policy, that tenants will have to pay a responsible rent and, in our recent adjustments we are moving in that direction. That however brings us back to the historical precedent set in northern rental housing, as was mentioned earlier, and that goes back 20 years when all services were provided within a dwelling unit. Now, we are certainly faced with very high heating and power bills and we are budgeting on the basis of funding housing associations to a quota and receiving greater returns in terms of rent, requesting tenants to sign leases and to pay a reasonable responsible share of their income for housing as was discussed on a sliding scale. So, there is a greater perception of people's responsibility in this regard.

MR. STEEN: Just a little bit more. Would the Housing Corporation allow people to change over to wood stoves, put a smokestack through the ceiling, would they allow them to do that?

MR. DIETZE: Yes, in fact in our home ownership programs both the small settlement home assistance plan and the remote and rural program we are providing funding for those very simple heating devices. We are encouraging people to build log houses, that is within the tree line, and the program is encouraging the use of non-fossilized fuels because only then would CMHC agree to provide a mortgage for this rural and remote program, by not using fossilized fuels.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I wonder, just as a point of interest, Hay River in the early stages was burning wood and we found that it cost more to buy cordwood to give to the houses so they could heat them than it cost to put diesel fuel in and the net result was that a change-over was made, but it is the whole theory of the house because people expected everything to be provided. If you have to provide wood, the cost of wood at \$45 or \$50 a cord, it is just as expensive as diesel fuel. So, this is the relationship that you sometimes get into. It is the whole basic theory of housing but has slipped off the track very badly somewhere along the route. Mr. Butters, I believe you indicated you wished to speak.

Housing, The Most Insolvable Problem

MR. BUTTERS: Only to add to the tale of woe. I think that there are many problems which we face which are extremely difficult and the administration faces which are extremely difficult. I think housing is one that is almost insolvable if it is not insolvable. I remember the Northwest Territories Council task force on housing I think developed an excellent report, a strong recommendation of that body was home ownership. In its study at that time -- socialized housing did not just happen this year or last year, Hon. Dave Nickerson -- at that time the housing task force determined that 95 per cent of the families in the Northwest Territories lived in rental accommodations. This compared with something in Ontario, say, of 60 per cent. Even at that time we faced this terrible imbalance between rental accommodation and home owned accommodation.

I think too one of the things that impressed me on the trip to Alaska was how socialistic we are in Canada, how socialistic is Canada's North. How much of the infrastructure has been provided by a benevolent government, by the Crown. It struck me, looking around in the barren north slope and the other communities that a goodly portion of the land claims money that will be given to and has been given to the native corporations of that area will be spent to provide the facilities and infrastructure which are already in place in Canada's North today. I think that we Canadians in the North can say that you would have to look long and hard to find a family that is inadequately housed or is not entitled to adequate housing.

The terrible cost of this is that we have taken from the individual his independence. There has been no source of welfare by this government that has destroyed more or damaged more people I think than the provision of housing without any requirement of paying for it or attempting to pay for it. Nobody likes welfare. You can not fool people. They know when they are getting welfare. They know they are living in subsidized houses, like dogs chained in a kennel. It is not one's own. So what do you care? What do you care about the dwelling you live in? What do you care about the settlement you live in? What do you care about the territory you live in? What do you care about yourself?

Personal Independence

You know every year that you are receiving between \$2500 and \$4000, and the figures are right here in the settlements, of social welfare money, just in the housing aspect alone, just to pay for your fuel and oil, not anything to do with amortizing that house. Some people are still struggling, not very many, but they are still struggling and you have to admire them because of their independence which is a trait every northerner had until just a few years ago. Personal independence is now costing men maybe \$10,000 or \$12,000 a year. I do not know where the answer lies. I feel that this government, I feel that our Deputy Commissioner, Mr. John Parker, has tried desperately hard over the past five or maybe even ten years to improve this situation. He has gone to Ottawa and talked to the Treasury Board. Nobody could be a better spokesman than our Deputy Commissioner, the chairman of the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation, but he has not succeeded. He has not been able to convince them that we should be assisting people to own their own homes and subsidizing power, especially when we are paying such large subsidies for so many people that we can not find a few measly dollars to subsidize the independent man or woman.

It is a tragic situation. I do not blame Mr. John Parker. I do not blame Mr. Sig Dietze. I do not know what the answer is, but there is an unwillingness I feel on the part of the federal government, on the part of CMHC to look at the North with new eyes and not see a transplanted Calgary or "Brushy Bottom", Saskatchewan, but see our specific and unique problems and assist us to solve them.

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

Solving The Problems

MR. FRASER: Mr. Chairman, from listening to Mr. Butters here I do not know if anybody can solve the problem. It is a problem, but in this paper that we have here dated January 12th, they have a task force which is going to explain to the communities in the Mackenzie Valley about the housing program. I just wonder if this problem could be solved by giving the tenants who are able and who have a bit of income and probably some of them who are on welfare, to just give them the house and say "This is your house. We are not going to look after it any more", with the exception of the widows and ones who can not help themselves. I am talking about able-bodied people, it might be cheaper just to turn the house over to them and say "This is your house and if you want to put a wood stove in it or just burn a candle, that is up to you". I think it would be cheaper for the government to just give them the house because of the money that is poured into those houses now for power and fuel and what have you, money that is just going down the drain.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Mr. Fraser. I have knowledge of several instances where that was more or less done and they ended up burning the house piece by piece until there was nothing left.

MR. FRASER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): They use the house itself for fuel. Mr. Deputy Commissioner.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, we have had instances where the transfer that Mr. Fraser mentioned has taken place and we have had other instances where people have asked to give up their own home because they could not afford to operate it, even though they were supplying their own fuel in the form of wood. If you are going to gather wood, then you do not have as much time to work. There is some saw-off there. I personally think that we went into the use of oil on far too fast and on far too widespread a basis. We objected to that program when it was a federal program and we were not successful.

However, I do remain much more optimistic than Mr. Butters is. I do not think that the situation is as far out of hand perhaps as he suggests. There is no doubt that the provision of housing in the form of rental housing, subsidized rental housing is a form of welfare and there is no doubt that people lose a degree of individuality by this act. However, the alternatives to that, as he also indicated, are few and far between. The original housing task force suggested taking all of the subsidy money and using it to subsidize basic utilities which would then have the effect of the individual at least being aware of what it costs to operate a house and paying for the quantities of electricity and heating oil used even though that individual was not paying for the full cost. At least if he used less heat or less light it would be reflected in the bills that he would pay each month. I think that is something we have got to get to.

Overly Generous

One of the problems is the rental program was overly generous and it is not that easy now to turn away from that. One of the first steps in turning away from that program is going to the public housing basis and on that basis an individual pays a percentage of his rent and he should be seen by society as really pulling his weight. There is a tremendous number of people in the Northwest Territories in rental housing who are trying to pay their rent and who are really taking care of their houses. I would not want to leave it on the record that the situation is totally bad by any means. There is a great deal of improvement necessary, but people are learning to live with their houses.

I think it has to be looked on very favourably that the Government of Canada and the Government of the Northwest Territories have been able to provide anywhere from 250 to almost 400 housing units per year for a considerable number of years. I think the debate must go on and we are looking for advice as to how these subsidies can be rearranged or the style of housing so that people can take a larger responsibility.

Economic Viability Of A Locale

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I wonder if I might be allowed to ask one question before I call on Mr. Lyall because he indicated he wanted to speak. Does the Housing Corporation take into consideration economic viability of a locale? In other words, if a place is viable, do they try to put more houses in there to hold those people there to take advantage of the work that is there or is this done on generally a population basis?

MR. DIETZE: Mr. Chairman, to some extent this is done. It is certainly done by a policy directive for single person accommodation, that we are to build single person accommodation only where there is employment for these people. In terms of other housing projects we find that because of the overcrowding and the movement of people to employment centres that those are the places where more housing is needed. In our annual surveys of need we can determine that some communities grow more than other communities. But we can not neglect at the same time those communities where there is no employment but which are also in need of housing. So we have to draw a reasonable balance and try and satisfy the housing needs in communities with employment.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Do you not think we are also creating a monster that will come back and haunt us and that is getting places in such a growth pattern, or their natural growth pattern, with no economic base and houses and houses and no jobs and we are perpetuating an impossible position as long as we go along that path, are we not?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: We would be delighted if you or any Member could suggest an alternative to that. We have, over the years, looked at various concepts, you know, the concept of providing central services, of naming certain places as growth centres and so forth, but we found there is no use naming something as a growth centre unless there are jobs there, unless there is employment. Until such time as we have places in the Northwest Territories where there are a substantial shortage of workers, or a substantial increase in the amount of employment, due to whatever, industrial jobs or whatever kind of jobs, then there is not much use in saying to a community, "There is no use in this community continuing to grow because you have no future". We do not have other places to which people can be moved.

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

Housing In The Central Arctic

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, just very generally speaking for the Central Arctic only, there is no way anybody in the Central Arctic could afford to live in their own home because no one makes enough money to pay for fuel, water and electricity. I personally would like to own my own home but it is just impossible, and the way things are going we will just have to keep building more houses in every community because the thing is the population will grow too big, and it is, there are no natural causes any more that takes people's lives the way they used to, when they used to live off the land. There was at one time starvation which tended to keep the population controlled, that was the way the natural causes used to take that step, but now, with nursing stations and hospitals we will keep creating this problem and it will get worse and worse. You can go to places like Spence Bay and there are only a certain number of jobs there, you are living there, and you must work at the co-op or Hudson's Bay or you sew, because what more can you do?

A lot of us have tried to make a go of it, and I have been living in my house for the last four years, and I tried to keep it up, to repair my own. I even put on my own porch and did this kind of thing and I banked it up every year to try and save fuel, to keep the heat down to 66 degrees. I tried to help that way a little bit but there is no way I could keep up with the rent I pay and with the wages I make, I just get further and further in the hole. The only time I can get caught up a little bit is when the fishing season opens. It is just impossible to live in a home in that country, you can not go out and collect wood. So, speaking of home ownership, although a lot of us would like to have our own home, our income, with that, it is just not possible.

Now on this subject there is nothing else I could say, as people are glad they have these houses but how can we -- people on welfare, and I know I was speaking to some people in Spence Bay, and this woman came up to me and told me after I explained, she said, "I know that but I can not help it, I can not provide for myself. Although I would like to pay for that house a bit more I can not help it, there is no money, or at least I have not got any." We keep putting people down, but we were the ones who created the problem. Honest to God, I saw it when they started pulling people in from outside, that is when they started creating a problem. I do not know how we can solve it but we keep putting people down. Our own Minister here has been putting people down, and that is his job though to try and help people. I can not say anything else. What the heck are we going to do? It is impossible for us to do anything, it will just keep growing unless we line up some people and kill them off so the population stays down at the size we could accommodate. It is impossible to do anything as far as I can see with the housing situation. We just go on and on and on. The prices keep going up and we have to give more money and we can not help it.

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

Employment For Natives

MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Chairman, I was going to say the same thing that Mr. Lyall said, there is no need to expand it any further, other than the fact that some of the communities in the Northwest Territories, people in these areas, I keep saying so repeatedly over and over, in one case we have 300 people out of work, basically because we keep bringing people in from the South to go to the jobs, for example the Strutt Lake hydro was built not by people from this community, not by the people from my constituency, but basically people from the South working on the machinery. Trapping is not like it used to be, we like to think it is, but it is not. So, consequently all the money that is made must go back into the bills to repay the bills from the summer or the fall.

The Housing Corporation I think now is doing a very good job in trying to meet the demands of the people, knowing full well that a lot of these people can not afford to pay for rental, or the purchase of the home. Very few of the northern natives are able to own their own homes and I am sympathetic with Mr. Steen, I am, I own my own home, however, there are lots of people who would like to who can not afford it, and basically because we just do not have a system I think big enough that would be able to train these people in terms of job opportunities.

I do not think that if you took all the people from Rae and moved them to Yellowknife it would make any difference. I think these people are better off, in that community at least they can go out periodically to catch fish or hunt or even trap, but I think the solution is contrary to what Mr. Stewart said, moving them into a community, but I do not think so, I think they are better off in the small communities where they can do their own thing. However, at the same time the conditions in these communities, and I have said this before, is extremely high, 14, 15, 16 or 17 people to a home. So, things have to be done for them as well. As far as tearing down walls and burning them, grant you perhaps there are a few, but maybe if we went ahead and built log houses like most of them wanted to do they would have been cheaper, they would have been able to build them in the community, and maybe they would not tear them down as fast.

So, I do not know, I think our solution now is to find a means or vehicle to be able to try and accommodate as much as possible this kind of a demand, some kind of a program, in other words the community that is presently there now, and has to be developed, it should be developed by the people there rather than sitting there knocking those people in the community.

A Small Problem Will Become Larger

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I would just like to clarify one point, Mr. Whitford, I was not suggesting that people should be gathered and taken to a place but the smaller places will be tomorrow larger places and the problem will get larger and larger in every way. We must make a breakthrough on the economic base somehow, somewhere, or else what is a small problem today will be one ten times larger very, very soon in the future. Mr. Fraser.

MR. FRASER: Mr. Chairman, I am just wondering why in a place like Norman Wells where there is no lack of employment, we have a lack of housing, and if we had ten or 15 more low rental houses in Norman Wells I am sure they could be filled up and these people could all be working and paying for these houses. It seems to me that they put houses in other communities and Norman Wells seems to be neglected. Now, like I said there is no unemployment at Norman Wells, the problem we have is housing. I am sure if they put in ten or 15 more low rental houses, and they have low rental houses in there now, but I do not know if the natives from the outlying settlements are going to be able to apply for them, or if they do, if they are able to apply for them, they were not notified, they were told those houses were going in for the construction workers and the people who were in the settlement already. I wonder if Mr. Dietze could verify that for me, those houses that are going in there now, are they for anybody who applies for them?

MR. DIETZE: Mr. Chairman, yes, the allocating of housing in communities is done on the basis of need. In most communities we have housing associations who have a waiting list. In the case of Norman Wells there is no housing association and hopefully when the new houses are occupied we might be able to form one. So, the allocation will be done by our district office in Inuvik on the basis of need. Now, the basis of need is usually family size and income, and overcrowding, if indeed they have been living in a smaller house. The houses are just now ready to be occupied, as we know from our need and demand information, there is a need for ten additional houses in Norman Wells, within the next few years that will be built. But we have overcrowding and need in all the communities and, unfortunately can not satisfy all in one year. However, we try and do a little bit each year, and this has been the historical approach to overcome the housing shortage, by providing houses say every two years, or every three years if the funds are available.

Seasonal Employment In Norman Wells.

MR. FRASER: There is possibly a slight problem in so far as building these big houses, three bedroom houses is concerned. Most of the employment at Norman Wells is seasonal and I do not think there is enough employment in the settlement itself for winter employment and, Imperial Oil might hire 15 or 20 locals in the summertime but that is only for a four or five month period. So, there has to be another way to get the seasonal guys accommodation and, right now the practice is to hire single people so they could accommodate them in a barracks. However, the single people that they hire have a tendency of working for a month and then going home. If you bring in a married man who is married in the outlying settlements and has a family he will not stay unless his family can be moved over and consequently he has no place to put her, put his family, so he goes home too. If that problem could be solved for Norman Wells at least, there would be a lot of native employment at Norman Wells.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Mr. Fraser. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I was just going to say, Mr. Chairman, that I completely agree with what Mr. Whitford has to say. In keeping with his thoughts I have some words to say on recommendation (6), page iii which states that one of the goals of the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation will be to support the housing production by non-profit and co-operative corporations wherever possible. I do not think we can argue that that is not desirable but one thing that bothers me about it is that rather than excluding from this list the local entrepreneur, the person who wants to get into housing development, housing construction, should we not be encouraging as much as possible local people to get involved from a profit motive? Encourage people to get into the construction operation of housing. Are we not concentrating too much on non-profit organizations which invariably become subject to government control one way or another? Is there not some way we can find to encourage the local people to do this on their own initiative?

Obtaining Collective Ownership

MR. DIETZE: Mr. Chairman, that proposition is implicit in the statement under recommendation (6) because those are all local organizations. The purpose of (6) is to obtain collective ownership where single ownership, private, personal ownership is difficult. With the funding arrangements we have worked out, local organizations can indeed go into their own ownership, design their own houses and obtain funding through the National Housing Act and the Housing Corporation of the territories utilizing local contractors to the fullest possible extent or collectively as co-ops build their own houses. That vehicle is available and is encouraged and we wish to promote that concept very much.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. In view of the hour the committee stands recessed until 2:30 o'clock p.m. I understand there is a meeting at 1:00 o'clock p.m. in room 303. There is a caucus meeting at 1:00 o'clock p.m. The House stands adjourned until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

---LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The Chair recognizes a quorum and calls this committee back to order. Prior to the luncheon recess we were studying Tabled Document 6-61, An Integrated Housing Policy for the Northwest Territories. Hon. Dave Nickerson was the next speaker but he is not in the House at the moment. Does anyone else care to make a comment at this time? Hon. Peter Ernerk.

Extensive Educational Programs

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, I think one of the things, speaking of housing, which we will have to do in the future is to get some extensive educational programs going in the communities either with respect to home ownership programs or with respect to any other programs such as teaching the people in the communities about the cleanliness of the houses, how to keep the houses clean and so on. Maybe this is where the Department of Education comes in through the home management programs. I think it would be so important to include something like this when you get into local housing programs. It is true that in the past, like anything else, there are various housing associations at the community level which have gone through some extensive training programs, but I think what is yet to come is some kind of home management educational programs which will teach the people in the communities to keep low on fuel and these kinds of things. I am just wondering if anything like this has been done in the past through the Housing Corporation with the Department of Education, for example?

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

MR. DIETZE: Mr. Chairman, we have met with the Minister of Education some time ago because we had been requested to expand the whole home management courses that that department is operating. We realize that some courses are being held such as that one in Baker Lake and we felt that it was a great priority to expand the program throughout other communities. We understood the last we heard that the courses are being offered in other communities and that department was trying to determine how many clients were available. As regards education generally, the Department of Education is offering a housing maintenance apprentice course which is being now offered in two locations, Frobisher and Fort Smith. That is certainly helping us out as regards housing maintenance. We have also had some discussion with the department concerning a teaching program for people to build their own log houses and I understand they are working on that one as well.

Motion To Adopt Tabled Document 6-61

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Integrated housing, any further comments? Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Maybe, Mr. Chairman, this might be the moment to reintroduce the motion I introduced incorrectly earlier on in this session relative to this report. I think I had it circulated to all Members and the motion reads: I move that this committee adopt, giving strong support to the Integrated Housing Policy of the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation placed before this Assembly at the 60th session convened at Rankin Inlet, mid-October 1976, and contained in pages iii to vi inclusive, of that document, plus the addition of the supplement to the Integrated Housing Policy dated January 12th, 1977 and tabled during this session.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Has everybody got a copy of that motion or do you wish it to be redistributed? To the motion. Mr. Whitford.

MR. WHITFORD: No, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): To the motion attached to your supplement to the Integrated Housing Policy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Question being called. I will leave it to Mr. Butters to see if he wants to speak on this. The question is being called on your motion. Do you wish to speak?

MR. BUTTERS: No, sir.

Motion Carried.

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

---Carried

Basically on this motion this could conclude the discussion on Tabled Document 6-61. Is it your wish that I report this motion and document dealt with?

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Stewart.

Report of the Committee of the Whole of Tabled Document 6-61, An Integrated Housing Policy for the Northwest Territories

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been studying Tabled Document 6-61, An Integrated Housing Policy for the Northwest Territories. The committee approved the following motion: I move that this committee adopt, giving strong support to the Integrated Housing Policy of the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation placed before this Assembly at the 60th session convened in Rankin Inlet, mid-October 1976, and contained in pages iii to vi inclusive, of that document, plus the addition of the supplement to the Integrated Housing Policy dated January 12th, 1977 and tabled during this session.

The latter document has been added to the Integrated Housing Policy as a result of repeated discussions with affected agencies and with various local and native organizations and because of comments made at the recent meeting of the Legislative Assembly and the board of directors of the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. I assume the wish now is to deal with Tabled Document 5-61, Report of the Task Force on Electrical Energy Costs in the North. Agreed?

---Agreed

Who shall we have in the chair? I see Mr. Fraser is not with us. Mr. Stewart, do you want to take the chair?

This House will resolve into committee of the whole for continuing consideration of bills and other matters, specifically Tabled Document 5-61, Report of the Task Force on Electrical Energy Costs in the North, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into Committee of the Whole for consideration of Tabled Document 5-61, Report of the Task Force on Electrical Energy Costs in the North, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER TABLED DOCUMENT 5-61, REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON ELECTRICAL ENERGY COSTS IN THE NORTH

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The committee will come to order to study Tabled Document 5-61, Report of the Task Force on Electrical Energy Costs in the North. I believe we have requested two witnesses to appear before this committee, Mr. Jim Smith and Mr. Barry Yates. Is it the committee's wish that we call them now?

---Agreed

May we call then Mr. Smith and Mr. Yates? Mr. Smith and Mr. Yates, thank you for making yourselves available to this committee. Generally we allow the witnesses if they have any comments relative to their reports lead us into it and have first kick at the cat. Does anyone wish to start off on this?

MR. YATES: If I might kick off on it, I was the chairman on the task force on electrical energy costs in the North and the members of the task force consisted of Mr. Smith, the chairman of the Northern Canada Power Commission; Mr. Michael Bell of the Treasury Board Secretariat; Mr. Ted Humphries of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources; Mr. Gordon Taylor of the Department of Finance, and myself. We were charged by the previous minister of Indian and Northern Affairs to study the financial obligations of the Northern Canada Power Commission in the hope of finding means of reducing its costs of financing and to examine other means of lowering future power rates to northerners less able to afford them. I think all the Members of the Legislative Assembly will have seen the report of the task force. Essentially in dealing with the current rates the task force was not asked to deal with those. It was rather asked to look at future rates that might be imposed as the result of increased costs.

Work Of The Task Force

The task force did however examine the cost of power in the North and made some comparisons with other cities in Canada. In examining the financial obligations of the Northern Canada Power Commission, it was clear that its costs were exceeding the revenues it would receive under the current rate system. The task force was able to identify however a couple of areas in which some immediate rectification of costs could be achieved and one of these was in some expenses that NCPC had incurred over the years in planning for future power projects. The sum of some \$1.6 million was identified in that regard. Under the Northern Canada Power Commission Act such expenses are chargeable to the federal government. So, one of the first outcomes of the task force's work was to recommend that this money be paid to the Northern Canada Power Commission. It is my understanding that that will be accomplished in the final supplementary estimates of this year.

A second element which Mr. Smith himself took up, and perhaps can deal with in more detail later on, was the actual cost of running the commission itself, and in that regard the task force with the aid of Mr. Smith was able to identify some \$800,000 that could be accomplished in savings this year.

In dealing with the longer term financial problems, however, the one point that I think is not perhaps identified as clearly as it might be in the task force's recommendations and for that reason I would like to draw it to the Assembly's attention is the cost of building future projects where the size of those projects is in excess of the current needs of the communities which the project will serve. That is to say, the building of excess capacity in future power projects, and the task force recommended very strongly that when such a major future project takes place in the future, the financing of that project should be examined very closely to ensure that the current consumers are not required to bear part of the costs for power which will not be required for a number of years in the future.

MR. BUTTERS: Hear, hear!

Concerning Excess Capacity

MR. YATES: In looking at the current situation we also tried to carry out an examination to see if there was excess capacity in the present system that should be similarly treated. From our examination, and I would like to make one comment in relation to the smaller communities following this, but from our examination it would appear that there is no excess capacity built into this system. Therefore, currently, there did not seem to be justification for someone else to bear the cost of excess capacity.

Now, the commission made a presentation to the task force, arguing that the excess capacity which it is required to install in the remote communities to provide something like twice the amount of power you need as stand-by, in the small communities of the territories, that that was in excess of what a southern utility would have to provide, a southern utility being connected up to a grid system and it would not have to provide that amount of stand-by power.

The commission advanced the argument therefore, that that excess capacity that they had to build into the small communities in the North should be regarded as excess capacity for the purposes of rate setting. The task force as a whole, and I am sure you will appreciate the conclusions of the task force represent a compromise between differing views of its members, but the task force as a whole did not accept that argument. Therefore, they concluded that there was not excess capacity at the present time which should be compensated for other than by the rates, but they did recommend very strongly that any future major project should only be costed to the current consumers

to the extent to which it serves those consumers, and that any further rate increase down the line as the number of consumers increases to take up that excess capacity would be imposed at some later date.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have taken enough time, I just wanted to touch on that major recommendation which is not clearly identified in the task force report.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Smith, would you like to say anything at this time?

MR. SMITH: Might I suggest that we allow this discussion to carry on based on what Mr. Yates has said and possibly what I have to say would tend to be more directed towards the actual day to day operations of the commission itself than those implications of the task force report which I really directed toward the political arm of it, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Any questions, gentlemen? Mr. Butters.

Source Of Funds Available

MR. BUTTERS: Well, I would wish to start it off by inquiring of the source of funds available to the commission at the present time and the interest paid for such funds.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, if I may, the source of funds available for capital projects to the commission is theoretically any earnings that we have, that we could put towards capital acquisitions. In actuality, our capital costs are funded entirely by loans from the federal government of Canada and the rate that is applicable for those loans is the rate that applies on the particular day or the particular time that the loan was negotiated, and that is dictated by a formula that is applicable to other crown corporations. In the terminology of interest rates and government financing, it is looked upon as a most favoured interest level in that type of financing.

MR. BUTTERS: I am curious as to what the most favoured level of interest in that type of arrangement is. Mr. Smith indicated that it was comparable to that allowed other crown corporations. It would appear to me that this is an area in which the federal government could allow an amount surcease, it could give some indication of its recognition of the very, very high burden that domestic consumers of power and private enterprise consumers of power are paying in the North. I am wondering what the rate charged is and whether or not this might be an area in which the federal government could express a little bit more understanding.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the actual rates that are being charged, I do not have that exactly with me at the present time, but I can tell you that the Northern Canada Power Commission has loans from the federal government that go back for many, many years, some of them at rates in the neighborhood at less than four per cent. In recent times we have loans that have been negotiated in excess of 11 per cent. The actual rate today is something less than that, than 11, but I am afraid I do not have that actual rate with me at the present time.

Reducing Costs Paid By Northerners

MR. BUTTERS: Eleven per cent, while it might be a favourable rate in comparison with the rate you might obtain from a bank it seems to me to be very high, when one considers that the corporation or commission is providing a very important and necessary service to the people of the North. It strikes me that the government might look at their interest rates being charged in this

area and reduce them in accordance with the terrible cost burden presently being paid by northern consumers. It seems to me, and I do not recall the details, but it seems to me that the government became very generous in the case of a sister corporation of NCPC, NTCL, just recently by doing some fiscal manipulations or legerdemain and assisted them in what is a situation which is comparable to that experienced by the commission.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, once again I think that these are the kinds of things that we would be very hopeful that this Legislative Assembly would direct the attention of the federal government to. I am sure the Honourable Members realize that a power commission within itself is powerless to change the formulae under which we operate. We are given a mandate from the parliament of Canada and must live within it but we would certainly look with very, very high favour upon any changes in our financing structure which would make it possible for us to get cheaper money. We would look to the help and assistance of this body and, likewise, other similarly constituted bodies to direct the attention of our political masters in Ottawa to this plight we are in. I can assure you that the kind of money that has to be paid out at the present time of our total revenues for financing is a very, very large portion of the money that we actually take in.

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

MR. FRASER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask a question of the witnesses. Do you anticipate any further increases in power rates, say, within the next two to five years and if so, what percentage are you looking at for the two to five year period?

Future Increases In Power Rates

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, rate increases, based on the knowledge that we have to anticipate the future that is before us today are inevitable. Now, I think that it is not an unreasonable statement for me to make that a goodly portion of the electricity that is made available here in the Northwest Territories is generated from diesel fuel. I am not aware that there is any alleviation on the horizon from the present high costs, indeed every indication we have clearly indicates that these costs are going to go up.

I would like to bring to your attention something in connection with these kind of fuel costs that I think is only right -- I think it is only right that Honourable Members should have this before them. Here in the Mackenzie district one of the great entisements to the burning of diesel fuel, particularly at the Inuvik plant when it was originally put in, was a very attractive price for bunker-type fuel that was available through the production of the refinery at Norman Wells. In 1959 this fuel was made available f.o.b. Norman Wells to the commission at a price of 5.5 cents per gallon, and the price of that same gallon of fuel f.o.b. Norman Wells for 1977 is anticipated to be 25.7 cents per gallon. Now, I think everybody should understand that it is fair enough to blame the Northern Canada Power Commission for the end result of the cost of this fuel oil, namely the cost of electricity, but the Honourable Members might bear in mind ...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): We are having trouble with the interpreters, could you slow down a little please? You are speaking too fast.

MR. SMITH: I am sorry. The Honourable Members might bear in mind that one of the major elements of cost in the generation of that electricity is the fuel that goes into those engines. This is one prime example I would like to bring to your attention at this time.

You are asking anticipation of the next five years, the rate of increase, Mr. Chairman, was the question that the Honourable Member had. I would like to suggest to you that I would not care to predict five years down the line but I would suggest to you for at least the next two that these increases across the board will average about ten per cent.

MR. FRASER: You are saying in the next two years we can see another ten per cent increase in power rates, is that right?

MR. SMITH: In each of the next two years. Mr. Chairman, you know there are two stories. I can either tell you what you want to hear or what you should hear. I sincerely trust you do not mind me telling you what I feel you should hear, namely, the truth.

MR. FRASER: Thank you.

MR. YATES: Mr. Chairman, if I might just add to that, I think you are probably aware that the Minister did accept the recommendations of the task force, although he wishes to examine some other options which may go further than those recommendations. One of the recommendations of the task force was the debt deferral and if that did not come into force it would result in increases greater than ten per cent in the next two years. There is in fact therefore some alleviation of the higher rate of increase already accepted.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Gentlemen, we have the witnesses here today. A lot of these questions keep popping up on NCPC and we have the men here today who can answer them. Where are the questions? Hon. Dave Nickerson.

Northerners No Worse Off Than Southerners.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I have a number of questions but maybe I will start off with not a question but a matter of fact. On page 21 of the report, Conclusion, A., it reads as follows: "A. The analysis carried out by the task force does not show that northern residents are significantly worse off than many residents of southern Canada with respect to the cost of electric power."

MR. BUTTERS: Shame!

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: "Therefore it is difficult to make a case for additional subsidies, ..." etc. If you turn over to Figure 2 in the back of the report in the appendices and take the case of a user who uses approximately 1500 kilowatt hours per month, which I am given to understand is the low average for a householder in this part of the world, you have to extrapolate this a little bit because in order to show how little we pay I imagine the task force is only giving the very low end of the scale, so in order to use a realistic consumption figure you have to extrapolate the information there. Here it would appear that the cost to a consumer in Montreal would be \$25. The cost of an average of ten Canadian cities would be \$30, yet in Yellowknife the cost would be about \$57, which is the equivalent of the highest rates in southern Canada, that is, in Charlottetown. In the case of Inuvik it would be \$105 and in the case of Fort Simpson it would be approximately \$142.

I want to know how can you come up with Conclusion A. on page 21 saying that residents are not significantly worse off; whereas at best they are paying at least double the average of ten Canadian cities? In the case of Inuvik, for instance, they are paying three or four times that amount. That to me would seem to be a very, very significant difference.

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

Complexity In The Power Rate Structure

MR. YATES: Mr. Chairman, I think I had better try to answer that. It is a difficult question to answer because I think, as you are aware, there is a lot of complexity in the power rate structure of the territories. There are a large number of people who are having their power paid for them. Therefore, the impact is not on them personally. There are a large number of communities, particularly the more isolated communities in the territories where the person who pays for his own power is the exception rather than the rule. I think the members of the task force certainly accept that there are some people in some of the smaller communities who are paying excessive amounts for their power and we always have difficulty with semantics. The wording we are using is that they are not significantly worse off than many residents of southern Canada. Some of the people in the small communities are definitely worse off than people in southern communities but the majority are either subsidized in their -- "subsidized" may not be the word but the cost of the first block of power is held down by the Northern Canada Power Commission, five cents a kilowatt hour so the initial block of power is sold at a comparatively low rate and this comparison is borne out. I think the figure used, Hon. Dave Nickerson, you used 1500 kilowatt hours a month.

I think that is in excess of the actual consumption in the communities in the North which is better illustrated I think by the average monthly bills on Figure 7. These are the actual bills taken from the Northern Canada Power Commission's records. They reflect both the consumption and the amount of the monthly bill. Of course you are quite right, there are a number. Fort Simpson is a particularly significant one and perhaps I should have mentioned earlier that is the one community where there is excess capacity in the system and one of the recommendations of the task force was to request the commission to examine its rate in that particular community. If you take Fort Smith, however,

for example, you will see the average consumption is about 780 kilowatt hours per month and Fort Smith has an average monthly bill of \$22.50 as compared to Prince Edward Island with 491, a lower consumption, but about the same bill.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Hon. Dave Nickerson.

Figure 7 Gives The Wrong Impression

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I am afraid those answers, Mr. Chairman, are not entirely satisfactory. First of all I am unable to accept the philosophy that the lone individual in the community who is not working for the government, someone who is trying to make his own way and does not want to live in welfare housing and that type of thing -- it does not matter about this guy. You know, he is just a little individual off on his own. That to me is the very person we should be trying to assist and not be putting the entire burden on him.

Secondly, the initial block of power that comes at low rates is only I believe 300 kilowatt hours per month. That is about one 60-watt lightbulb and maybe an electric toaster operated every second day. You know, 300 kilowatt hours a month is practically insignificant when you talk about the power consumption of a normal home.

Thirdly, Figure 7 is erroneous or that is my understanding after having spoken to the people in the electrical distribution business. The average billing takes into account little shacks, it takes into account places, for instance, a business might have a little warehouse with one electric lightbulb in it and that type of thing. It takes into account houses which are not being used, houses which have been left vacant and are paying the minimum monthly rate. So Figure 7 gives you the wrong impression. It gives you a much lower figure than is actually used in a home that is being operated as a home. In reviewing the figures for Yellowknife I find that the average consumption for a home that is being used is probably in fact closer to 2000 kilowatt hours per month rather than the 1500 that I used.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Yates, do you have any comments on that?

Cross-Subsidization

MR. YATES: If I could just make one comment, Mr. Chairman, which I think is fairly important: We carried out an examination too of all the smaller communities in the South because the first indication we had from the statistical information relating to major cities like Montreal, Toronto, Charlottetown and so on so certainly some of the members of the task force thought about places like Fort Nelson or Thompson, Manitoba, isolated communities somewhat similar to isolated northern communities. We find the rates in those smaller places not to be grossly out of line with those, shall we say, in Charlottetown which is one of the higher cost areas.

On inquiring further into that we found that it is not the cost of producing the power that is reflected in that rate setting process but it is the fact that the utility concerned has been cross-subsidizing. In other words, charging to consumers in Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver more than they should be charged for their power in order to reduce the rates in the more remote communities. Certainly it was not part of the task force's responsibility to examine that aspect of major policy but I suspect that the Government of the Northwest Territories might indeed want to examine that itself because I believe it probably lies within its power to effect some kind of process of cross-subsidization without interfering with shall we say the business aspect of the running of the Northern Canada Power Commission. The Northern Canada Power Commission is obligated to operate on a commercial basis and it would seem to me at least not to be proper for it to operate cross-subsidization on its own as a policy.

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

MR. BUTTERS: Just to say that I share my colleague's concern regarding the figures upon which the task force report is based. I would have liked to have seen them. I would have liked to have seen the data that was used by the task force. I think that if such data were publicly available a great many holes could have been found in the base upon which the task force built its report and its final recommendations. It is most difficult to criticize the recommendations of the committee when the raw data is not available to the public for examination and for objective criticism. I would think had that been available, had that material been available, the task force report would have received a lot more criticism than it did receive. I know that I wired the Minister asking him for that data but it never arrived. I do not think the Minister reads his wires anyway.

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

MR. YATES: I would hasten to say, Mr. Chairman, the data can all be made available. There is no problem whatsoever except in its assembly and forwarding. I must say I was under the impression that Mr. Butters's letter had been answered but obviously he has not seen it but I will undertake to make sure he receives the data he is requesting.

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

Bad Decisions And Debts.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say that like Hon. Dave Nickerson I am not too terribly impressed with some of the things stated in this report. I like he feel that Conclusion A is totally and completely in error. I think the report itself indicates that we pay significantly higher power costs here but, it depends upon what you compare them to. If you compare them to the very highest other areas in Canada then you could argue that we are just a little higher, but if you compare the costs to any reasonable area in Canada then we are paying far, far more.

I do support Conclusion C which indicates a short-term cash shortfall, and long-term financial difficulties. I think that the Government of Canada has to some time or another put some money into this company other than by way of loan. I think bad decisions in the past and debts that have occurred as a result of those bad decisions have to be somehow absorbed through forgiveness.

I have lived here 31 years and I must say that through this whole period of time I have been totally and completely unimpressed with the operation of NCPC, it has got to be one of the most difficult companies to even communicate with. I say that as a practising lawyer who has to write eight and ten follow-up letters on the simplest document to get an elementary response. None of this I blame on Mr. Smith of course, he has just come lately and I must say, sir, that if you come to grips with this company in the same responsible way I know you came to grips with the finances of the Yukon Territory, then maybe we have some hope. So, nothing I have said about the past has anything to do with its current management which I understand has had some very substantial changes made, but I think you have a tough job ahead of you, simply to put it in a financial position where we are not here today paying for the terrible errors of your predecessors.

So, having said that, I suppose the thing I can do is wish you and Mr. Stewart and the other directors well in your trying to make Frankenstein work, but on a simpler and more local level may I just ask one question and that is, why is it, does anyone know why is it that we here in Yellowknife are having three and four outages a day on most days which extend themselves from 15 minutes to half an hour? If we are lucky we would have one any time now as a demonstration of what I am saying.

---Laughter

Is there something inherently wrong with the system in Yellowknife? We have these outages and they are very expensive if you are the owner of a business which is full of fluorescent lightbulbs. We seem to be changing ours in our building about every six months and if I could find a way of passing the cost on to NCPC I would love to do that. Is there some technical difficulty here I wonder?

Others To Blame

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am not competent to answer the question completely that Hon. David Searle has raised but I would remind him that the Northern Canada Power Commission is not in totality involved in the distribution of power here in Yellowknife, it has a partner and that particular company is Plains Western. I suggest that in the first instance that maybe his wrath should be directed towards that organization. He might find out, as I have found in some of my past examinations that NCPC while not entirely blameless is not the only culprit with regard to going around and inadvertently knocking over power lines with bulldozers and various other things that I understand happen, including an attack by woodpeckers on the transmission line out at the Snare Lake power plant and I believe a couple of nesting bald eagles which I believe last spring and summer contributed mightily to some of your outages as well. So, being strict conservationists and supporters of the environment we do not want to disturb the woodpeckers while they tear the poles apart or the transmission line and we would not think, we would never give any thought at all to disturbing the nesting habits of eagles.

So, really if you were to get the odd errant bulldozer driver to watch where he is going and remember that the rest of the outages are attributable to these other things of nature that we do not want to interfere with, that might not be so hard to take.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Do I take it then that NCPC is strictly for the birds?

---Laughter

MR. SMITH: It is just as well that you are one of my fellow directors on the board or I would have to crack back at you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Are you concluded, Hon. David Searle?

HON. DAVID SEARLE: I have heard about the woodpecker problems and the others but I appreciate there is a benefit to look at it lightly because if we did not it would drive us all mad. However, it seems to me that we do have difficulties that may exceed natural causes. I suppose perhaps I should address my question to the local authorities because it is obviously a very localized problem and I suppose I will do that, Mr. Chairman.

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

Private Enterprise Versus NCPC

MR. BUTTERS: I wonder if the witnesses, if they would listen to these statistics. I wish to compare Inuvik and Hay River, your fair city. The population statistics for Inuvik is about 3100, for Hay River 2800. Electrical operator in Inuvik, NCPC and at Hay River, Alberta Power. Both generate power using diesel as I understand, the installed capacity in Inuvik is approximately 16,000 kilowatts, in Hay River 6000 kilowatts. Fuel price paid by NCPC is 33.6 cents a gallon and in Hay River it is 46 cents a gallon.

Now, looking at the costs of the power, Inuvik proposed April, 1977 for the first 300, five cents per kilowatt hour and for each hour over 300, nine cents per kilowatt hour. Hay River, 1 to 30, \$4.70 plus \$1.61; 31 to 50, \$9.18; 51 to 200 kilowatts, \$6.85; and over 200 kilowatt hours, \$4.69 per kilowatt hour. I do not know if you can corroborate those figures but it would appear that Hay River is paying a great deal more for its fuel than is paid at the Inuvik plant and yet Inuvik is paying an exceedingly high per kilowatt hour cost. Why is this, is this private enterprise versus NCPC?

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

MR. SMITH: I have not the totality of information in front of me to answer Mr. Butters' question in complete detail but I would say this to him, that the difference between operations in Inuvik and operations in Hay River are the difference between the geographic locations of the two communities. Without inferring that I am completely familiar with the totality of logistics of both these communities I believe that it would not be an inaccurate statement for me to say that transportation and communication are available on an equitable basis all year round to the community of Hay River, to the road systems of the Northwest Territories and likewise the road system of the province of Alberta. Can you verify if that is correct or am I making an incorrect statement?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Generally speaking the chairman tries to stay out of arguments, sir, so on this one I plan on following the book and stay out of it.

Inuvik Differences.

MR. SMITH: Fair enough. Mr. Butters will understand then that I am not attempting to usurp the complete knowledge of a local because I do not have it. In so far as Inuvik is concerned one simple problem alone I would bring to his attention that adds dramatically to the cost of doing business in Inuvik is the fact that we have to lay in a minimum one year supply of fuel and I believe most of the time we attempt to carry a two year supply of fuel. The cost of these tanks alone is in the multimillion dollar area. This is simply one particular problem. The cost of providing housing for our employees in Inuvik, which we very obviously have to do in most instances I am sure is vastly different than what our private enterprise competitor finds himself faced with in the community of Hay River.

One thing he did bring to my attention early in his question was the installed capacity in each of these communities. In Inuvik we have an installed capacity far, far in excess of what the peak demand is for the simple reason that if any of the motors give out, immediately after the water transportation season is over it is not possible to replace them in totality until the next water transportation season. So, as a consequence we probably have something in the neighbourhood of two and a half to three times the installed peak capacity that we ever use at Inuvik, simply to protect the citizenry in that area against the vagaries of nature which we can not do anything about other than install that excess capacity to protect them with and that must be paid for and it is being paid for by the consumers in the community of Inuvik.

Now, one thing I would like to bring to the Honourable Member's attention, Mr. Chairman, if I may, and I was going to leave this until later but he has brought up the question of rates and I think it is only right that I mention this.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you could tell the witness to slow down? Every time he speaks he is going like a bullet.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): We do not want to tie your hands ...

MR. SMITH: Being a politician who never knew when he was going to be cut off by the Chair you will have to forgive me.

Government And Non-Government Rates

One of the things I would bring to Honourable Members' attention is that the Northern Canada Power Commission has inherited a rate structure which has government and non-government rates. How this was originally put together Mr. Yates is in a better verse than I am to tell you of it, but as a consequence of this rate structure not being properly examined as to what the consequences of it are, at the present time, about \$6 million in government subsidy is induced into the rate structure in the Northwest Territories and, it is not induced in my opinion on an equitable basis.

The differential between government and non-government rate structure varies from nothing at all in some communities to as high as 20 cents a kilowatt in other communities. In the community of Inuvik the differential between government and non-government rates is in the neighbourhood of, I believe, about half a cent. It is half a cent a kilowatt hour. In other communities, some of them, as I have said, they go as high as 20 cents a kilowatt hour. I know it is all well and good and I have been a propagator of this over the years too, of blaming a lot of our difficulties on Ottawa. I can not disagree that we have to do this but I also think that there was some things that we should be doing at home to put our own house in order.

I would like to suggest that this is one of the areas in which the Northern Canada Power Commission and the Government of the Northwest Territories might well put their heads together and go to your Public Utilities Board to seek some kind of equitable distribution of the consequences of government rate structure here in the Northwest Territories. I know that this deviates somewhat, Mr. Chairman, from Mr. Butters' immediate question and his comparisons between Hay River and Inuvik. I would like to suggest that we are comparing apples and oranges in so far as the two communities are concerned and I would likewise also suggest as far as the rate structure in Inuvik is concerned, if there was any legitimate cause for complaint in relation to that rate structure compared to other rate structures in the Northwest Territories it is in the inequitable application of government versus non-government rates.

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

Inefficiency In The Equipment.

MR. BUTTERS: Yes, sir. I would certainly support that position and I am delighted that your board is taking that position and possibly you and he are in the best position to make the necessary corrections. The witness, Mr. Smith spoke of the cost of storing fuel. It seems to me, and I would put it to him, that there is also inefficiency in the equipment being used. Take for instance the Inuvik plant. While we may have something in the order of potential, something in the order of 16,000 kilowatt, really one of these big units, a 5000 kilowatt unit which was purchased second hand in 1973 I do not think is operating yet. I would like to have the witness correct me that to date that unit has cost the corporation something in the order of \$1.25 million and it has not generated a kilowatt hour of power.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry. I have not got the competence along with me to answer that particular question but I would certainly be very happy to get the answer for Mr. Butters and it can be supplied.

MR. BUTTERS: I realize that. It is just that the amount of money we are talking about is a large amount of money, \$1.25 million. The report indicates a saving here of \$1.6 and this was considered very good, so it seems to me there may be some value in examining economies and efficiencies in the operation itself.

To pursue this matter further, within the plant at Inuvik you have I understand one Merrillees another Merrillees, an EMD, Caterpillars, there seems to be a variety of pieces of equipment. Somehow it would appear to me that an economy in standardizing the various plants not only in the sense of supplying parts but standardizing the plants throughout the North, so that repairs could be made quickly. The inventory of parts would be kept down and I think the whole total operation made more efficient. I wonder if you could address a comment to that?

Strictures Of The NCPC Act.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I can assure you there is no disagreement at all as far as I am concerned or members of the board or the active management of the commission but I would likewise suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we have undergone a pretty dramatic turn-around in our approach to a lot of these problems and of course in the last year or 18 months. You have a Member on the board who can attest to this particular fact and we know that while it is one thing to direct your attention, the public's attention through the Assembly here to the political arm of government to seek relief from the kinds of strictures that the Northern Canada Power Commission Act places upon us. We likewise recognize that, in so far as the operational responsibilities are concerned, the Northern Canada Power Commission can not use the inadequacies of the Northern Canada Power Commission Act to protect us in that particular field. We have to become a cost conscious, consumer oriented utility that shows visibly in every way and every day in everything that we do that we are minimizing costs of doing business.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): You are too fast for the interpreters again.

MR. SMITH: I would not make any attempt, Mr. Chairman, to try to delude the Honourable Members here that we consider ourselves at the present time to be the epitome of efficiency, but I likewise would tell you that we are endeavouring to correct these particular things in the best way that we know how. I would also suggest that in the context of Hon. David Searle indicating that we as consumers in the North are faced at the present time with having to pay costs of the errors of the past, I do not think it unfair to bring to your attention, Mr. Chairman, that we are not the only public utility in Canada or in North America for that matter who have found ourselves the victims of uncontrollable costs in the inflationary period that we found ourselves in here in the last three or four years. So that while we do not claim to be number one in efficiency, I would likewise bring it to your attention that we do not claim to have a monopoly on stupidity either. We are not the only ones who have got caught in these kinds of cost binds in the course of the last short while.

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

Approved Level For Contingency Fund

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I would, if I may, go back to the recommendations of the task force and I guess as such I should address my comments to Mr. Yates. Just a particular question at the beginning, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if I may have an idea of what the approved level for the contingency fund will be in future years? That is recommendation F.

MR. YATES: I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that there is a firm figure that is identified there, but it is somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$6 million, somewhere in that range. As I understand it, it is not identified in here.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I guess that is why I was asking. I could not find it. Would Mr. Yates possibly give me an idea of what percentage then that would be, \$6 million of what?

MR. YATES: I do not know whether you are prepared to comment on that, Mr. Smith. It is really a contingency fund to be held to accommodate such things as the Cyprus Anvil strike or the water storage in the Northwest Territories or the breakdown of the major plant in Inuvik where you have to buy a new one. I think that is a judgment the commission has to reach, the directors of the commission have to determine the level of that contingency fund in relation to their over-all expenditure plans. I do not know if Mr. Smith wants to comment.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, in the coming fiscal year, starting on April 1, the Northern Canada Power Commission anticipates doing something in the neighbourhood of \$39 million worth of business throughout its system in that fiscal year. We are going to be doing this with a plant that has an investment in it of approaching \$200 million. When you are talking about a level of contingency, it is a matter of judgment as to how much that level should be. We have to seek Governor in Council approval for the particular levels it is to be at and I believe at the present time it is limited to a percentage of the total money invested. I am sorry I can not give you the figure offhand. I do not know, but I would say this, Mr. Chairman: No business can operate without some money in the kitty.

NCPCC's Cash Register Is Dry

The Northern Canada Power Commission cash register is dry and the bottom has gone out of it and we are so far below the bottom of the cash register that it is not funny. This past year I think was a very prime example of where the unforeseen overtakes the best run business in the world. We unfortunately ran into low water levels on the Snare system which services the Yellowknife area. As a consequence, instead of using water for much of the generation we had to buy diesel fuel. In both the Yukon and Northwest Territories we ran into shut-downs in the industrial sector of our customers due to matters over which they had no control which diluted our inventories very, very severely. We had nothing at all to back this up. As a consequence the total money that might be looked upon as adequate in the contingency fund is only something that experience can dictate what it actually should be. We are certainly in a position now that we have to recruit some money into that in the very near future. The rate at which we do it is obviously going to be very slow.

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I realize that other Members have talked about some of the conclusions and recommendations. As regard those conclusions and recommendations in terms of the first one, as it has been pointed out, it indicates that northern communities are not worse off than southern Canada. Having had, I would suggest, some considerable experience living in Charlottetown, there were in fact about four northern communities that are better off than Charlottetown.

I recognize as do most that Charlottetown has one of the highest rates in Canada. I would suggest that the inference that one may draw from those thoughts would be in fact that northern communities, or the North in general is higher and therefore it is difficult not to make a case, just the opposite, as the conclusion that is suggested. It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that cross-subsidization in point of fact simply means that certain northern power consumers defray the cost of power to most others, but as a whole the Northwest Territories, consumers in the Northwest Territories do not receive the net benefit. It would seem to me as well, Mr. Chairman, that the kind of recommendations that have been made as a result of the task force study would be to encourage more public disapproval of the crown corporation, and in point of fact does not come to the crux of the problem, that being that to offer some kind of relief to consumers in the North. If we compare a place like Charlottetown and other northern communities, I think Mr. Smith used the term, in referring to Inuvik and Hay River, comparing apples and oranges, and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that may well be the case here when one compares Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island and a community in the Northwest Territories.

Requests For Increased Rates

I think that the task force's report does not address itself to the question of high consumer rates, I think that what it basically does is talk about other areas such as the Nova Scotia Power Commission and the Ontario Hydro request for increased rates and, to a great degree it defends or attempts to defend the position that rate increases of ten or 11 per cent over the next few years are in fact reasonable. A ten per cent increase in rates in the Northwest Territories is extremely high, and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that a 22 per cent increase in Ontario may not have the same kind of reaction or the same difficulty as would be experienced in the North. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I should stop at this point and, if there is a reaction to what I have said by the witnesses, maybe then I could go on to a couple of others.

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

MR. YATES: I think, Mr. Chairman, the only comment I would like to make which is only really for the purposes of clarification, is to remind the committee that the task force was composed of the central agencies of the federal government, the Department of Finance; Energy, Mines and Resources, Treasury Board and so on, and at the time the task force was carrying out its work the situation in Charlottetown was before the federal cabinet. As you are probably aware there was a lot of pressure for the federal government to subsidize the power in Prince Edward Island. It was only in that context, and I have to agree with you that the rates in the North are high, there is no doubt about that, but it was in that context that the assessment had to be made. The federal government having now rejected the concept of subsidy in Prince Edward Island would, I think, find it difficult to accept the concept of subsidy somewhere else in the country.

On the other hand, were they to accept that principle in one of the provinces it would equally follow here in the territories. It is just to put it in that context if I might.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I was under the impression that the Government of Prince Edward Island did get a referral and is that not so or is it still in doubt?

MR. YATES: The final conclusion was to provide for a subsidy if you like on insulation with a view to conserving energy rather than subsidizing the actual cost of energy.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I understand my old buddy Hon. Gerry Regan was going to ask for the same thing in Nova Scotia but Prince Edward Island got it.

The Final Result In The Maritime Provinces

MR. YATES: If I could add one further comment, Mr. Chairman, the final result in the maritime provinces has been the formation of a power corporation between the three maritime provinces but to what extent that may be assisted I do not know.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I think just one final comment. I think that the comments that Mr. Yates made in terms of the central authorities, that is people on the task force by and large, notwithstanding that Mr. Smith was there, would be a case in point. I find it very difficult to think that Hon. Alex Campbell in Prince Edward Island would allow, or would have me or Mr. Fraser or any other Member of this government here to go down and do a task force report, notwithstanding that we may not have the expertise, but to walk in and put a task force on the very advanced aspects, particularly of power. He may welcome someone coming in to do a study but I think that is a case in point and maybe that is basically another one of my prejudices coming forward.

Throughout the report however, Mr. Chairman, I keep getting the impression in reading the task force report that the basic theme of the report is to consolidate the crown corporation's position, financially but to do very little in terms of easing the high cost of power to northern consumers. I guess that is what strikes me more than anything, and yet I would have to appreciate that that possibly was part of the ground rules under which the task force was established. It would have seemed to me that the task force would have been established to look into the high rates of power consumption in the territories in general, but not so much as to bail out the crown corporation.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Would our witnesses care to make any comment?

MR. YATES: I would just like to make the point, and I think I made it earlier, that the Minister whilst accepting the recommendations of the task force has

expressed I think some of the reservations which Hon. Arnold McCallum is making and says he himself wants to examine some of the other options which have been indentified in the task force report but which did not form part of the recommendation; namely, the question of either increasing or modifying in some way the existing subsidy for the first block of power or, secondly, the payment of the grant to offset the impact of the Cyprus Anvil strike and the low water situation in Yellowknife. The Minister is I believe examining those two options at least himself.

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

Compensation For Power Failures

MR. FRASER: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask a question of the witnesses. I just wondered if NCPC carries any type of compensation for burned out furnaces and television sets due to power failure in the northern communities. We have had a lot of problems when the power goes off and comes on. We have had televisions burn out and furnace motors burn out and every other type of motor. Do you carry any type of compensation for this kind of failure?

MR. SMITH: I am certainly not aware of any insurance that we carry on anything of this nature. I do not know if it is a common practice in the utility business or not but perhaps, Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Member would like to privately apprise me of precisely what difficulty he is aware of in this field I would like to personally look into it a little bit further.

MR. FRASER: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The hour is 4:00 o'clock p.m. and shall we recess for coffee at this time?

---Agreed

This committee will stand recessed for 15 minutes for coffee.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The Chair recognizes a quorum and calls the committee back to order. Would our witnesses join us, please? Hon. Arnold McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I would like to make one more comment on the task force's recommendations, and that is on the recommendation lettered G, in which the NCPC suggests that the federal government permit debt extension based on unused capacity in the NCPC system, and the task force recommends that no action be taken on this suggestion. I am sure most Members will recall that not too long ago, a matter of a few years ago, the federal government had NCPC undertake a major capital expansion program because at that time the federal government was supportive of development in the North but again, as Members of this House will recall, on January 22, in point of fact, this year, the Hon. Warren Allmand suggested that the North not rely solely on gas and oil development and exploration activities in the North. We have now, at least those of us who have been concerned in various aspects of government within the North over the past policy and the implied policy stated by the present Minister, a kind of federal approach to development in the North of giddyup-whoa. I would be kind of concerned that there would be no protection for northern consumers of unused capacity if in fact there is any. I would, Mr. Chairman, be against that kind, or that concept that there is no protection offered northern consumers as regards debt extension on unused capacity.

Little To Say About Consumer Rates

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to reiterate that from my reading of the task force's conclusions and recommendations that it was an exercise that told us our power rates are high but in some cases no higher than those of Charlottetown. As I indicated before, the task force's report and the exercise did not address themselves to the question of high consumer power rates in the North, but in point of fact, pointed out means by which NCPC could get relief from its shortfall and proposed shortfall by rate increases levied to cover the past costs and future costs but it had very little to say about the high consumer rates paid by northerners other than to say in effect there is no way we should get further subsidization.

As to the operations of the corporation in areas that I am familiar with, by and large I experience very little difficulty. Perhaps that is because in my home the manager of the local NCPC operation is a next door neighbour and even though we experience power fluctuations back and forth and we may experience difficulties when Pine Point turns on and we turn down, the lights turn down, the motors, refrigerators and various other electrical appliances turn off, that may be one of the things that one would have to experience or live with because of the decision to live here. I suggest, sir, that that does not necessarily have to be one of the conditions under which one should live.

Export Of Potential Hydro Energy

I think there are all kinds of hydro power and I am fully aware of and appreciate, sir, that the harnessing and capital cost that would be incurred in setting up additional areas would be very enormous. Nevertheless, where we have considerable potential hydro energy it would seem to me that regardless of whether we can utilize all of it in the territories, we should be able to do something about even exporting some of it. As I indicated, I know that the costs of harnessing it and setting it up would be immense, but it is a renewable resource that we should be able to do something with.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Hon. Arnold McCallum. Have either of our witnesses any comments?

MR. SMITH: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the last item that the Hon. Arnold McCallum directed his comments to, namely, that the installation of major projects with the potential of interties to other systems would permit us an export market for this energy is indeed one of the objectives of the Northern Canada Power Commission which it is interested in getting its attention directed toward because in our opinion it is the only long-range answer to cut down energy costs in any part of Canada's North. The economic development of any area in Canada has traditionally depended upon a constant source, at fairly constant pricing, of electrical energy and we do not see where the North is any different than any other part of our nation in this regard. But in order to have this we have to have customers, in order to sustain the cost of the installation. Those customers, at least in the early stages of this development are not present here in the territories but live elsewhere. The sources are in the North, the markets are in the South and I think the comment, Mr. Chairman, made by the Honourable Member is really the key to the whole future as far as the consumer in the North is concerned, getting a supply at relatively stable costs some time in the future.

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

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to comment on two things. The first one was exactly that comment that Hon. Arnold McCallum ended up making and I was pleased at the response. I always felt what we needed was a tie-in with the southern grid and to go after exporting power to southern markets. I wanted to raise that. I do not think I need dwell on it any further because of the response made. I think that that would certainly make a lot of sense to me.

Excerpts From Yellowknifer

The second thing I wanted to do, I wanted to cover the statistics of last week as reported in the newspaper. February 2nd, Yellowknife, and this is the power outages, time 20 minutes, cause h.g. H.g. is the abbreviation for human goof. February 4th, two days later, Yellowknife, time 20 minutes, cause h.g. again. February 5th, Fort Franklin, 20 hours, cause a.o.g., which is the abbreviation for Act of God. The next day, February 7th, Yellowknife, 20 minutes, m.f. M.f. is mechanical failure. February 9th, Yellowknife, 20 minutes, m.f., mechanical failure. These are, I presume, the reliable statistics reported in the Yellowknifer for Thursday, February 10th at page five. This little article says "It has been a bad week for Northern Canada Power Commission and its customers. NCPC had four blackouts in Yellowknife within one week and a 20 hour power blackout in Fort Franklin which cost that community its church." That is not my words, those are the newspaper's words. "NCPC regional director Mr. John Allen said a burned out voltage regulator caused Monday nights 20 minute blackout. Once that happened the Jackfish diesel plant cut down and shortly after that the Snare hydro plant tripped out because of overload. Mr. Allen said the noontime outage was caused by mechanical failure. Two sump pumps in the Snare Falls generating station used for maintaining low water levels in the turbine pit quit. The unit switched itself off to prevent the turbine pit from flooding. The other two blackouts were caused by human error. Workers tripped a wrong relay at the Snare plant shutting down the generating plant a week ago. Last Friday night workers changed fuses at the Yellowknife substation at Giant Mines, tripped a circuit breaker shutting off power to the city but Mr. Allen said he does not anticipate any more similar problems."

That was the news report on one weeks activity showing four 20 minute outages in Yellowknife, two of which appeared to be human error and the other two mechanical. I am not so sure if that is an unusual week but it is the sort of thing that we in Yellowknife have had to live with and it is pretty annoying.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, could I suggest this is rather a forced energy conservation program?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): It cuts down on your monthly bills if the power is cut off, does it not?

HON. DAVID SEARLE: I wonder if I could make a presentation of this article for no other purpose than what I said earlier, to get his back up by the reliable reporting of the Yellowknifer.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Any further comments? Mr. Butters.

Excess Capacity In Various Communities.

MR. BUTTERS: Our witnesses indicated earlier that they are here to tell us where it is at and I would like them both to provide some kind of an answer to this question. I think that Northern Transportation Company Limited has admitted that their overcapitalization problem is directly related to the expectations that Hon. Arnold McCallum described, to be prepared for a development build-up in the Mackenzie. I think that the majority of the residents of the Mackenzie district feel that the same thing has happened with regard to NCPC, that the excess capacity now found in various communities and specifically Fort Simpson and Inuvik is a direct result of planning expectations of senior management of the corporation relative to the anticipated demand that development would bring. Before you make any further comment on that, is that assumption correct or incorrect?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Do the witnesses care to answer, Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, as I understand Mr. Butters, he is asking: Is the present excess capacity at Inuvik and Fort Simpson directly related to government anticipation of activity that did not take place?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): That is how I understand the question.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I can not attest to this directly one way or the other. It would take a search of the files of the commission to really determine with any element of accuracy a proper answer to the Honourable Member's question but I do think that it is a fair statement to say that if there was to be a build-up of activity in the Mackenzie district related to the pipeline or other similar kinds of developments, Fort Simpson and Inuvik would have been two very serious pressure points on which the demands placed upon the power commission would be far in excess of what they would normally be expected to meet.

Commission Protecting Responsibilities.

A simple deduction from that point would indicate to me that the management of the commission felt that they were doing the right thing in the protection of their own responsibilities, the responsibilities of the commission and the responsibility to their present customers in endeavouring to see that as much capacity as was practical and possible to put in place in these two areas was done, so as I would see it, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is an unreasonable assumption to be making, that capacity to some degree presently installed in these two communities is there as a consequence of anticipated activity that simply did not occur.

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

MR. BUTTERS: I accept that reply as a statement of good managerial foresight and preparedness. Now, I would direct my attention to Mr. Yates. Mr. Yates was a member of the honourable department labouring in the vineyards of DIAND all these years, and I think he will remember when a former minister of the department, the Hon. Jean Chrétien, in the Elks Hall in 1974 said that the Mackenzie Valley pipeline was considered by the government to be in the national interest, and if he was not there I think he might imagine the anticipation and expectations that that statement brought to not only the crown corporations in the North, but I would say private industry and individuals alike, including the territorial government. Recently, the Hon. Warren Allmand on December 31, interviewed by Mr. Jeff Carruthers and in articles appearing in both the Globe and Mail and the Ottawa Citizen said that he had no brief for development, a total turn around in an attitude by a Minister who represents a federal department, Indian Affairs and Northern

Development. So, I am asking Mr. Yates if that build-up did occur in both power generation capacity found along the river and in the barges and carrying capacity for NTCL, and that build-up resulted from the statements made by ministers of the cabinet, and that money was spent to develop the capital infrastructure to meet that anticipated growth, and that development did not happen, who got stuck? Who is going to get caught for the payments and higher freight rates and higher electrical costs? I wonder if that is a rhetorical question and maybe Mr. Yates can not answer that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Yates, would you care to make any reply to that?

Consumer Pays Costs Of Management Decisions

MR. YATES: I am sure you do not wish me to comment on the actions of any minister, past or present, or really to answer what is as you say a rhetorical question, but under the current legislation it is quite clear that the consumer ends up paying the costs of the management decisions that were made by the different crown corporations. Perhaps the only thing I can add though is that I think that Mr. Smith has clearly indicated how those decisions were made. They were indeed management decisions by respective crown corporations to purchase additional barge capacities in the case of NTCL or perhaps to install some slight additional plant although in Fort Simpson and Inuvik -- although myself was not conscious of that decision having been made at any time I was conscious of the NTCL one. To the extent that the government then, shall we say, blessed those management decisions by providing the financing necessary to carry them out then you have to place the responsibility for them at the door of the government of the day.

With respect to NTCL, just for the sake of clarification and not any other purpose, but just to go one step further, in the case of NTCL, the government has decided to buy equity in that corporation to the extent of some \$25 million. Now, that, of course, has had the effect of reducing its debts substantially and it will enable them to control the rates somewhat. The question was raised with respect to NCPC in the same regard, that perhaps the government should take equity in the Northern Canada Power Commission, and that is one of the options that was studied. It was not accepted by the task force, but it was certainly examined as a possibility. I presume it is still a political option that is obviously open at some time.

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

MR. BUTTERS: I welcome the answers of both witnesses and I think no one faults either the management of NTCL or NCPC for moving into a preparedness state, but what does frustrate us is that we now appear to be looking at the backs of Northern Development ministers instead of their fronts, and we are looking at, if no development occurs, for a long period of time we are going to be paying for the costs on what was obviously a federal decision.

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Just a couple of questions in light of Mr. Smith's comments. I really anticipated having a comment made following what I said, however, Mr. Smith certainly has commented on it. May I ask how many members were on the task force?

MR. YATES: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Five.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: May I continue on that? I as well, Mr. Chairman, accept Mr. Smith's comments about the farsightedness and good management practices of the crown corporations in this but if what Mr. Smith said is correct, if it is

right, in light of that, why would the task force not heed the suggestion of the crown corporation, NCPC? Why have the present users, consumers, paid for the excess capacity?

MR. BUTTERS: Hear, hear!

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: If Mr. Smith is of that opinion, and certainly with the experience of both he and Mr. Yates in the North, I find it difficult to accept the fact that the task force would refuse the recommendation of NCPC whereby they -- if I can find it again, whereby they recommended that no action be taken with respect to NCPC's suggestion that the federal government permit debt extension based on unused capacity. If two of the people on that task force, and I take it maybe I am being unfair, but if they were of the strong opinion as I would anticipate they are, was this then a recommendation based on a majority decision or was it the unanimous? Was it unanimous on the part of the task force that the NCPC suggestion was not taken?

MR. YATES: I think I had better try and answer that. I think we are getting a little confused here as between protective capacity and excess capacity. I draw your attention to page 20 of the task force report which deals with both of those aspects. The power commission's submission to the task force was that the level of protective capacity in the North has to be 2.5 to 1 as compared to about 1.5 or 1.6 or maybe 1.2 to 1 in the South. The argument the commission puts forward was that that excess between the range 1.2 to 1.6 to 2.5 to 2.1 should be borne by the government. It was that aspect that the task force -- this has nothing to do with development or expansion, it is simply in a small community, say like Pelly Bay, you have to have two plants in there in order to be able to operate, whereas if you were in a southern community of the size of Pelly Bay you have access to rail, you have access perhaps to a grid, you can certainly replace a plant that breaks down much more quickly.

Excess And Protective Capacities

So, the argument that the commission advanced was that that stand-by capacity which we called here protective capacity should be provided for by the government, and I quote from the report. "Although the need for additional protective capacity in the North is recognized, it is a real cost and whether or not NCPC's debt arrangements should be adjusted to take this factor into consideration is questionable." And the conclusion of the five members of the task force was that it should not be taken into consideration.

However, with respect to excess capacity, the next paragraph down here deals with that, talking about major new hydro developments, principally because the task force did not really find any substantial excess capacity built in apart from this protective capacity aspect. They did not find excess capacity built in to any great extent although they recognized the problems at Fort Simpson by making a point of it in the report, but it did not seem sufficient to make a recommendation on the basis of that one example that was noted.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Well, gentlemen of the committee, time is moving. Do you agree that I should report progress on this paper? Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: I wanted to ask him something about the Edmonton office building whether they would move it north one of these days.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The question is are you going to move north one of these days, gentlemen?

MR. SMITH: Well, to the extent that I have made my home north of the 60th parallel since 1940 there is no further north I intend to move myself and perhaps the Honourable Member could tell me what he had in mind.

MR. BUTTERS: I understand there are over 100 telephones in that office building in Edmonton and maybe some of those people would like to become northerners too.

Location Of Headquarters Of NCPC

MR. SMITH: Well, Mr. Chairman, at the time that the proposed move the Northern Canada Power Commission from Ottawa to Edmonton was first raised I was a Commissioner of the Yukon and along with some of my staff members we put together a very comprehensive document which was presented to the minister of the day, pointing out that indeed Edmonton was something less than a very suitable halfway house in the staging of the Northern Canada Power Commission's activities from Ottawa to the North where the customers are that they serve. I can tell you that I had a tacit understanding with your own Commissioner that there would not be any basic objections raised by either of the two territorial governments as to which territory the minister chose to put the headquarters of the power commission. In light of the lack of success that I had with that and the firmness with which the Northern Canada Power Commission's present headquarters were established in Edmonton, including the residency of many people who were moved from Ottawa at the time, while the members of the board and the commission itself are fully dedicated to the power commission ultimate, that we be broken into two sections, one to service the Yukon and one to service the Northwest Territories, and the move of those segments of the commission into the areas that they serve I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that anyone should hold their breath on this happening because in the first instance we have got to get many of the problems in connection with the operations and long-term financing and short-term financial problems of the commission cleared out of the way because otherwise you would be taking on the very troubles that the Hon. David Searle has suggested I am having along with the members of the board, being slow to cope with things at the present time; so possibly yes but immediately no.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I would like on behalf of this committee, to thank Mr. Yates and Mr. Smith for their attendance. Deputy Commissioner Parker.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: If I could prevail on your well-known good humour for just a moment and say a word publicly as it were about Mr. Barry Yates' contribution to government in the North through his long service with the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs.

Appreciation Of Mr. Barry Yates

Mr. Yates worked in the North with the northwest highway system in the Yukon quite a number of years ago. He has spent many years in Ottawa with the department, first I believe when it was Northern Affairs and National Resources. He rose through the ranks as a chief of engineering services. He became a director and later a director general in that department. He has now moved to Petrocan and has taken a senior position with that corporation in Calgary. Speaking as one who has worked with Mr. Barry Yates throughout the years, I must say that he was one person we could always rely on in the department for honest, straight answers and for support wherever it was possible that it be given. His integrity and fairness which he brought to whatever position he held with the government was something that we all admired and appreciated very much. He is going to be sorely missed in the department because he provided through a changing number of other officers and ministers a continuity that served us very well and I speak from a good deal of experience in this area. I would like to say publicly how much we appreciate Mr. Barry Yates' service in that area.

---Applause

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you very much, gentlemen. Mr. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER (Mr. Hodgson): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add one word to your remarks with regard to Mr. Smith, the chairman of NCP. Commissioner Smith and myself have been old colleagues and confreres for many years. He and I belong to the last of the institute of commissioners, that is commissioners, not commissionaires, although many times we do the latter rather than the former. I am sure that you would all like to know that later this year before too many months go by it is the intention of my wife and I to host a little dinner for Commissioner Smith and Mrs. Smith just as a token of the years of appreciation and respect that we had and the good relationship between the Northwest Territories and the Yukon. Before you get too upset at the cost, I want to assure you it will be a candlelight dinner.

---Applause

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Stewart.

Report of the Committee of the Whole of Tabled Document 5-61, Report of the Task Force on Electrical Energy Costs in the North

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been studying the Report of the Task Force on Electrical Energy Costs in the North and wishes to report that we have had a very interesting and informative discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Stewart.

Item 11, Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have unanimous consent to return to Item 3?

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent to return to Item 3, oral questions, agreed?

---Agreed

ITEM NO. 3: ORAL QUESTIONS

Question 046-61: Advancing Of Bill 10-61

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I think this is an urgent matter. It would appear that this is the last sitting day of this House and we are approaching the third reading stage on a number of bills. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire whether the Commissioner will be advancing for first reading immediately Bill 10-61, An Ordinance to Establish a Committee to Inquire Into and Make Recommendations with Respect to the Constitutional Development of the Northwest Territories?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Butters.

Return To Question 046-61: Advancing Of Bill 10-61

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Speaker, no.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 11, third reading -- Deputy Commissioner Parker.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, could I have your permission to give replies to two questions which were asked this morning?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed?

---Agreed

REVERT TO ITEM NO. 2: QUESTIONS AND RETURNS

Return To Question W44-61: Heating Oil For People Of Pangnirtung

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 14th, Mr. Kilabuk requested that the administration investigate the matter of establishing agencies in communities to enable local payment of fuel oil bills. The Department of Finance, supply services division, has already initiated action in this regard with the intention of designating the settlement manager or hamlet office as being responsible for providing this service. Discussions are now being held on this matter and it is hoped that within the near future this service will be in operation.

Return To Question W45-61: Landing Docks, Broughton Island

On Monday, February 14th, Mr. Kilabuk asked what progress had been made concerning construction of a dock in Broughton Island. The construction of such a facility is the responsibility of the Ministry of Transport. The Government of the Northwest Territories has requested MOT to carry out studies this year on the feasibility of constructing a dock in Broughton Island. Mr. Kilabuk will be kept advised of progress on this study as it is carried out.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Deputy Commissioner Parker.

Item 11, third reading of bills.

ITEM NO. 11: THIRD READING OF BILLS

Bill 2-61, Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance No. 3, 1976-77, Hon. Arnold McCallum.

Third Reading Of Bill 2-61: Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance No. 3, 1976-77

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 2-61, 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 third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Whitford. Discussion? Question. Question being called. All in favour?

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: On a point of privilege. I am sorry, I have got the wrong bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. All in favour? Down. Contrary? Third reading is carried.

---Carried

Bill 8-61, the Workers' Compensation Ordinance, Hon. Peter Ernerk.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 8-61 -- I seem to have lost the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: It is Bill 11-61, not Bill 8-61. It is my fault.

Third Reading Of Bill 11-61: Workers' Compensation Ordinance

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 11-61, An Ordinance Respecting Compensation to be Paid as a Result of Injuries or Death Caused to Workers in the Course of Their Employment, be read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Lyall. Discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. All in favour? Down. Contrary? Third reading is carried.

---Carried

Motion To Adjourn Assembly Following Assent To Bill 2-61 And Bill 11-61

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I move that immediately following assent by the Commissioner to Bill 2-61, Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance No. 3, 1976-77, and Bill 11-61, Workers' Compensation Ordinance, and without giving third reading to any other bills that this Legislative Assembly adjourn until 9:00 o'clock a.m. on Monday, March 28, 1977 in Yellowknife.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder to that motion? Hon. Dave Nickerson. Question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. All in favour? Down. The motion to adjourn is carried unanimously.

---Carried

Item 12, assent to bills. Bill 2-61 and Bill 11-61. Mr. Clerk, would you see if the Commissioner is available to assent to Bill 2-61 and Bill 11-61?

ITEM NO. 12: ASSENT TO BILLS

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Speaker, Members of the Assembly, as Commissioner of the Northwest Territories I hereby assent to Bill 2-61 and Bill 11-61.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 13, orders of the day, Mr. Clerk.

ITEM NO. 13: ORDERS OF THE DAY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Orders of the day, 9:00 o'clock a.m., March 28, 1977.

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. First Reading of Bills
11. Second Reading of Bills
12. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills and Other Matters: Bill 10-61, Motion 24-60, Sessional Paper 1-61, Territorial Government Policy as to Pricing Liquor, Report of the Auditor General for Year Ending March 31, 1976
13. Third Reading of Bills
14. Assent to Bills
15. Time and Place of Next Session
16. Prorogation.

MR. SPEAKER: This House stands adjourned until 9:00 o'clock a.m., the 28th day of March, 1977.

---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