



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES
DEBATES

63rd Session

8th Assembly

Official Report

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 21, 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. XOE 1HO
(Yellowknife South)
(Speaker)

The Honourable Arnold McCallum, M.L.A.
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
XOE 1HO
(Slave River)
(Minister of Local Government)

The Honourable Peter Ernerk, M.L.A.
Site 18, Box 16,
Yellowknife, N.W.T. XOE 1HO
(Keewatin)
(Minister of Economic Development and
Tourism and Government House Leader)

Mr. Donald M. Stewart, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 310
Hay River, N.W.T. XOE ORO
(Hay River)
(Deputy Speaker and Chairman of
Committees)

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

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

Mr. Thomas H. Butters, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1069,
Inuvik, N.W.T. XOE OTO
(Inuvik)

Mr. Mark Evaluarjuk, M.L.A.
Iglooĭik, N.W.T. XOA OLO
(Foxe Baffin)

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

Mr. Ipeelee Kilabuk, M.L.A.
Pangnirtung, N.W.T. XOA ORO
(Central Baffin)

Mr. Ludy Pudluk, M.L.A.
Resolute Bay, N.W.T.
XOA OVO
(High Arctic)

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

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

Mr. William Lyall, M.L.A.
Cambridge Bay, N.W.T. XOE OCO
(Central Arctic)

Mr. Richard Whitford, M.L.A.
Yellowknife, N.W.T. XOE 1HO
(Great Slave Lake)

OFFICERS

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

Clerk Assistant
Mr. Pieter De Vos
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
XOE 1HO

Sergeant-at-Arms
Mr. F.A. MacKay
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
XOE 1HO

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

LEGAL ADVISOR

Ms. P. Flieger
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
XOE 1HO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

21 October 1977

	PAGE
Prayer	161
Replies to Commissioner's Address	161
Questions and Returns	171
Reports of Standing and Special Committees	177
Motions	178
First Reading of Bills:	
- Bill 3-63 Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance, No. 2, 1977-78	205
- Bill 5-63 Liquor Ordinance	206
Second Reading of Bills:	
- Bill 3-63 Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance, No. 2, 1977-78	206
- Bill 5-63 Liquor Ordinance	206
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Bill 2-63 Wildlife Ordinance	210
Report of the Committee of the Whole of:	
- Bill 2-63 Wildlife Ordinance	266
Orders of the Day	267

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 21, 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. Pearson, Mr. Kilabuk, Mr. Pudluk, Hon. David Searle, Hon. Dave Nickerson.

ITEM NO. 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

SPEAKER (Hon. David Searle): Item 2, replies to the Commissioner's Address.

ITEM NO. 2: REPLIES TO COMMISSIONER'S ADDRESS

Are there any Members who have not replied yet who wish to? Mr. Butters.

Mr. Butters' Reply

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, the Commissioner's Address, as it always does, contained many interesting observations and suggestions to us and I wish to open my remarks with a brief comment on one or two things he said. He noted that much has happened since we last met and I would suggest that surely this is the understatement of this or any year. Further on he said "For those in the Yukon and in the provinces who will be affected by this project, this is the Alcan natural gas pipeline, the problems, repercussions and benefits will be varied. For us in the territories, particularly in the Mackenzie Valley, we should remain relatively unaffected".

Although it is difficult to appreciate, I would suggest that in reality the fact of no pipeline development will probably affect our future more than the construction of a pipeline. But how much over the past few months has happened, has occurred to irreversibly alter our lives, our futures and the lives and futures of our children. The last few months have seen few gains or victories even for the Dene. However, as you pointed out, Mr. Commissioner, all has not been diminished hopes or dashed expectations. We had the Prime Minister's statement and on hearing that statement one regretted that the Prime Minister is unable to turn the full attention of his intellect and his humanity to the many problems that affect our lives and that all too frequently he must rely on the judgment, the knowledge and the bias of lesser men.

Constitutional Development In N.W.T.

Members will remember the Prime Minister's appearance on a television program recently on the occasion of the recent cabinet shuffle and, when replying to reporters' questions, he admitted and was physically moved in making the admission that the pressures of his awesome responsibilities were such that he was not getting the opportunity to study thoroughly the challenges of these trying days to his administration. When he does get the opportunity for examination of our national challenges, he cuts right to the heart of the ailment to the core of the Gordian knot. One such example is the Prime Minister's recent statement on constitutional development in the Northwest Territories. How long have we waited for such an examination, such direction, such clarity of thought? I am sure the appointment of the Hon. Charles M. Drury, a respected former member of this House and an able former member of the Hon. Pierre Trudeau's cabinet as the Prime Minister's and not the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development minister's representative, as

special representative on the northern constitutional development scene will bring much order and light after five years of strife and confrontation. The Prime Minister is to be congratulated on his decision, on his direction and his action.

Sir, Mr. Speaker, the Commissioner is also to be congratulated. He noted in his address that: "The appointment of the Hon. C.M. Drury as special representative to the Prime Minister for those matters articulated in the Prime Minister's statement is an acknowledgment by the Government of Canada to the recommendation made by the Carrothers Commission to review after ten years what had transpired constitutionally in the territories". I think many in the North may have forgotten the very major role that he personally played when a member of this House in having that Carrothers Commission established. A few weeks ago he celebrated concurrently with our Queen's Jubilee year, a decade of his administration's presence in the Northwest Territories. Government on the ground, the late Mr. Arthur Laing described it. Yours, Mr. Commissioner, has been a remarkable decade of personal achievement. That the Carrothers recommendations have to such a large extent become reality, that the directions suggested by Mr. Dean Carrothers and his committee members have been followed in such a large measure reflects to a great extent the diligence and dedication that you and your Deputy Commissioner, Mr. John Parker, have applied to this task. Yours is truly a remarkable personal achievement and we will never see its like in the North again.

In the past few years we have seen one minister shafted -- shifted, and I may say more on this later. We welcome our new Minister, the Hon. Hugh Faulkner, in his new portfolio who will be coming to Yellowknife in the coming week end. The Hon. Hugh Faulkner is no stranger to the North, fortunately, so there should not be such a long breaking in period, as we usually experience with a totally inexperienced minister.

Priorities For The North

Other things occurring in the past few months variously have been the move of Executive Member, Hon. Arnold McCallum, to the Department of Local Government. On noting that I would wish to compliment the Hon. Arnold McCallum on his excellent work over the past few months, from March 11, in his role as an ad hoc constitutional development committee chairman. That committee on which I count myself privileged to have had an opportunity to serve did an excellent job, a thorough job and a most commendable job. The paper, "Priorities for the North", I believe will be recognized in the future to be the most important work of our collective four years. It is the product of the minds and the knowledge and the intelligence of Members of this House from all parts of these territories, from the Eastern Arctic, the Central Arctic and High Arctic, Keewatin, the big lake country hereabouts and the Mackenzie River. I do not think it should be any surprise that in reality the Prime Minister selected it to form the basis of his paper on the evolution of constitutional government in the North.

I think one should note a few personal contributions over and above that of the other Members of the committee toward the success of this document. I think, sir, your own, Mr. Speaker, for the contribution you made and the knowledge you provided from your ten or more years of service in this House. I think too the contribution made by my honourable colleagues from the Eastern Arctic, Mr. Mark Evaluarjuk, Mr. Ipeelee Kilabuk, are very, very important. Also the contributions of our resource people, Dr. Walter Kupsch and Ms. Shirley Milligan, both of the University of Saskatoon and also to our interpreters who are very, very often forgotten in the work of this House, who patiently disentangle the complexity of the two languages that we use in this House and enable a meeting of the minds to produce that paper, "Priorities for the North".

MR. PEARSON: Hear, hear!

MR. BUTTERS: With regrets, I note also in the past few months the passing of two northern churchmen whose contribution to the North and its people stands out above many others. I refer particularly to the Rev. Leonard P. Hollman and the Rev. Father Joseph Adam, O.M.I. They were good men. A dying breed, men whose lives were examples for us all and whose sole purpose in life was to serve.

I regret I was not present at the opening day of this session. I read the remarks of the Members carefully and it probably in my mind more than any day that this chamber has sat in the last ten years reflected the frustrations, the anger, dismay, the problems of these territories today.

Challenges In The North

I was concerned to hear the fear and the dismay expressed in some of the replies from the Members of the barren lands, the fear and I know this fear is very real, the fear of development. I suggest that while the fear may be very real, the grounds for that fear may not be real. For three or four years in this valley we have been told by outsiders of all the terrible things that would happen. I think to a large extent this fear generated by those tales of horror made the people afraid to reach out and grasp the challenges of this north country, to reach out and accomplish what the people of the North truly can do.

Just three nights ago I watched a documentary on Scotland. There is not too much difference between Scotland and this area. The Scottish people, as you know, have just recently faced or are facing the affluence from the finding of petroleum resources at their doorstep. Their country too like this country has been a country of the land. That program concluded with these remarks, remarks that I think we could all take to heart. It is unfortunate that these remarks have not guided us in the past. The announcer said, "Oil is only another challenge to their enterprise. This land will endure. The people will see to that."

Judge Berger's Report

On May the 9th Judge Berger released his report to the public and while the tenor of it was much expected by most of us, I think that many were surprised at the advocacy contained in the report and the partisanship that was manifested therein. Early in July came the National Energy Board Report and I think that report was the real stunner, because the three members of that commission followed Judge Berger's lead without any hesitation and apparently without any critical analysis. In August, the Lysyk Report came and this was an excellent report for the terms and the financial allowances provided Dean Lysyk by the Government of Canada. In fact, I am personally convinced that had we had a Lysyk type of inquiry in the Northwest Territories, that is a three member commission with representatives from the valley's native community and from what might be called the territorial assembly, then the Mackenzie Valley pipeline would be going ahead today and it would not be being built in the Yukon Territory. I believe that the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry Report and the NEB Report were in the main not based on social environment and economic factors, but on political ones.

Interestingly enough and understandably, recently, and I think it was as recently as three days ago Judge Berger appeared on our television screens and I recollect that a colleague has described the good Judge Berger as a false prophet, but my colleague was very much mistaken, as he usually is. The good Judge Berger is nothing if he is not a true prophet and the first prophecy he made on May the 9th has come to pass, yea, verily. When Judge Berger appeared on television two or three nights ago he was addressing a University of British Columbia student audience and he noted very modestly that the Government of Canada had apparently accepted the bulk of his recommendations, yet interestingly enough he did not mention that as yet neither the Government of Canada nor the people of

Canada have received a report from him relating to the terms of his commission. The terms of his commission, as we all remember, were the conditions under which the Mackenzie Valley pipeline would be constructed. Possibly our new Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs might look into that omission and determine whether the Canadian consumers will be getting a return on the \$5 million direct expenditure that it cost to fund the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry.

The Lysyk Report

Earlier I mentioned the Lysyk Inquiry. I am very sorry that this House did not see fit to appear before Dean Lysyk, especially as the commissioner of that inquiry -- and committee members decided to look briefly at the Dempster connection mentioned by the National Energy Board. The Government of the Yukon and its executive members figured very largely in the Lysyk Inquiry. The Lysyk Report reflected in large measure their recommendations and one reason I believe it did so was because Dean Lysyk specifically and particularly requested and encouraged the appearance and the participation of the Government of the Yukon Territory and the elected executive members of that jurisdiction. This situation did not occur in the Mackenzie. I apologize to this House since I was the Member who raised the motion suggesting that we should appear before the Berger Inquiry.

As caucus chairman I took the initiative to approach the National Energy Board and suggested we should appear before that body also and we did. We presented through your good offices, Mr. Speaker, I think two excellent reports; two excellent reports that recommended the construction of the Mackenzie Valley pipeline with certain terms and conditions, specific terms and conditions. Interestingly enough, conditions which have been imposed on the Yukon line. We made these recommendations to both Judge Berger and the NEB, but in neither case were they thought important enough to be included to any great extent in the reports of these two commissions. The Legislative Assembly, the elected House of the people of the Northwest Territories, their reports to the two commissions were not considered important enough to bulk at all in those two commission hearings. What price democracy! I apologize before you all for having had the temerity to suggest that if we appeared before these people we would be heard and we would be considered and that our direction would probably be taken. What a mockery! Going on, we know what happened. We know that the Government of Canada accepted apparently unquestioningly the combined decisions of the National Energy Board and Judge Berger. I had a very hectic month in August myself attempting to change the thinking of the federal government, of the cabinet, who were making that decision and this pile of correspondence before me represents letters and telegrams that I deluged the cabinet and the Prime Minister with, relative to the decisions they were making regarding the Mackenzie Valley pipeline and the Yukon line communicating my concern that they were making a bad decision. Some letters came back saying, "I acknowledge your correspondence and I have passed it to the Minister whose responsibility it is, the Hon. Warren Allmand, the Minister for Indian Affairs and Northern Development". Other people just acknowledged the letter and I assume that they read it. Others whom I had spoken to said, "You know my views on this."

Canada, United States Negotiations

I am afraid that the Government of Canada and by extension the people of Canada have been taken in the recent negotiations with the Americans. No, I do not blame the Americans. You might remember seeing President Jimmy Carter on the television after the decision was announced, "My", he said, "Those Canadians sure are tough negotiators", and you got the feeling listening to President Carter or I got the feeling looking at him of a lynx with a few feathers sticking out of his mouth saying, "My, those were sure tough turkeys". Because he just consumed us. They did not consume us because there are more than 200 million to our 20 million; they consumed us because of knowledge. What does Mr. Basil Robinson know about the North today? In fact, what did he know about the North when he was deputy minister for all the visits he made to the North? What does the Hon. Allan MacEachen know about the North? Has he ever been up here? We have been bombarded with all kinds of visits from other cabinet ministers but have not seen the Hon. Allan MacEachen.

How about the Americans? How many times have you seen the Americans in the North? I would be willing to bet that the United States Consul, His Excellency Thomas Enders, calls some Members of this House, whom he knows by their first name, Members of the Mackenzie Valley constituencies. He has certainly been in the Mackenzie Valley recently and representatives from his other consulate offices across Canada, and you will remember that His Excellency Thomas Enders was the senior negotiator for the Americans.

No, I do not blame the Americans. They wanted Alaska gas and they got Alaska gas. The Canadians want to get Canadian gas and they make this very clear. The Hon. Allan MacEachen in his release of September the 9th, makes it very clear that it was certainly the intent of the Government of Canada. As it says here: "The Hon. Allan MacEachen, who is chairman of the special cabinet committee on the northern pipeline was also head of the Canadian group responsible for negotiating the agreement in principle with the United States. He said that the construction of the proposed system would provide additional gas supplies already urgently required in the United States and would provide Canada with the opportunity of averting the shortage of gas supplies in the first half of the 1980's, foreseen by the National Energy Board through a connecting link with the reserves already discovered in the Mackenzie Delta."

Dempster Route

Certainly the Canadian negotiators recognized Canada's need. Where did they fail? The treaty between Canada and the United States reflects the requirement to build a link between the Alcan line running between the southern Yukon and the Mackenzie Delta. The only difficulty is how that need is interpreted. The Americans seem to say from their position "If and when it is required", and Canadians seem to say "As and when required", but this agreement suggests that the American position prevailed. What is disturbing about this agreement is that it particularly specifies a Dempster connection from Whitehorse to Dawson City, thence to the Mackenzie Delta. The routes of that connection are specifically laid out. It does not provide an opportunity to develop an alternative option. The money, the financing agreement, the arrangements for sharing the cost of that spur line are related directly to a Dempster connection. There is no suggestion, no intimation, that an alternate is considered. Why this alternate has been ignored is beyond me. We know that the main factor that killed the Mackenzie Valley pipeline was the Porcupine caribou herd and the continued existence and vitality of that herd.

The line as proposed by Canadian Arctic Gas just cuts along the northernmost limits of that herd's migration area. The Dempster route will go almost right through, halve that herd's migration area and area of usage. There have been no studies on the Dempster route, environmental or social. Yet the agreement with the United States was made on the expectations that the environmental studies that are to be carried out, that the social studies to be carried out, will agree that a Dempster route agreement is feasible. I know a little about the Dempster route and from my experience in both the Yukon and the Mackenzie Valley I think that there are more grounds for disallowing a Dempster link than there were for killing the Mackenzie Valley pipeline.

It is beyond me, beyond my comprehension that the Government of Canada did not see that and the only thing that I can put it down to is ignorance, ignorance of its negotiators.

Minister's Lack Of Interest

I wish in closing to make a suggestion to this Assembly and a suggestion through this Assembly and through your Chair, sir, to the Prime Minister, because I think this is one of the matters in which the Prime Minister did not have sufficient time to study the ramifications and the factors. This is one of the occasions when the Prime Minister turned this responsibility over to a man who was not interested in northern development, who had made it clear at the outset of his term of office as minister that he was interested in native affairs and that is good because native people require the best representation they can get. But the development of the North also requires the best representation it can get and it did not get it from the Hon. Warren Allmand.

Last January the former minister spoke to this Assembly and, as I mentioned in my reply on that occasion, his important words were not said in this chamber. They were said to Mr. Whit Fraser of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. That was the important statement made that day by the minister, to CBC when he indicated that his attitude toward development was one of very great hesitancy and his tenure bore that out. Okay, now if the Dempster spur is built, may I suggest to you that there is a very real responsibility, that when Hon. C.M. Drury comes to the Western Arctic that he will hear increasingly from the people of the Western Arctic that they are interested in and would like to consider union with the Yukon. It makes a lot of sense. Our all weather year-round ties will be with the Yukon and our resources will be tied into a Yukon pipeline system. I think this is something for you to contemplate. I, for one, would resist this, but it will be very, very hard to resist if our economic links, our social links, our cultural links, which already are and have been from time immemorial, are with the Yukon.

Alternate Pipeline Route

I would just like to indicate for you... If you can see along the bottom of the map, the Alcan highway proposal which follows approximately the current route of the Alaska highway. The Dempster spur as negotiated with the government of the United States and which the Canadian government apparently feels is the method by which the petroleum resources in the Mackenzie Delta will be carried, looks like this.

Now, there is an alternate and a very real alternate, an alternate I am convinced is supported by the native people, by the Loucheux people of the Western Arctic. It is not my idea. It is the idea of Mr. Grafton Njootli the vice-president of the Council of Yukon Indians. It is his idea that I am going to put before you now and I think it is an idea which will really give us the best of both possible worlds. It would see a link built, the Parsons field and the Shell and Imperial fields in the Delta. It will come approximately down the Mackenzie Valley to Norman Wells, I would hope, on the west side. At Norman Wells it would connect with the old Canol road which drops south and then cuts through the mountains over to Johnsons Crossing in the Yukon. The line now looks like this.

What is so surprising about this line is that it is not very much longer than the route proposed by the Government of Canada. The difference in mileage is about 80 miles, 770 miles for the Dempster connection and 850 miles for the Johnsons Crossing, Norman Wells connection. That route will do two things: first of all, it will give us resource revenue sharing which we want, because these resources will be developed in the future. It will give us taxation benefits. Look how much of the Dempster line is in the territories? How much taxation are we going to get from that little piece up here? How much taxation is going to accrue to Northwest Territories coffers from that little bit of a line?

Thirdly, it goes through areas which are amenable to exploration for petroleum. How much petroleum do you think you will find in the Yukon? My colleague, Hon. Dave Nickerson, is a geologist. He could tell us very little. This is where the potential finds for petroleum will be, down the Mackenzie Basin through the geological strata in which petroleum resources are traditionally found. This route will do much to increase exploration since the companies have got a line right there. Then it is not very hard to hook on to enter and come right down through the valley, when the need for such a line has been determined through the successful results through the exploration companies.

That alternative, gentlemen, was never considered by the Government of Canada and that is why I say Canada negotiated in ignorance and that is why I also feel that President Carter would have been correct to say "Those Canadians are sure tough turkeys". Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further replies? Mr. Stewart.

Mr. Stewart's Reply

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I rise in reply to the Commissioner's Address and taking the chance of too much repetition I think that we have to take another crack at the pipeline situation. At this time of year winter is on its way and in winter we have snow. It is probably in order then here to suggest to this Assembly that probably the biggest snow job that has ever been done to Canada, and indeed the United States, has been the matter of accomplishment ably abetted by the New Democratic Party, the Indian Brotherhood and Mr. Whit Fraser. We have been led down the garden path and I say this, and I will develop my theme, if you will have the patience to stay with me.

I think basically historically the NDP party, for example, has been an opponent of big business and many of their arguments have been if big business would do things on an economic base that the price to the consumer would be reasonable and that the people, the common people, could live better. Yet what has happened with regard to the pipeline, the Alcanroute means 67 cents per 1000 cubic feet more for gas. This in itself in the price of gas is an awful lot of money, when we are speaking in trillions of cubic feet. This pipeline will establish the value of natural gas for North America because of the quantities involved. It is not only going to be the gas that comes out of the end of that pipeline that is going to have the benefit of the 67 cents, it is going to be every producing well in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and indeed all through the United States. This will establish price and this price is going to be at least 67 cents per thousand more. They are even talking of more, that probably with inflation it could be far greater than 67 cents.

As you follow the pipeline debates and the situation you would suspect that Alberta, the Alberta government would have supported the Mackenzie Valley pipeline. Why would you suspect this? Because Alberta would gain far more on the construction of this pipeline, the Mackenzie Valley route, than they would on the Yukon one, but did the Alberta government support the Mackenzie Valley pipeline? No, they did not. They were not looking at the benefits of construction. They were not looking at cutting costs, they indeed were looking at the value of their gas going up by 67 cents a thousand. So, big business won again they have used people, the Indian people, and the Berger commission that was set up to win a battle that if they had tried to win themselves, they would not have been able to do so. We won the battle for them, the people of the Northwest Territories with the Berger Inquiry and the news media that followed the inquiry. This decision does not only affect the territories and the matter that we do not have the construction benefits of the pipeline and all of the spinoffs that we would have realized, but it also increases the inflation rate all across Canada to a point where that everything we buy is going to be more expensive because there is nothing, not even food processing, that is not dependent on energy costs. So, we have contributed greatly to Canada and the North American continent with our position on the Mackenzie Valley in a negative way.

The pipeline is probably a dead issue, so I suppose our job now as the Commissioner has indicated is to pick up these pieces and go on. I asked the Commissioner what pieces. You know, people have a wonderful ability to get off the mat after being knocked down and be able to continue to fight. Take the farmers for example. They can be hailed out but there is always next year, but with the situation in the Northwest Territories there is not only no tomorrow there is not any next year. Nobody can operate without an economic base.

MR. BUTTERS: Hear, hear!

No Economic Base

MR. STEWART: We have no economic base at the present time that is viable to look after the population that we have, and we are turning them out of our schools by the hundreds every year with no place to go, no jobs, just one alternative, to go south.

So, we have got probably two choices: we can become a complete welfare state or we can say in part, part I think, as I understand it, of the position of the late minister, I am sorry, not the late minister, our last minister. He may have been late for a few things, but not that late! It is for the Government of the Northwest Territories and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to buy out the southern Canadians who are here and send us all home and turn the land back to the native people. If this is done with the increasing population that is transpiring within this society, it will not be too long and this will not be of any value.

Economic Situation, Hay River

Development is the only way of survival and the only thing we have to develop are our natural resources, whether they be minerals or oil and gas. When the pipeline decision was made the Hon. Warren Allmand, in part of his presentation, promised federal assistance to the Mackenzie Valley. If the federal government does not get that assistance to the Mackenzie Valley soon, the patient is going to be dead. We have young people in Hay River through no fault of their own. They did not invest in the Mackenzie Valley pipeline, they had a job. They bought a trailer and they were settled down and there are a lot of people who can not meet their payments on their trailers today. The banks have shut off money, to a great extent. If you want a thousand dollars now for a bank loan you had better have two thousand dollars in assets to get it. Property values, normally property is as good as money in the bank but property in Hay River -- a home, for example, that was worth \$70,000 on the morning the National Energy Board came out with their decision is not worth \$20,000 today. It comes down to the basic fact that if there is no work and if there is no way that a person can make a living, then nothing is of value any more.

MR. BUTTERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEWART: Sooner or later people are going to have to recognize it. Possibly that will not happen until the seat is out of their pants and they are starving to death, but it will happen because that is the way the world works. We need help in the Mackenzie Valley and I speak of the Mackenzie Valley and undoubtedly there are other parts of the territories that need help too, and we need it in a hurry. Whether it is by way of re-establishing work other than Hire North projects, I agree with Hon. Dave Nickerson that these work projects are certainly not an answer, but at least they may be a stop-gap to keep these people from losing their trailers and losing their hope. They started down the path of life correctly. They were trying to make their living and a situation like this occurs and, once that welfare syndrome sets in, too often we lose people from the work force and this becomes a way of life. God knows we have enough in the territories who, through no fault of their own, probably are part of the syndrome today and the situation as we have it is going to increase in the numbers of people.

Outside statistics show now that there are families going into fourth generation, the fourth generation on welfare. You wonder what is wrong with the Canadian dollar? You wonder what is wrong with the economics in Canada? Even the bees know better. There are a lot of drones who do not do any work but the queen kills them off after she is done with them. Society does not allow us to do that. But if Canada itself, and the Northwest Territories in particular, is going to have any success we are going to have to go back to the fundamentals that people must work and must produce and without that, we are doomed.

NCPC Rates

I suppose as your elected or appointed Member from the Assembly, the representative on the board of Northern Canada Power Commission, I suppose I should say a word with regard to this rate organization. I believe that the board was formed with three northerners actually forming a majority on the board, that it has gone as far as possible in curing the ails of NCPC that are within the powers of the board. We have reduced the staff by roughly 20 per cent. We have replaced several senior officials. We have tried to incorporate various good business ethics within the corporation. The job certainly is not complete in that respect as of yet, but I do believe we have come quite a ways. But the board now is stymied. It can do nothing more until the NCPC Act is changed. We had an agreement -- I was going to say with the past minister again -- I do not know why he strikes me that way, but with the Hon. Warren Allmand to go to cabinet and request the changes in the act. However, we are into a new ball game and what the new Minister's position is going to be, or course, we do not know, but I can tell you that, without a change in the act, the power rates in the Northwest Territories are going to continue to escalate and in many instances probably get to a point where they are going to be completely impossible to pay. We have some hopes of asking for subsidies, a reasonable subsidy for power in blocks of somewhere between 700 and 1000 kilowatts. The present 300 kilowatts is basically a farce, it really does not do anything for anyone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Power Development

MR. STEWART: If this recommendation is followed it will ease greatly the power bills in the Northwest Territories. The corporation is looking at power developments. I think for the most part a great many people felt that the large power development on the Slave River, in the vicinity of Fort Smith, was mostly in the Northwest Territories, this is not so. It is pretty near 95 per cent in Alberta. NCPC is negotiating with Calgary Power and the Alberta government and is supporting the development of the project on the Slave River. This sounds, probably, pretty good. Unfortunately from the day a decision is made it will take at least ten years to put on stream power from that area and that ten years is greatly dependent upon how much backlash from the environmentalists that a project such as this will undoubtedly generate.

I think probably this House has been on record officially, possibly not officially, but on two separate power commissions, one for the Northwest Territories and one for the Yukon. With a change in times this may not be desirable. If the plans of NCPC are proceeded with to electrify all of the pumping stations of the pipelines in the Yukon, production of power in that area then will be of such a size, as compared to the production in the territories, that we would probably be better off to try and get some sort of compensation between the two places rather than go on our own.

Gentlemen, as usual, I do not wish to waste too much of your time on speeches. However, I would like to take this opportunity of reminding you that the Arctic Winter Games will be in Hay River from March 19th to 25th, 1978, and we certainly invite all of you to attend. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further replies? Mr. Pearson.

Mr. Pearson's Reply

MR. PEARSON: Mr. Speaker, I just can not let the opportunity go by. Sitting here this morning feeling very depressed listening to my colleagues tell of their woes, I get the feeling that we are allowing ourselves to be buried in a morass of self-pity, sorrow, gloom, call it what you will, over a decision that was, as my colleagues would say, made by an insignificant gentleman, Judge Berger, one solitary soul who has destroyed the future of the Northwest Territories. I think that is utterly erroneous. I can not possibly think that such a decision could be taken by one individual and that one individual should bear the scorn and arrows of comments such as those made by the Hon. Dave Nickerson and other Members of this House. I would suspect that those decisions were made a long time ago by people in very high and responsible positions, particularly in the United States. After all, it is going to be their money, but let us not argue about that. I repeat that I think the Berger Report is one of the finest documents ever produced on the Northwest Territories.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. Boo!

MR. PEARSON: I still think it was one of the finest documents ever produced.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay. Boo!

Redirect Economic Policy

MR. PEARSON: We have potential in this country, we have people, we have resources, but we are not using them properly. Each year across the Northwest Territories some seven or eight or ten million goes into the building of houses across the Northwest Territories but where does most of the money go? At the moment it is going to southern Canada. What this government has got to do is redirect its efforts, redirect economic policy. I am dismayed to have sat here now for a whole week and not heard an optimistic comment from the Minister of Economic Development. Is the territorial government going to do anything about the economy, our economy? We have the potential, we have the needs and the money is there but we are spending it in southern Canada. We are giving it to organizations such as Weber and the people in Yorkton, Saskatchewan, are getting the benefits, not the people who live in the Northwest Territories. That is what we have to do, we have to redirect our resources and we can improve the economic conditions in many of the communities if we just take some effort and get some creative thinking going in this organization.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Are there further replies?

Item 3, questions and returns. Are there any returns? Deputy Commissioner Parker.

ITEM NO. 3: QUESTIONS AND RETURNS

Partial Return To Question W18-63: Tuktoyaktuk Airstrip Extension

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, I have one return to Question W18-63, asked by Mr. Butters. On October 19th, Mr. Butters inquired as to what plans were under way for extending the Tuktoyaktuk airstrip.

A project to extend and widen the Tuk runway from 3500 feet by 100 feet to 5000 feet by 150 feet is now under way and will be funded entirely by Dome Petroleum Ltd. Work started on August 26 and, as of October 19, common fill

for the 1500 feet by 150 foot extension was in place. Dome have now begun to widen the existing runway to 150 feet and will continue to do so until their targeted seasonal shutdown date of October 28, 1977.

The project will resume in 1978 as soon as weather and conditions permit. The remainder of the work to complete the project will include the widening of the existing runway and the placing of crushed gravel upon the entire runway surface by July 1, 1978. Although detailed cost estimates are not available from Dome, Transport Canada who did the design work and who are providing engineering supervision estimated the total cost of the project at \$1,200,000. However, it is now apparent Dome may complete the work at a cost considerably lower than the Transport Canada estimate. In addition to the work carried out by Dome, Transport Canada have programmed approximately \$122,000 to improve the airfield lighting system in 1979 to 1980. Transport Canada are hopeful this might be brought forward to 1978 to 1979, although this will not be known for some months to come.

MR. SPEAKER: Are those all the returns? Are there any questions, written questions? Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Just relative to the return provided by the Deputy Commissioner, I am aware basically of the material provided by Deputy Commissioner Parker just recently. My question dealt with a further proposal by the Ministry of Transport. This was outside of the work or beyond the work being carried on by Dome Canmar and there has been a suggestion that the Ministry of Transport will be extending that strip to 6000 feet and paving it. That is what I wanted information on particularly.

MR. SPEAKER: Deputy Commissioner Parker.

Further Return To Question W18-63: Tuktoyaktuk Airstrip Extension

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, I know of no plans to extend the strip beyond 5000 feet or to pave it, nor have I heard any discussion of such a project.

MR. SPEAKER: Further questions? Mr. Evaluarjuk.

Question W39-63: Radio Station, Coral Harbour

MR. EVALUARJUK: Mr. Speaker, when I was in Coral Harbour I was told that the people in Coral Harbour want a local Canadian Broadcasting Corporation station but the population is not 500 and when the population is not 500 they can not get CBC service. I was wondering if they could get funding, to set it up by themselves. It is not that they want the local CBC station, but a lot of times they want the public to know or they want to make public announcements but they can not do that. I am wondering now if the people in Coral Harbour could get funding to get CBC service locally?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Commissioner.

Partial Return To Question W39-63: Radio Station, Coral Harbour

COMMISSIONER (Mr. Hodgson): Mr. Speaker, what the Member says is correct. The matter has been raised several times and when I was there three weeks ago it was again raised. I undertook to write the CBC to see if there was some way of assisting them. We have limited funds for radio stations or radio communications and are rather reluctant to get too involved in it because of the introduction of the satellite system within many communities, and radio is not really something that we are that knowledgeable in, nor can we provide the backup system equipment and capital outlay that is required for the operation of a station.

I admit it is frustrating to know that television and radio are there with the satellite and the Anik receiver station and that all they require is the installation of a transmitter and they can receive up-to-date programming. Maybe the program should be adjusted. Maybe 500 people for radio and television is too many, but I think in all fairness to the CBC that that is all the funds they had. They had to strike a balance somewhere and that is what they did, but we, as I say, have forwarded this request to the corporation but maybe we should talk to them again and maybe we can get it lowered. If it was lowered just to 400, then Coral Harbour would indeed qualify. That holds out very little hope, I admit, but under the circumstances that is about the best I can do.

MR. SPEAKER: Further questions? Mr. Lyall.

Question W40-63: Future Of S.M. Hodgson Arena, Cambridge Bay

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the administration what progress, if any, has been made considering the future of the S.M. Hodgson Arena in Cambridge Bay?

Return To Question W40-63: Future Of S.M. Hodgson Arena, Cambridge Bay

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid it is like the name of the person that it is named after, it is getting old and falling apart at the seams. I do not know what the future is. The community put together a back to back grant and with the assistance, with a lot of local help and contributions, they put up a structure and through utilizing LIP grants were able to cover it in, but therein lies the problem. We have assessed it and I think I am correct in saying that we figure there would be almost \$1 million needed to complete it and then, of course, there is the operating side which would be substantial.

I can only suggest that we should continue talking about it and looking at ways and means of utilizing government programs because that makes available government money for operating, but, unless we can come up with some sizeable cash from somewhere, I am afraid that the future does not look too bright. I expect to discuss this with the community next month when I visit them, but I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I have no solution for it.

MR. SPEAKER: Further questions? Mr. Steen.

Question 041-63: Return to Question

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Department of Economic Development, where is the reply promised to me for Question W23-63 yesterday?

Return To Question 041-63: Return to Question

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, I thought one of the Members would ask that question. I am waiting for it and it should be here later on today, sir. I will not say tomorrow morning because tomorrow morning is Saturday, but I assure you, sir, it should be here later on today.

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

Question W42-63: Settlement Office, Cambridge Bay

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, further to the question I asked just a while ago, I would like to know if the administration is going to be doing something about the demand that the Cambridge Bay settlement council has been making for the last two years, whether they are going to consider putting a new settlement office in Cambridge Bay within the next year?

Return To Question W42-63: Settlement Office, Cambridge Bay

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, the problem of the settlement office for Cambridge Bay is a problem we are trying to tie together with the problem of the completion of the arena. In the front part of the arena there was a plan for recreational and office space and this is the one ray of hope that we have for that building. If we can get the consent of the people to utilize that front part for office space and if we can come up with a plan which we are working on now, then that is the direction that we would like to go. I think that we will look for a plan and the final figures somewhere this winter. Perhaps at the January session we will be able to say what we can do in that area.

MR. SPEAKER: Further questions? Mr. Lafferty.

Question W43-63: Additional Staff For Game Office, Fort Simpson

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Speaker, my question is in two parts. Over the last couple of years there has been developing a need and, resulting from this need, is the request by the game office in Fort Simpson for clerical staff or a clerk typist or a receptionist, an additional member of government there who can be utilized by the game branch. If this need is known to the administration what is the administration doing to fulfil this need?

The second part of the question relating to the same matter is an additional game officer for the Mackenzie Liard district because of the people of Fort Liard requesting this additional man and, if so, if again it is known to the administration what are they doing about it?

MR. SPEAKER: Deputy Commissioner Parker.

Partial Return To Question W43-63: Additional Staff For Game Office, Fort Simpson

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, one of the problems we have is that in trying to control the growth of the public service we continue to receive requests for additional service and it makes it difficult at times to balance these two things. We will take the question that has been asked regarding a clerk and the question regarding an additional game officer for the Mackenzie Liard area under consideration and provide a reply.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Whitford, do you want to ask a question?

MR. WHITFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Question W44-63: Housing Rents In Rae

Mr. Speaker, we had a meeting in Rae on August 17th, 1977, with Deputy Commissioner Parker in attendance. It was discussed in length about the housing rent in that particular community and at that time it was agreed that we would be having a meeting at a later date with the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation officials, but unfortunately because I have been out of town and the chief himself, Chief Charlie Charlo, has been out of town, we could not get together with the government people to have this meeting. Now, the power meters have been disconnected from the homes thus leaving 11 families with no heat at all because the homes are heated by oil stoves. I asked Deputy Commissioner Parker if he can reply to me exactly when these meters can be reinstalled and can that meeting take place on Tuesday afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: Deputy Commissioner Parker.

Return To Question W44-63: Housing Rents In Rae.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, a meeting was arranged and an official of the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation went to Rae but, unfortunately, there was no attendance at the meeting and, therefore, I guess the arrangements must have been inadequate. There is a meeting to be held this coming Tuesday at Rae, in the afternoon, and there will be some publicity given to that and, at that time, the problem of the payment for utilities and rents will be discussed thoroughly with the people. I must take this opportunity, while answering this question, to advise that the action that was taken to cut off the electricity was taken by the Rae-Edzo Housing Association as a proper action, a proper function. They have done this before with people who have not kept their rent payments up to date and I must say that it is one of the very few constraints that the association has at its disposal. It has proved effective in the past and there was some hope that it would prove effective in this case. The people who are in arrears are not expected to pay all of their arrears at once. If they will merely advise as to when they will start paying, or even make a first small payment as evidence of their good faith, then the power will be turned on again.

The officials of the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation have a great reluctance to interfere with the operations of housing associations, because we give housing associations the responsibility, that is, decentralize to them, to operate their association, to charge rents, to carry out maintenance and all of those various functions. Each time that the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation or the government steps in and takes over their responsibilities, then they have a very good reason for not continuing to do a good job. If we undercut them consistently then, of course, the work will simply be referred back to headquarters and the whole purpose of decentralization and of people accepting responsibility for their actions will be lost.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Having said that, there is no intention to be terribly hard-hearted and I have high expectations that, when Mr. Lowing and his people meet with the people of Rae on Tuesday, a solution will be found.

MR. SPEAKER: Further questions. Mr. Whitford.

Question W45-63: Shortage Of Building Materials For Weber Homes In Rae

MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Speaker, last year when we built houses in the community of Rae we were short materials amounting to approximately \$5000 which included plywood, insulation, nails, etc. This year again we are building 18 homes and we find already that we are missing approximately two sheets of plywood per home and we also feel there will be a shortage of other materials. Last year we believed it was because it was the first time we had built homes by ourselves, that perhaps we had made a mistake, but this year we have got a superintendent for the project who is an excellent organizer, as well as a very responsible fellow. My question, Mr. Speaker, is that I believe in the shortages we may incur, there is a good possibility there are other communities in the Northwest Territories that are having these Weber homes built and that they too are short. I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the cost of the materials throughout the whole of the Northwest Territories could in fact reach a figure of probably \$1.5 million? I would like to ask the administration if they can investigate the situation for me and have a reply perhaps in January as to how much money is short on Weber homes throughout the North?

MR. SPEAKER: Deputy Commissioner Parker.

Partial Return To Question W45-63: Shortage Of Building Materials For Weber Homes In Rae

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to do that and, in addition, I will advise this Assembly of the steps that are taken to correct any shortages that occur, that is, to fasten the responsibility back onto either the supplier or the shipper.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further questions?

Item 4, oral questions.

Item 5, petitions.

Item 6, reports of standing and special committees. Mr. Lafferty.

ITEM NO. 6: REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES.

Report Of Standing Committee On Finance

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Speaker, the standing committee on finance met on October 20th, 1977, to consider the proposed Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance No. 2, 1977-78. The committee found the estimates to be in order and considers the amounts requested justified. The standing committee on finance, therefore, recommends to this Assembly that the supplementary estimates as submitted be approved.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there further reports of standing or special committees?

Gentlemen, as coffee is scheduled for 10:30 o'clock a.m., I propose we stand recessed for 15 minutes.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes a quorum. Item 7, notices of motion.

Item 8, motions for the production of papers.

Item 9, motions. Motions 5-63 to 14-63, starting with Motion 5-63, Mr. Butters.

ITEM NO. 9: MOTIONS

Motion 5-63: Examination Of Northwest Territories Fiscal Priorities

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS the decision of the federal government to reject the Canadian Arctic Gas Pipeline Limited proposal to build a natural gas pipeline through the Mackenzie Valley has cast serious doubt on continuing meaningful economic, political and social development in the Northwest Territories;

AND WHEREAS the territorial government budget we approved in January, 1977 was a budget based on the expectations of the approval this year by the National Energy Board of the Canadian Arctic Gas Pipeline Limited proposal;

AND WHEREAS the National Energy Board decision has had marked and irreversible effects on the economic and social communities of the Northwest Territories;

AND WHEREAS reports currently circulating suggest that the federal Treasury Board will be effecting serious cuts in moneys required and requested for expenditures in the Northwest Territories;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this Assembly convene in committee of the whole, as soon as possible, to examine territorial financial priorities in the light of the decision not to build the Mackenzie Valley natural gas pipeline.

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

MR. BUTTERS: Briefly, sir, I think that should the House approve this motion, it could be completed very quickly in committee of the whole. Assistant Commissioner Mullins could give us a brief report on any changes that have taken place in priorities and satisfy the intent of this motion very quickly.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker, I support Mr. Butters' motion. As far as the government is concerned at this point in time we have not really developed a concrete fiscal policy to deal with the depression in the Mackenzie Valley. We do not want to develop one quickly. We want to take our time over it and make sure that whatever we do it will have long-lasting beneficial effects. It would be very useful for the government to hear from Members of the Legislature what they think the priorities should be, how they think we should go about altering financial priorities in order to deal with this very desperate situation. Therefore, I would fully support Mr. Butters' motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion 5-63, Carried

MR. SPEAKER: The question being called. All in favour? Down. Contrary? The motion appears to have been carried unanimously.

---Carried

Motion 6-63, Hon. Dave Nickerson.

Motion 6-63: School Of Dental Therapy

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I do not know whether this motion should have been put forward by me as Minister of Health and Social Services or Hon. Arnold McCallum in whose riding the school of dental therapy is located. I guess I got the first shot anyway.

WHEREAS there is reason to believe that the Department of National Health and Welfare is considering moving the school of dental therapy from Fort Smith to a location in British Columbia;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that the Minister of National Health and Welfare be advised of the strong opposition of this Legislature to any attempt to relocate the Fort Smith school of dental therapy to a place outside of the Northwest Territories.

MR. SPEAKER: Seconder, Hon. Arnold McCallum. Discussion. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: It came as quite a shock to the people in this government when a few months ago we first heard that the Department of National Health and Welfare had certain plans of which we did not really approve for the Fort Smith school of dental therapy. Some of the things which they wished to do are in many respects good. I believe they wish to turn it into a national school. It was very much our idea in the first place. I think Mr. Butters had a lot to do with it, and apparently it has worked out very well and is turning out competent practitioners who are particularly useful in northern areas.

I think the Department of National Health and Welfare, as I said, wishes to have people trained in the school of dental therapy from all over northern Canada, but what they want to do which really irks us is to move the location to a place in British Columbia. In view of the serious economic problems we are experiencing in the southern Mackenzie at the present point in time; in view of the fact that we want to encourage this type of activity in the Northwest Territories, I think it would be a very backward move to take this unit out of the territories. I think we would like to see it developed as a national school but there is no reason on earth why it could not still remain in Fort Smith or some other location in the Northwest Territories.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion? Mr. Pearson.

Support For The Motion

MR. PEARSON: Just to add my support to the motion and I am appalled that such a move would be under way. I have visited the school of dental therapy and I have spent a considerable amount of time in supporting it on previous occasions in this Assembly. I have publicly commended the director of that program and feel that it is absolutely essential that it remain. I strongly urge Members to support this motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion? Mr. Stewart.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion. It would appear to me that this particular operation is not really a matter of a painless extraction.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Fraser.

MR. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, I stand to support the motion. However, I would like to know if somebody has figures as to how many students use the school, how many have graduated and how many are still practising dental therapy?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: I likewise support the motion. I believe it is the first school of dental therapy established in Canada, fulfilling a very important need. While the motion appears to be quite strong, it might be a good idea also, in view of the partiality recently shown to this jurisdiction by our Prime Minister and his interest in seeing our territories develop in all directions, that he be informed of this suggestion by the Department of National Health and Welfare.

I recognize too, that in the recent shift of cabinet portfolios the Minister is now the Hon. Monique Begin and I doubt that she has had an opportunity to visit the territories. I think it might be an idea to include with the request contained in this motion that we invite her to visit the territories and at the same time to visit Fort Smith and examine the school of dental therapy on the ground.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion? Hon. Arnold McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I will, of course, wholeheartedly support the move, the motion to retain the school of dental therapy in the Northwest Territories. The school, of course, for a number of years now has turned out graduates. I think it is a two year course and the number of students in each particular year is 15. I am not sure just how many are there. I think we could get figures for Mr. Fraser on it. I can not recall the exact figures since the school has begun, but nevertheless, there are a number of graduates not only in the territories but in other places in northern Canada.

High Calibre Of Tutorage

The school is very capably equipped with modern equipment that is mobile and in fact the school equipment is taken to other areas. It has, of course, the highest calibre of professional tutorage in terms of the instructors. These particular dentists have in fact become citizens of the town of Fort Smith and hence citizens of the territories, not just living there but of course some of them have built their own homes and are now taxpayers within the municipality. It is this kind of commitment to the Northwest Territories that I think we should honour and make sure that we do include this kind of motion in any of the discussions that we have with our federal officials.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Peter Ernerk.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, I stand to support this motion, because I think it has produced a lot of good people into various kinds of positions such as dental therapists in the Eastern Arctic or at least in my constituency. I think this Legislative Assembly should make a stand on these kinds of things when they do come from the Department of National Health and Welfare or the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs or any federal department, because just a couple of days ago we passed an Income Tax Ordinance and we will give it second reading. In that we are trying to get responsible government in the Northwest Territories, if things of this nature are continuing to be taken away from the Northwest Territories we are not going to see any responsible government. So, while the Department of Health and Social Services or the Government of the Northwest Territories or this Legislature is trying to get more responsibility, it seems to me that this is one responsibility that is being taken away from us again. So, what I am saying is, I fully support the motion as it stands, especially since we seem to be struggling to have the federal health responsibilities transferred to the Northwest Territories.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion? Question.

Recorded Vote Called

MR. BUTTERS: A point of order, please, a recorded vote.

MR. SPEAKER: A recorded vote being called.

MR. PEARSON: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I never thought I would live to see the day that I would support something on the Adult Vocational Training Centre.

Motion 6-63, Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Maybe that is why the recorded vote is being called. On the recorded vote being called would the Members in favour or against the motion remain standing until their names have been called for the purposes of the record? Mr. Remnant, are you ready? Recorded vote being called. All in favour of the motion?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Mr. Steen, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Lafferty, Mr. Lyall, Mr. Butters, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Whitford, Hon. Arnold McCallum, Mr. Evaluarjuk, Hon. Peter Ernerk, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Kilabuk, Mr. Pudluk, Hon. Dave Nickerson.

MR. SPEAKER: The vote is unanimous.

---Carried

Motion 7-63. Mr. Butters.

Motion 7-63: Petrocan's Invitation

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS major private petroleum exploration companies have reduced their activity in the Beaufort sedimentary basin;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada has constituted Petrocan to act in the national interest in developing energy resources and exploring for new petroleum reserves;

AND WHEREAS Petrocan management has expressed interest in carrying out and is carrying out petroleum exploration and development activities in both the High Arctic and the Western Arctic;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that the Commissioner invite Petrocan's president, Mr. Maurice Strong and/or vice-president, Mr. Bill Hooper, or in their absence, Mr. Barry Yates to meet with this Assembly in committee of the whole and outline the corporation's plans, programs and proposals that Petrocan may have for filling the vacuum left in the Northwest Territories and especially in the Western Arctic region, with the departure of the major oil companies.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Members correct the word "air" that is contained in the last line of the motion as written? Correct it to "oil". Is there a seconder? Mr. Steen. Discussion? Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: I believe the benefits to result from such an invitation are self-evident, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion? Mr. Pearson.

MR. PEARSON: A question of Mr. Butters. Does Mr. Butters anticipate this meeting during this session?

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion? Hon. Peter Ernerk.

Motion To Amend Motion 7-63, Carried

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a further clause to the motion. Where it says "in committee of the whole" I would like to add "in the January session". My reason for this is that during his speech, the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Joe Clark, made mention I believe of the fact that he would like to see this particular committee, Petrocan, be abolished as the next step, or once he is elected as Prime Minister of Canada. So, if we feel strongly about inviting the members of Petrocan, I think we should say as to when we would like to invite them to appear before this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you moving an amendment?

HON. PETER ERNERK: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: To add the words "at the January session" after the words "in committee of the whole", is that correct?

HON. PETER ERNERK: That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, could that be included, as I agree?

MR. SPEAKER: If your seconder agrees. Is there any disagreement with that? Do you want to go through the other process, Hon. Dave Nickerson?

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay. No short cuts today, gentlemen. The words "at the January session" after the word "whole" moved by Hon. Peter Ernerk. Is there a seconder? Mr. Butters. Discussion of the amendment?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: The question being called. On the amendment. All in favour? Down. Contrary? The amendment is carried.

---Carried

On the motion now, is there further discussion on the motion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion 7-63, Carried As Amended

MR. SPEAKER: The question is being called on the motion as amended. All in favour? Down. Contrary? The motion as amended is carried.

---Carried

Mr. Clerk, would you see that it is included on committee of the whole matters for the January session?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Yes, sir, I will.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 8-63, Mr. Stewart.

Motion 8-63: Liquor Ordinance Amendment

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS the Liquor Ordinance lists quasi military messes which include by interpretation Royal Canadian Mounted Police, armed forces and civil defence as being eligible for a canteen licence;

AND WHEREAS local fire department duties are similar to civil defence in many ways and indeed act in that capacity in many municipalities;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that the Liquor Ordinance be amended to include recognized fire departments in PART III, 29(1)(f) of the Liquor Ordinance.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Stewart, the difficulty I have with your motion is that looking at its wording, "I move that the Liquor Ordinance be amended..." suggests that you are purporting to amend it by this motion. As you well know the only way you may amend legislation is by either a government bill or in this case quite properly a Private Member's Bill which would be given three readings in this House. So, you can not purport to amend the legislation by motion. You can recommend that the government bring in an amendment or you may of your own volition bring in a Private Member's Bill. So the motion as it is drafted really is out of order and I would suggest that maybe you would be well advised to reword it as a recommendation to the government or simply to proceed yourself with a Private Member's Bill.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I wonder could I have the acceptance of this House to amend? I move that the interpretation include fire departments, that is, recognized fire brigades.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Stewart, I am sorry, but the difficulty is the motion itself is out of order and I do not see how I can permit you to amend it. You can withdraw it and resubmit it and if this committee gives you unanimous consent to give notice of it today and move it today then you can get back to where you are now with the new motion, but I can not. I would be bending the Rules substantially to permit you to now amend the motion which is out of order and is unacceptable.

Motion 8-63, Withdrawn

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 9-63, Mr. Whitford.

Motion 9-63: House Trailer Lots And The Landlord And Tenant Ordinance.

MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS the relationship between landlords and tenants of house trailer lots appears to be inadequately defined;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that the administration be requested to review the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance and report back to the Legislative Assembly at its January, 1978, session whether amendments are recommended to more adequately protect the parties to any agreement respecting the rental or leasing of house trailer lots.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Whitford. Is there a seconder? Mr. Butters. Discussion. Mr. Whitford.

MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are mobile homes in the Northwest Territories that are on leased properties or rental places and the problem is that there is not very much protection for the tenants who own these mobile homes. An example is that an occupant can be removed within a 24 hour period from the lots. As well there are no proper contracts to make sort of an agreement between the tenant and the landlord. The fire protection as well; it seems that insurance companies are not insuring because of the closeness of mobile homes to one another. That is another point that is quite important. Throwing out some of these ideas to Members of the Assembly, I would hope that it could be reviewed and that there would be better protection given to the mobile home owners.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion? Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I am very pleased that the Honourable Member for Great Slave Lake brought this matter up. It is, of course, of recent importance in the constituency of Yellowknife North and it would appear to me that there is some uncertainty as to the relationships between landlords and tenants of house trailer lots. I think that in this type of legislation we have to be very careful to be fair to both the lessors and the lessees. On many occasions in the recent past, legislators have been persuaded by tenants to enact legislation which is very much in favour of the tenants and contrary to the interests of the landlords. The first thing that happens if you do that, and I have seen it happen on several occasions, is that an undesirable tenant enters the premises and the other tenants want to get rid of him and there is no way that a landlord can, so that is one of the things that we have to keep in mind.

Definition Of House Trailer Lots Not Clear

In reviewing the existing Landlord and Tenant Ordinance it would appear to me that house trailer lots are included in the definition of "land" under the general ordinance so that there is some legislation dealing with contracts between landlords and tenants for house trailer lots, but it is not at all clear whether or not house trailer lots are included within the definition of residential property under PART IV of the ordinance. It is customary for us to be more specific in legislating what shall be contained or implied within a contract with respect to residential property. It might be that for good reasons you would not want to include house trailer lots in the definition of "residential property." You might want to add a whole new section to the ordinance dealing specifically with this type of property.

This is a request to the administration to review this matter. The whole matter of landlord and tenant relationships and matters relating to property is fairly complex, of a complex legal nature and I think that we

would do well to avail ourselves of expert legal advice on these matters. I am very pleased that Mr. Whitford has brought this matter up so that, should this motion pass, we will have proper advice with which we can work at the next session of the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Lafferty.

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased with Mr. Whitford's move to look into this matter because we do have similar problems in Fort Simpson and I am rather amazed at the response of our Honourable Minister speaking of undesirable tenants and I really do not understand what he means. Maybe I will ask the question later, perhaps in private.

Must Be Fair To All

I do not think that any legislation at all that we pass probably dealing with ordinances respecting the rights of tenants or landlords should be based on the majority of tenants who may not desire to have another member of the community living in that area. This is the kind of problem that we have had in Fort Simpson and we have managed to overcome it and it is starting to clear itself up. I think, to put his own words back, we must be fair to all people, particularly our individual people who make up our communities and we also must consider areas that we control. A lot of these people can not move their trailers away from the communities because of certain laws that prevent it, so people are forced into the communities and we have to be very careful with people that we may empower, whether they will allow a person to live in a designated area or not. In that regard it probably deserves a lot of discussion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion 9-63, Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. Question being called on Mr. Whitford's Motion 9-63. All in favour? Down. Contrary? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Motion 10-63, Mr. Evaluarjuk.

Motion 10-63: Housing Corporation And Associations To Visit Baffin Island

MR. EVALUARJUK: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS the local housing associations no longer have the same authority to set rents or in other matters that they used to have;

AND WHEREAS although the government has promised that housing associations and co-operatives would be given opportunities to bid on contracts for the construction of houses in their settlements, this does not always happen;

AND WHEREAS there are various other problems about housing in settlements which concern the housing association and the Housing Corporation;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this Assembly recommend that the board of directors and the managing director of the Housing Corporation visit settlements in the Baffin region as soon as possible to hold meetings to discuss these problems and to explain the functions of the housing associations and the Housing Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further discussion? I do not think I called for a seconder for the motion. Mr. Stewart. Further discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS. Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Steen.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I just have a question of the mover. Does he mean the Housing Corporation board of directors or does he mean the people who work for the corporation to go to his communities to discuss or have meetings with his people? I am not too sure whether he means the board of directors of the Housing Corporation or the staff of the corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Steen, the wording of the motion says: "I move that this Assembly recommend that the board of directors and the managing director of the Housing Corporation visit settlements ..." etc. It is clear from the wording of the motion, I suggest.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, can I go on further?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, you can speak to it.

Teaching Is Function Of Staff

MR. STEEN: A number of us are on the Housing Corporation board of directors, myself, Mr. Pearson and a number of other people around the territories. I do not think it is necessary for the board of directors to go to settlements to discuss things with the local housing associations. I believe the Housing Corporation's job is to discuss things in general, not to teach individual housing associations. I think that is the job of the staff of the Housing Corporation, so on that basis I can not support the motion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion? Anyone before I let Mr. Evaluarjuk speak because his speaking will close the debate.

MR. PEARSON: Well, as a director of the Housing Corporation I concur with the views expressed by Mr. Steen in a sense, but I wonder if Mr. Evaluarjuk would be prepared to elaborate a little more on his view because it would be impossible for me to spend the time to visit and I am sure for the other directors to visit all the communities in the Eastern Arctic.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion? Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON DAVE NICKERSON: I think, Mr. Speaker, that I would have to be persuaded by the argument put forward by both Mr. Steen and the Honourable Member for South Baffin. It is not really a function of the board of directors, I would suggest, to go around and do all the leg work, that is why the board of directors have under them a competent staff. I would certainly support and would be very pleased to support Mr. Evaluarjuk in his request that senior staff members visit the settlements in the Baffin region and I can see that it might make sense to have, once in a while, a meeting of the board of directors, say, in Frobisher Bay, but for it to be required that the board of directors visit all of the settlements in the Baffin region I believe does not really tie in with their function.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there further discussion? Hon. Peter Ernerk.

Visits To Regions Necessary

HON. PETER ERNERK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to agree with the motion and disagree with Mr. Pearson and Mr. Steen. It is like saying that it is not really their responsibility to visit these communities in the Eastern Arctic as part of the board of directors. That is like any Executive Member saying, "It is not really my responsibility to talk to a clerk of the local government or a clerk in Economic Development," or something like that, but whatever you say. However, I would support this motion because I think as directors of the Housing Corporation, you should be able to make a point of visiting the regions in the Northwest Territories, not all them, mind you, but certain regions just to find out the differences between the Western Arctic and the Eastern Arctic.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters.

MR. LYALL: A point of privilege, sir. I had my hand up long before Mr. Butters put his hand up.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, Mr. Lyall, I did not see your hand and I apologize if that is the case. I am sure Mr. Butters will defer to you.

MR. BUTTERS: Good old Mr. Butters.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this motion. I am quite shocked in hearing one of the directors of the Housing Corporation say that. It sounds to me like they do not have time to go and visit. As one of the persons who supported putting the two people who are against this motion on the board of directors, I put them on that board of directors on the Housing Corporation so that they could carry out a job that would be done for this House.

Setting Aside Of Private Interests

I, for one, have heard too long that some Members belonging to some committees of this House have to look after their barges before they will do anything for us. Every morning we pray that we set aside all of our private interests for this House, so I would strongly support this motion and strongly oppose some of the Members who would not take

time out to go and visit the settlements because it is a waste of time as they have stated. I do not think it is a waste of time. The board of directors or the managing directors of the Housing Corporation should make every effort to try to visit as many communities as possible. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters and then Mr. Pudluk.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I think there is a danger of getting too emotional and too personal about what is really a very simple request, a request that I am sure will be supported by the majority of the Members of this House. I did not understand that the two Members on the board of directors suggested that they were against travelling to the Eastern Arctic. In fact ...

MR. PEARSON: I do not recall that.

MR. BUTTERS: ... in fact, I understand that the board has met in Frobisher Bay on a couple of occasions since it has been formed. I think what is important for the board of directors is that they do see the difference between the barren lands and the treed lands. There is a very great difference and I think that the board should recognize that fact.

MR. PEARSON: Right!

MR. BUTTERS: So I think that is what we should remember. The Honourable Member for Foxe Basin has also requested attendance of the managing director; I think what Mr. Steen, my honourable colleague from the Western Arctic, was pointing out is that the man who has the answers to maybe not all of the problems, but a lot of the questions that are being raised by the housing associations in the communities, is the managing director of the Housing Corporation. Therefore certainly he is the one who should be travelling and answering the particular questions.

I think that I will be supporting the motion of the Honourable Member from Foxe Basin, but I do not think we should get carried away and charge one another and other Members of not doing this or not doing that.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Pudluk and then Mr. Lafferty.

Chairman's Visits

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this motion and the Honourable Member from Frobisher Bay who said that he does not have time, is a decision maker. The chairman of the board, and he has never been to all of the settlements in the Baffin, sometimes does not know what he is talking about at a board meeting.

---Applause

That is why I support this motion, so he can be sure what he is talking about. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Lafferty.

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge it is the first time that such a request has come or will be coming from this House for the board of directors of the Housing Corporation to visit maybe isolated areas that they probably have not visited before. I also will be lending my support to this request for various reasons; but since it gets a little emotional now and then, I think that for the purposes of the board of directors, who are fairly well from all of the areas and some of them have no doubt visited Mackenzie Liard, our housing problems are quite unique and probably not known to the board of directors. Our situation is quite different because we have so many baffling policies, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, communities and everything else, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Northwest Territories Housing Corporation and so on. Perhaps it would not be out of order, since I do have an intention and request from my people for the board to come and visit our community at some date in the future, as it may be of usefulness, if I move an amendment worded so that the Housing Corporation visit communities in the Baffin region and communities in the Mackenzie area that have not been visited by the board members.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment, you want to add the words "and other communities"?

MR. LAFFERTY: "And communities that have never been visited by the board."

MR. SPEAKER: "And other communities in the Mackenzie?"

MR. LAFFERTY: "That have not been visited by the board."

Motion 10-63, Amended.

MR. SPEAKER: "That have never been visited by the board." Presumably that amendment then would appear after the words in the third line "Baffin region" and you would add there "and other communities in the Mackenzie that have never been visited by the board" and then you would continue on "to hold meetings as soon as possible"?

MR. LAFFERTY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder for that motion? Mr. Whitford.
Discussion on the amendment?

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, to make that amendment you really are going against what I was talking about. I feel that if anything, "the Baffin region, Baffin Island and the Mackenzie region" should be added in there. But it should be taken right out of there and just put in "the whole of the Northwest Territories."

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Lyall, you are entitled to speak against the amendment and against the motion if you want. I am afraid I have to deal with the amendment as proposed.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, is it allowable to make an amendment to the amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, it is.

Amendment To Amendment Of Motion 10-63.

MR. LYALL: Well, I would like to make that amendment, sir. I would like to amend the amendment that is made to take out "Baffin Island and Mackenzie Valley" and to add the words instead "the whole of the Northwest Territories."

MR. SPEAKER: So then instead of the words "the Baffin region," the words "in the whole of the Northwest Territories". Is that correct?

MR. LYALL: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: So the amendment would have the effect then of: "Now therefore I move that this Assembly recommend that the board of directors and the managing director of the Housing Corporation visit settlements in the whole of the Northwest Territories", continuing on "as soon as possible", etc. Is there a seconder for the amendment to the amendment to the motion? Mr. Evaluarjuk. Discussing the amendment to the amendment? Mr. Steen.

Board Members' Time For Travelling

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see the amendments come up because it gives me a chance to speak again. I think, you know, if you are going to take one of your people here and put him on the board of directors to go all around the Northwest Territories, then you are going to have to put him on full time. You are going to have to pay him the same amount as Hon. Peter Ernerk who does not even visit this country, so I think, just to tell you short and sweet, that if you support this motion, then you have lost one member of the board of directors. I just do not have the time and I have to tell you now and I might as well tell you straight, that a member of the board of directors has to deal with many things. He listens to the views of the other people who come from his area.

There seems to be quite a bit of mistrust with representatives from each area. You see it in the Assembly here, you see that now there seems to be mistrust. I get the feeling there is mistrust for the Members to bring the views of their area to the board of directors. I agree that we should go once in a while, but boy, this is a big country. It is going to take us a long time to make a round. We will be off our term before we even make a round, so I just have to tell you, I mean you appointed me to be on the board of directors and I will just say that. I was serving the time and, if it gets too much for me, I think you will have to find someone else. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for the amendments and everything.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Speaking to the amendment to the amendment, I will vote against the amendment to the amendment because I feel it has made nonsensical the reason behind the original motion. I think there may have been some possibility that that motion could have been carried out but, as the Honourable Member from the Western Arctic suggests, what is required by the amendment to the amendment is a full time travelling board.

One Visit Will Not Resolve Housing Problems

Housing problems have been with us for many, many years. Housing problems will not be resolved by one visit of this board to various communities. I think that not one of the three Members of this Assembly who sit on that board has any indication when they accepted their seats that they would be required to perform a function as has been suggested by my honourable colleague from the Central Arctic. I would expect that not only would we lose Mr. Steen, but other Members as well because the responsibility that we are asking of them here, the job that we are asking of them here is unreasonable, impossible and very, very expensive. Just putting it in terms of figures we understand, I would figure to carry out the wishes of the mover of the amendment to the amendment, it would cost the board of directors or the Housing Corporation something in the order of \$200,000 or four family-type homes. I think that if I were looking at cost benefits I would rather see four families housed adequately and comfortably than having our board of directors junketing around the territories. So, while I can support the motion of the Member from Foxe Basin, I can not support the amendment to the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any further discussion? Mr. Lyall, you can not speak again. You can not speak again because you are the mover of the amendment to the amendment and you spoke first.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, do I not close the debate?

MR. SPEAKER: Not on an amendment. The mover of an amendment does not have the right of reply. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I may be guilty of repeating myself somewhat, Mr. Speaker ...

MR. SPEAKER: But not an exception.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: No, I am afraid that is not an exception at all. I think that I would be inclined to support the amendment to the amendment. As Mr. Butters points out, this would in fact make the original motion much different from the initial intent. The initial intent was pretty specific, to go to the Baffin Island communities and drag the board of directors all around Baffin Island. I think that the way the Housing Corporation would have to interpret this motion, if the amendment to the amendment passed and the amendment passed and then the motion as amended passed, would be that they would have to do the best job possible to make sure that all the various housing associations were informed and advised of current policies and to make a point of having the board of directors do as much travelling as possible. Obviously it is impossible to get around to all the settlements, so that is the way I think they would have to interpret it.

Function Of Board Of Directors

If you will allow me to say a few things that might possibly be not strictly on the subject of the amendment to the amendment, but with your permission, Mr. Speaker, which I may not get, I would like to elaborate a little on what I would see as being the function of a board of directors. These people are generally chosen from various geographical locations and various areas of expertise and specialities so that they can come together and each bring their own knowledge to bear on the problems, so by doing that, it is not necessary for the group to travel around to every settlement in the territories. The problems are not unique in each settlement. They are very much the same in Arctic Bay as they are in Pond Inlet, and as they are in Pangnirtung, so that it is not necessary in my opinion for the board of directors to go to every settlement. I think they should be involved with very broad policy. They should not get mixed up in the day to day operation of the Housing Corporation. One of the main functions as far as I am concerned is to keep a watchful eye on the managing director. This is probably the most important function and, if he is running a good show, they stay off his back. As soon as he starts to make mistakes, then they call him to task and if he is not performing properly it is their job to remove him and that is their main job. I agree with Mr. Steen. I think at the present time we probably have more people in the air than we do have on the ground in the Northwest Territories and maybe we are going a little bit overboard on everybody travelling around and seeing the sights.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Pearson and then Mr. Whitford.

MR. PEARSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly because this thing has really gone on long enough. The unfortunate thing is that my colleague from the Eastern Arctic, Mr. Evaluarjuk, made a simple request and it has now become completely distorted. It is out of all control. I mean really Mr. Evaluarjuk is asking that the board of directors of the Housing Corporation visit his particular area because he feels they could make a contribution to the problems in that area. No doubt we could.

Original Motion A Reasonable Request

It is possible for the board of directors to visit Igloolik or wherever, I am sure, within the foreseeable future, but then for the Assembly to go absolutely ape and demand that we visit every community and solve all the housing problems within the next 15 minutes or all resign is utterly ridiculous. The original motion was perfectly reasonable, a perfectly reasonable request. Igloolik and Foxe Basin do have serious housing problems. Yellowknife has serious housing problems but the board of directors can not solve all of those problems. We are aware of them and we work diligently, the directors along with the staff of the Housing Corporation. You know, fellows, let us get back to earth for a minute and, as I say, support the original motion. It is a reasonable request but now it has become unreasonable so I support the original motion but not the amendment or the amendment to the amendment or the amendment to the amendment to the amendment. The original motion is reasonable.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Very good.

Amendment To Amendment, Motion 10-63, Withdrawn

MR. LYALL: I would like to reply, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw my amendment to the amendment...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hooray!

---Applause

MR. LYALL: ...but reluctantly because of the fact that the cost of four houses would be sacrificed. I think if the board of directors could go to Greenland just to have a meeting, then I think they could afford to go around the Northwest Territories.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: It looks like we are back to the first amendment to the motion that you therefore visit "the Baffin region and other communities in the Mackenzie that have never been visited by the board". Is your amendment to continue, Mr. Lafferty?

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to this Assembly I do support the original motion.

MR. PEARSON: Hooray!

---Applause

MR. LAFFERTY: My reason for asking for this single little amendment is that...

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Lafferty, excuse me. I have asked you a simple question. I just need a "yes" or "no" answer to it. Does your amendment stand or do you wish to withdraw it?

MR. LAFFERTY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you wish to withdraw it?

MR. LAFFERTY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any more discussion on the amendment?

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, did the seconder to the amendment to the amendment agree to withdraw the amendment?

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: No.

MR. SPEAKER: I did not get that point of order, Mr. Stewart. Will you restate it?

MR. STEWART: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, did the seconder of the amendment to the amendment agree to withdraw the amendment to the amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: Who was the seconder of the amendment to the amendment?

MR. STEWART: Mr. Evaluarjuk, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I assume, Mr. Evaluarjuk, that you have no objection to Mr. Lyll's amendment to the amendment being withdrawn?

MR. EVALUARJUK: I do not mind if the amendment is taken off. However, I would like to know if I could speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. Not now until I get this thing sorted out. Gentlemen, as I see it the motion as amended by Mr. Lafferty is what we are discussing now. Now, those Members who did not speak to Mr. Lafferty's amendment may continue discussing his amendment.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: The question.

MR. SPEAKER: On Mr. Lafferty's amendment.

MR. PEARSON: The question.

Amendment To Motion 10-63, Defeated

MR. SPEAKER: The question being called. All in favour? Two. Down. Contrary? The amendment is lost.

---Defeated

On the motion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Evaluarjuk has the right to wind up the debate on the motion. Mr. Kilabuk, do you wish to speak on the motion?

MR. KILABUK: Mr. Speaker, it has been a lot of fun speaking on this and I do not mind if we go back to the first motion. It seems that we are off the track but, however, we are back to the original motion again. I am in full support of the motion if the board of directors would be visiting the communities. However, I think it would be a good idea for us to at least start in the Baffin region first. We are hardly ever given any opportunity to speak about the housing situation or speak with the manager of the Housing Corporation and we have not had time to discuss particular housing problems for this reason. I am in full support of the motion to have the board of directors discuss the particular problems in the Baffin area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Evaluarjuk will close off the debate. Is there someone else who wishes to speak before he does on the motion? Mr. Whitford.

Support For Motion

MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Speaker, I too, am one of the board of directors of the Housing Corporation. It was a simple request here that I think got quite out of hand and exploded into many other things. I personally feel that as a simple request I would not mind going to one or two communities and that would be it, but to go through the whole Eastern Arctic is just virtually impossible. These other communities, and the Member has raised that already, the Member from Holman Island wants us to go to Holman to have a look at that particular area and we are trying to find time for that as well. The thing is that the Housing Corporation does not have that kind of money to send its members around to community after community. They are not given any budget at all to be able to travel and visit each community and discuss housing with the housing associations or the people in general. It makes it a bit easier for me because of the fact that having a small budget from the House gives me the chance to travel and be able to see some of these things, but the other members who are on there who are not from this House are unable to go from community to community. So, while I am in support of this motion I can only say that I am in agreement with the two communities if it was agreed by the Members and that would be it.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Lafferty, are you sure you did not speak on the original motion?

SOME HON. MEMBER: Yes, he did.

MR. SPEAKER: I think you did.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

MR. SPEAKER: Did you not speak on the original motion?

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Speaker, I did not speak to the original motion. I moved an amendment to the original motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay, then speak. Mr. Lafferty.

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Speaker, we are told by those Members that we have appointed that they do not have the time nor money and then we are told that it would be literally impossible for them to visit these communities in their term. These are communities which are affected greatly by the decisions and recommendations which are coming forth from areas in relation to the expenditure of money. The request on my part from my own area that some board members or people visit Fort Simpson is because of the housing problems that they are faced with.

Problems In Fort Simpson

Let me remind you, my honourable colleagues, that when the budget comes before you and when you look at the territorial government housing expenditures and all the public information releases that you find, there rises in the minds of the people in the Mackenzie Valley, how come people in the High Arctic are getting most of the money? We need that type of an explanation and if you seek my support for that type of an expenditure then I ask you to think about our economic conditions and our housing problems. That request for the amendment was just a simple little thing asking people to come and visit Fort Simpson or other communities that may have had that problem as it was outlined. So because of that type of pressure on myself and because of the kind of money problems that we are having and we are faced with, although it is a simple request, it will be impossible for me to support that motion if I am denied, if my people are denied the right to talk to the board of directors of the Housing Corporation. Housing affects us the greatest. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it safe, do you think, for me to suggest that Mr. Evaluarjuk will wind up the debate?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Evaluarjuk.

Powers And Responsibilities Of Board

MR. EVALUARJUK: Mr. Speaker, I was the first one to make the motion and this discussion has got a little bit frightening. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to say too much in this situation, but however, I do not think I want to talk too much on this problem area. I do not want to talk too long. The Housing Corporation's board of directors, there are ten of them and I am not saying that I want all of them, that I want the full board of directors to visit each community. Probably some of the board of directors could go, but if the board of directors for the Housing Corporation are not fully recognized as to what their position is in the Baffin area, do they even know their responsibility within the Baffin region, I myself personally can not really know the actual powers and responsibilities of that particular board of directors. Personally I do not even know that.

So, with that thinking in mind it seems that if their only power is collecting the rent raises in the houses in these communities, I do not want to speak too long on this. However, the managing director of the Housing Corporation and some of the board of directors, it would be a very good idea for some of them to visit these communities and also when the board of directors sits this year as it did last year the director of the Housing Corporation was also in that party.

However, they have never gone to Igloolik. When they did arrive at Igloolik they went to the co-op store and bought some carvings and immediately after buying the carvings they left Igloolik and that was the situation in Igloolik. However, if they are going to Igloolik they should meet with the people in the communities and I am very much in favour of that. I do not want to get into the problem in these communities, however, there is not one here, the managing director is not here so that is all I have to say at the moment for now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

MR. SPEAKER: On the motion, the question being called. Mr. Pudluk.

Recorded Vote Requested

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker, can we have a recorded vote, please?

Motion 10-63, Carried

MR. SPEAKER: A recorded vote being requested. Mr. Clerk, I do not think we need to explain the procedure, we have just been through it recently. The question being called. All in favour?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Stewart, Mr. Butters, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Whitford, Hon. Arnold McCallum, Mr. Evaluarjuk, Hon. Peter Ernerk, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Kilabuk, Mr. Pudluk.

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Steen, Mr. Lafferty.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is carried.

---Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Gentlemen, with respect to that last vote the Rule apparently requires us to record abstentions and I think there was at least one. Hon. Dave Nickerson, you abstained and did someone else abstain? Mr. Lyall. Any other abstentions to be recorded? Thank you.

Motion 11-63, Mr. Pudluk.

Motion 11-63: Radios, High Arctic.

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS there is an increase of outpost camps in the High Arctic, but they do not have enough radios, which is inconvenient to the campers; I think there are only three radios in north of Baffin outpost camps;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that in the coming year, 1978, I would like an increase of radios to be used by outpost camps.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Stewart. Discussion. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to make a very long speech about this motion, but I would like to explain to this House what happened last summer. In Arctic Bay there are a lot of hunters over there who went out hunting. A few days later, probably about 50 miles from the settlement -- they travelled by boat, by canoe -- someone got sick. He was sick nine days and died. If there had been a radio there, they could have made it by plane because the water was too rough to go back. That is the reason why I would like to increase the outpost camp radios in the High Arctic, because they have to travel by water sometimes 100 miles across the ocean -- not the ocean, but the islands I would say. That is all I have to make a speech on at the moment. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion? Did you have your hand up, Mr. Lyall?

MR. LYALL: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Go ahead.

Outpost Camps.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, although I am not in full favour of outpost camps that are funded by the government, I have seen on several occasions where these outpost camps are funded by the government with good intention for the people who are going out. People who do go out are so used to living in a nice warm house that as soon as it starts getting cold they go back into the community, although we already spend a great amount of money to get them out into the outpost camps. I will support the motion because of the fact that those outpost camps do need radios, the same thing as we need radios in Spence Bay, Pelly Bay, Gjoa Haven, because of the fact that Canadian National Telecommunications is not providing proper service that we do need in those communities. I think this situation with radios in outpost camps goes along the same lines as every community in the Central Arctic when we are having trouble with our telephones. Several communities, as I said before, are requesting already to put radios back in the settlements. I think in that case I will be supporting this motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion? Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak but the Honourable Member from the High Arctic in his remarks referred to the need, I think, only for the High Arctic. The motion though does indicate that such need would be utilized or provided for in all areas in the Northwest Territories.

I think that this is an important motion because I think we recognize that the territories now will have to fall back on the Berger theory of development, the alternate theory of development which is making use of the land to an increasing degree than has occurred in the past. So I think we will be seeing an increase in the number of outpost camps established and an increase in the number of people who will have to seek their livelihood on the land rather than face a welfare economy in the settlements.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion? Mr. Fraser.

Radios For Emergency Use

MR. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, I will support that motion made by my colleague over there but I would just like to mention a few things. These radios are put into these outpost camps and some of these trapping places I believe for emergency reasons only. He mentions in his talk to the motion somebody being sick and it was a case of not getting out, being unable to get out and the person died. I am in full support of radios for outpost camps. However, I have seen these radios being abused. If they were put in there for emergency cases, I can see that, but when they get on the radio and deliberately run other people down which is the case in some instances, I do not think those radios are meant for that reason. In lots of cases the radios are used four or five hours just telling people that they caught four fish today and five rats yesterday and the batteries are gone dead, so if they get an emergency they can not get out anyway because the batteries are dead. So I believe if the radios are put into the outpost camps and used for what they are meant to be used for I will certainly support that motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Whitford.

Radios Useful For Messages

MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Speaker, I fully support the motion by Mr. Pudluk in regard to radios. We use a lot of radios or use a lot of radio time I should say in Snare Lake, Rae Lakes and the Lac La Martre areas. I travel that constituency quite often and I find it to be quite an asset not only for emergencies but at the same time they know if someone is coming in. They get an advance through the radio, an advance warning that a person from the government may arrive as such and such a day so the people can meet with him or come back from whatever parts of the land they are at, so these are the kinds of things that it is useful for as well and I strongly support this motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion? Mr. Lafferty.

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Speaker, I would support Mr. Pudluk's request for an increase in radios but it has been pointed out by Mr. Fraser and others who spoke that we have to be quite careful in view of the breakdown in the economy of the North and we are told that it is getting harder and harder to get money. There would have to be some kind of controls imposed on the use of this type of equipment throughout the Northwest Territories because even down in the Mackenzie area I know of many abuses of radios where people just get on the radio for the sake of calling their wife or their friend and things like that. That results in radio breakdowns, wasted batteries and what not, increased maintenance costs, so we have to be careful the numbers of radios that we put out and things like that. I support the motion simply on the basis that it is needed in the case of an emergency in outpost camps but only to that extent. I am supporting this motion on that principle only because in our area we need a lot of money and we meet a lot of increased costs and I will keep pointing this out because it is true and the cost is rising and we have no way of getting any money. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion? Mr. Kilabuk.

Radios Helpful Where Anik Does Not Transmit

MR. KILABUK: Mr. Speaker, I fully support the motion. The Baffin region has already mentioned that they wanted more radios. We were not only thinking of emergency safety. We were thinking of some people who get lost while they are out because people get worried and they do not know what has happened to them. That is one of the reasons that we wanted radios, plus emergency safety. That is one of the reasons that this motion was brought up because it would be a lot better with radios. It would be very helpful including the communities that do not have transmissions from Anik. If they could get more radios, we could tell the people what to use the radio for. Therefore, I fully support the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further discussion? Mr. Pearson.

MR. PEARSON: Mr. Speaker, just an announcement first. There is a fire in the Yellowknife Inn, apparently on the third floor. It may give the press something exciting to do. I do not know how serious it is, but it is a fire.

Radios in the High Arctic, I think, is an interesting motion. It is one which I certainly endorse and I think it is one that the administration should take good note of, because I think there is a necessity for this government to consider the future, to consider the economic developments and the aspects that were so well outlined in the Berger Report, that there is a return to the land happening in many areas. It is certainly happening in my area and there is ever increasing interest by the people in returning to the land and spending a lot of their time there. If this is to continue, then it is necessary that they be given some tools with which to be able to do this and do this safely and to use modern methods along with the traditional methods, to reap the harvests which are still there, the abundant wildlife that is still there that can sustain life and provide people with an economy in a traditional way, as I say, using modern tools, so I certainly support this.

DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Are there any further speakers?

SOME HON. MEMBER: The question.

Motion 11-63, Carried

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question being called. Mr. Pudluk, are you prepared to close the debate or do you want the question called? All those in favour of the motion? Opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Motion 12-63, Mr. Pudluk.

Motion 12-63: Polar Bear Tags

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker, I believe this is going to be a little simpler motion.

WHEREAS the hunting season for polar bears closes on May 31st. This spring someone found a polar bear with the number 99 on its fur and this is causing problems;

NOW THEREFORE, I would like the administration surveying the bears not to put numbers on before May 31st.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion is in order. Do I have a seconder? Mr. Lyall.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, I personally can not understand the intent of this motion. Could it be explained to me, please?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I accepted your hand up as being the seconder to the motion. Is that what you did?

MR. LYALL: No, sir, I stood up.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The matter can not reach the floor until I have a seconder. Do I have a seconder? Hon. Dave Nickerson. To the motion, Mr. Lyall.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, could this motion be explained a little bit better? I do not understand the intent or what has caused it to be on the table.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Mr. Pudluk can not take the floor to give an explanation. If he does, he gives his explanation on the closing remarks. I am sorry, you are correct. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker, thank you. Mr. Speaker, I will have to deal with the story first. Last spring, May 26th, a hunter went out and there was only one polar bear tag left, only one polar bear on the quota left and there were not really many polar bear at that time of the year. He went out and spent about a week looking for a polar bear and he found one, but there was a big number on its behind, 99. He could have caught that one but he did not get it because it is useless, he is not going to be able to sell it with the number 99 on it. The hair has to be changed first to get rid of that big 99. So, he did not get that one and the weather got bad and he had to come back and it was too late. He did not use that polar bear tag. So that is the reason why he did not get his polar bear and I wonder if they could not mark them before May 31st of each year. Is that enough explanation?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Pudluk. To the motion?

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, I still do not get it. "I would like the administration surveying the bears not to put numbers on before May 31st." I can not get the drift of that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Possibly if they put on number 66 they could have sold it to Phillips!

---Laughter

Surveys Of Polar Bears

MR. LYALL: I personally think, Mr. Speaker, that the reason that number was on it was because of the fact that they were surveying polar bears. So, if they could have told the game department that the polar bear was at that location then that survey would be effective. In trying to find out where the polar bears travel, from where to where they go, the number on that polar bear, just for explanation, is a surveying number. I think that if that person was to shoot that polar bear he still could have got that number off and for finding that polar bear at that location if he reported it to the game department, he more than likely could have had a little reward also.

We find fish in the Central Arctic that are marked with tags every year. They do not know where the char travel so they tag them. We find char even as far away as coming from Labrador, in Cambridge Bay, and I think maybe that bear might have come from Russia and nobody knows unless you ask the

game department. The number of that polar bear was the result of a survey being done by fish and wildlife people. I do not support this motion on that basis, because I still can not see what he is trying to do.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Lyall, as I understand the motion, Mr. Pudluk has no objection to them putting numbers on the bears but he would like it not to be done until after May 31st. I think that is the nature of the motion. To the motion. Mr. Steen.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I think what Mr. Pudluk is referring to is that polar bears shed their fur at certain times of the year. I think what he means is that if you tag them with numbers after a certain time of the year then the numbers would disappear. So, I think I will support the motion. I do not know, but maybe we should have some explanation from the game people of what happened. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion? The Honourable Minister.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, I also find this motion very difficult to understand. I am wondering if there is anybody in the room who might know something about the putting of number 99 or 007 or whatever on the fur of the polar bear.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, I already explained that.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking. Surely the Canadian wildlife management must have a reason for putting numbers on the polar bears. I stand to be corrected, but I do not feel that our game department has that responsibility, to put numbers other than to survey the polar bear situation in the Northwest Territories. Maybe Deputy Commissioner Parker might enlighten us on this situation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: To the motion? Deputy Commissioner Parker, do you have any comments?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question being called. Mr. Pudluk, do you wish to wind up the debate if there are no further speakers?

MR. PUDLUK: I am ready for the question.

Motion 12-63, Carried

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Ready for the question. All those in favour of the motion? Eight. Opposed? Two. The motion is carried.

---Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 13-63. Mr. Lafferty.

Motion 13-63: Mackenzie Liard Highway Construction

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS many residents of the South Mackenzie and Liard region depend on highway construction and maintenance projects;

AND WHEREAS this type of ongoing developmental project is of utmost importance to the people of the Mackenzie district for their social and economic well-being;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that the Treasury Board, through the Government of the Northwest Territories be asked by this House to provide Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories with information and/or documents that may affect any decision regarding approval of the Mackenzie Liard highway.

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

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Speaker, it is the view of many people in my constituency and other parts of the Mackenzie district a view I support, that there is going to be an outright economic depression along the Mackenzie Valley. Yet, we have found Hire North closing down and the Dempster highway will be completed very shortly and in general there is nothing happening. Of course this creates a lot of fear among the people, not only in the work force but in the business community and the native communities where there is no business but then they represent largely the labour group and they have, as they expressed, no alternative but to leave.

As you very well know, it has been argued in this House by my predecessor, Mr. Sibbeston and several other Members and by native organizations and many other groups, that native people tend to live in their community and do not move from one community to another or, in other words, they do not move with jobs. In spite of these kinds of reports there are a lot of Indian people and young Metis men, who are skilled labour leaving the country and, of course, because they know they can get a job elsewhere, simply because they have had time to develop skills that are required elsewhere, and those that are qualified but have not had the time to develop skills are the ones who are left here. In the event that some kind of project development takes place, you will find that we have not got the skilled men to man whatever development is going on unless they are put into an apprenticeship role. So that means we would have to bring in people from the South.

To prevent this type of thing and to clear the air, to keep our people in the North as long as possible, I believe that is only fair to ask responsible people in the federal government to release to Members of this House any information that they may have that would affect the people. I am not in any way attempting to control the movement, the free movement of people who chose to go. It is one of their fundamental beliefs that a person has to be free, but the point is there are many people in spite of themselves, their beliefs are forced, they are put in a position and forced to leave.

Listening to the Honourable Member from Frobisher Bay, his fears as to the high cost of living are evident throughout the North. The only way, if we just seek an increase in welfare which we may not get, and if we did, it is not what the people want, their desire is to develop the skills that they very well know they need so that they can become a part of a changing economy and no doubt this is what we are all looking for.

MR. PEARSON: Hear, hear!

MR. LAFFERTY: So I ask this House for the support that this motion needs so that we as an Assembly and those to whom we are responsible may be informed as to what is really happening to us. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion 13-63, Carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. All in favour? Down. Contrary? One. The motion is carried.

---Carried

Motion 14-63, Mr. Butters.

Motion 14-63: Dempster Pipeline.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS the Canadian, United States agreement to build a spur line off the Foothills Yukon pipeline to tap Mackenzie Delta natural gas supplies specifically mentions a Whitehorse, Dawson City, Dempster highway pipeline route;

AND WHEREAS there are no guarantees contained in the Canadian and United States agreement that the Dempster highway route is a firm proposal for construction;

AND WHEREAS northern Yukon Indian people and Loucheux people generally appear to oppose the Dempster route because of its anticipated effect on the population dynamics of the Porcupine caribou herd;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that the administration encourage the Government of Canada that any consideration of the Dempster highway connection include study as an alternate, a Johnsons Crossing, Norman Wells and Mackenzie Delta route, in the event unforeseen social, economic or environmental factors prevent construction of the Dempster highway natural gas pipeline.

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

MR. BUTTERS: I will say nothing. The bulk of my remarks in my reply to the Commissioner's Address justified this motion. I think therefore that it has been justified to Members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion 14-63, Carried

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

---Carried

Item 10, tabling of documents.

Item 11, introduction of bills for first reading.

ITEM NO. 11: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS FOR FIRST READING

Bill 3-63, Hon. Dave Nickerson.

First Reading Of Bill 3-63: Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance, No. 2, 1977-78

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 3-63, An Ordinance Respecting Additional Expenditures for the Public Service of the Northwest Territories for the Financial Year Ending the 31st Day of March, 1978, be read for the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Lyall. Question. Question being called. All in favour? Down. Contrary? First reading is carried.

---Carried

Bill 5-63, Mr. Stewart.

First Reading Of Private Member's Bill 5-63: Liguor Ordinance

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 5-63, An Ordinance to Amend the Liguor Ordinance, be read for the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Hon. Dave Nickerson. Question. All in favour? Down. Contrary? First reading of Bill 5-63 is carried.

---Carried

ITEM NO. 12: SECOND READING OF BILLS

Item 12, second reading of bills.

Bill 3-63, Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I presume that no one wishes to prevent second reading at this time. Has that been ascertained, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: That is why I paused for an unduly long period of time, to give Members an opportunity to indicate that. I am not going to remind them on each occasion of second reading. I have to assume that Members learn the Rules at some point.

Second Reading Of Bill 3-63: Supplementary Appropriation Ordinance, No. 2, 1977-78

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 3-63, An Ordinance Respecting Additional Expenditures for the Public Service of the Northwest Territories for the Financial Year Ending the 31st Day of March, 1978, be read for the second time. The purpose of this bill is to provide additional funding for the 1977-78 budget.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Whitford. Discussion may be had at this time on the principle of the bill. Is there any discussion? Question. All in favour? Down. Contrary? Second reading of Bill 3-63 is carried.

---Carried

Bill 5-63. Mr. Stewart.

Second Reading Of Private Member's Bill 5-63: Liguor Ordinance

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move second reading of Bill 5-63, An Ordinance to Amend the Liguor Ordinance. The purpose of this bill is to amend the Liguor Ordinance to provide for the granting of licences in respect to firehall canteens.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder?

MR. BUTTERS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Has the bill been circulated? I can not find it in my legislation book.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Remnant has Bill 5-63. It will be in Members' books over the noon hour. Mr. Lyall seconded the second reading. Any discussion? Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: With respect, sir, it is very difficult to speak to the principle of a bill we have not seen.

MR. PEARSON: Right. Hear, hear!

MR. BUTTERS: I am quite sure the Honourable Member would probably be just as willing as I to defer this until the first order of business on our agenda when we return after lunch.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the clock to be 1:00 o'clock and we stand recessed for lunch.

---LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

MR. SPEAKER: Gentlemen, the Chair recognizes a quorum. Item 12, second reading of bills. Bill 5-63, Mr. Stewart.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, prior to the luncheon recess I moved second reading of Bill 5-63.

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

MR. BUTTERS: I wonder if the private Member who brings this bill before this Assembly at this date, this rather late date, might give us some background information as to the reason for his requesting of the amendment to the Liquor Ordinance at this time and what he sees it doing?

Letter From The Hay River Fire Department.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, this was brought about by a request by the Hay River fire department and I will read a portion of their letter addressed to the chairman of the Northwest Territories Liquor Control Board: "Some time ago we made enquiries to the Northwest Territories Liquor Control re the book, re the procedure to follow in applying for a canteen licence for our club room in Hay River. We were advised by Mr. Christoph that it was impossible for them to grant us this licence for the following reasons:

1. We were not members of armed forces.
2. We were not members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.
3. We were not part of the Northwest Territories civil defence system.

The first two reasons are indeed valid ones. However, it is our contention that all fire departments or brigades are a part of the civil defence system in that they are one of the first bodies of men, if not the first, to be called upon to serve the public in an emergency, that is drownings, lost persons, earthquakes, riots, etc., along with the everyday task of providing the public with home and business fire inspections and fire protection for life and property."

Now, indeed the Hay River fire department have, I suspect, for the last 15 years operated a canteen and to my knowledge have never had or were never in any conflict with the law over the canteen. However, with the increased liquor inspection procedures in the Northwest Territories, and I understand that we have received a liquor inspector from Yellowknife and he has broken beer bottles for breakfast, I believe that they have decided that it was time to make sure that it was legal and they have taken every action that was possible to make themselves legal and have been refused on the grounds stated.

MR. SPEAKER: Question. I am just considering whether I can let you speak, Mr. Pearson -- never mind, go ahead.

Supporter Of Firefighters

MR. PEARSON: I was under the impression that the Honourable Member started the discussion as it was his bill and then he is given the chance to sum up at the end. I am a supporter of firefighters, I think they are all right. In fact, if it were not for firefighters I would be having difficulty today because my room would have been consumed by the flames, but the firefighters were able to save the Yellowknife Inn and keep the damage down to a minimum. I think they are to be congratulated for their speedy efforts to put out those nasty flames. Now, had the fire occurred, let us say, tomorrow evening about 9:30 o'clock p.m. or 10:00 o'clock p.m. when they were in the midst of celebrating some function or other in their canteen with "X" number of bottles of hootch, I wonder if they would have been able to answer the fire bell as quickly or instead of going down the pole some of them may have gone up it.

I would be very concerned if this bill were passed because it could set a difficult precedent for many communities who once they do have volunteer forces and we do appreciate the efforts they make, if this bill were passed it would then make it legal for any bona fide fire department in any community across the Northwest Territories to have a canteen and to serve and consume alcoholic beverages in those canteens. In the communities where alcohol is available or in Frobisher Bay where we have various clubs, including the Legion and I am sure there is a Legion in Hay River where the men can go in their off hours and consume alcohol, but to have a licence of this sort available in a fire hall, I think, Mr. Speaker, is a dangerous precedent to set and one which is in fact really unnecessary.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion on the principle of the bill? Mr. Fraser.

MR. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, I stand to support this bill. A lot of what my colleague from Frobisher Bay said may be true, but it is not always the case. Mr. Stewart has stated that they have been having the use of liquor without a licence and all they are trying to do is make it legal and, if this bill were not to go through, they probably would still carry on illegally. If they have been using liquor in the fire hall I can not see any reason why they can not make it legal with a simple bill like this.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion on the principle? Question. Mr. Butters, excuse me, but I think you have already spoken. I know it was only by way of asking the question, but if you want to speak again I think you have to ask the indulgence of the House to do so.

Background Of The Bill

MR. BUTTERS: A point of order, I was not going to speak but since I have been refused my opportunity to speak I raise a point of order. I believe it is the usual practice of the administration when introducing a bill to give you some background on it and we have not had background in this case. I think in the event where a private Member introduces a bill it would be a courtesy for him to advise what the bill is without having to be so requested. I think it is not only a matter of courtesy, but it should be a matter of right.

SOME HON. MEMBER: The question.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters, that may well be, but your argument is not with me, it is with the Member. I am just enforcing your Rules. I am sorry, but I indicated to you how you may speak again if you wish. Simply ask the Members if you can. Now, are we ready for the question? Hon. Peter Ernerk.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, two points: I rise to oppose this particular amendment simply because I think there are going to be a lot of people in the Northwest Territories and a lot of communities in the Northwest Territories who will simply take advantage of this and not get anywhere. In other words, as I understand it, you are going to have a lot of liquor in various fire halls and so on which is what Mr. Pearson is trying to say. That is my first point. My second point, I read in the newspaper yesterday some advertisements which indicate that the Gold Range hotel is under new management and it states: "Free lunch with any liquor purchase," and I think that is a completely unacceptable situation in the Northwest Territories.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Peter Ernerk, that has nothing to do with the principle of this bill.

HON. PETER ERNERK: On a point of privilege then, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: This is not the time for a point of privilege. We are in the middle of a vote and on second reading of a bill. Question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Second Reading Of Bill 5-63, Carried

MR. SPEAKER: The question being called. All in favour? Hold your hands up, please. Seven. Down. Contrary? Four. Second reading is carried.

---Carried

Item 13, consideration in committee of the whole of bills, recommendations to the Legislature, information items and other matters.

ITEM NO. 13: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS, RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE LEGISLATURE, INFORMATION ITEMS AND OTHER MATTERS

Bill 2-63, the Wildlife Ordinance. I assume from the note I have here that the Executive want to clear that up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: Was it Mr. Fraser in the chair on the Wildlife Ordinance? Hon. Arnold McCallum was in the chair. This House will resolve into committee of the whole for consideration of Bill 2-63, the Wildlife Ordinance, with Hon. Arnold McCallum in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into committee of the whole for consideration of Bill 2-63, Wildlife Ordinance, with Hon. Arnold McCallum in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL 2-63, WILDLIFE ORDINANCE

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): The committee will come to order, gentlemen. Just before we go into the ordinance itself and so that possibly we do not run through the difficulties that we experienced the other day and, at the same time, take into account that there will be questions being raised by Members wanting replies from the witnesses that we had. May I have your concurrence to simply call out the parts of the bill itself, indicate what it would be and ask for comments of our expert witnesses as to whether or not we have had questions about it. Is that agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): May I then call upon the witnesses I had the other day, Mr. Norm Simmons, Mr. Ellis Land and Mr. Vince Steen. Thank you, gentlemen. Mr. Simmons, may I ask if the procedure that I outlined to the Members would be -- that you would concur with that and we could ask whether you have had representations on various parts of the bill? Can you follow...

MR. SIMMONS: I am not sure if I do or not, would you repeat that?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): What I proposed to the Members was to simply read out what was contained in the various parts of the bill. There were PARTS I, II, III, etc., and I would indicate what the parts contained, ask you if you have had representation, any of you three gentlemen, and then ask if Members would want to comment on that.

MR. SIMMONS: That is fine.

Definitions

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): That is fine. Members, we are ready then to proceed. The definitions are laid out on pages one to five. Mr. Simmons, have you or the other members, Mr. Steen and Mr. Land, have you had any representation made to you about any of the definitions?

MR. SIMMONS: The main one that I can recall, and I stand to be corrected by Mr. Steen, was the question of residency which we discussed earlier.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): They had representation on the definition of "resident".

MR. BUTTERS: What number is that?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): That is paragraph (u). Hon. David Searle raised that Wednesday, I think it was. Are there any other Members who wish to raise questions over any of the definitions? The Member from Foxe Basin.

MR. EVALUARJUK: (no translation).

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

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, I did not understand what the move was in reference to "residents" in paragraph (u). Is the move that there is a change in this paragraph?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): No, Mr. Lafferty, there is no change. It is simply that there was discussion in meetings the Game Advisory Council and the department have had. They were discussions on that term as well as here in the Assembly the last time we met in committee. It was raised by another Member. We are not talking about changes here at all. We are simply talking about questions on various parts of it. Mr. Vince Steen.

MR. VINCE STEEN: There was also some discussion on what constitutes a sealed firearm.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you. Hon. David Searle.

Firearms In Camps

HON. DAVID SEARLE: I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, where the regulations are that were to be circulated, this draft six, I believe. Have they been reproduced for Members yet? I will tell you why, Mr. Chairman. For instance, if I may, in clause 34, that clause says: "Subject to this ordinance and the regulations ...", so, in other words, we have to know what the regulations say, "... no person, other than the holder of a licence to hunt wildlife or a permit allowing the collection of wildlife specimens for scientific research, shall be in possession of an unsealed firearm in a camp."

I am particularly concerned about a situation, quite frankly, that involves me and that is that being an owner of a cabin 30 some miles northeast of Yellowknife, reading that section, unless the regulations otherwise provide, I can not leave a .30-30 there for the protection of myself and my children from bears, unless it is sealed. The regulations may say that I can because a camp is defined, as I read it, as including such a cabin, recreational spot. There may be some suggestion that you can still have a rifle. It just has to be sealed, but if you are someone

like myself who does not hunt, has never killed a single living creature except fish, every now and again you need to have some target practice. Quite honestly, what I do about twice a year is I take my .30-30 down off the wall and I put about 20 rounds in my pocket and I pick up a couple of old cans and I go out on the back road, 45 miles from Yellowknife, where there is not another person within rifle shot range and I practice for a few minutes just to make sure that, if that bear ever does come, I can hit him.

As I read these regulations, not only will I remain a bad shot without the slightest possibility of ever hitting anything, but if I were to break that seal I suppose I would have to bring the rifle in and ask the game people to reseal it for me. They are going to accuse me of having shot moose and caribou and probably whooping cranes and all sorts of things; whereas in fact I have just been target practising. Do I read these regulations right, that I could not have the rifle in a cabin out in the bush?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Hon. David Searle, on page one the term "camp" is defined as being "a tent, cabin, mobile unit or other accommodation ..." etc., used to house people who are employed in various occupations. I would suggest that your particular concern would not be there. Would you like to comment on that, Mr. Simmons?

Existing Problems In Construction And Exploration Camps

MR. SIMMONS: Yes. I should speak to our intent, as I would intend to do in all of these questions. Our intent is to cover a problem, that was brought to our attention, existing in construction and exploration camps where there seems to be a need for control of use of firearms in such camps. That was the thing that we expected to speak to through the definition, as you pointed out. It is also our intent to have the method of sealing such that a person can fire the rifle without having to go through a big operation. You mentioned self-protection and that would adequately be covered there. Also in cases where a person is licensed, having a small game licence or big game licence or any kind of similar licence, general hunting licence, for example, he would be allowed to have an unsealed firearm in that camp.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Hon. David Searle.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, as I read the definition of "camp" it includes, if you go right to the bottom, "for sports fishing, education or other undertaking." I would class my little camp in the wilderness as probably sport fishing if anything. It would certainly not be "other undertaking." It might be that, but, my question is, not being a hunter, not wanting to have a small game or a large game or a general hunting licence, not that I am entitled to the latter, in other words, I am not a hunter. I guess what bothers me, not wanting ever to kill anything unless I do so in self-defence purely, I do not like the idea of having to go through the rules of getting a small game or a large game hunting licence just so I can legally have a weapon there that I can use to practice with, etc. I suppose there should be another way around it. That immediately occurred to me as the way around it, to just go and get a small game hunting licence, but surely if we want weapons sealed, that technique will occur to anyone pretty quick.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Simmons, would you care to respond?

MR. SIMMONS: I should only restate our intent. It certainly was not our intent to restrict the type of activity that you are speaking to and we have no management reason for restricting that type of activity. So, therefore, if there is a way around it, we would like to be advised accordingly.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Mr. Simmons. Mr. Butters.
Sealed Firearms.

MR. BUTTERS: Also, on the matter of sealed firearms, I refer Members to clause 19 of the old draft ordinance which says: "No person shall carry or have in his possession in a sanctuary a firearm other than a sealed firearm". I am specifically referring here to native people who have the privilege to roam the land seeking sustenance and I am wondering if this applies to them or whether they should be excluded by the addition of the words "holder of a general hunting licence." Here they can not even cross a sanctuary without having their rifle sealed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Simmons?

MR. SIMMONS: If they have a licence, a general hunting licence, and are covered under the Northwest Territories Act, they are in effect hunting on unoccupied crown land by federal definition and, therefore, they would be home free if they were within one of our sanctuaries.

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

MR. BUTTERS: A licensed hunter with an unsealed rifle in a sanctuary is, in Mr. Simmons' words "home free"; which means that he is not eligible for prosecution under this provision?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Simmons?

MR. SIMMONS: I should back off on one part of that. I am not certain whether I should have said general hunting licence here. The certainty is that the Northwest Territories Act covers the person, the native person who wishes to hunt animals, not listed under the act as endangered, within a sanctuary so he is properly covered and he does not have to have a sealed firearm.

MR. BUTTERS: I was not putting forward the case of a person who is hunting. I was putting forward the case of a person who is just crossing a sanctuary with an unsealed gun. That was all. Crossing a sanctuary from point "A" to point "B".

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Mr. Butters. Do you have any further comments, Mr. Simmons?

MR. SIMMONS: Maybe I should refer this to Ms. Flieger, but I do not think the person even crossing it, if he is a native, is really prohibited from having an unsealed firearm, but that is only my opinion.

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

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, after listening to the dissertation of Hon. David Searle as to the frequency of his practices and the method of his practices I would like to bet \$50 on the bear.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Are there any other questions then on definitions? Mr. Lafferty.

Hunting Rights Of Indians And Eskimos

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, I understand Mr. Simmons to say that in the Northwest Territories Act native people are allowed to hunt in game controlled zones or preserves or what not. Is that applicable to Metis people in the North or is that only applicable to Indian people and those other people who are defined to be Indians for the purposes of the Indian Act?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Lafferty, I think that you may be asking a legal question of Mr. Simmons and perhaps the Legal Advisor could answer something on that.

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Mr. Chairman, the section in the Northwest Territories Act refers to the rights of Indians or Eskimos and those words are not defined in the Northwest Territories Act. So what they mean depends on what they are interpreted to mean. Without benefit of a definition, I think that the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development regards the word "Indian" and in that section it is referring not just to status Indians under the Indian Act, but I do not know how far they carry the meaning of "Indian".

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. LAFFERTY: What I am getting at, Mr. Chairman, is that on one hand I am led to believe that a native person includes a Metis person but, for the purposes of the Indian Act, "Eskimos" are defined by the Indian Act and perhaps I can be given some legal advice that there may be a requirement in the Wildlife Ordinance of the Northwest Territories that, if there is no definition of a Metis person or a Metis resident, his rights as a native person can be protected.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Ms. Flieger, would you like to respond?

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Mr. Chairman, the words "Indian" and "Eskimo" were defined at one time in the Game Ordinance of the Northwest Territories and I believe it was in 1972 that those definitions were removed, so that under the Wildlife Ordinance there is no specific mention of the words "Indian" or "Eskimo".

MR. LAFFERTY: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Vince Steen, do you have a comment?

General Hunting Licence

MR. VINCE STEEN: Yes, since the question from the Member is leading up possibly to what constitutes to be a general hunting licence, the Game Advisory Council has never come to a conclusion as to what a general hunting licence would be and, since it is listed under the definitions, it is not generally what the Game Advisory Council agreed to. We felt that it would have to be settled in the Legislative Assembly and we left it at that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you. Further comments on definitions? Mr. Stewart.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I know that we have just completed passing the Metric Conversion Ordinance. However, I notice in the definitions as well as in other places in this Wildlife Ordinance that the metric system is used. It would appear to me that inasmuch as we are having that much

difficulty in some instances with English, and I am speaking not necessarily of anybody but myself, probably the normal system should also be enclosed in brackets for a period of time so that an act such as this in the hands of people generally in the territories -- we have got kilograms, several different expressions that I am sure are going to be very foreign to the native people and to the rest of us. It would appear to me that in an act such as this surely in brackets we could put the normal phraseology that we normally use, something about vehicles. You could use a boat, other than a barge, of less than 15 metres in length. It is just a suggestion and I was wondering what other Members would feel in this regard.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

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

MR. EVALUARJUK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say when we are talking about this ordinance that it is difficult for me to find the specific parts you are referring to.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Well, I think we will identify the part that we are talking about. The questions are pretty well of a general nature rather than be specific about it. At the present time we are just asking questions on the definitions that deal with the ordinance and I will call out that part. Are there any further comments on the definitions? If not, we could go into PART I which deals with the administration, the superintendent, the officers and the guardians and the vendors are those who may issue licences or permits. Do you have any comments on that part, Mr. Simmons? Have you had any representations?

MR. SIMMONS: We have nothing on PART I.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Any Members? Any comments on PART I? Would the committee allow me as chairman to ask one question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Ex Officio Officers

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Simmons, in terms of the officers and guardians, the ex officio officers, under clause 4, subclause (3), paragraph (c), would that include then park wardens at Wood Buffalo National Park or would it only include park wardens of parks in the territories?

MR. SIMMONS: Within the meaning of the National Parks Act, it would include Wood Buffalo park wardens operating in the Northwest Territories.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Simmons, am I correct in assuming that they would only be utilized as ex officio officers in that part of Wood Buffalo park that is in the Northwest Territories?

MR. SIMMONS: That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): No other place, not outside the park?

MR. SIMMONS: Within the Northwest Territories they could operate outside the park as well, just as we would operate all throughout the Northwest Territories only as ex officio fisheries officers.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): I guess the reason why I raised the question, I am wondering about the philosophy of your department vis-a-vis the philosophy of Wood Buffalo park wardens and that to people in my constituency raises some concern. I think you are familiar with what I am trying to say rather than coming out -- in that instance people in my constituency had a very great concern about the manner in which they conduct their surveillance, as opposed to possibly the attitude or philosophy of wardens within our Government of the Northwest Territories. Again that is a concern that I raise and you have not had any representation on that part?

MR. SIMMONS: One of our Members has raised points about the conduct of operations within the park boundaries which of course we did not comment on.

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

Special Constables

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, "all members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police," does this include the special constables?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Simmons, would you like to comment?

MR. SIMMONS: Could I ask Ms. Flieger to field that one for me, please?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Lyall, your question then is, "all members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police," and does that include special constables, is that your question?

MR. LYALL: Yes.

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Mr. Chairman, I do not think I can give an answer to that without checking to see how special constables are described in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act, but I will do that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): We could make a note that you have raised that, Mr. Lyall, and try to get some information. Is that satisfactory?

MR. LYALL: One of our Game Advisory Council members, a former Royal Canadian Mounted Police, just indicated to me that they are, that they are covered under that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Mr. Lyall. Are there any further comments on PART I, the administration, officers and guardians and vendors of licences and permits? If not, then I would like to move on to PART II, which is the actual licences and permits, and it includes in that the classes of licences and permits, the conditions attached to such licences or permits, the terms and conditions, the form, how one applies for such a licence or permit. It goes on for about ten pages. Mr. Lyall.

General Hunting Licence

MR. LYALL: Our committee discussed this quite lengthily and we passed clause 17. For instance, with the following comments and observations...

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): May we identify that section, that is under general hunting licence? Just so people know what it is.

MR. LYALL: Yes. The general hunting licences issued in the past by the Commissioner should be reviewed. It must be recognized that hunters' and trappers' associations are likely, to some extent, under the provision of paragraph 17(d), to recommend the issue of general hunting licences to their friends and (c) that the cancellation of a general hunting licence issued to a native person would not prevent that person from hunting for food under the provisions of the Northwest Territories Act.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Mr. Lyall. Mr. Simmons, have you or the other witnesses had questions raised on this part of the ordinance?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, we have. Clause 13 on transfer of licences and taking of transfer of licences and also clause 15 regarding the cancellation of licences or suspension and prohibition of renewal.

MR. BUTTERS: On a point of order, it is getting very confusing to me, sir. We are still operating from two references. One, the books we took home in the summer and two, the new draft ordinance. To jump around like we are doing makes it very difficult to follow. If you are going to use the

new ordinance, then I would prefer you go through in numerical order so that one can tell where we are.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Butters, I asked the question whether you would agree, whether the committee would agree for me to call out the parts, not the clauses, the simple parts of the ordinance. I understood I had agreement to do that. I referred to the part, not by the page, simply as to what was contained in the part and I understood again that I had concurrence to do that. Mr. Lyall, chairman of the standing committee on legislation, indicated when we were discussing this on the last day that he had comments that he would make on a particular section or part as we go through it. I can only apologize for the muddling, the difficulty in going back from one to the other, but I do not think the parts have changed. Maybe they have. Mr. Simmons may have information.

MR. SIMMONS: We prepared a cross reference between the two documents which I believe is in the hands of the Clerk of the House now. This might make that job less difficult.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, when I approved "parts", I heard what you said but I did not understand what you said. We have never used this technique before going through a bill and I assumed without thinking that "part" meant each individual provision because it is very difficult to approve a full part.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Butters, again we are not approving anything. All we are doing is talking about the question that Members wanted to raise concerning various parts. We are not approving any of this bill, any of the clauses of the bill itself. We are simply going through and airing the questions hopefully that Members will have on various parts. Now, at the same time we have our three witnesses who will indicate to us whether they have had questions raised of them in their meetings and deliberations. Mr. Lyall.

Age Qualification

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, also on this section, clause 18, which provides that no licence may be issued to any person under the age of 16. We pointed out that many northern native persons are hunting from the age of 11 or 12 and up. They, therefore, are compelled to do so illegally by the provisions of this ordinance. Mr. Simmons then explained to us the basic premise that the Criminal Code prohibits any person under the age of 14 to use a firearm. It is not clear, he added, whether the Criminal Code or the provisions of the Northwest Territories Act entitling native persons to hunt for food would take precedence. Mr. Land advised the committee that legislation, as drafted, recognizes such a situation of underage hunters to the extent that he can attempt to legalize the activities, at the same time recognizing the limitations imposed by the Criminal Code. After those comments from the game department we finished with that section.

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

MR. FRASER: Mr. Chairman, my concern is under subparagraph 17(d)(iii) on page 16 and it says, "...is a Canadian citizen or landed immigrant". I wonder if the witnesses could tell me if there is anybody in the territories holding a general hunting licence who is not a Canadian citizen to their knowledge?

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

MR. SIMMONS: We have had both applications and granting of permits to people who are not Canadian citizens. I am not sure whether or not they were landed immigrants and we can check into this if you like. One example that has been brought to my attention is a couple of fellows who hold what we call, or what I call anyway, a special general hunting licence issued under Schedule A, in the Reliance area who are American citizens.

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

MR. FRASER: If you could get the information for me, I would appreciate it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Fine, thank you. Are there any other comments on this part by Members? Mr. Butters.

Travelling Fur Dealer Licence

MR. BUTTERS: The part opens, I believe, with a reference to Schedule B on page 59, and it lists the licences or permits that may be held. I would like some information relative to item 6, which is described as a travelling fur dealer licence. There was some suggestion or fear I think by hunters in my constituency that this could be a northern-type carpetbagger, who maybe is given a licence to rip off people by not being here tomorrow to accept responsibility for any deals he may make. So I just wondered if Mr. Simmons might explain what this licence is and what responsibility it entails?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Mr. Butters. Mr. Simmons.

MR. SIMMONS: I understand that this government has had this type of dealer before. We put this clause in, or this licence in, on the request of some groups of people, of hunters and trappers, to allow this type of thing. That is about all I can comment on at this time. This makes a provision to enable us to do this in the regulations.

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

MR. BUTTERS: The people I represent were concerned about the licence and felt it could be abused. I have another comment on eligibility but I will wait.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Is it within this section, Mr. Butters?

MR. BUTTERS: Yes, it is.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Within PART II?

MR. BUTTERS: Eligibility, clause 17.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Proceed.

Eligibility

MR. BUTTERS: It seems to me the eligibility provision has been changed considerably from the document tabled in May. Mr. Simmons can correct me on that. It seems to me that the section which enabled a young person to

obtain a general hunting licence, if his parent was a resident of the territories, has been removed. But there seems to be one eligibility factor which has caused concern and that is the loss of general hunting licence entitlement, if one is a resident of another jurisdiction for a period of more than five years. I think the feeling is that if there is one aspect of our law that comes closest to representing what might be termed an aboriginal right, it is the general hunting licence. I think this is what Mr. Lafferty was pointing out today with his questions, that although the Metis is not defined in the Northwest Territories Act, the word "native" includes the Metis as a person entitled to hold a general hunting licence. As I say, I get the feeling that many native people see this as an aboriginal right. There are a few whites who hold these licences too, but these are whites who are recognized as natives. They have lived in the country as natives and are recognized as natives, so they would argue this removal of the general hunting licence from a person who resides outside for a period of more than five years.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Would you like to comment? Would any of the witnesses like to comment? Mr. Simmons.

MR. SIMMONS: Our intent was not to take away anything from a general hunting licence holder that is not already spoken to in the current ordinance. I believe that requirement is in the existing ordinance now as well as previous legislation.

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

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Simmons is absolutely correct. When that provision was formulated the variety and the importance of the input that has been made by the general populace at large was not available to us. Now that the trappers are aware of this provision in the old ordinance, I do not think they like it too well and would like to see it removed from the new ordinance.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): We will take that as a comment, Mr. Butters. Hon. David Searle.

To Ensure Democratically Run Organizations.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the matter of the general hunting licence as well. I am concerned with paragraph (d) where it says: "is recommended by a hunters' and trappers' association recognized by the superintendent or, in the absence of such a recognized association, by the council of a band, within the meaning of the Indian Act, Canada..." Firstly, and I was just discussing this with my colleague, Hon. Dave Nickerson, what are the rules set up for hunters' and trappers' associations with respect to how they are formed and how they operate, their membership, and to ensure that it is a democratically run organization which obeys certain principles of fairness and justice? The same comment applies, of course, to the council of a band. How can we be sure that they exercise their judgments fairly and impartially, judicially? What is to prevent hunters' and trappers' associations or a band council from refusing a legitimate situation just because they do not like the person? What protection for the individual have we got in those regards? These must be questions that they have wrestled with.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Simmons, or if others of the witnesses would like to answer or comment on that. Mr. Steen.

MR. VINCE STEEN: It was found and made quite clear to the Game Advisory Council that the final say as to whether a person gets a general hunting licence or not would be up to the superintendent or the Commissioner. A person could appeal if he felt he was not dealt with fairly by the band council or the hunters' and trappers' association.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you. Hon. David Searle.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Where are the appeal provisions, Mr. Chairman?

MR. VINCE STEEN: It comes under clause 15. A person referred to in subclause(1) if his licence is cancelled, he may appeal to the supreme...

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): It is on page 13 of the bill, clause 15, subclause (2).

MR. VINCE STEEN: I am sorry, that is the wrong one.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: My reading of that, Mr. Chairman, would confirm that that is not the right one.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): I would agree.

MR. VINCE STEEN: Mr. Chairman, if it is left out of this ordinance it was what was told to the Game Advisory Council and that is why we agreed to that section.

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

MR. SIMMONS: I must concur with Mr. Steen. It was our intention to have this appeal procedure built into our ordinance.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Are you saying in effect there is an omission here?

MR. SIMMONS: I am not sure. In the past few seconds we have been unable to find it. We can certainly bring up this point later on.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Yes. Do you have further comments, Hon. David Searle?

Long Term Residents

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Well, the thing that I am looking for is some provision that would enable a very legitimate case to receive a general hunting licence, even though he could not find, say -- for instance, the word, if there were a band council concerned with that area and there were not and hunters' and trappers' associations and for instance, in Yellowknife I do not think there is a hunters' and trappers' association. I rather suspect that you could very quickly fly out of any area that would be normally regarded as within the normal hunting and trapping area of a particular band. So, what do you do, if you are 125 miles northeast of Yellowknife? I do not know if that would still be regarded as being within the normal hunting area of the Yellowknife band, but take yourself just outside of that and there being no hunters' and trappers' association and let us assume for some reason that that is where you wanted to go and live and that you did not qualify as being of native extraction and you are not hurting anybody off in the wilderness by yourself, this ordinance would not permit you to do that.

I guess the other thing that bothers me is the fact that you can live here as in my case, 32 years, and though I am not a hunter and would never want such a licence, you can live here your whole life and it does not seem you are ever entitled to get a general hunting licence unless you can persuade a band council or every member of a band to recommend you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Hon. David Searle, maybe we have reached the same conclusion and possibly it is in clause 10 on page ten, subclauses (2) and (3) where it says, "An applicant whose application is refused by a vendor may appeal..." and you may then appeal to the superintendent and if you are refused there you can appeal to a judge of the supreme court who may confirm the decision of the superintendent or order the superintendent to issue the licence. Mr. Steen, did you want to say something further?

MR. VINCE STEEN: Well, it is not on this particular subject though, it is on clauses 15 and 17.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Well, it is within this part that we are discussing?

General Hunting Licence

MR. VINCE STEEN: Yes. Under clause 15 it states that the superintendent can remove parts of licences or cancel licences and it was felt by the Game Advisory Council that a general hunting licence should not, the superintendent should not have the power to cancel the full general hunting licence. It was felt by the Game Advisory Council that, for instance, if a man shot a polar bear out of season he should not be able to hunt polar bear any more. However, he should still be able to hunt caribou to feed his family. Also, under the Northwest Territories Act, it would be literally impossible to stop that man if he were in need of hunting for food.

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

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, I am getting slightly confused with jumping around all over the book but, nevertheless, it is a very interesting discussion. Things are beginning to light up that I was really unaware of. I am rather concerned, as Hon. David Searle is, on the general hunting licence. The Honourable Members here are completely aware that I have always pressed for the enshrinement of native rights, both Indian and native and

other native people who are here, including those white people who are born in the Northwest Territories, and who are ineligible for the privileges of hunting that are equivalent to what I have. These, I am told by my constituents, particularly the native people, that section of the native communities who are Metis and they claim and tell me that the purposes of the general hunting licence, that they have pressed for for so many years, is for the immediate need or the immediate taking of food.

I am becoming aware of the setting up of overlapping authorities through which bureaucracy we have an appeal channel going right to the Supreme Court of Canada. I think that this might just get us into trouble. I think that we should review this very, very carefully, although we are told consistently that the general hunting licences are not affected. It is affected, so far as I am concerned, simply because in the ordinance we are empowering the hunters' and trappers' associations and, in the absence of the hunters' and trappers' associations, the Indian band council authorize or recommend the same thing. Then the superintendent, if he recognizes those hunters' and trappers' associations, may accept and if he does not he may reject.

Eligibility To Hold General Hunting Licence

In that same section it goes on to tell us that a person who has lived in the Northwest Territories for five years -- we have a lot of Metis people from the Northwest Territories who are residents of British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta and these people have left or migrated from here in the 1940's, who are under the Metis Association land claims presentation, and who, under the present ordinance, are eligible for general hunting licences, in here it tells us that it does not change because anyone who was here before 1938, whose parents were here in 1938, but, nevertheless, it is subject to appealing to the authorized bodies such as the hunters' and trappers' associations or an Indian band council. I do not understand it and this is one of the reasons why I am saying this, to bring out the problems that may arise as a result of this, and it may affect and it does affect it, so far as I am concerned, to Metis general hunting licence holders.

Now, the question that arises in my mind. In the event that a Metis person, who presently is eligible for a general hunting licence and is not presently a resident of the Northwest Territories but who was born here in the 1940's, returns after this ordinance becomes effective, will he be eligible for a general hunting licence? Presently, if he comes back from Edmonton he can apply and get it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Is that a question you are asking?

MR. LAFFERTY: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Simmons, would you like to answer the question?

MR. SIMMONS: I wonder if Ms. Flieger could help us out of this one? I have a section in front of me which says that if he held a licence or was eligible to hold a licence that he would be able to get one, but I am not certain.

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Mr. Chairman, if this person who went to Edmonton is a person entitled to hold a general hunting licence before the coming into force of this new ordinance, which is to say, this bill before us, if he is eligible at that point, then he would still be eligible after the coming into force of the new Wildlife Ordinance, if it ever does. That is, anyone who has a right to a general hunting licence under the present Game Ordinance would continue to have a right to a general hunting licence under the new ordinance.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Ms. Flieger. Mr. Fraser.

Native Born Eligible For General Hunting Licence

MR. FRASER: My colleague has gone out of the room. I was going to answer the Hon. David Searle's question but I see he has gone out of the room. I will answer to Mr. Lafferty. He is quite concerned and it is also a concern of mine to a certain extent. However, he mentioned that anybody who was born in the Northwest Territories should be eligible for a general hunting licence. Is that what you are saying?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): You are asking the question of Mr. Lafferty?

MR. FRASER: I was asking if that is the question he asked.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Was that the question, Mr. Lafferty, yes or no?

MR. LAFFERTY: My question was that we do know people here who are descendants of people who were general hunting licensees prior to 1938, the cut off date of 1938, and thereafter anyone who is eligible can get a general hunting licence. All I am saying is, a person who was born here after 1938 and has left, but is presently allowed to get a general hunting licence, and upon return to the Northwest Territories is he allowed to do so? That was explained to me by our Legal Advisor and I am quite satisfied with that answer. Nevertheless, I do not take it for granted that, because I am satisfied, it is going to be satisfactory to the Metis people.

Another question related to that -- in the case of a person who is legally entitled by law in the ordinance, why then should that person apply or seek consent of the trappers' association or an Indian band council?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Perhaps Ms. Flieger would answer that.

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Mr. Chairman, I think that question is directed to paragraph (d) of subclause (1) of clause 17 and, in fact, a person would apply through this hunters' and trappers' association or the band council only if he were not entitled under the earlier paragraphs. That is to say, he probably would be a person who was not born in the Northwest Territories and did not have ancestors who hunted here before 1938. There is another section back somewhere, too, about 1953, if the family hunted here before 1953. So he would use that only if he did not come under another paragraph.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Ms. Flieger. Hon. David Searle.

Issuing Licences Under Special Circumstances.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, in that we are not, as I understand it, likely to pass the ordinance, I am not going to propose an amendment at this time. I am going to make the suggestion because, as I understand it, this is what they want, our feelings on various sections. I am going to make the suggestion that there be some provision put in this ordinance, apart from the appeal provisions which I have examined, which would permit the superintendent or the Commissioner to issue general hunting licences under special circumstances, with special restrictions as they deem necessary. My reasoning for that is because I can see a situation where there might be an appeal to the court and the court, in looking at this particular section, finds you do not fall within any of them and have not been recommended by a hunters' and trappers' association or a band council, then the court will just say, "I might have decided otherwise but they are the people who have to recommend you. Not having done so, your appeal fails."

In other words, I would like another person in there, where there may be legitimate situations on its merits that have been turned down, and the court will not get into that. The court would just say that they have or have not followed the procedures properly. The court will not get into, for instance, deciding whether the band council exercised its judgment correctly or not, the only appeal you would ever have any hope unto a court would be if the procedures were followed correctly to some extent or the rules of natural justice were not applied.

So, I would like to see a new subclause (5) in clause 17 which would permit the issuance of a general hunting licence in special circumstances, either by the Commissioner or by the superintendent, presumably by the Commissioner because, if the superintendent has already refused you back under the other one, he is not likely to look kindly on you in any other forum.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Simmons, did you want to comment on that? Mr. Steen, could I ask if you have any comments on what the Hon. David Searle has indicated? Has the Game Advisory Council talked of that?

MR. VINCE STEEN: Mr. Chairman, as I stated earlier, the Game Advisory Council was in favour of an appeal system and the statement in this new draft of the ordinance, where it states that you have to go to the Supreme Court of Canada, was never mentioned to the Game Advisory Council. I am sure the Game Advisory Council will agree that, by the time you get through the court the trapping season is closed, so the guy will never have reason to have his licence for that year. I am sure if there was a shorter system whereby it could just go to the superintendent or the Commissioner, that was the intent of the Game Advisory Council anyway.

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

MR. FRASER: Mr. Chairman, just one short statement. While I would like to sympathize with Mr. Speaker on his not being able to get a general hunting licence where there are no hunters and trappers, then he goes to the band council to see if they want to give him one, but I can not seem to feel sorry for him. He says he has been in the country 32 years. I have been in the country 48 years and I can not get a general hunting licence. I have not eaten moose meat for so long I do not know what it tastes like.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): The committee will recess for coffee and reconvene and Mr. Butters will be first on the list.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Hon. Dave Nickerson, if you would join us, we would have a quorum. We already have a quorum now, Hon. Dave Nickerson. Gentlemen, I recognize a quorum and we may proceed. We left off for recess and Mr. Butters had a comment to make. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Before I make my comment, Mr. Chairman, I would like to exercise the right of a Member, under our Rules to place before the committee a motion to extend this sitting, in the event we do not finish it before 5:30 o'clock p.m. I am entitled to make this motion for the next ten minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): On a point of order, Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, that motion would not be in order for another ten minutes. It would be okay to make that motion ten and a half minutes from now.

MR. BUTTERS: Hon. Dave Nickerson is absolutely correct but he is splitting hairs. Consider the motion made in ten minutes and 30 seconds. Relative to the eligibility on page 15, may I direct two questions to the Legal Advisor on page 15. Paragraph 17(1)(b) I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if 17(1)(b) is really not required, that the intent is covered by paragraph 17(1)(a)?

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Mr. Butters is correct, Mr. Chairman, and in the amendments that were circulated by someone, it was suggested paragraph 17(1)(b) should be deleted.

Five Year Residency

MR. BUTTERS: The second question has already been taken care of too. On page 16 subparagraph 17(1)(d)(ii). I would assume that that five years refers to a person who has lost his general hunting licence because of absence and is returning to the territories. I would imagine a person in that category could apply to the local hunters and trappers and have that five year residency waived and, therefore, that too is not necessary.

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Mr. Chairman, I do not think that subparagraph(ii) which refers to five years residence in the territories would necessarily be limited to people who had been in the territories and then moved out and had returned. I think that, for example, for someone who lived in the territories for five years, and is not otherwise eligible for a general hunting licence, it would be open for him to apply under paragraph(d).

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Ms. Flieger and Mr. Butters. Are there any comments of a general nature on that section or PART II of the ordinance? Mr. Lafferty.

MR. LAFFERTY: In that five year residency I was concerned about, I think I fully understand it now and I think it is a good clause. For the information of the Honourable Members here, in Fort Simpson and the south Mackenzie area, like in Providence, Resolution, Fort Simpson, Liard, there are many Metis people who have trapped there back in the 1920's and 1930's but who have moved on into the provinces and communities immediate to the boundary, but whose sons do come into the territories and who are by law ineligible for general hunting licences and in this case they can apply.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Mr. Lafferty. Any other comments? Would you like to comment now, Mr. Steen?

Not Eligible Under Sixteen Years Of Age.

MR. VINCE STEEN: On clause 18 on page 17: "...no licence shall be issued to any person who has not yet attained the age of 16 years." The council felt that a person hunting with his parents should be able to do so and it is allowed for under subclause (2) of clause 18, but if a person has no parents or is hunting just for his mother and he has not reached the age of 16, if he is a native person and comes under the Northwest Territories Act, it is my understanding that he can not be stopped anyway.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): You mean the Government of the Northwest Territories can not stop him?

MR. VINCE STEEN: Well, if he is not eligible according to the ordinance for a general hunting licence, under the Northwest Territories Act, he can hunt.

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

MR. VINCE STEEN: I believe that was one of the points brought up by Mr. Lyall and that is why I bring it up.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Yes, agreed. PART III, beginning on page 18 deals with management and management regions. It talks about wildlife management units, fur management regions, hunting for management or research purposes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): It deals with nuisance wildlife, sanctuaries, hunting in preserve, unsealing of firearm and an interpretation of wildlife preserves. Are there any comments? Hon. David Searle.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, my attention has been directed to something else but I assume you have left clause 17 and the general hunting licences?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Yes, I had.

Special General Hunting Licence

HON. DAVID SEARLE: If I may, I would just like to point out that in the existing ordinance in Schedule A a general hunting licence is shown under column I, then under column II, it may be issued to any person who is not included in paragraphs (a) to (d) and, in the opinion of the Commissioner, should be issued a licence in order to harvest properly an unoccupied area. Now, that is the special general hunting licence which has been referred to. Apparently there are a couple of people out in the east arm, around Fort Reliance, who have that one and this is the point that I was making. There should be with the Commissioner or with the superintendent the authority to issue a special general hunting licence, in those circumstances only, where that person would not be hunting in the traditional hunting area of a band and where, say, there is no hunters' and trappers' association. In other words, if you get an unoccupied area that is away out back where game is not being harvested at all, you are interfering with no one's traditional hunting place or hunting rights and you have someone, who wants to go there -- why should he not is my question. I guess coming back again to that same point, I would like to see the authority vested in someone who, in those special circumstances, could issue a general hunting licence. I am just wondering what the other Members might think of that because this is the sort of thing that should come back included or not.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): I was hoping you would say the other Members, I thought you were going to ask me the question. I agree with you. Mr. Steen.

MR. VINCE STEEN: Mr. Chairman, the Game Advisory Council felt that in these areas Hon. David Searle is referring to, whereby there is presumably nobody using it and evidently nobody even trapping in it, it may in fact be an area that the hunters' and trappers' association or the band council is leaving for animals to have peace with nobody to bother them, whereby they can build up and, the overpopulation from that area then goes into your trapping area, they have an area of peace. This is why we felt that, in some opinions of the council, even the Commissioner should not be able to overrule the band council or the hunters' and trappers' association.

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

MR. BUTTERS: Well, I was on this new section you were on. Hon. David Searle is back on licences. Are we on to the new part, PART III now? I want to talk on clause 24 on page 20, surveys and census.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): If I may, Mr. Butters, ask if anybody else wants to comment on what the Hon. David Searle and Mr. Steen raised. Mr. Fraser.

MR. FRASER: Yes, I was going to answer the same way as Mr. Steen did. How could the Commissioner or the wildlife people define an area that is not going to be used by anybody? There is no way they can define that area, whether it was not going to be used or never was used, because I have seen trappers 250 miles from the settlement and they just keep going. So, I do not think that there is any way that they can define that it is an area where nobody is going to trap.

Authorizing Issuance Of Licences

On the other question that they have raised, I would be fully in favour of the Commissioner or the superintendent authorizing the issuing of licences, with the recommendation from the hunters' and trappers' association or the band council, but I do not think the band council or the hunters' and trappers' association should have the final say. Once the application is filled in, if they wanted to give you a little background, or if the Commissioner or the superintendent do not want to go along with their application, he could go and get the background himself or have somebody get it for him. In this way I do not think that you would have people

getting general hunting licences who are not entitled to them. If you leave it up to the band councils and the hunters' and trappers' association, you will have everybody in the country holding a general hunting licence. Most of them will be relatives of the hunters or trappers or other band councils. That could be stopped if it was left up to the superintendent or the Commissioner to have the final say on any general hunting licence that is issued.

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

HON. DAVID SEARLE: At first I thought Mr. Fraser was disagreeing with me but from his last statement I take it then that we are in agreement.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): I would think that as well. Mr. Steen.

MR. VINCE STEEN: Mr. Chairman, up to now the practice of the territorial government has been that, if a hunters' and trappers' association or a band council refuses, that applicant then applies to the Commissioner or to the Game Advisory Council. It was felt that if this preface was kept, it may help the situation.

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

MR. STEWART: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

Extend Hours Of Sitting

MR. STEWART: To facilitate the business of the House I understand it is the desire of most Members to extend the sitting hours. Within the Rules, I presume that unanimous consent will be required unless the business to be discussed with an extension remains the same as it is at the time the request is made. I presume that mainly would be the Wildlife Ordinance. I would like a ruling on this and if this is the case I would like to suggest that we report progress, deal with the bills at hand and then give notice of extending sitting to study the Wildlife Ordinance further. My understanding of the Rule is that the business must relate to what is being discussed at the time the motion is being made. It is not my wish to hold up the business of the House. However, I am very anxious to proceed with the bills as I have to leave early this evening.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Stewart, I think that your interpretation according to Rule 7 is correct. If we are to extend, we would have to report progress and then leave it to the Speaker. Mr. Stewart, are you moving a motion to report progress?

MR. STEWART: I would like a ruling whether my interpretation of the Rule is correct. The Rule 7 reads: "Notwithstanding Rules 4 and 42, a Member may present a motion without notice in the Assembly, or in the committee of the whole, to continue a sitting beyond the hour of daily adjournment for the purpose of continuing consideration of a specified item of business, subject to the following conditions: (a) the motion must relate to the business then being considered ..."

I suggest that, if a motion is made at this time, the extension can only relate to the Wildlife Ordinance and, in fact, we have two bills. If it is the desire of the House to conclude today, I would suggest that we report progress and get on with the bills in committee of the whole and get that business out of the way. We then make the motion to come back in and continue the discussion of the Wildlife Ordinance which I believe to be extremely important.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Well, Mr. Stewart, not being as well versed in the proceedings as you or the Speaker, I would say that your interpretation, if we are to make the motion now, would only deal with the Wildlife Ordinance and that the motion would not be debatable. However, we can report progress and then, as you suggest, we can take the latter approach. Agreed?

---Agreed

Motion To Extend Hours Of Sitting

MR. BUTTERS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. If we go back into formal session, I would wish then to ask for unanimous consent to move a motion to sit this evening and to return to notices of motion.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Butters, I guess that is well within your realm to do that.

MR. BUTTERS: If that is done, there is no necessity to extend beyond 5:30 o'clock p.m. We could close for supper and then come back at 7:30 o'clock p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Deputy Commissioner Parker?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, I rather hesitate to say anything, but I will say it anyway. Do you not think that before you go back into formal session you might, while you are in a relatively informal frame, have a little chat about how much business you have left and about how long you want to stay in session, rather than tying yourselves into formal session and then not being in a position to discuss it quite as openly?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you. What is the desire of the committee? Mr. Stewart.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, due to previous commitments I will be unable to attend the night sitting tonight, tomorrow, or Sunday. I will be available Monday.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): I thought you were going to give me a decision or something, Mr. Stewart. I would appreciate your comments. Mr. Lafferty.

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, I will be available Monday but tonight I have commitments. I have many, many telephone calls to Fort Simpson so I will not be able to attend tonight.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): You are next, Mr. Lyall.

MR. LYALL: I would come down anytime you want me.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Where are you up?

MR. LYALL: I will not be here on Monday.

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

MR. BUTTERS: My preference would be to sit tonight and, failing that, tomorrow.

MR. FRASER: I will be here Monday.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Evaluarjuk?

MR. EVALUARJUK: (No interpretation)

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Was there no interpretation?

MR. PEARSON: There was no interpretation.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): There was difficulty with the interpretation. Is it on number one?

MR. EVALUARJUK: I will be available and be there tonight. I do not think it is going to be inconvenient to me. I also think maybe the administration could organize something and maybe we could meet Monday. Maybe the Assembly could go on Tuesday and we could delay the meeting in Rankin Inlet. If I go to Frobisher Bay I would be able to get home on Wednesday. This is my idea.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Hon. Peter Ernerk, there is no sense asking you. You will be here? Did you want to say something?

HON. PETER ERNERK: I just wanted to let you know that I will be here for the week end.

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

MR. PEARSON: Well, the dilemma I find myself in is I have an airline ticket for the United Kingdom on Saturday night and I do not plan to be back on Monday. They do not fly that fast. Do you want translation?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): You are coming through loud and clear.

MR. PEARSON: What I am concerned with is the time that is being wasted having these people sit around Yellowknife for days on end waiting to appear before this Assembly. Now they are going to be here for another week end when they are going to go through this process again. I am sure that if we knuckle down, we might be able to get through it tonight. We could certainly get through it tomorrow but having people, a vast number of people, sitting in hotels and airplanes being delayed, you know, I think if we could really get down to it, we might be able to get finished. I have one concern to deal with and we all know what that is, that is the welfare matter. Maybe we can settle it out of court.

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

MR. KILABUK: Mr. Chairman, can you hear me now? Mr. Chairman, if we have to meet on Monday I do not mind because we have lots to talk about. I agree with Mr. Evaluarjuk. I do not mind if I stay here. I am an elected Member so I have business to do here in this Assembly. This is my thinking.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Mr. Kilabuk. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Chairman, I will be here on Monday.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Hon. David Searle.

Evening Sitting

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I set two weeks aside to deal with the business of the Assembly and, as far as I am concerned, the second week is still set aside. I can be available all next week. However, having said that, I am prepared to accommodate the Members who wish to leave earlier by sitting tonight or tomorrow. There is no doubt we can sit this evening by extending, any time in the next 15 minutes, the subject of game and limit it to game, pursuant to the Rules, the Wildlife Ordinance. In other words, the subject under discussion can be extended simply by a motion made here or in formal session and there is no debate on it. It is simply put to the vote. If you want to sit tomorrow, then I am afraid we have certain problems: One is that you then have to have unanimous consent to go back to notices of motion and then unanimous consent to move the motion to sit tomorrow.

Finally, the other matter of third reading of bills is not on the order paper. If you wanted to conclude today, you would have to have unanimous consent. I can see one person in the driver's seat with respect to the matter. However, I am prepared to do whatever the House wants to be done. I have just pointed out the alternatives. I think you can entertain a motion to extend the sitting to discuss game or you can receive a motion to report progress. If you can get unanimous consent to sit tomorrow and go through all that business. It is up to whatever any Member wishes to try.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I have the advantage, Mr. Chairman, of speaking last and it would certainly seem to me that the majority of Members would prefer to come back Monday. There are only one or two people who apparently would not be able to do that. It is probably a little bit ironic that one of the Members who will not be able to do that is probably the Member who has done the most to delay proceedings.

I have done a lot of work in anticipation of this very important committee discussion on welfare rates and I certainly want to do that at a very leisurely pace. That is a very important item so that is something I am not prepared to see rushed over. It would make sense to me for us to come back tonight to discuss solely game matters, so that the gentlemen of the Game Advisory Council will not be sitting here over the week end.

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

MR. BUTTERS: I had a motion on the floor an hour ago or so and I ask that that motion be considered to extend discussion to complete the game matter right now.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): You have made that motion now?

MR. BUTTERS: Yes, I make it now.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Members are aware there is no debate on that, so obviously then I call the question. Those in favour of the motion? Does everybody understand the motion?

MR. PUDLUK: No.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): That we extend the sitting now to complete debate on the Wildlife Ordinance. That is the motion. We do not break, rather, we continue on. By God, I will get it straight yet. Does everybody understand the motion? All those in favour?

MR. FRASER: We do not get any supper?

Motion To Extend Hours Of Sitting, Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Later on. All those in favour of the motion signify in the usual manner by raising your right hand. Keep them up. It might be close. Seven. Down. Those against. Four. The motion is carried.

---Carried

MR. PEARSON: Just to comment on the Hon. Dave Nickerson's statement of a few minutes ago that some Member has caused a delay in these proceedings, and I assume he is referring to himself, because had he been boxing clever the other day...

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Pearson, I will have to rule you out of order. The motion has been made to carry on discussion on the Wildlife Ordinance. We will have to continue on that particular role.

MR. PEARSON: Well, I am a hunter.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Then when it comes time for you to hunt wildlife you may do so, but we are going to discuss the Wildlife Ordinance now and we are in PART III, management and management regions. Mr. Simmons, may I ask if you or the witnesses have had any representations made to you or questions asked of this particular part?

MR. SIMMONS: I am not aware of any issues that were raised on this part.

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

Unsealed Firearms

MR. VINCE STEEN: Sir, just on the part of the sanctuaries. However, it was pointed out to the Game Advisory Council by both the Canadian Wildlife Service and the territorial game service that deal with unsealed firearms in sanctuaries. If it is pertaining to a migratory bird sanctuary, then the person comes under the Migratory Bird Convention Act, but if it is a Northwest Territories sanctuary, the person can have an unsealed firearm in that sanctuary hunting for food, as long as it is not an endangered species.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Mr. Steen. Mr. Butters, did you have your hand raised on this?

MR. BUTTERS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. In the old book, page 15, clause 30, I think it is clause 24, page 20, in the new ordinance. It says that "No person, other than an officer or employee of the fish and wildlife service shall conduct any aerial, ground or aquatic census or survey". Now, certainly when members of a trappers' and hunters' association go out looking for caribou they are conducting an aerial census or aerial survey. They are surveying from the air looking for caribou which they will pinpoint and later take as meat. So it seems to me that that is very, very broad and under that too the pilot flying the aircraft would be liable as he is committing an offence.

Caribou Survey

The second part of the question is that it excludes native organizations. We have seen in recent years organizations developing what may be called research staff. Understandably the native organizations have a very real interest in the management and the utilization of game, the traditional pursuit by the people. It is possible that they may wish to hire biologists, qualified people, to carry out a census or survey and I do not think they would be able to do so under this provision.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Simmons, would you like to comment on that? Would you concur? Is that the intent?

MR. SIMMONS: No, it was not the intent to preclude the kind of searching for game that Mr. Butters was talking about. Under the definition of "to hunt", searching is not included. Unlike other provinces and states in the United States, searching is not included in the hunt so, therefore, they would not need this kind of a permit or permission to go out and look for caribou to hunt. I am not sure what Mr. Butters wanted on the second part of his statement.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, just whether the administration and the Game Advisory Council had considered this possibility and I recognize that this section would exclude that possibility as it presently is written.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Do you have further comments, Mr. Simmons?

MR. SIMMONS: The intent here is to cover all biologists, or people doing scientific studies with this permit system, and this would include the people that Mr. Butters is talking about, I believe. We will or have referred to this provision in the regulations, where we have gone into quite a bit of detail on the procedure for getting these permits, which includes, I believe, a review system by hunters' and trappers' associations, etc.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you. Any other comments on this section or this part? The Member from Foxe Basin.

MR. EVALUARJUK: (No translation)

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): What channel are we on? Channel three?

MR. EVALUARJUK: Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, I do not know which part of the ordinance we are in now. I do have a couple of questions. The first question will be as to what has been discussed earlier, pertaining to the idea of getting permits or licences. I have heard that those people who are of the age of 16 could only get licences at the age of 16. If a person had a child who was 15 years old, would it be possible for him to hunt? If that is the way the ordinance is going to be, I am very much against it.

More Power To Issue Hunting Licences

The second question is hunting licences. There are people who could take somebody else's hunting licence or refuse anybody for a hunting licence and the Wildlife Ordinance people and the Commissioner state that they are the only ones who could provide or give a hunting licence to the public. Would it be possible for the game people to give some of their powers to the local communities throughout the territories. The hunters' and trappers' association in each community should be given more power where they will be able to issue hunting licences and they could also reject hunting licences, if they are in agreement with the person who is trying to purchase the hunting licence. I am now asking the people here, our witnesses, would this be possible?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Mr. Evaluarjuk. The answer to your first question would be in clause 18 of the ordinance, subclause (1) and (2), that is in relation to the question of the age of a son. I would ask Mr. Simmons to comment on that and on the second issue you raised. I am sorry, Mr. Land.

MR. LAND: Mr. Chairman, there is a reference under clause 33, subclause (2), which deals with people who have not yet attained the age of 16 years and are assisting the holder of a general hunting licence to hunt.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Land, that is clause 32 in PART IV, which is dealing with hunting and related activities, the general rules for hunting is clause 32, subclause (2). Is that correct?

MR. LAND: Yes, on the top of page 24.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Right. Mr. Evaluarjuk, would you like us to read that, perhaps the Hon. Peter Ernerk could translate it for you? Is that satisfactory? Thank you. Now, Mr. Evaluarjuk, we are dealing with PART III which talks about the wildlife areas, the regions, the surveys or the taking count of various animals and it talks about the dangerous or nuisance animal. It talks about the sanctuaries and preserves. Those are in the English edition on page 18 through to page 22. I am not sure of the corresponding pages in your document. Are there any further comments on this section? Mr. Butters.

General Hunting Licences

MR. BUTTERS: Well, going through the two papers it is difficult to keep track. I have a couple of things that were really in PART II but I would like to bring them up, raise them and just comment. In the old book, clause 45 related to the expiration of general hunting licences and in the new edition it is subclause 16(1): "The holder of a licence to hunt shall, before or forthwith after its expiry, transmit the licence..." Does this refer to a general hunting licence?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Simmons or Mr. Land, would you care to comment on that?

MR. LAND: Yes, that does apply to general hunting licences.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): It does?

MR. BUTTERS: Am I to believe that a general hunting licence has to be renewed every year, it is not an ongoing entitlement because you once proved eligible?

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

MR. LAND: The general hunting licences expire on the 30th of June yearly and are then reinstated and we are presently switching to a plastic licence in which there would be a validation sticker attached on the 30th of June, when the licence expires, making it valid for the next year.

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

MR. BUTTERS: This would seem to be an unnecessary administrative act because, once it is accepted, the holder of a general hunting licence should hold that licence until it is lost or removed from him or her.

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

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, it is not added administrative work. The person turns in his licence every year so that the game management could know exactly how many animals people are taking. On the back of every general hunting licence you are required to fill out the back of that hunting licence every year and also when the new licences come out, the plastic one, like Mr. Land says, it would be validated every year and every year you still have to record how much you killed. You report exactly how many ducks you killed, as close as you can, how many ptarmigan you killed, how many caribou you killed, how many bear you killed. That is the reason for having the licence being renewed every year.

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

Powers Of The Superintendent.

MR. BUTTERS: The second point I want to make in the old book is on subclause 49(1) and in the other book it is subclause 15(13). Our witness Mr. Steen has already made this point, but the people I discussed the matter with, they felt that the manner in the old book gave the Commissioner too much power to refuse a licence or cancel a licence in the manner stated and I would say they would also agree that the power given the superintendent on page 13, subclause 15(1), "Where the superintendent has reasonable cause to believe that a person has contravened any of the terms and conditions of his licence or permit ..." and that can be cancelled or suspended. This seems to be a very great power, especially as it applies to a general hunting licence, to give Mr. Simmons or to give the superintendent and I think the hunters and trappers I have discussed this with would say the same thing.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Mr. Butters. All of that is subject to appeal, as I am sure you are aware. That relates to subclause 15(2). There is a right to appeal there. Mr. Steen, would you care to comment?

MR. VINCE STEEN: I will comment on the first statement made by Mr. Butters as to how long a general hunting licence is good for, whether it has to be renewed every year. The Game Advisory Council felt that it should be good for five years at a time but that there should be some system whereby the person has to turn in the amount of animals he killed. However, it is definitely, or it definitely would put some hardship it was felt by the council on some people if they do not turn in the licence on exactly the 30th of the month. His licence is thereby no more good, where in fact it is still good under the Northwest Territories Act. He can still hunt.

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

MR. VINCE STEEN: It is felt there should be some system whereby you have to report your kills.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you. Further comments? We can move on to PART IV that begins on page -- I am sorry, Mr. Evaluarjuk.

MR. EVALUARJUK: Nobody has answered my question. I would like to see in this ordinance here where it would indicate to me -- I do not want the game officials to be the only ones with all the power. Also I would like to see the local hunters' and trappers' associations given some powers and that it be written in this ordinance.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Simmons, would you like to comment?

Powers Of The Hunters' And Trappers' Associations.

MR. SIMMONS: Maybe Mr. Steen would like to follow up on this comment, but it is my impression that that is the intent of this ordinance, to give review power at least to people in communities and under this new ordinance there is more power wielded by the hunters' and trappers' associations and band councils, quite a bit more power, than in the current ordinance.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Steen, would you care to comment?

MR. VINCE STEEN: I did not get the question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Evaluarjuk has raised the question of wanting to have the hunters' and trappers' associations or the band councils to have more power to determine licensing, the issuance of permits, etc. Mr. Simmons has indicated that this ordinance in fact does do that. It gives much more power to the local hunters' and trappers' associations as well as the band councils to take on more added responsibility. I guess the question that I would ask of you is do you agree with that statement?

MR. VINCE STEEN: Yes. I think the council would agree with such a statement because there is more reference to hunters' and trappers' associations in the new ordinance than there is in the old ordinance. It was not even referred to at all with any types of power and it is the intention of the Game Advisory Council to try to get as much power for the hunters' and trappers' associations as possible, and have it written into the ordinance.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Evaluarjuk, do you understand there is more power under this new ordinance, right handed power? Mr. Lafferty.

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, because I had similar fears as Mr. Evaluarjuk has and in listening back and thinking very carefully and listening to Mr. Steen and Mr. Simmons, I think that there is a lot of delegated power in this ordinance so far as we went anyway in PART III in management and management regions.

Wildlife Management Areas.

Perhaps I can have either Mr. Steen or the Commissioner tell us in these management areas such as wildlife preserves, wildlife management areas, critical wildlife areas and special wildlife management areas and so on, in the areas of the Delta there are special management zones that are set aside, zones that certain groups or people use that piece of land to exercise a certain amount of power, will this be extended, this kind of management be extended to other areas of the Northwest Territories? In the case of the Fort Resolution group of people they want to set aside a piece of land over which they would have management. Will this kind of authority be extended?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Lafferty, I would perhaps refer the question then to the witnesses, Mr. Steen, Mr. Simmons or Mr. Land, rather than the Commissioner. They are the witnesses here. Would one of you three gentlemen like to comment on that? Mr. Land.

MR. LAND: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is provision in the proposed regulations to continue the fact of registered traplines or registered trapping areas if this is the wish of the hunters and trappers in any particular area in the Northwest Territories. These would be called fur management areas.

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

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I have some questions which I would imagine would best be addressed to Mr. Steen on the question of hunters' and trappers' associations. It appears that the intent with which everybody apparently agrees is to give the hunters' and trappers' associations a lot more power and authority than they had hithertofore. It seems to me, if I remember correctly, that hunters' and trappers' associations are constituted by means of the Societies Ordinance and they can adopt their own rules and procedures, their own memorandum of association or whatever it is called, determine their own eligibility as to who might be able to be in a hunters' and trappers' association and generally there are no specific guidelines for the operation of those associations. I could foresee difficulty arising, say, where a hunters' and trappers' association was made up predominantly of two families in a settlement and another two families decided that they wanted to set up a rival organization and you ended up with two hunters' and trappers' associations in one settlement.

Organizational Procedures For Hunters' And Trappers' Associations

I wonder whether the Game Advisory Council have given any consideration to having specified maybe in the Wildlife Ordinance or regulations made thereunder standard organizational procedures, standard eligibility as to who may or may not run for office or be a member of a hunters' and trappers' association. I wonder if he foresees any need for that, or foresees any difficulty arising with the power now being transferred to these organizations?

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

MR. VINCE STEEN: Mr. Chairman, dealing with his specific question, the Game Advisory Council has never thought that that might ever come up, but there is a related situation to what he is talking about and that is the registered group area whereby you have to be a member of the hunters' and trappers' association to belong to that group area and they vote their members in or out. In a situation like that we felt that it had to be a certain percentage of the votes to vote a man out of a registered group area, but no percentage to vote him in.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Hon. Dave Nickerson, you indicated you had more than one comment?

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: That is all I wanted to ask and apparently the Game Advisory Council has not considered this point and we already know the administration's view on it.

Hunting And Related Activities

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Fine, thank you. Any further comments on that section? If not, then I would like to move PART IV. This begins on page 23 of the English version of the ordinance and its heading is hunting and related activities, and in this particular section it deals with the general rules for hunting, the rules for hunting particular classes of wildlife. It indicates what activities are not treated as hunting. It talks about the equipment that is prohibited in hunting. It talks about firearms in camps. It deals with hunting from a vehicle, hunting after flight, the use of dogs ...

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Cats.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): ...the discharge of firearms and it deals with harrassment of wildlife, self-defence and reporting such to an officer. It deals with the equipment that is prohibited in the hunting of big game, with the use of bait for big game and the use of bow and arrow.

It deals with the guides' licences and the hunters' licences, the guides right to kill. It deals with hunting small game, the prohibition and hunting of fur-bearing animals by any other means than a firearm. It deals with the interference and removal in the setting of traps, and finally has a section relating to peregrine or gyrfalcon. Are there any comments, Mr. Simmons, of a general nature on this particular part?

MR. SIMMONS: This is probably no doubt the most controversial part in the whole ordinance. We had quite a few issues which were brought to our attention. Would you like me to go through these generally?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: There were comments on clause 33, particularly prohibited equipment.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Excuse me, Mr. Simmons, would you just explain that in a little more detail?

Objections Raised By Game Advisory Council

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, in the first part of clause 33, prohibited equipment, there were objections raised by the Game Advisory Council to allowing fish and wildlife officers to use poison. Just following that there was some opposition to the prohibition of set guns.

In clause 35, hunting from vehicle, there was much heated discussion on the use of aircraft in hunting.

Clause 37, discharge of firearms, the Game Advisory Council members disagreed -- there was within the Game Advisory Council some disagreement about what should be permitted and prohibited as far as roads go: hunting from roads; what is a road, and so forth.

Clause 43, prohibited equipment for big game hunting, there was some objection to a prohibition about the use of snares for big game.

Clause 46, guide licence, there was discussion, I am not sure whether there was a lack of resolution on this, but there were discussions about the right of a guide to be able to hunt for food while guiding a hunter. The Game Advisory Council felt that a guide should be able to hunt for food and they commented that it must be an animal that the hunter did not have a licence to hunt.

Clause 48, hunting small game, which restates the Migratory Birds Convention Act, the Game Advisory Council and Mr. Frank Bailey's report also spoke to this. The people generally opposed restrictions on the type of weapon that they would use.

Clause 49, fur-bearing animals, there was discussion on what types of bait should be used and the trappers feel that the baits that we specify as being permissible are not necessarily the baits that the trappers would prefer to use. That was from the Game Advisory Council, and generally Mr. Bailey found that people were opposed to prohibition on baits to be used. I think that is all for that part that I have recorded.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Mr. Simmons. Just so that we are clear, Mr. Evaluarjuk, you found the section that we are discussing? Did you find it in yours?

MR. EVALUARJUK: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Hon. David Searle.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to point out that it is in this part that we found clause 34 again dealing with a firearm in a camp and I just remind the game authorities that they may wish to look at that so that the sort of thing that I discussed earlier is not prohibited.

Use Of Aircraft In Hunting Game.

Secondly, I think one of the most controversial parts of this ordinance is found in subclause 35(4) dealing with the use of aircraft and not hunting big game for 12 hours immediately following the termination of the flight. I just wonder how sensible this is, Mr. Chairman. I am not going to use any names and certainly I am not included in the group, as a non-hunter, but the people I know who hunt and hunt for food in and around the Yellowknife area decided the prime time of year for hunting their four or five caribou and their moose and as I understand it is in the fall, just in fact three or four weeks to a month ago. They will go out for the sole purpose of bringing back their four or five caribou and their one moose. Generally speaking they will fly around until they find it and then they will kill it and they will clean it up and bring it back. They will take as long as is required to find their limit and they will bring it back as soon as they have found their limit. It seems to me it makes that process 12 hours less efficient to have them sit on the ground for 12 hours, because they are there for one purpose and one purpose only and they are going to stay there until they accomplish it, that is the first thing.

Secondly, of course, I just do not know how you are going to enforce this, that is the big problem that I see. You know, there just are not the officers standing around at the dock in Old Town watching every piece of game that comes off every flight and even if there were, I suppose they would start coming in under cover of darkness or landing out of town somewhere, so this seems to me to be virtually impossible of enforcement. If I may say so it is impractical and maybe there is some reason that I do not understand for this 12 hours, but assuming people are entitled to take five caribou they are going to go out and take five caribou.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Hon. David Searle.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: But it is not less merciful that they wait 12 hours to do it or more merciful. It may make it more difficult, but I do not know, maybe what you have to do if you want to make it more difficult is lower the limits.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): I would imagine that that is a point of concern for a number of Members. Mr. Steen, would you care to comment?

Zoning The Use Of Aircraft

MR. VINCE STEEN: Well, it is a concern of all of the Game Advisory Council, mainly because we can no longer hide behind the Northwest Territories Act now. They are telling us that an aircraft is not a traditional weapon, that we did not traditionally use aircraft to hunt. We thought we could possibly hunt moose or any other animal not listed as an endangered species with aircraft, but apparently we can not. So then all of the council got concerned and it appears that the actual problems of the use of aircraft for hunting and the most damage done with it is in the Yellowknife area or heavily populated areas and there is no problem on the coast. The council felt that possibly rather than restricting everybody this thing could be zoned or since the fish and wildlife people are only concerned about the barren ground caribou and not the moose, it could be a seasonal thing whereby even the general hunting licence guy

could not go out in an aircraft within a certain area. These were all suggestions to the fish and wildlife people from the council, other than this 12 hour waiting period because all the council felt that if you landed alongside of a caribou or moose he is not going to stand there for 12 hours even if you are willing to, so you are defeated before you start. Actually nobody in fact, if the use of aircraft is that popular, nobody in fact will get their five caribou.

Also there comes the problem of the guy flying into the bush and he is there for three months. Now, he may never see a game officer for three months and there is a moose sitting there, right where his camp is, and he has to wait 12 hours and he may never see another moose for three months and he has to wait 12 hours before he shoots that moose and there is just no point to it. The Game Advisory Council as a whole were hoping that the fish and wildlife people would come up with other suggestions, other than this 12 hour waiting period.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Mr. Steen. Hon. Dave Nickerson, I will put you on the list. Mr. Simmons, would you like to comment?

Controlling The Use Of Aircraft As A Weapon

MR. SIMMONS: The safest thing for me to do would be to retire again to the intent of this section. We are nervous, to say the least, about the use of aircraft in the Northwest Territories as a hunting weapon, particularly for moose and caribou and our intent is to have a law that is enforceable that would control the use of aircraft as a weapon.

One example at least that Mr. Steen used, the poor fellow who would alight from his airplane intending to stay in his camp for three months and seeing a moose and being unable to shoot it until 12 hours elapsed, of course, that fellow is not our target. Well, I will not comment further on our attitude on that case, but he is certainly not the fellow we are aiming for.

We feel that the current use of aircraft in some areas of the Northwest Territories is really threatening wildlife populations. We would like to have suggestions, I think, from this Legislature or from anybody as to a workable, enforceable alternative to this but we, as the fish and wildlife service, even with the guidance of the Game Advisory Council, have been unable to come up with anything better. We do believe this is enforceable.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Mr. Simmons. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to make a few brief comments on this section and leave it at that. I do not have the proper designations in the new book. In the old draft on clause 50, again it was mentioned that it excludes the use of a snare and a snare in some native areas is a traditional manner to get big game. There is a suggestion that clause 51 might be better placed in the regulations. On prohibited equipment there is also the suggestion too that the set gun has its uses and especially for taking wolverine. There are communities in our region where this is currently used. Clause 56, the aircraft problem was not solved. There was no solution offered to this. One person said that maybe the regulations should exclude holders of general hunting licences but what the group in Inuvik suggested was that a regional -- maybe it should be made a regional option with each region developing their own option to prevent using the aircraft to hunt. They did not have an idea how the aircraft could be used.

On clause 58 where a dog is prohibited, it was pointed out that in some areas a dog, where the dog teams are no longer used, the dog is used to warn hunters of the polar bear's presence and the dog is like an alarm clock that says "watch out". There is also the dog used as a pack dog and while a pack dog may not be in use as much today as it used to be, it is used in some parts of the northern bushland.

Beaver And Muskrat

There was the suggestion on clause 64 in the new ordinance that says "outside of a municipality you shall not damage or destroy a beaver dam or a lodge or a muskrat push-up." In the Delta proper you can not take a muskrat unless you destroy the push-up to set the trap. I understand that in some areas closer to Tuk the muskrat push-up may be the den but not in the Delta. That is going to wreak hardship on the trapper. There was a concern on clause 71 by members of the hunters' association that not only should traps be picked up but also snares should be removed and that the aspect of snares should be included in clause 71.

MR. FRASER: Are you on the new ordinance?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): You were referring to the old ordinance?

MR. BUTTERS: That is where I have everything written down.

MR. FRASER: Nobody has that copy.

MR. BUTTERS: It is on the record. That is all I cared about.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Simmons, did you indicate you wanted to make a comment?

MR. SIMMONS: I thought I did. I am almost ready to chicken out. That is a rather long series of points and some of them I think we accept as being very good. The only one that sticks in my mind right at this point is the one about dogs, and clause 36 of the current bill indicates that bear may even be hunted with a dog and there is no intent to prohibit the use of a dog as a warning device in camp. That is not quite hunting in case of bear, wolverine or other proscribed big game.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Mr. Simmons. Mr. Steen.

Use Of Set Guns

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, I have two specific questions. One of them is on clause 33, page 24. I think Mr. Butters mentioned something about set guns, some people use them for wolverine in his area, but I understand in the Eastern Arctic they use them for hunting seal, almost everybody uses it for

hunting seal through the ice. We used to use that when I was a trapper and we did not consider it a dangerous weapon. We knew it was part of the equipment that we had to use because it would help you obtain or get your seal without standing over the hole all day and all night. I was just wondering on that particular section whether or not we could specify just what animals can not be -- what type of a set gun -- what are you setting the gun for? Because if you set a gun for a wolverine, it is a pretty small little hole where he sticks his head out and I can not see it becoming a dangerous weapon to anybody unless somebody wants to put his head in there and grab the bait by his teeth.

On clause 35, hunting from a vehicle, I find that there is a restriction here that most people are hunting with skidoos which is called a vehicle and they are setting and running their trap lines with skidoos and almost everyone in the Western Arctic -- perhaps I could have some clarification what kind of vehicle is meant by a vehicle?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Mr. Steen. I would just offer the definition of a vehicle is on page four. It excludes a motor toboggan, a boat other than a barge of a certain length and any other prescribed conveyance. I would ask Mr. Simmons to comment, if he would.

MR. SIMMONS: Regarding seals and set guns, seals come under the Fisheries Act and there is no prohibition of the use of set guns for seals.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you. Mr. Steen, Mr. Vince Steen.

Set Guns And Deadfalls

MR. VINCE STEEN: Regarding the set guns, the Game Advisory Council was opposed to the use of set guns except for one member and once they understood they could use the set gun to hunt seals, the Eastern Arctic people had no opposition to it. However, they do not use the set gun for anything else and the people in the bush from up the river, there were no comments from them on set guns, but the people use set guns to hunt polar bear in the Western Arctic, until recently they did it, until the polar bear became an endangered species and it was regulated. It was a popular thing, setting guns for polar bear. None of the council is in favour of using set guns for polar bear because it is not selective. You may get the female and let the cubs starve, but the council or this member of the council anyway is in favour of a set gun other than that used with a trip wire. There is nothing dangerous about a set gun. As a matter of fact, it is probably the most humane trap there is. People use deadfalls. The Game Ordinance allows the use of deadfalls but it works on exactly the same principle. You stick your head in there and that is it. So, a man can simply do that as easily with a deadfall as with a set gun.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Mr. Steen. Hon. Peter Ernerk.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, my comments are with regard I believe to clause 43. I am not sure how many Members received the correspondence which I received both from the hunters' and trappers' association from Baker Lake as well as from the director of the Department of Natural and Cultural Affairs. These letters deal with the use of the rifle, two rifles; .22, .250 and .222. If you would allow me, Mr. Chairman, I should like to read the letter which I received that was addressed to the superintendent of game from the fish and wildlife office in Baker Lake as well as a letter from residents of Baker Lake with about 20-odd signatures to the president of the hunters' and trappers' association in Baker Lake. They are very short letters.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): I was going to suggest, Hon. Peter Ernerk, if they were not short letters, that you could maybe give us a precis on them.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Give you what?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Shorten them anyway.

MR. PEARSON: Give a digest.

HON. PETER ERNERK: They are very short anyway.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Copacetic.

Letters From Baker Lake

HON. PETER ERNERK: The first letter says: "I would like to protest the proposed Wildlife Ordinance whereby .22 to .50 calibre rifle would not be allowed for the hunting of caribou. This rifle ..."

MR. LYALL: I would like to make a comment on that because we could go on about that for quite a while. The thing is it is already changed in the regulations for the use of .222 above the tree line. It is already changed.

HON. PETER ERNERK: I did not realize that, Mr. Chairman. If that is so, I will withdraw my comments.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Hon. Peter Ernerk. Mr. Fraser. Thank you, Mr. Lyall.

MR. FRASER: I forgot what I was going to say now.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): You have to go on the list.

MR. LYALL: You did not say what hours we were going to sit.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): There is another person ahead of you yet.

MR. FRASER: First of all, I would like to comment on the hunting with aircraft. It is a very touchy subject in the valley. They do a lot of their hunting and there is no way you can get out to where the game is unless you use an aircraft and, if you have to bring an aircraft out and take an aircraft to go hunting and then have to sit there for 12 hours before you can shoot anything, have the aircraft come back again, it is pretty costly at the price of aircraft right now.

Hunting Sheep By Helicopter.

Another thing, hunting with helicopters, there is no other way to get into the mountains to get sheep unless you use a helicopter, aircraft can not land up there. My learned friend there, Mr. Simmons, disagrees with me, I know, but I still have to put this in because he did a lot of travelling and a lot of research up in that area and all he used was helicopters too.

However, hunting sheep in the mountains, you use a helicopter to get out there and some of the guys spend a lot of money preparing for these hunts. The aircraft costs \$360 an hour to start with and it takes you an hour or even more to get out there. They have skidoos rigged up with wheels on them instead of skis that they use to get around with, which is another costly thing that they have to convey, so you would have to say that an ordinary hunter who wants to go out and get a sheep is looking at \$1000. Then usually he is out there for maybe two days or three days and that would not bother the 12 hour waiting period for him. However, if the helicopter happened to land on a bunch of sheep and they attacked him he would have to tell them to stand by.

The natives use helicopters quite a bit for hunting caribou and the caribou are not like they used to be, when they came into the communities and you could get at them with dog teams or in some places by walking with snowshoes. In some way or another with the talk of the pipeline the caribou did not come back into that area and they stayed a long way off, so now you have to use an aircraft to get at them. The custom down there is you get an aircraft and you go out to where you know the caribou are and you usually have an idea of the vicinity and you take a Cessna 185 or a Beaver or whatever and you go out there and if you see caribou on the lake you stop and shoot them and load them up and then come home, and even at that alone you are looking at \$500 or \$600.

Most of these guys who do this kind of hunting are guys who maybe have a job and maybe they are working for the nursing station or the Hudson's Bay Company or the Government of the Northwest Territories and they have that kind of money to put out, but if it were not for them working and trying to get some meat for their family and possibly the money they are getting is not enough to keep the ones with big families and they would revert back to welfare or else just do like their neighbour and just quit working and go on welfare. Welfare will bring them meat and why should they bother to pay for an aircraft if welfare will bring it to them? So, I think we have to take a very close look at this 12 hour wait, especially for guys who are holding general hunting licences. I can see the tourists going in and wanting to get a sheep with a 48 inch ram horn or something, a big moose with about a 15 foot rack and all this, they have the money to do it, but it is the guy with the general hunting licence which you have to protect and this clause in the Wildlife Ordinance where you have to wait 12 hours is a no-no. Thank you.

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

Opening Muskrat Push-ups

MR. VINCE STEEN: I would like to clear up a point brought up by Mr. Butters. In clause 39, dealing with rat push-ups and beaver houses, it is my understanding and it is the Game Advisory Council's understanding that as long as you have a licence to trap you can break open muskrat push-ups and if you do not have a licence -- I mean if you are doing it out of season and if you are doing it for food and it is not an endangered species and you can open up his push-up, or in the case of a beaver, a beaver house, and use that thing as long as you do need it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Mr. Steen. Hon. Dave Nickerson, I know it has been a long time and you have probably forgotten about it.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I was going to say exactly what Mr. Simmons said approximately a half an hour ago. I can elaborate a little bit on it, if you really want me to.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): No.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: As far as the administration's or the government's concern is, we are worried about the practice of hunting game with an aircraft. We are not in our own minds particularly satisfied with the wording as it exists at present, but obviously something has to be done to control the number of animals being taken by this method. I guess really where the trouble is the greatest is in the Yellowknife area where there is such a large amount of organized hunting of caribou, paid for largely by the government, so we could control this in an administrative way if we wanted to, by just ceasing to fund organized hunts. We would be very pleased to hear the views of Members on this question of hunting with aircraft and the proposed 12 hour wait and one suggestion that was made and may have some merit is that instead of having the 12 hour prohibition, when you spot your caribou herd and instead of having to wait for 12 hours by which time the caribou would obviously have all gone away, is that there be a 12 hour prohibition on the transportation so that you can go and get your caribou and then you have to wait there 12 hours before you can bring it home. I do not know if any of the Members have views on this or if Mr. Steen has any observations to make with regard to that suggestion.

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

MR. VINCE STEEN: Well, this suggestion was never put to the council, but I feel that the answer would be that if you have to wait 12 hours before you shoot you are going to send your aircraft home anyway, so if you have to wait 12 hours before you can pick up your meat, the price of the meat is the same.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Mr. Steen. Mr. Lya11, it is your turn.

Animals Menacing Caches Of Food For Dogs

MR. LYALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The one thing that I would just like to elaborate on was the set gun. You get people still using dogs in some places. When you have to keep meat out on the land for dog food and wolverines are bothering it. I talked to the hunters like the ones in Coppermine and they say that all of the hunters know when they have a set gun out for wolverine because it is set pretty well. So, when there are people still using dogs and they have to keep a cache of food out, I wondered if there could be something set so that this could be used for animals which are a menace to the dog food or whatever you have out that they are bothering?

Also, the legislation committee dwelt quite a bit on that 12 hour waiting period but it is kind of a hard thing to come up with anything. I mean like myself, living in Cambridge Bay in the Central Arctic there is no one who really has that kind of money to charter a plane to go and get meat. The thing is that where we are it is easier and cheaper to go about by skidoo. These organized hunts, I dwelt quite a bit on that one too, I disapprove of organized hunts. They cost money, lots of money, especially when they are using Twin Otters and that is the fastest way that you are going to kill off the caribou herd and that is why they organize these hunts. This 12 hour waiting period is a good thing to have if organized hunts are going to keep going, because those organized hunts that have been happening without this piece of legislation, that 12 hour period being in there, they are killing off the animals faster than any other way they could. In fact, the way it was described was that a bunch of hunters pile out of the airplane in the middle of a lake and they start shooting up the caribou. I will bet you any amount of money that if you drop 50 there are going to be 50 more dropped after you leave that place of where you got that animals.

Opposition To Organized Hunts

I kind of heard a rumour that there is one herd close to here which is dwindling down and this is a big factor, these organized hunts. I personally have only observed one organized hunt and we had to go in and clean up. These people had gone out, on welfare money, shot a bunch of caribou and picked off what they wanted and left the rest, just the tongues taken out of them. Personally I really am against organized hunts. I could organize a hunt personally and I know that we are only going to drop so many animals if I go out. I do not get trigger happy when I go out shooting caribou, but the guys who are going out on these organized hunts, some of them more or less never hunted in their lives before. They jump in an airplane because their friends are going out. Like I say, I know that 12 hour waiting period before you kill was debated quite a bit but we could not come to a solution of what we were going to do with it. Afterwards when I started talking about being against organized hunts I think it was a pretty good thing, because many of those people that you put down have to make camp and that gives them a lot of time to make camp and they are not so excited as just coming out of an airplane and starting to shoot. So, personally I think I would like to make a suggestion to the administration that they stop funding organized hunts. Like I say, organized hunts are the ones that kill off the animals and we are trying to preserve wildlife. Mr. Chairman, I guess for now I will give somebody else a chance to say something.

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

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of things that are discussed here and I think this is very, very good. I appreciate very much the concern expressed by the Honourable Minister, Mr. Nickerson, and the Honourable Member, Mr. Lyall, from Cambridge. These are expressions that I hear a great deal of, particularly in my community and the concern as expressed by Mr. Lyall, of organized hunting groups. They are looked upon to some degree by the experienced hunters of the Fort Simpson area not so much as in opposition to the hunt itself but, rather, the method by which the hunt is carried out. I have heard concerns expressed by Indian people in my constituency that they have sought the money to establish outpost camps in an effort to train the young, inexperienced native people from the communities to take game properly, in other words, without too much disturbance or without needless chase and that type of thing.

Harrassment Of Animals.

As it is said, and in the views exchanged by different people from different regions of the Northwest Territories, that there are people using snowmobiles or skidoos or planes to harass or chase caribou and other animals. Because of these kinds of comments that have arisen through the last three months that I have been having different meetings at different places with game wardens and what not in my area I have asked the opinions of these types of activities and they said it did not matter to them too much because they are above the tree line and there is no way they can chase any animals with skidoos. Nonetheless, many people feel that since caribou are migratory animals, that if they are disturbed in one area, they have to be defended in another, so there is an interrelationship here.

The areas that I have been told to make comments on which happen to be this section and that is in the area of hunting on highways from motor vehicles, the use of aircraft, the 12 hour wait and the use of rifles or firearms. Because there was concern expressed to me, by the majority of native people of the sealed firearms that Hon. David Searle talked about, they were not against it or anything like that, but it was simply that the question which I was unable to answer or our game officer in the region was, does this apply to a general hunting licence holder? That answer I will seek later or you can reply through Mr. Simmons or Mr. Steen.

Hunting From Vehicles.

In the area of hunting in clause 35 dealing with hunting from vehicles it is the opinion of the majority of the people that I have been able to talk to on a personal contact basis and in meetings and discussions that I have had in the community of Nahanni, Jean Marie River, Trout Lake, Fort Liard and Simpson, with the exception of Providence, that too many people hunt on the highways and shoot on the highways and the Indian people in that area, in Simpson and Jean Marie River areas are truly concerned that there is altogether too much shooting on the highway.

There is an instance that happened not too long ago where a game warden stopped to check a vehicle and this was brought to my attention by one of my constituents, and he went to check the vehicle. He knew there was game taken out of season by a non-native fellow and the fellow drove off on him. This type of thing happens. Then there was another incident where a guy was coming around a corner just outside of Fort Providence, around a sharp bend and when he came around there was a fellow shooting at targets across the highway. He had barely any time to stop and they were shooting out of a parked vehicle.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Lafferty, you have half a minute.

MR. LAFFERTY: Can I get permission to finish?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): If you can finish now within 15 seconds, otherwise not. You just lost 15 seconds.

MR. LAFFERTY: Hunting after the flight, it was suggested in Simpson by the people there that is a simple thing and they are very concerned about people using aircraft and maybe there should be a 24 hour wait after an aircraft brings the person to the place of the hunt.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Mr. Lafferty. Are there any other comments on this section dealing with hunting and related activities, PART III, rules for hunting particular classes of wildlife, etc.?

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: One question, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the advisers could point out in the regulations where regulations are made pursuant to subclause 52(2) of the ordinance regarding the possession and capture of peregrine falcons and gyrfalcons?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Do you want to raise a point of order now?

MR. LAFFERTY: I do want to raise a point of order now.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Go ahead, what is the point of order?

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Simmons did not get a chance to answer my question. Do the sealed guns apply to a general hunting licence holder?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Did you understand the question? Do sealed firearms apply to general hunting licence holders?

MR. LAND: Mr. Chairman, to answer that question, this would apply to general hunting licence holders who are not hunting for food in the sanctuary as provided under the Northwest Territories Act.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum); Thank you. Hon. Dave Nickerson, you raised a question as well. Mr. Simmons? Mr. Land?

MR. LAND: We are still looking.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Steen, you wanted to make a comment?

Prohibition Against Hunting By Guide

MR. VINCE STEEN: I wanted to comment on clause 46 where it states that "a guide shall not kill or wound or attempt to wound or kill wildlife while guiding a hunter." The Game Advisory Council felt that there may be cases, especially on the coast, where a person is guiding a hunter to hunt polar bear and may in fact be in need of other meat to feed himself and his hunters or his dogs and should be allowed to kill caribou, for instance, and the Game Advisory Council does not feel he should be allowed to kill polar bear, but other meat to feed the dogs or the hunters.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you. Did you find the response to Hon. Dave Nickerson?

MR. SIMMONS: In the proposed regulations, page 46, clause 38 is the reference I think that Hon. Dave Nickerson was seeking. That is on page 46 of the proposed regulations, draft six, clause 38.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you. Did you find it, Hon. Dave Nickerson? Gentlemen, if there is not anything further on the hunting regulations, can we move now to PART V?

Fee On Falcons

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Is there any provision for a fee payable in respect to a permit given to possess or capture falcons? I notice there is an export fee payable when you want to export a gyrfalcon out of the territories, a fee of \$5000, but I wondered if there is a fee you had to pay in order to capture one or possess one in the territories?

MR. LAND: Yes, there is a fee set out in the licence to capture wildlife which is at the beginning of draft six of the proposed regulations or the draft regulations and there is a fee on falcons.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Land, can you tell us how much that fee is?

MR. LAND: Just to clarify; this would be on exporting the birds from the Northwest Territories. In the case of gyrfalcons it is \$5000 and there is no provision for peregrine falcons.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: So in fact somebody could capture and possess a falcon in the territories so long as they did not wish to export it without paying a fee. Is that correct?

MR. LAND: He could only do so if he had approval issued to capture a peregrine falcon.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: But no fee is payable with respect to this permit?

MR. LAND: Not at this point in time but provision is in the ordinance for some future date if you wanted this to take place.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Get your gyrfalcon now before we change the rules.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): If you can catch one. The Member for Foxe Basin.

MR. EVALUARJUK: Mr. Chairman, going out on aircraft to go hunting, the question I have, the one thing I did not quite understand, people were talking about the bow and arrow that can be used to go hunting; bows and arrows that were used by people before or the kind of bow and arrow that the white man makes or the ones that the Inuit make? I am sure somebody knows which type is the strongest. That is the first question.

The second one concerns clause 51. Paragraph 51(a), I would like to know exactly what it means. I do not quite understand what it means. The other one is in the case of anyone who is going to go out hunting musk-ox, 2712 joules. I do not have one. Does that mean I can not get a polar bear even if I want to?

MR. LAND: Mr. Chairman, to answer the first question, clause 51, removal of traps, that is mainly to do with registered trapping areas or group areas where if an outside person would be coming into that area and setting traps the officer under this section could remove the traps.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Land, excuse me, is that the section he is referring to?

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some confusion here and is it PART IV, V or VI?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): It is IV, the Roman numeral is IV and is that what you mean?

HON. PETER ERNERK: I think what Mr. Evaluarjuk is trying to figure out is the use of the bullets.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Is that clause 47?

HON. PETER ERNERK: The Eskimo translation says here concerning bullets.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): One moment please. Hon. Dave Nickerson.

Types Of Bows And Firearms.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: The questions as I understood them were first of all the specifications for a bow which are contained in the draft in our book in subclause 43(3) and Mr. Evaluarjuk's specific question was would a traditional type bow used by Eskimos or Indians fall within that category or would it just be the fancy manufactured bows?

The second question was with regard to what appears in our draft as clause 47, the reference to the muzzle energy of a firearm for hunting certain species of animals, and we specified it must be 2800 joules of energy and perhaps you could give an indication of what types or calibre of firearms would be above that or what calibre of firearms would come below that.

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

MR. LAND: The first one would be a bow that would have 45 pounds of draw weight with an arrow that pulls back to a distance of 28 inches and has seven eighths of an inch of blade on the arrow. The second question....

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Land, would a traditional bow and arrow do that?

MR. LAND: It would have to be tested. This is meant to apply to all bows and if they would reach the specifications it would be legal.

The second question dealing with foot-pounds, that is 2000 foot-pounds of energy at 100 yards and it pertains only to the hunting of polar bear and that is the sport hunting of polar bear and bison.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Can you indicate what kind of a gun that would be?

MR. LAND: Well, we would get into ballistics and I do not have a list of all the guns that have 2000 foot-pounds of energy at 100 yards.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): I do not either. What about a .30-30? Mr. Lyall.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, I think it was mentioned in the legislation committee that you would get the specs for the types of bullets and I think the .30-30 is in that category.

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

MR. VINCE STEEN: It was pointed out to the Game Advisory Council that a .30-06, it would be nothing smaller than a .30-06 that would come into that category and that is meant strictly for the sport hunter and not for a guide or any Inuit or people hunting traditionally. A .30-30 does not come into that category, that was our understanding.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, Mr. Steen. Mr. Simmons.

MR. SIMMONS: It might be helpful if I commented that -- what little I know of the musk-ox bows, the musk-ox bow would probably meet the minimum specifications that are set down in this clause, but that is merely an opinion. I certainly have not sampled a whole lot of musk-oxen bows.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you. Mr. Evaluarjuk, is that satisfactory now?

MR. EVALUARJUK: Yes.

Possession And Use Of Wildlife

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you. Gentlemen, may we turn now to page 33 of the English version, PART V, possession and use of wildlife, and this deals primarily with what is defined as illegal possession and what is deemed as possession the unauthorized acquisition of wildlife, the captive wildlife, the capture of such, the inedible parts killed for food, the receipt of wildlife as a gift, illegal contracts, the serving of game meat, prohibitions against feeding and wastage, the transportation of wildlife within the territories, the exportation of wildlife, an export permit, commercially canned meats, those people who are entitled to deal in furs and it identifies tanners, a licensed fur farmer, an outfitter's licence, a hunter's licence and a game farm licence. Do you have comments, Mr. Lyall, in terms of this?

MR. LYALL: Yes. Mr. Chairman, from clause 51 right up to clause 54 they discuss quite extensively the gift of meat that the general hunting licence holder could give to a non-general hunting licence holder. The gift of meat being given every 60 days and we considered that and we thought that was too long and traditionally people out hunting would give, it is stated in here that they could give ten pounds but that was still being considered and we said that at one time generally when a hunter comes home he would give a hind quarter to his friends, which weighs about 25 pounds. So we were considering this and considering that a person coming back from a hunt giving meat to his friends. We were discussing how many pounds it should be and that may be 1000 pounds a year and I think it was considered, to give to one friend because we did not want to make it too big so that there might be something going on that we do not know about. That is enough for now, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you, gentlemen. I propose we take a five minute break.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): We will come right back.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): I recognize a quorum. Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, one last point relating to taxidermists and I wonder if that section excludes the handicraft people who make -- well, they fill out muskrats and things like that? It is sort of like little crafts.

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

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, clause 63, it does not apply to native handicrafts but instead would apply to the licensing of commercial tanneries and it is a new provision. The clause was approved with that explanation.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Is that satisfactory, Mr. Butters?

MR. BUTTERS: No, it was not the tanning, it was the stuffing of these little animals.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Clause 64.

MR. BUTTERS: I would like to just refer now to clause 58 and there was the part of the hide, the moose, whether it is considered here. Some of the women felt that a lot more strictures should be put on the men to ensure that the hides were not left out in the bush.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Is that a comment?

MR. BUTTERS: That is a comment and I am finished.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): You are not looking for a response; that was just a comment?

MR. BUTTERS: That was just a comment and I was just telling the game superintendent.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Land, do you have a comment to make?

MR. LAND: Just on the one about home tanning, Mr. Chairman, regulation 91(m) protects the home tanning industry.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you. Are there any other comments? Does anyone else have any comments?

Storage Of Meat

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I wonder with regard to the possession and use of wildlife if the draft we have before us still prohibits a non-licensed holder from storing meat on behalf of a licensed hunter? Can I, for instance, store meat that a general hunting licence holder has shot which is in my freezer for him?

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

MR. LAND: No, there is no such provision.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: That means, does it, Mr. Chairman, that I would be acting illegally by storing meat in my freezer for somebody else even though the meat had been lawfully killed?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Land, is that correct?

MR. LAND: That is my interpretation.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Would you like some help from the Legal Advisor?

MR. LAND: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): That is correct, Hon. Dave Nickerson.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I wonder if maybe the game people could look at this before they come back to us.

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

MR. VINCE STEEN: Not dealing with that particular section, I have comments on two other sections.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Do either of you want to make any comment on Hon. Dave Nickerson's suggestion? He made a suggestion that possibly you could look at that. Is that okay? Mr. Steen, do you have some comments?

MR. VINCE STEEN: The Game Advisory Council had some comments on section -- now I am lost -- clause 58, subclause (3) "A person may feed big game or game birds to dogs used for transportation at a time when they are being so used and are at least eight kilometres from a municipality or settlement." The councillors felt that it is pretty hard to do sometimes and they had some opposition to that statement. But also "no person shall feed big game, other than bear, wolf, coyote or wolverine... to a domestic animal..." that is the wrong one.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Those are the comments from the Game Advisory Council?

Edible Dog Meat

MR. VINCE STEEN: I have another one here. Some members would like to give edible meat to dogs in settlements, as they do not use dog food and have no spoiled meat. The main concern, however, is the ability to feed dogs on the trail, especially in the Arctic.

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

MR. FRASER: Yes. We are going through these regulations and to just reply to what Hon. Dave Nickerson said, I think if somebody killed a moose he can give you up to ten pounds of meat and no more. Was that in the regulations?

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

MR. LAND: The regulations are in draft six and they are still in a draft form and we have figures we are working with but they are by no means the final answer. This point was raised before in committee and we will certainly take a look at it.

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

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, the position of game, because there are a lot of complaints by people in my area and elsewhere that I know of, of game as Hon. Dave Nickerson put it, general hunting licence holders putting game in somebody else's place. I think, as you indicated, Mr. Land, that this is allowed. I think that this may just lead to some abuse. A person could go ahead, a general hunting licence holder could go ahead and a friend, a non-general hunting licence holder could go ahead and say that is his moose or his animal.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): That is a comment, Mr. Lafferty, thank you. Any other comments on this section? Mr. Steen.

MR. VINCE STEEN: There were a lot of comments from the Game Advisory Council as to whether you could export or import meat because people in the Western Arctic, specifically in the Delta, do travel back and forth across the territorial border into the Yukon and they hunt in the Yukon and come back into the territories. The explanation given to the council is that you are dealing with the Export and Import Permits Act and it is a federal act or something.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Yes. Thank you. Are there any further comments on this section, possession and use of wildlife? The Member from Foxe Basin.

MR. EVALUARJUK: Mr. Chairman, concerning clause 78.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Clause 78?

MR. EVALUARJUK: Yes, clause 78.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): That is in the old testament.

Feeding Game Meat At Meals

MR. EVALUARJUK: It states that no person shall give away meat of an animal, whether or not it is commercially given away. You can give away food at your place, so I wonder, I do not know what that means. You like to feed your friends or feed your dogs, which one is it trying to say, feed the animals or the dogs or is it for people or for the dogs?

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

MR. LAND: That is for feeding people and it was expressed to us that people who go to other communities and in a private residence are served a meal of game meat. They do not want to be committing an offence if they want to leave some money behind at the house when they depart. That section accommodates that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): You mean if I had some game meat and I was eligible to hunt it I would need another permit to give it to somebody.

MR. LAND: Mr. Chairman, it means...

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): When I say give it to them, I mean serving the meat.

MR. LAND: Serving the meat as part of a meal.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): I would need a permit to do that?

MR. LAND: You would not need a permit if you were in a private residence. Otherwise you would.

MR. PEARSON: You mean a restaurant?

MR. LAND: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): So if I were in a restaurant, I would need a permit but if I am in a private residence I would not need a permit? Is that correct?

MR. LAND: That is correct.

MR. EVALUARJUK: Like if I go caribou hunting with a friend and the other guy got a caribou and I do not get a caribou, so he would not be able to feed me while we are on the trip?

MR. LAND: Holders of general hunting licences under this proposal would be able to barter or sell among themselves without restriction. This is dealing with people other than holders of general hunting licences who would be serving big game as part of a meal for sale.

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

Situation In Greenland

MR. PEARSON: One of the aspects of life in Greenland that is very interesting is that people may barter their food, their game, the bag from their hunting trips. In the village square at a market place which is established in each community, a large table is provided, in some cases with a roof over it, and anybody may buy and sell his game there, be it birds or animals, sea mammals, which results in a very worthwhile supply of fresh food. It enables people to be able to buy and eat game food without any hardship and in some cases it is bartered, traded or simply sold. Every community in Greenland has such a market place and it is an institution which I think we need very badly in this country.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Do you need a permit?

MR. PEARSON: Do you need a permit in Greenland? No, it is free trade. I mean it encourages people to eat...

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Down on the village green, so to speak. Thank you. Mr. Simmons.

MR. SIMMONS: With meat that is covered as a commercial meat, such as caribou and in the new ordinance, perhaps musk-oxen, this can happen. You can buy and sell caribou freely even now within the territories, perhaps with the new ordinance, musk-ox meat.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you. Any further comments? Hon. Peter Ernerk. I am sorry.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this particular clause, I recall arguing the situation here, especially when public functions are being held in a community where, let us say, for example, the Commissioner visits Holman Island or Repulse Bay or things of that nature and the community council wants to have a meal for him and his party. I think it was indicated to me that the community would need a licence or a permit to hold such a function.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): I imagine it says "subject to regulations" and I imagine there it could be an instance where there it would be allowed.

HON. PETER ERNERK: I would like an answer from the game management.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): I beg your pardon?

HON. PETER ERNERK: It is all right.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): He wants an answer from Mr. Simmons.

MR. SIMMONS: It is our intention to permit this activity without having it be difficult for people who are trying to throw this carnival or affair as has happened in Baffin, for example. Quite often under existing law a phone call has settled the whole affair and it will be provided for in the new regulations as well.

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

MR. VINCE STEEN: The Game Advisory Council is still confused as to clause 58 because it states that you can throw bear meat away and, if you go back to clause 57 it says you can not feed it to anybody, but also clause 58 states that you can throw bear meat away. It does not describe what kind of bear and people do hunt barren ground grizzly for food. However, another section, paragraph 58(b) states you can not throw the pelt away. If you do not hunt, if you are hunting him for food, you do not eat the skin.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): True. Thank you, Mr. Steen. Mr. Lyall.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, the answer I was going to give to Hon. Peter Ernerk has already been given by Mr. Simmons.

Search, Arrest, Seizure And Prosecution

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you. Are there other comments? Are there other comments on this section? We will move then on to PART VI which begins in the new edition or the new "testament" on page 40. It deals with search, arrest, seizure and prosecution. It gives the general powers of officers to search with a warrant, the use of force, personal liability. It deals with the inspection, seizure and prosecution following seizure. It outlines the procedure following seizure. It indicates the federal offence and it talks about the disposition of a seized article, the government's non-liability for loss, the inspection in premises, the seizure of records and the examination of wildlife for disease, and of course, the compensation payable to the person from whom the hides or pelts are seized. Mr. Simmons, do you have comments of a general nature?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, there were comments on this part of the ordinance, starting with clause 68, arrest. The Game Advisory Council said that this section would give officers too much power and that arrest without a warrant should be restricted to non-resident hunters.

In clause 69 a comment came from the Game Advisory Council again suggesting that an officer should have a warrant to search any building.

In clause 69, subclause (4), there was some divergence of opinion within the Game Advisory Council. One opinion given was that all vehicles, including motor toboggans, canoes and boats with less than ten horsepower engines should be included in the right to search.

In clause 71, the last comment that I am aware of is from the Game Advisory Council that a live animal that is seized should not be sent to a zoo. It should instead be released or destroyed. On that last point, we could accommodate that. However, our intent was to prevent the unnecessary killing of wildlife.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Does clause 71 in fact -- and that is the section you are talking about, clause 71? There is not anything in there about a zoo.

MR. SIMMONS: No, but there is the provision for the disposition of seized animals.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): You could take it to the Queen. Mr. Lyall.

Exotic Animals

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask one question: Is there anything in here that covers the lioness that was taken from Yellowknife and for future people bringing in exotic animals or whatever you call them?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): It just deals with wildlife, I believe. It just deals with wildlife, does it not?

MR. SIMMONS: I will wait. Mr. Land should perhaps speak to this one.

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

MR. LAND: There would be a requirement under the regulations for an importation permit for the type of animal that is being referred to.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): What reference do you have to that? What section?

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Clause 62.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): I beg your pardon. Right. That is where we dealt with importation.

MR. LAND: It is number 36, page 45 of the draft six regulations.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you. Hon. Dave Nickerson, did you have another comment to make?

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: No.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Any further comments?

MR. EVALUARJUK: Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to indicate that it is almost 7:30 o'clock p.m., according to my time, however, presumably we could complete this this coming Monday and I am quite hungry right now.

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

MR. BUTTERS: I would almost think that we have completed all of the points in the ordinance or the draft which have been argumentative or have produced arguments, have we not? If so, if it is going back to the communities we could send it there.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): I do not know.

MR. LYALL: I think we have to, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Maybe I can facilitate you. Does anyone have any other points to raise?

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: I have one point. In the reply given to Mr. Lyall's question you referred us to page 45 of the regulations, draft six. Regulation number 36 which deals with the importation of wildlife and wildlife has a restrictive definition in the definition section and subclause 60(2) in the ordinance deals with the importation of any vertebrates. I can not find in the regulation where the importation of live vertebrate other than wildlife as defined is covered.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Simmons or Mr. Land.

MR. LAND: Mr. Chairman, I stand corrected. The reference should have been to clause 60, subclause (2) of the bill, page 37, as far as the importation of lions or exotic animals is concerned.

Importation Permits

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: The lady on the microphone is slowing down a little bit. It will of course be necessary to make reservations under subclause 60(2) because of course a live vertebrate would include a mouse or all kinds of things that you do not wish to have people get importation permits for in order to bring into the territories, so it will be necessary to draft regulations.

MR. PEARSON: Are Legislature Members live vertebrates?

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): At this stage of the game I question that. Do you have a comment, Mr. Land?

MR. LAND: Well, the reference to a prescribed animal means a reference to the regulations so these animals we are dealing with would have to be set out in the regulations.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Copacetic, Hon. Dave Nickerson?

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Thank you. Are there further comments on any aspects then? May I report progress?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Arnold McCallum): Mr. Simmons, Mr. Land and Mr. Steen, I want to thank you on behalf of the committee for the information and the discussion that took place. Thank you very much.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Arnold McCallum.

Report Of The Committee Of The Whole Of Bill 2-63, Wildlife Ordinance

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been discussing the wildlife regulations and the Wildlife Ordinance in general and wishes to report progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any announcements for the week end?

MR. PEARSON: I would like to seek unanimous consent to return to the order paper to deal with the welfare matter that was set aside.

MR. SPEAKER: Just to be sure, Mr. Pearson, you want to go into committee of the whole, I take it? Mr. Pearson, you want to go into committee of the whole, I take it, to consider your Motion 4-63, an increase in welfare rates in the Northwest Territories.

MR. PEARSON: That is correct.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Pearson, what you really have to do is, you see, we were operating on the extended sitting Rule which restricted debate until the Wildlife Ordinance was completed. So, now we would normally recognize the clock, but what you really have to do is ask unanimous consent to go back to notices of motion to give notice of a motion to continue to waive the Rules and continue the sitting. Then you will have to ask unanimous consent to go to motions to make the motion. Do you follow me? So, Mr. Pearson then presumably is asking for unanimous consent to go back to Item 7, notices of motion and do you follow me?

MR. PEARSON: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent being requested to go back to notices of motion.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: Unanimous consent denied, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent denied.

MR. PEARSON: I just wanted to thank Hon. Dave Nickerson for his co-operation.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any serious announcements for the week end? Do you have an announcement, Hon. Peter Ernerk?

HON. PETER ERNERK: No, I was going to seek unanimous consent to return to Item 3, questions and returns.

HON. DAVE NICKERSON: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent denied. If there is nothing else and no announcements? Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: On a point of order, sir, did we change our Rules so that we convene on Mondays at 2:30 o'clock p.m. now?

MR. SPEAKER: The hours of sittings as set out in the Rules and on Monday, I believe, it is a 9:00 o'clock a.m. sitting. Rule 3(1), "The Assembly shall meet on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. and from 2:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.", so Monday would be a 9:00 o'clock sitting. Anything else? Hon. Arnold McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, did I understand you to say that it is 9:00 o'clock a.m. until 1:00 o'clock p.m. on Monday?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, that presents a problem to the House and the Members. As you will recall, the Commissioner indicated to us that there was a meeting set up with the new Minister at 12:00 o'clock on Monday from 12:00 o'clock to 1:30 o'clock and that is the only time that the Minister has available to meet with the Members. If we are to sit until 1:00 o'clock then we are not going to have too much time with the new Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Arnold McCallum, presumably at about 12:00 o'clock some Member may wish to...

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: ...recognize the clock. I would then just like to remind Members that we have that meeting as well and that there are some items that we must consider before Members meet in caucus and again it would be a time situation. Before Members leave we must meet in a caucus meeting.

MR. SPEAKER: Really, do we have to continue? What else is there? Mr. Butters.

MR. BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, if your quorum is not tight, Mr. Steen and I might not be back in Yellowknife until maybe 3:30 o'clock on Monday so you might not be able to start at 9:00 o'clock a.m. That is the basis for my question.

MR. SPEAKER: There are 12 Members here. Eight is a quorum. Mr. Pearson.

MR. PEARSON: I move we recognize the clock right now.

MR. SPEAKER: We are doing exactly that. Mr. Clerk, orders of the day.

ITEM NO. 14: ORDERS OF THE DAY.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Orders of the day, October 24, 1977, 9:00 o'clock a.m., at the Explorer Hotel.

1. Prayer
2. Questions and Returns
3. Oral Questions
4. Petitions
5. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
6. Notices of Motion
7. Motions for the Production of Papers
8. Motions
9. Tabling of Documents
10. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills, Recommendations to the Legislature, Information Items and other Matters: Bill 2-63, Bill 3-63, Bill 5-63, Recommendation to the Legislature 1-63, Tabled Document 5-63, Resource Management in the Northwest Territories, Motion 4-63, Information Items 2-63, 3-63, 5-63, 7-63, 11-63
11. Third Reading of Bills, Bills 1-63, 3-63, 4-63, 5-63
12. Assent to Bills, Bills 1-63, 3-63, 4-63, 5-63

13. Time and Place of Next Session

14. Prorogation

MR. SPEAKER: This Legislative Assembly stands adjourned until 9:00 o'clock a.m., October 24, 1977 at the Explorer Hotel.

---ADJOURNMENT

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