



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES
DEBATES

65th. Session

8th Assembly

Official Report

THURSDAY, MAY 11, 1978

Pages 114 to 159

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

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

The Honourable Arnold McCallum, M.L.A.
Yellowknife, N.W.T. X0E 1H0
(Slave River)
(Minister of Local Government and
A/Minister of Social Development)

The Honourable Peter Ernerk, M.L.A.
Box 834
Yellowknife, N.W.T. X0E 1H0
(Keewatin)
(Minister of Economic Development and
Tourism and Government House Leader)

Mr. Donald M. Stewart, M.L.A.
Box 310
Hay River, N.W.T. X0E 0R0
(Hay River)
(Deputy Speaker and Chairman of
Committees)

The Honourable Thomas Butters, M.L.A.
Box 1069
Inuvik, N.W.T. X0E 0T0
(Inuvik)
(Minister of Natural and Cultural Affairs)

Mr. Dave Nickerson, M.L.A.
Box 1778
Yellowknife, N.W.T. X0E 1H0
(Yellowknife North)

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

Mr. Ludy Pudluk, M.L.A.
Box 22
Resolute Bay, N.W.T. X0A 0V0
(High Arctic)

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. William Lyall, M.L.A.
Box 24
Cambridge Bay, N.W.T. X0E 0C0
(Central Arctic)

Mr. Richard Whitford, M.L.A.
Site 15, Box 8
Yellowknife, N.W.T. X0E 1H0
(Great Slave Lake)

OFFICERS

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

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

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

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

LEGAL ADVISOR

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

11 May 1978

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	114
Questions and Returns	114
Reports of Standing and Special Committees	116
Notices of Motion	116
Notices of Motion for First Reading of Bills:	
- Bill 7-65 Territorial Court Ordinance	117
- Bill 18-65 Senior Citizens Land Tax Relief Ordinance	117
Motions	118
Tabling of Documents	121
Third Reading of Bills:	
- Bill 5-65 Municipal Ordinance	123
- Bill 15-65 Electoral District Boundaries Commission Ordinance	123
Assent to Bills:	
- Bill 5-65 Municipal Ordinance	124
- Bill 15-65 Electoral District Boundaries Commission Ordinance	124
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Bill 9-65 Tobacco Tax Ordinance	125
- Bill 16-65 Senior Citizens Benefits Ordinance	125
- Bill 10-65 Engineering, Geological and Geophysical Professions Ordinance	141
- Bill 2-65 Child Welfare Ordinance	153
- Bill 4-65 Territorial Hospital Insurance Services Ordinance	154
Report of the Committee of the Whole of:	
- Bill 9-65 Tobacco Tax Ordinance	141
- Bill 16-65 Senior Citizens Benefits Ordinance	141
- Bill 10-65 Engineering, Geological and Geophysical Professions Ordinance	152
- Bill 2-65 Child Welfare Ordinance	154
- Bill 4-65 Territorial Hospital Insurance Services Ordinance	158
Orders of the Day	159

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

THURSDAY, MAY 11, 1978

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

ITEM NO. 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

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

Item 3, questions and returns. Hon. Peter Ernerk.

ITEM NO. 3: QUESTIONS AND RETURNS

Return To Question W8-65: Motel And Bathhouse, Lac La Martre

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, I have a reply to Question W8-65, asked by Mr. Whitford on May 10, 1978, regarding the use of STEP, Subsidized Term Employment Program, funds to complete the motel/bathhouse in Lac La Martre.

There has been no request for STEP funds to complete work on the Lac La Martre motel/bathhouse. To date Lac La Martre has received funding for this project as follows: federal government community employment strategy, \$50,000; federal LIP, Local Initiative Program, project, \$19,500; Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, a total amount of \$3000. Total \$72,500. If it is the desire of the settlement council to seek STEP funds to complete the project, their request should be submitted to the Department of Economic Development and Tourism, regional office in Fort Smith through the area economic development officer in Yellowknife.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further returns? Hon. Tom Butters.

Return To Question W11-65: Caribou Bones For Dog Food

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Yesterday the Honourable Member for Yellowknife North asked the following question: Why will the game department not allow caribou bones to be fed to dogs in Yellowknife? The answer as provided by the wildlife department, or the Department of Natural and Cultural Affairs is that "the bones and other parts of game animals not suitable for human consumption may be fed to animals according to the Game Ordinance. However, section 16(1)(c) of the Game Ordinance states: No person who has killed, taken or acquired game shall allow any part thereof that is suitable for human consumption to be used as bait in hunting or to be fed to any animal."

The only exception to this section is the meat of bear. Game means big game, small game, birds of prey, fur bearing animals, predatory animals and any part of them. Warnings have been issued to individuals, both general hunting licence holders and sports hunters resident in the Yellowknife area concerning situations where it was suspected that caribou meat was being fed to dogs. No charges were laid in these cases. Wildlife officials have, on occasion, suggested to caribou sport hunters, dog owners, that they may be able to use stripped caribou bones for dog feed.

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

Return To Question W7-65: Vehicle For Social Development In Cambridge Bay

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 10, the Member from the Central Arctic, Mr. Lyall, asked Question W7-65 concerning what progress the Department of Health and Social Services was making in obtaining a new vehicle for their office at Cambridge Bay. I am pleased to advise Mr. Lyall that a new nine passenger suburban vehicle has been ordered for Cambridge Bay and is scheduled to arrive on this years barge delivery. Say thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further returns? Questions, written questions. Mr. Whitford.

Question W12-65: Care In Transit PWA

MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the news they said that the Japanese explorer or expedition had been charged a \$500 fine for the way they handled the dogs that died in the aircraft going to be used to make the trip to the North Pole. Mr. Speaker, I hope also that the administration is seriously looking at PWA, Pacific Western Airlines, who I think should be controlled as well in transporting this kind of thing, or rather, I am sorry, the dogs other than in the way that they did. I think the administration should write a letter and express the way that PWA is doing this.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Whitford, what is your question?

MR. WHITFORD: Sorry, sir. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask that the administration write a letter to PWA telling them that the way in which they carried the dogs for the Japanese explorer to Resolute Bay was very bad and that in the future PWA should take more care in this kind of transport for dogs.

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

Question W13-65: Jean Marie Sawmill

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker, has the administration any plans to see that the, as of yet, unpaid creditors of the Jean Marie sawmill are properly compensated?

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice and provide a reply later.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further written questions?

Item 4, oral questions.

Item 5, petitions.

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

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

Report Of The Standing Committee On Legislation

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, the standing committee on legislation met today and I will be tabling its report at the proper time.

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

Item 7, notices of motion for first reading of bills. I understand that neither Bill 7-65 nor Bill 18-65 listed there are in fact yet printed or available.

So, going on to Item 8, notices of motion. Mr. Nickerson.

ITEM NO. 8: NOTICES OF MOTION

Notice Of Motion 6-65: Production Of Papers Re Bid Bonding And Dempster Highway

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on Friday, the 12th of May, 1978, I will introduce a motion for the production of papers:

NOW THEREFORE, I move seconded by the Honourable Member for the High Arctic that the following papers be produced:

- (a) Report on bid bonding prepared for Northwest Territories Department of Public Works and
- (b) The federal government paper on management plans for the Dempster highway.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of motion? Mr. Pudluk.

Notice Of Motion 7-65: Development Of A Hamlet Ordinance

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give a notice of motion and I will move, on Friday, May 12th, 1978, the following:

WHEREAS the provisions relating to hamlets are now found in the Municipal Ordinance together with those which relate only to villages, towns and cities;

AND WHEREAS this situation creates unnecessary difficulties for members of hamlet councils and hamlet officials;

AND WHEREAS the Baffin regional council has attempted to correct this situation by preparing a proposed hamlet ordinance which was tabled two days ago;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this Assembly request the administration to develop a hamlet ordinance based on the Baffin regional council's proposal for introduction at the fall session in 1978.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further notices of motion? Mr. Lyall.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, first of all I have a question. I think you went by the bill we discussed this morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Lyall, I am told by the Clerk that Bill 7-65 and Bill 18-65, although they may have been looked at by your committee have not yet been printed and are not yet for some reason available to us. You can certainly give notice, you can give notice.

Notice Of Motion 8-65: Appointments To Standing Committee On Legislation.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that tomorrow, Friday, May 12, I will be moving the following motion:

WHEREAS a vacancy exists in the membership of the standing committee on legislation;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that Mr. William Lafferty be appointed to this committee.

Notice Of Motion 9-65: Standing Committee On Legislation, Terms Of Reference.

I will also move the following motion:

WHEREAS the standing committee on legislation has in the past encountered various difficulties carrying out the responsibilities assigned to it;

AND WHEREAS certain of these difficulties could be resolved by changes in the committee's terms of reference;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that the proposed terms of reference attached as schedule A be adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: I think, gentlemen, that we should return to Item 7 and give notice of those two bills. We can not go on to first reading yet because they are not available but certainly they could properly be given notice of. So, returning to Item 7, notices of motion for first reading of bills.

ITEM NO. 7: NOTICES OF MOTION FOR FIRST READING OF BILLS

Bill 7-65, Territorial Court Ordinance. Hon. Peter Ernerk.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, I am very confused now. I understand this piece of legislation has not been distributed to the Members. It has been discussed by Mr. Lyall's committee. It is in its first draft but it has not been distributed to the Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Peter Ernerk, I thought I had indicated that though it would not be proper to give first reading because it is not distributed, it is on the order paper for notice of first reading which would, presumably, take place tomorrow. Even though it is not distributed, you can properly give notice that you plan to move first reading at some time in the future. If you do not wish to give notice, however, that is up to you.

Bill 7-65: Territorial Court Ordinance

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on May 12th, 1978, I shall move that Bill 7-65, An Ordinance Respecting the Territorial Court and the Judges Thereof, be read for the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 18-65, Hon. Arnold McCallum.

Bill 18-65: Senior Citizens Land Tax Relief Ordinance

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on Friday, May 12th, 1978, I shall move that Bill 18-65, An Ordinance to Provide Tax Relief for Senior Citizens, be read for the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, are there any other notices of motion under Item 8?
Item 9, motions for the production of papers.

Item 10, motions.

ITEM NO. 10: MOTIONS

Motions 2-65, 3-65, 4-65 and 5-65 apparently have been given notice of.
Motion 2-65, respecting appointments to the Workers' Compensation Board,
Hon. Arnold McCallum.

Motion 2-65: Appointments To Workers' Compensation Board

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS three vacancies will shortly exist in the membership of the
Workers' Compensation Board;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this Assembly recommend to the Commissioner
that the following persons be appointed to the Workers' Compensation
Board for terms of two years each: Mr. John Kachmar, Mr. Dale Johnson
and Mr. William Berezowski.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion 2-65, Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. All in favour? Down. Contrary?
Carried.

---Carried

Motion 3-65, Appointments to the Northwest Territories Water Board.
Mr. Lyall.

Motion 3-65: Appointment To N.W.T. Water Board

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS a vacancy exists in the membership of the Northwest Territories
Water Board;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this Assembly request the Commissioner to
convey to the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs its recommendation
that Mr. Darcy Edward Arden be appointed to fill that vacancy.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion 3-65, Carried

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

---Carried

Motion 4-65, Marketing of Freshwater Fish, Mr. Nickerson.

Motion 4-65: Marketing Of Freshwater Fish.

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Speaker:

NOW THEREFORE, I move seconded by the Honourable Member for Hay River, that at a suitable time to be set by the Speaker, this House resolve itself into committee of the whole to study problems related to the marketing of freshwater fish.

MR. SPEAKER: You are the seconder, Mr. Stewart?

MR. STEWART: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion 4-65, Carried

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

---Carried

Motion 5-65, Mr. Lyall.

Motion 5-65: Banning Organized Hunts.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, Motion 5-65:

WHEREAS organized hunts tend to result in the killing of about twice as many animals as are required;

AND WHEREAS the peoples of the North are considering moving back onto the land;

AND WHEREAS organized hunts are the main cause of the depletion of animals;

NOW THEREFORE, I move that this Assembly strongly request the administration to immediately discontinue funding organized hunts.

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

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I have in the past watched how the game management has been saying that the caribou herds are going down in numbers. I, personally, believe that the organized hunts which are funded by this administration should be responsible enough not to try and fund these organized hunts. I notice around Yellowknife every year, at least three times in the newspaper, you see that people are going out in Twin Otters by the load and they get amongst a herd of caribou which might number in the thousands and they just get out there and start shooting. They can only bring in so many caribou in an airplane. Also, when they start shooting they hit about maybe twice as many animals as fall down and the animals that are being hit die off after they have been running for a while. I think the Bathurst herd is going down pretty fast. So this is my big worry, that if these people are considering going back to the land, if you want to hunt traditionally, I do not think you should be using aircraft to go and do organized hunts. There is a much neater way to do that, I think, than to use an airplane.

Protecting The Wildlife

I notice that a lot of people in Yellowknife, when they arrive in town and so on, blame it on the native peoples, that they are doing it. They slaughter them in town here, they go and kill caribou and they do not even use the meat. Even about a month ago a member of our proud force here in the Northwest Territories threw away caribou meat in the dump. If people like that are doing it, I think that we should strongly, this Assembly should strongly ask this administration to quit funding organized hunts. I do not believe in it. As I say, I think it is the worst way to hunt any animal, especially being funded by the people who are trying to protect the wildlife of the Northwest Territories. I, again, would like strongly, Mr. Speaker, to ask this Assembly to support this motion with all the effort we could give it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Lyall, if I may say so from the chair with respect to the case you mentioned, that has been disposed of by the courts and I know as a matter of my own knowledge that the young man in question was acquitted of any wrongdoing. Mr. Whitford.

MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House to take this motion, to put it into committee of the whole basically because it concerns my constituency, that of Rae, Rae Lakes, Edzo, Lac La Martre, Snare Lake and Detah, along with part of the constituency of the Honourable Member from Yellowknife North, Mr. Nickerson, and he works closely with the Detah people in organized caribou hunts. Now, some of the examples from the Central Arctic, what Mr. Lyall just said, some of the points he made were of the case where the caribou was taken from the dump to the courts and another one where he heard around Yellowknife that there were people, not just native people but other people who had caribou in their back yards. I do not think that they should cite these as what the native people are doing. The native people are taking their meat and using it for the old as well as those people who can not get back to the land for other medical reasons. So, I ask strongly that this particular motion be put into committee of the whole. In the meantime there is a letter coming in from the chief and band council of Rae, the head chief of all these communities and I have not yet received that letter although I have received a letter today from the chief of the Detah village. Again I say at some time suitable to yourself, sir, and the Members of this Assembly that we discuss this motion in committee of the whole.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Whitford, you have to, in fact, as I understand the Rules, say "I move that this matter be referred to committee of the whole."

MR. WHITFORD: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, sometimes there are ways of having these...

MR. SPEAKER: That is why I am helping you by telling you, that that is what you should do before you sit down.

Motion To Move Motion 5-65 Into Committee Of The Whole

MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that this motion be put into committee of the whole at a time suitable to the rest of the Members of the Legislature.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Steen, on the motion to move into committee of the whole.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest on referring this motion to committee of the whole that we get some figures from the administration as to how much has it been costing the government for landed, per pound, landed meat that was derived from organized hunts. I understand that sometimes these organized hunts, the end result was about four dollars a pound or greater and that it would be cheaper -- probably we will have a chance to get better guidance in order to come to a good decision as to whether or not we should ban organized hunts and perhaps we can request the administration to bring all their resource people to help us out on that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion To Move Motion 5-65 Into Committee Of The Whole, Carried

MR. SPEAKER: The question being called on the motion being put by Mr. Whitford to refer this motion of Mr. Lyall's into committee of the whole. On that motion all in favour? Down. Contrary? The motion is carried.

--Carried

Mr. Clerk, would you put it on the order paper for committee of the whole discussion?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): I have, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Those are all of the motions.

Item 11, tabling of documents. Mr. Fraser.

ITEM NO. 11: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

MR. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, did we get a vote on Mr. Lyall's motion?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Fraser, we did not vote on Mr. Lyall's motion because Mr. Whitford's motion had the effect of deferring discussion to committee of the whole. That motion of Mr. Lyall's will be voted on in committee of the whole, concluding its discussion. All right?

MR. FRASER: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Lyall.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the following:

Tabled Document 12-65: Report of Standing Committee on Legislation Concerning Certain Bills to be Introduced at the 65th Session of Council.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Mr. Steen.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I was going to say that I feel that perhaps in addition to Mr. Whitford's motion that we have these people, the administration agree to come before the committee of the whole and I should have probably made a motion or added to Mr. Whitford's motion an order to get these people here.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Steen. I rather expect the administration would do that because that is when witnesses can be heard. Hon. Tom Butters is the Minister responsible and would you like to very quickly, because we are kind of outside the Rules here but very quickly indicate that you will or you will not satisfy Mr. Steen.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: What you indicated will be the procedure and our officials are aware that this is on the order paper and are preparing information at the present time and will be present for this discussion.

MR. STEEN: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there further documents to be tabled? Hon. Peter Ernerk.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the following:

Tabled Document 13-65: A letter from the general manager, Mr. John B. Nye, of the International Fund for Animal Welfare, a letter to the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories in which he indicated to the Commissioner that he will be in Europe and unfortunately his plans include remaining there for the month of May. That is referring to Mr. Brian Davies, the head of that organization.

MR. SPEAKER: I think we would be interested to know, Hon. Peter Ernerk, the results of your inquiries with respect to Brigitte Bardot. Are there any further documents to be tabled?

Item 12, introduction of bills for first reading. Now, in that Bills 7-65 and 18-65 are not here, the only one we can deal with is Bill 11-65, Petroleum Products Tax Ordinance.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I gave notice on this because I was not informed it would be introduced today. I thought it would be coming in tomorrow but if it is to come in today I can give notice and then give first reading, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The reason it is on for first reading is that I assumed notice was given yesterday or the day before. However, if you are not prepared to move first reading we can stand it down. Hon. Tom Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: While we are on the subject, if I could be permitted to return to giving notice I would give notice of the bill at this time and if it is ready it can be brought in this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: Let me just ask the Clerk.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, notice has been given.

MR. SPEAKER: I am advised notice has been given and is the bill in the Members' books? No? Well, if it is not in the books, we will stand it down.

Item 13, second reading of bills. Is Bill 14-65 ready for second reading? Hon. Peter Ernerk.

HON. PETER ERNERK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: So there are no bills for second reading.

Item 14, third reading of bills.

ITEM NO. 14: THIRD READING OF BILLS

Bill 5-65, Municipal Ordinance. Hon. Arnold McCallum.

Third Reading Of Bill 5-65: Municipal Ordinance.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 5-65, An Ordinance to Amend the Municipal Ordinance, be read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Hon. Peter Ernerk. Discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

---Carried

Bill 15-65, Electoral District Boundaries Commission Ordinance, Hon. Arnold McCallum.

Third Reading Of Bill 15-65: Electoral District Boundaries Commission Ordinance.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 15-65, An Ordinance to Establish an Electoral District Boundaries Commission, be read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Hon. Tom Butters. Discussion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

---Carried

Item 15, assent to bills.

ITEM NO. 15: ASSENT TO BILLS.

Bills 5-65 and 15-65 at this time only. Mr. Clerk, would you see if the
Commissioner is available to assent to Bills 5-65 and 15-65?

Assent To Bills 5-65 And 15-65.

COMMISSIONER HODGSON: Please be seated. As Commissioner of the Northwest
Territories, I assent to Bill 5-65 and Bill 15-65.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 16, consideration in committee of the whole of bills,
recommendations to the Legislature and other matters.

ITEM NO. 16: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS,
RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE LEGISLATURE AND OTHER MATTERS

What is the wish of the Executive with respect to the business of this House?

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, we could probably go on to Bill 10-65,
Engineering, Geological and Geophysical Professions Ordinance. No?

MR. SPEAKER: My recollection is that on Bills 9-65 and 16-65 progress was
simply reported at the conclusion of yesterdays debate and they were not
completed. Do you want to complete them?

HON. PETER ERNERK: My mistake, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: This House will resolve into committee of the whole for continued
consideration of -- Mr. Stewart.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, after spending yesterday afternoon having a
nicotine fit and getting older by the minute, I would wish someone to
replace me in the chair for those two bills.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Fraser, would you complete committee or complete the two
Bills 9-65 and 16-65 by chairing them?

MR. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Lyall requested to go to the chair
for a while this afternoon. If he wants to, it is all right with me.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Lyall, are you prepared to take the chair for the
completion of discussion on Bills 9-65 and 16-65?

MR. LYALL: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: In that case, this House will resolve into committee of the
whole for continued consideration of Bills 9-65 and 16-65, with Mr. Lyall
in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into committee of the whole for consideration of Bill 9-65, Tobacco Tax Ordinance, and Bill 16-65, Senior Citizens Benefits Ordinance, with Mr. Lyall in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL 9-65,
TOBACCO TAX ORDINANCE, AND BILL 16-65, SENIOR CITIZENS BENEFITS ORDINANCE

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Committee will come to order. I would like to ask the committee, we were on general comments on both of these bills and is it the wish of this House to do one or shall we keep on going back and forth like we were doing yesterday? Mr. Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, I think the better approach to this question would be to deal with the Senior Citizens Benefits Ordinance first and after we have completed the discussion on that then we will be in a position to know how much taxes we will have to raise by means of additional tobacco taxation. I think that would be the proper order to deal with these two bills.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): What is the wish of this House? Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Discussion On Bill 16-65, Senior Citizens Benefits Ordinance

So, we go to Bill 16-65, An Ordinance Respecting Senior Citizens Benefits. Comments of a general nature. The purpose of this bill is to authorize the government to pay certain benefits to senior citizens resident in the Northwest Territories out of funds allocated for the purpose by the Legislature. Comments of a general nature. Mr. Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: This is not a comment of a general nature but I would like some information from the administration which they probably have anticipated anyway. I would like to know what the old age pension paid at the moment is, how many dollars per month, what the maximum GIS, guaranteed income supplement, is at present and what are the conditions that have to be complied with in order for a person to be eligible for GIS.

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I just want to get it straight what Mr. Nickerson is requesting. He wants to know what the actual GIS payment is now? The spouse allowances?

MR. NICKERSON: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that all GIS payments are not equal. There is probably a maximum amount and depending on the old age pensioner's other income he may for instance just get one dollar from GIS or he might get the full amount.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Is Mr. Nickerson looking for the range?

MR. NICKERSON: I would like to know what the maximum GIS supplement is and what the conditions are, what is the maximum amount of other income an old age pensioner is allowed to have before he becomes eligible for a guaranteed income supplement.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, if you just give me a moment.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Mr. Lafferty is calling on a point of order.

MR. LAFFERTY: I would like the administration to tell us what GIS is.

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

MR. LAFFERTY: We are using short forms and it is obvious many of us do not understand these abbreviations.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): GIS is guaranteed income supplement. Has the Minister found himself yet?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I understand that Mr. Lafferty asked the question what GIS was or is.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): I told him what it was. Mr. Minister, he says he would like to know all the short forms that you are using such as GIS and if you are going to be using other short forms. I think really what he wants to understand is what it really is.

Explanation Of Guaranteed Income Supplement

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, the guaranteed income supplement is paid to pensioners, old age pensioners as an amount of social assistance that would allow them to purchase goods and services that they would not be able to get if they were only under the old age security program. OAS, old age security, is the other acronym, if you like, that is used. In relation to what Mr. Nickerson asked, Mr. Chairman, the old age security program provides for an amount of \$156.66 a month, \$156.66. The maximum amount allowed under the guaranteed income supplement is \$109.88 per month. The amount of income that one would have to make, obviously needed to get the \$109, he would have no income. In order to get the least amount of 88 cents he could have an income of up to \$2639.

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

MR. NICKERSON: I must apologize, Mr. Chairman. I did not catch those figures. I wonder if we could have the last part repeated, please?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, with an income of \$2639 the amount of GIS one could get would be 88 cents. With no income they would get \$109.88.

MR. NICKERSON: In the \$2639 that would be income other than old age pension income, would it not?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NICKERSON: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Any further comments of a general nature? Mr. Fraser.

MR. FRASER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister a question. I have had a few queries on the differential in old age payments, old age pension cheques for an individual and they would like to know why a cheque differs from month to month. Sometimes it is small and sometimes it is bigger. I could not answer that question. I do not know whether he could or not.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Mr. Fraser, next time you speak could you pull your mike a little closer? Mr. Minister.

Variance In Old Age Pension Cheques

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I do not know why there would be a difference, a variance, in the amount of money unless there is an accompanying payment being made or something. I can not answer that question. I could look at it further and try to come back with something for the Member but right off I have no reason. I can not tell him anything about the variance.

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

MR. FRASER: Maybe I can get together later with the Minister and maybe we can get the persons concerned and find out why the differential.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Agreed. Any comments of a general nature? Mr. Steen.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, can I have the Minister responsible for Social Services advise us as to what is the amount presently for the old age people? I mean what are they getting now as far as old age assistance?

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, the amounts that I indicated to Mr. Nickerson are the amounts. The federal old age security program provides \$156.66 per month. We provide guaranteed income supplement up to a maximum of \$109.88 per month, that is from 88 cents to \$109.88, depending upon the amount of other income.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Mr. Steen, the monthly old age pension is \$156.66 and the GIS is \$109.88. That is about enough for half a man to live on. Mr. Stewart.

MR. STEWART: The Minister yesterday gave us some mean figures relative to tobacco tax. I wonder if he could also give us some mean figures regarding pensions across Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Bill 16-65, An Ordinance Respecting Senior Citizens Benefits.

MR. STEWART: My question is relevant to that section. I said that yesterday he gave us mean figures with regard to the tobacco tax. Could he give us a mean figure with regard to pensions by other provinces in Canada?

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

Various Old Age Pension Programs

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether I understand the request of the Member. The federal program provides for \$156.66 a month to all people over 65 years of age. Our income supplement is dependent upon whether it is a single pensioner in order to be eligible for it or whether there are two people, a married pensioner with a spouse in receipt of a spouse's allowance. A married couple of pensioners, a married pensioner with a non-pensioner spouse, if the husband is 66 and the wife is under 65, that is a different matter again in terms of getting the additional income that we provide. To provide the Member what is paid out across the country I really do not know but the federal program is consistent across the country. Various provinces have various programs which they would use to augment the income of pensioners. I do not have that information as to what the individual province's schemes are. I guess I could get them.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to be obstinate but it seems when it is to the advantage of the administration on a matter of trying to convince us of right and wrong they have mean figures available. In the Northwest Territories where we know the cost of living is higher than anywhere else in Canada, what I am trying to establish is is this being recognized in our pension system or not? I take it from your answer that it is not. Is that right, Mr. Minister?

Programs In Other Jurisdictions

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I think the reason we have a guaranteed income supplement is to take that into consideration, Mr. Chairman. I could indicate to the Member that various provinces supplement the old age security program. I am not sure what session but I think a couple of sessions ago, it may have been under the former minister of this program who did in fact table this information, one or both of the former ministers. In Alberta there is legislation called the Senior Citizens Benefit Act where the maximum benefit to a person a month is \$47.20. They must qualify for federal guaranteed income supplements. The piece of legislation British Columbia has is the Guaranteed Available Income for Need Act and the maximum benefit in that province under that program is \$49.83 per month. Their eligibility criterion is they must qualify for the federal guaranteed income supplement and not all GIS recipients qualify. In Manitoba there is a Social Services Administration Act which pays quarterly amounts to people who qualify under the federal GIS program and again not all people under GIS are eligible.

These provinces have other benefits available to persons under age 65. In Alberta they get free or assisted health services, a property tax reduction, a maximum of \$200. In British Columbia there is rent assistance, a rebate on property tax. In Manitoba there is a property tax rebate, or there was and I am not sure if it is still in effect under the new government. In most of the provinces there is some kind of supplement to this OAS, old age security payment and the amounts vary from eight dollars and some odd cents to \$53.59 in Ontario.

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

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, the old age pension, as I understand it from the Minister is \$156.66 and that I presume is per individual. If he has a spouse, does she get the same amount again on guaranteed income supplement, does only one get it, or do both of them get it?

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

Federal Programs

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Under the federal program, Mr. Chairman, people over 65 years get, or are eligible for the old age security program. In the GIS program that we have, there are various categories. For a sole pensioner, for a married couple both pensioners, for a married pensioner with a non-pensioner spouse and the other category would be married pensioner with a spouse who is in receipt of the spouse's allowance. With spouse allowances people can get full or partial allowance under this program the same as they can under GIS.

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

MR. STEWART: Yes, I would like to pursue the point I am trying to make. Let us assume we have a man who has a spouse, who is on the poverty line, exactly how much money over the age of 65 are they able to collect in the Northwest Territories?

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, they would be able to be eligible for the total of both the GIS and the old age security.

MR. STEWART: That is doubled, or is that doubled, do you take the \$109.88 and the \$156.66, add them together and double them for two people? Is that correct?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Depending upon the amount of other income they would have, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STEWART: I said on the poverty level.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Yes, that is correct.

MR. STEWART: Thank you.

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

Information Paper Needed

MR. FRASER: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to find out whether the administration could procure a piece of paper like they did yesterday for the House here and give us the different rates and allowances and stuff. Would it be possible for the administration to maybe table a document, something like they did yesterday giving us this information?

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: The information I read out that refers to the various provinces is a tabled piece of information that was tabled, I think it was two sessions previous. We will attempt to get some kind of a cheat sheet if you like, to give you something there, to give you some pertinent information on it. We will work on that and see if we can get something done.

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

MR. FRASER: I take it the administration is going to prepare a document and circulate it in the House here.

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

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

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, I am not very pleased with some of the things that were said by the Minister over there. I do not feel that the old age people should be subjected to deductions from their old age pension or their supplementary just because they went out and got an extra few dollars. I think the Minister said, depending upon how much other income the old age people make, they are subject to deductions from their old age pension, or their supplement. I feel that if a person wants to work after he is eligible to receive the supplement, then that should be his choice, he should not be subjected to deductions. After all, I believe people live longer if they are more active and I think, perhaps, maybe the impression I am getting is that you are destroying his initiative, so that then you bypass him and do not pay the supplement.

Eligibility For Benefits

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I think the Member is playing with some of the words I said and took them out of context and got the wrong meaning from them. I, in no way, said that we were going to deduct money from the old age security program, that is a federal program. Regardless of whether or not you work, in Canada you are eligible for that benefit. The guaranteed income supplement is a program that is set up to assist people who do not have any other income other than the old age security benefit.

The legislation was passed that would allow them to receive a certain benefit dependent upon the amount of extra income they have. We are not saying and I never said that when you are over 65 you should not work, not at all.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Mr. Chairman, I am still not satisfied with the answers.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I can not do much better.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, I think that we should have regardless, after the person reaches a certain age he should be eligible to receive his pension, or supplement, or whatever, without looking at what he is making, without looking at what other funds he may be making. I think after he reaches a certain age, everyone should be treated as such.

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I do not like to fight apple pie, motherhood and the flag. I agree with what the Member is saying. I am simply reiterating that I had never indicated that we should have people not work after 65. The old age security program is a federal program, guaranteed income supplement is a federal program, and the legislation there indicates that if you have a certain amount of extra income then you get a certain amount under the guaranteed income supplement.

Social Assistance, Not Welfare

The point of this whole exercise was, as Mr. Nickerson has so eloquently put it many times, what we are trying to do is not give welfare. GIS, is a social service, social assistance. We wanted to increase the pension and we went through that yesterday. Under the existing conditions with the federal government and what you decided as a House yesterday, we would pay increased social assistance under this bill. We did not make the legislation, what we are trying to get is new legislation in to assist more.

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

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to make a motion to amend the legislation before us to accommodate those who have been trying to suggest that we make provision in there that regardless of what a person makes, he is entitled to receive such funds, and perhaps, with the assistance of the Legal Advisor, probably you could draw up the proper wording.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): I am told that by making that motion you would be repeating the same motion that was made by Mr. Nickerson yesterday. I think he was using you a little bit there, he went over and then you made that motion. You should not let him do that to you. Anyway, that motion of yours Mr. Steen, is not legal.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, just on a point of privilege, I think I really have not seen the motion that Mr. Nickerson made yesterday and perhaps if I saw it, perhaps I could withdraw mine.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Yes, Mr. Steen. Hon. Tom Butters.

Information On Poverty Line Requested

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Sir, just to add to Mr. Fraser's request that we also be provided with the information as to the current figure that relates to the poverty line in Canada and a similar figure, if one has been determined, for the territories. My assumption is that the Canadian one is about \$2650 but I would like to have that confirmed. If there is a poverty line figure for the territories, I would like to know that as well.

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, we will attempt to provide that information.

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

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, using the guaranteed income supplement as \$109.88 and the old age pension at \$156.66, I understand these are maximum figures on the poverty line and if my addition is correct, it comes to \$266.54 for two people. Now, I am not sure that that is right.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Yes.

MR. STEWART: Now, if that is correct, is there any other social welfare that is available to people, because we all know there is absolutely no way that two people can live in their own home, or exist on \$266.54, it is not possible?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEWART: This is what I am trying to find out, I am trying to find out if added social assistance is provided on the side.

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

Cases Where Hardship Is Identified

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, there is no other program as such that we do within the department that deals with particular cases, specific cases where there is a hardship identified. I can not argue with what the Member has said, but again, you must remember that these programs are federal programs. We do not make the legislation.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Mr. Stewart, I think there should be a little bit better explanation on this. Hon. Arnold McCallum, I get the feeling that Mr. Stewart is saying that for two people, they get \$266.54 per month and I think you said before, if I am correct in thinking, you said that this was for one person only. Is that right?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): So, if you have two people, that means you get over \$500 a month. Is that right?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: It is \$533.08.

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

MR. STEWART: That clarifies the point I was trying to find out. I was not sure but \$533.08 in the Northwest Territories is certainly not very much money. I suppose, in part, that when we sit here as a group of people and we are arguing about a supplement that allows you \$25, or \$30, we are really not talking in terms of any amount of money that will be of much assistance to anybody.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Especially if everybody does not get it.

Proposed Amount Not Enough

MR. STEWART: I suppose to those who do not need it, \$30 is not too little but to those who do, \$30 really still is not any kind of an amount of money that will be of much assistance. On \$533, if people are living in their own homes and trying to maintain a home, there is no way in the territories, even in a place such as Yellowknife or Hay River, in the so-called lower cost areas. You can not exist. You are now back into a cabin, a log cabin with a kerosene lamp in it and a water bucket and the bog pails, and everything that goes with it to be able to exist on this kind of money. It is not possible in the territories.

The point I am trying to make is that surely we should be able to make a presentation to the federal people that if this is the amount they are paying across Canada, that because of the higher costs of living in the Northwest Territories which they recognize in the fact that they pay supplements, not supplements, but bonuses to federal employees in the amount of \$150 plus housing subsidies and everything else to their own employees in the Northwest Territories, to assume that our old age people can live on this kind of money seems to me to be absolutely ridiculous. Surely we must be able to make a case that this amount of money is not sufficient if they want, indeed, the older people to maintain their own homes and be able to live in them. This kind of money is fine if you have a senior citizens' home where they are able to get in for \$50 a month and the light and everything is paid. This kind of money then probably would suffice but certainly it will not suffice if they want to try and maintain themselves as long as they can under their own roof. What I am suggesting to you is that you are forcing people and I do not mean by that you, Mr. Minister, but the government is forcing people to say "Okay, sell the house. We will go into the old age or senior citizens' home because that is the only way we can exist." I am not sure that this is right.

Government Policy Is Inconsistent

It seems to me that if there is any time in a person's life after they have worked a full lifetime and want to stay in their own home and exist that they should be allowed to as long as they are capable of staying and looking after themselves. This kind of an old age pension scheme in the Northwest Territories forces them to take the other route and give up everything they have got and move into the senior citizens' places. This is exactly what it does. Of course it is not inconsistent with what the government is doing in every other way. I have said in this House before and I will say a man is a damned fool to own a house in this country and pay taxes. Everybody should be in subsidized housing. The thing is getting absolutely ridiculous. On the one hand, we have this Assembly and people within the government trying to encourage home ownership and it is completely and absolutely impossible in the present situation. This is another indication right here with these figures.

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I recognize and appreciate the remarks the Member has made. I am not opposed to them at all or in any way arguing against his particular beliefs. I think one of the things that we would have to realize is that because these are federal programs and the implications, undoubtedly they were looked at in some detail by the federal government to enter into in this case, in the case of social assistance, into the recognition of regionalization, the disparity in regions of Canada concerning the cost of living. I think that is one of the difficulties we would have had or we believe we would have had, this government would have in terms of trying to put the universality concept in to a piece of legislation.

Relief For Home Owners

As Members will know from the notices of motion of first reading of bills today, I intend to introduce a bill to allow municipalities and this government to give tax relief to home owners of single family dwellings within the municipalities. We recognize that this is a difficulty and I think that because we do recognize that, this is an indication on our part that we are attempting to do something with people who are senior citizens who are having difficulty in not only maintaining their own home but as well, paying taxes for their land and improvements. We recognize that that becomes a hardship and because we recognize it we, within the government, are prepared to enter into agreements with municipalities to give more benefits to senior citizens, especially those who own their own homes and live in single family dwellings within the municipalities. Our difficulty with this and again I recognize and appreciate what the Member has said, we are tied at the present time within federal legislation which will allow us only to do that which we are doing now. With this bill giving greater benefits to senior citizens and with hopefully the tax relief bill we would be showing people and indeed senior citizens that we are wanting to do something to benefit them.

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

MR. STEWART: Mr. Minister, with all due respect, I know it is not this local government's fault but the federal government recognizes when they hire people, give them a northern allowance, give them subsidized housing and yet when it comes to an old age pension scheme for people who have put their whole lives in the Northwest Territories they completely disregard the extra cost of living that they recognize for their own employees. Surely to God there has got to be something wrong with that kind of an approach. If people are able to work and getting the salaries that many of the federal civil servants have plus their northern allowance, plus their subsidized housing and we turn around and say, "Well, old age pensions, everybody across Canada gets \$156.66 and everybody in the North gets the same thing," there has to be something wrong with their thinking. Can we not get together and put some sort of pressure that would indicate there is something wrong here?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Mr. Stewart, I think you are following the same outline that we were going on yesterday when we were talking about the motion that Mr. Nickerson made. I would like to just say that we are getting caught up again in the same rut we were in yesterday. Let us try and get out of it.

Universal Application And Means Test

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, with due respect I am not speaking about a supplement without restrictions at all. I am just saying that what they are giving is a standard amount across Canada without thinking of the added costs of living in the Northwest Territories and this is the part that I am saying is wrong. I am not saying it should not be done without -- what is the terminology that we were using yesterday -- universal application. This is not the point at all. The point is that if they are giving \$156.66 in Toronto, they surely to God should be giving probably \$300 to somebody in the Northwest Territories who has to live in some of these isolated areas. They are not recognizing it. They recognize it with their own employees because they pay them and they not only pay them, they give them added benefits, they give them northern allowance, they give them housing subsidization. Yet when it comes to the old age pensioner it is universal across Canada. With due respect, Mr. Chairman, I am not asking for a situation of universal application without a means test, that is not the point.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): I know that is not the point but I meant the path was going about the same way it was. Hon. David Searle.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Carrying on, Mr. Chairman, to discuss the matter of what is a fair sum and at the risk of repeating what was said yesterday, as I understand the comments under the Tobacco Tax Ordinance, this year for cigarettes we are forecasting a receipt of about \$400,000. The sum that they are forecasting to receive in the first year at one cent a cigarette is \$1.3 million. In other words, there would be a net increase to this government of \$900,000. The sum of \$25 then to pay back to each one of 1000 pensioners comes to something like \$300,000, which is what they are proposing to spend on pensioners after having collected for pensioners \$900,000. My proposal simply is for us to recommend \$75 a month be paid out to pensioners which times 1000 pensioners times 12 months comes to \$900,000 which is exactly the amount that has been collected and that, as you know, is about two dollars and 50 cents a day. Not very much when you start to think of it in those terms. That is the sort of thing I would like to put forward but I am not going to put it forward because it seems I have not had much success lately. Someone else has to find that an exciting and interesting argument. However, may I congratulate Mr. Steen who seems to have changed his mind overnight and feels like I did, that it should have been universal. That is all I have to say.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Shall we go clause by clause? Let us try to get going and pass it and get this thing off the table. What is the wish of this committee? General comments or go clause by clause? Clause by clause then.

Looking After Pensioners Is A Basic Fundamental

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I may be a bit of a nuisance but I do not get too many opportunities. I think one basic thing in society is that if you can not look after your old people you are involved in a society that really is not much of a society. Here we are sitting with the type of figures that are presented to us and we know that people can not exist on this in a reasonable manner in most instances. I think that this House is going to be derelict in its duty unless we try to do something about it, even if it is just by way of motion that we ask the federal government to say "Well, look, you do these other things. You pay your employees and these things and so on and yet you expect the old people left in the territories, the people who actually made the territories, you are asking them to try to get by on this kind of money."

I think we have got to come out of this with more than just getting through the bill. I agree with you. When I sit in that chair I like to get through the clauses and get out. I like the job done. However, this is such an important bill because it really analyzes the basic fundamentals. There are two things, our children and our old people and if we can not look after these two things, we are not capable of looking after anything. To think that somebody can live in places where this kind of money is provided is absolutely ridiculous and I think we should make it known loud and clear to the federal government. I will bother you no more, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): As chairman I recognize this that we want to help the old age pensioners and everything but the only thing we are doing right now with this is that we are going to give them a little bit more assistance quickly if we get this through. If we wait and make recommendations and send this bill back to the federal government we will wait six more months before we can put it in front of this Assembly. The thing is, I think, that my feeling is that we all agree with what you are saying but the thing is that we want to do like Hon. Tom Butters stated yesterday. We are trying to give them help as quickly as we can and I think we will be doing it by passing this bill. Shall we go clause by clause? Is it agreed?

---Agreed

The Chair recognizes the clock and we will break for 15 minutes for coffee.
Mr. Nickerson.

MR. STEWART: There is only one thing you must remember going clause by clause in this bill we are not being Santa Claus.

Differential On Basis Of Cost Of Living

MR. NICKERSON: Before we do go into study clause by clause it would be most helpful if the administration would give us some kind of idea as to what exactly they have in mind for payments, whether they intend it to be a fixed sum per month for all people who meet the guidelines specified here, whether or not they intend to differentiate on the basis of costs of living in various areas, whether they intend to pay people at Pelly Bay for instance a much larger amount than they intend to pay people living in Fort Smith. What plan? They must have something on paper and looked at this and looked into the costs. So, what indeed are these? I wonder if we could be advised?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): The Chair recognizes the time and we will break 15 minutes for coffee and then perhaps Hon. Arnold McCallum could give those figures if he has them. I thought he said they had a fixed amount in mind yesterday.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): The Chair recognizes a quorum.

Poverty Line

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may respond to a question that was asked by the Member from Inuvik asking about the poverty line in Canada and in the Northwest Territories. We would have to ascertain from other places, other provinces, some figures because there are several figures for Canada. We do not have them at this time and we would want to be able to pursue it the rest of the afternoon and hopefully come back tomorrow with a Canadian figure, it would be a calculated figure at that time. The comparison for the Northwest Territories could be based on the particular criteria used for other standards and this would be an estimate as well.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Any other comments of a general nature? Shall we go clause by clause? Mr. Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: I wonder if the information which I requested earlier is available now, Mr. Chairman.

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Perhaps the Member would just repeat that request which of those still outstanding, the amount?

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

The Administration's Plan

MR. NICKERSON: Obviously the administration must have some recommendations as to what the amount payable to old age pensioners by way of this supplementary benefit will actually be. They have actually given the matter some thought. They must have something in mind, there might be several alternatives from which they have chosen what in their opinion would be the best. For instance, one plan might be to pay every GIS, guaranteed income supplement recipient in the Northwest Territories an additional supplement of \$30, that would be a very simple straightforward plan but the plan might be to scale that according to the various zones which they use for social assistance purposes. I just wondered what type of plan they have and what amounts they have in mind.

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, we have looked at the particular amount that would we feel be acceptable. We began first with going back to when we were talking about imposing a hotel tax and at that time the figure that was bandied about was roughly \$25 to \$30. It is my impression that that would not meet with very much accord. So, I would propose, Mr. Chairman, that we would not tie the amount to a scale and I would propose that we would anticipate utilizing approximately \$600,000 and therefore giving approximately \$50 per month to GIS and spouse allowance recipients. So, we are talking roughly in terms of \$600,000.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Mr. Nickerson, would you like to pursue that further?

Two Examples Of Old Age Pensioners

MR. NICKERSON: No, but I have one observation to make, Mr. Chairman. I have been doing some rough calculations and I have calculated it on the basis of two individuals 65 years of age. The first individual has no income, he does not do anything and sits on the porch all day either because that is what he likes doing or that is all he is capable of doing. That individual would then receive the old age pension of \$1879.92 a year plus he would be eligible

for the total GIS amount of \$2390.56 a year and then he would also be eligible for the \$50 per month supplementary benefit, \$600 a year and that would give him a total income of \$4870.48 per year.

The second person I have calculated is for a person who has a minimal income, a person who perhaps does a little bit of carving or sews moccasins and has an income that I have taken as being \$220 a month, that would be from odd jobs or carving or hunting or a little bit of trapping. It is not very much but that would give him an income of \$2640 a year earned income which would then make him ineligible for GIS. So, in addition to that \$2640 a year he would be eligible for old age pension at \$1879.92 which would give him a total yearly income of \$4519.92 a year. So, that is the type of total income that people in these two categories, two similar categories except one does a little of trapping or carving and the other does absolutely nothing.

I did that for two reasons. One was to illustrate to Members of this committee what type of incomes individuals in these circumstances would be getting, and secondly, to point out that the person who did not trap, who did nothing at all would be getting about \$350 a year more than the person who did a little bit of marginal trapping, a little bit of marginal carving. So, in fact by implementing this we would be encouraging people not to look after themselves, not to get any additional income. I think this is the point that Mr. Steen was trying to make earlier.

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

Spending The Additional Moneys

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, now that we have heard the Minister's suggestion of \$50 a month using up some \$600,000 of the \$900,000 collected, what is the administration's proposal with respect to the other \$300,000? How do they propose to spend that?

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I think that one of the bases for increasing the tax on cigarettes would be to bring our taxation more in line and I think that is being fiscally responsible and as the Deputy Commissioner pointed out there is a need for other particular programs. He listed or indicated one or two of them yesterday when the subject of the total amount of taxation of one full cent came up. So, I think we have to become more responsible in terms of our own taxation policies, bringing it more in line with today and there are other areas I think where we could utilize or would want to utilize this to either initiate or upgrade present programs.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Deputy Commissioner Parker.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, if I could add to what Hon. Arnold McCallum has said, we can not be too precise in our expectations on the income that the tax will generate. We hope that it will generate \$900,000 but frankly it is a tax of diminishing return because the tendency seems to be against smoking. In addition to that we are not all that certain whether there will be more people who will have tended to shop in the South a bit and that sort of thing, so we are proposing that there will be some float between the tax and the figure necessary to pay the supplement to the old age pensioners. We do not think that we can be too precise and we need that area of float, if you like. As Hon. Arnold McCallum has said, as there are a number of programs this year that are badly underfunded and I mentioned just one of them the other day. However, we are certainly very, very tight in our O and M budget, we are very much better off in our capital budget this year than we are in the O and M budget. Of course the matter would be subject to review after we gain some experience in this expanded taxation field.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Are there any other comments of a general nature? Bill 16-65, clause 2, interpretation. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 3, payment of benefits. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 4, termination of benefit. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 5, recovery of benefits. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 6, non-assignability of benefits. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 7, penalties. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 8, regulations. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 9, agreement with Canada. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 10, commencement. Agreed?

---Agreed

The short title. Agreed?

---Agreed

The bill as a whole. Agreed?

---Agreed

Shall we then turn to Bill 9-65?

---Agreed

Any comments of a general nature? Bill 9-65, An Ordinance to Amend the Tobacco Tax Ordinance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Is it agreed? Clause 1. Mr. Nickerson.

Tobacco Tax Increase Too Sudden

MR. NICKERSON: It would appear, Mr. Chairman, that by increasing the tax from eight twenty-fifths of a cent, or eight cents a packet, to twenty-five twenty-fifths, or 25 cents a packet, we are imposing in one fell swoop something in excess of a 200 per cent increase in taxes. I wonder if the administration could advise us as to whether or not there is any valid reason why we could not stagger this and say, for instance, increase the tax from eight cents a packet to, say, 18 cents a packet now and probably in one year's time raise the additional seven twenty-fifths? I think that

this might not discourage as many people from smoking all at once as a huge increase all at one time and people could stand to pay an extra ten cents a packet right now but they would be pretty reluctant to pay an extra 20 cents a packet right now. So that we might be scaring lots of people off from smoking and therefore, not collecting as much tax as we otherwise might have.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Nickerson's question has not been answered, it has not been answered, and I think I should wait for the answer.

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I think that the administration, of course, would be open to suggestions and we would like to think that by increasing it the full amount it would serve the purposes for which it is intended and recognizing that to attempt to bring our taxation as it relates to cigarettes in one year is, as has been pointed out, quite a large jump, there is no question. If we were to take Mr. Nickerson's suggestion, for example, of increasing it by ten twenty-fifths of one cent, that would serve the purpose for which I just indicated we would prefer, to pay the \$50 a month to the senior citizens. I think that we would like to think we should attempt as well to increase our taxes to a degree to bring it up and make it more realistic than today's.

Implement Increase In Two Steps.

May I, Mr. Chairman, then suggest for consideration that on July 1, 1978 the tax would be twenty twenty-fifths of one cent, and on January 1, 1979 the tax would then be one full cent. Mr. Chairman, that would take into consideration Mr. Nickerson's point but it would also at least give two twenty-fifths of a cent and a little more responsibility on the part of this government. We could do it in two steps.

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

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman I think I have often expressed my views with regard to taxation in the territories. Basically, we have two items, tobacco and liquor and I must confess that I probably will pay more tax than most in regard to both. I see no reason whatsoever to backpedal on the taxation as it is outlined in this bill. If you go to the richest provinces, or the most industrialized provinces in Canada, you will pay one dollar and 25 cents in Manitoba, Ontario, and Quebec. Here we are in the Northwest Territories crying poverty on one hand, something that is not necessary -- it is a luxury if you choose to smoke. It is certainly not doing anything for your health to do it, as we have been told and any taxation I would be quite prepared, even as a politician, to say one cent may not be enough, maybe we should even put two cents if it would prevent anybody from smoking but I do not think this is going to happen anyway. People will pay the price. I see no reason whatsoever to cut down on the one cent, or the ten dollar carton, or the package the administration is recommending.

Privileges Are Not Being Taken Away

As the Deputy Commissioner has made quite obvious, there are certain lines of taxation where we have to raise a certain amount of money. Rather than looking at fuel oil and these sorts of things, I am dead against taxation on these types of products, for heating fuel and many of the other items that that we now have a tax on but surely there could be nothing wrong when the medical people tell you that smoking is very hazardous to your health. Putting a tax on this kind of a product, as you see I am smoking one at the moment, if it were five cents more I would probably still be smoking it. I do not think that is necessarily the point at all but when you realize that we are not taxing to cut tobacco per se and those people who may be in a position where they can not afford to buy the tailor-made cigarettes, surely it is not too much of an imposition if they wish to roll their own at home and use them that way. Really you are not taking away a privilege from anybody as far as I am concerned. All you are saying is, "If you do not want to pay this kind of premium to buy a ready-made cigarette, you can still buy your tobacco and papers and roll them yourself." I am quite prepared to support the bill as it stands at one cent for every cigarette purchased. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Are there any more comments of a general nature? Mr. Lafferty.

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, I would agree with the comments of Mr. Stewart. I am a heavy smoker. I smoke almost two packages a day but I would be willing to pay the extra cost for cigarettes because it is really not a tobacco tax. People who wish to smoke tobacco -- a lot of the poor people do smoke tobacco anyway, so it is really no added inconvenience or hardship on them. Looking at it from a health point of view, I have seen some fairly good public relations work in the North which discourages people from smoking cigarettes. I do not think that it would create any unnecessary inconvenience on anyone. I would like to see the price of cigarettes, as is suggested, with the tax.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Any more comments of a general nature? We are changing one word by the way. We are changing "eight twenty-fifths" to "one" here. Does everybody agree then on clause 1?

---Agreed

The bill as a whole. Agreed?

---Agreed

Is it the wish of this committee to report progress? I am sorry, for third reading?

---Agreed

Hon. Peter Ernerk, are you going to speak?

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, I was going to speak but I will withdraw what were going to be my comments for now. Thanks. That is okay.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Lyall.

Report Of The Committee Of The Whole Of Bill 9-65, Tobacco Tax Ordinance And Bill 16-65, Senior Citizens Benefits Ordinance

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been studying Bill 9-65, An Ordinance to Amend the Tobacco Tax Ordinance, and Bill 16-65, An Ordinance Respecting Senior Citizens Benefits, and wishes to report that the bills are ready for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: What is the wish with respect to the next bill?

HON. PETER ERNERK: Bill 10-65, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Stewart, are you ready to chair Bill 10-65?

MR. STEWART: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will resolve into committee of the whole to consider Bill 10-65, An Ordinance Respecting Engineers, Geologists and Geophysicists.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into committee of the whole for consideration of Bill 10-65, Engineering, Geological and Geophysical Professions Ordinance, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL 10-65, ENGINEERING, GEOLOGICAL AND GEOPHYSICAL PROFESSIONS ORDINANCE

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): This committee will come to order to study Bill 10-65, An Ordinance Respecting Engineers, Geologists and Geophysicists. Mr. Lyall, has your committee anything to report on Bill 10-65?

MR. LYALL: The committee agreed to examine it. We previously looked at this bill in the last session and we went through it again on April 27. We just examined the changes that were made by the Legal Advisor and recommended that it come to the House for recommendation.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Mr. Lyall. The Minister responsible, do you wish to make any comments?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, the bill was given first reading at a previous session of this House and at the recommendation of the legislation committee was deferred until this time. As it did get first reading, it became a public document at that time and has been known to the public and to the mining industry. However, in view of the fact that one knowledgeable expert in this chamber will not be speaking to it, Mr. Nickerson, I have been assured that Mr. Ben Van Hees will be available to us to act as an expert

witness in the event we wish to direct questions to a member of the association. I am not versed in it but I will do the best I can with the assistance from the administration.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I understand Mr. Van Hees has been called. Is it the wish of this group to have him as an expert witness when he does arrive? Is that agreed?

---Agreed

In the interim, I will accept questions of a general nature. Comments of a general nature? Mr. Whitford.

MR. WHITFORD: When this bill was made up I wonder if the Minister could tell me did in fact they consult closely with the geologists and geophysicists to prepare this document or was it more with just government people?

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

MR. LYALL: We had Mr. Van Hees with us when we were looking at the bill or when we first looked at it and like Hon. Tom Butters said Mr. Nickerson was with us all the time and he is very knowledgeable on this so I think we did have their expert help.

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

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I am advised that consultation was carried forward at all levels during the preparation of this bill and that Mr. Van Hees will assure the Member that such did occur.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Any comments of a general nature? Is it the committee's wish that we wait for the expert witness or are you prepared to go clause by clause?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I would suggest we go clause by clause and if there is anything that would appear to concern Mr. Van Hees we might return to that when he can join us, just to save the time of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Is that agreed? I have two agrees. Is everyone else agreed with this, to proceed?

---Agreed

Bill 10-65, clause 2, definitions. Agreed?

---Agreed

We then jump to page five for clause 3, establishment of association. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 4, objects of association. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 5, powers of association. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 6, bylaws. The left hand side of the House is carrying the agrees. Mr. Lafferty.

MR. LAFFERTY: Where am I?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Page six.

Powers Of The Association

MR. LAFFERTY: I know but in the powers of the association, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have this clear. In clause 5, the association in addition to the powers vested in it by the Interpretation Ordinance and this ordinance has the power to (a) "acquire and hold real property and sell, lease or otherwise dispose of it at pleasure," now, this leaves me with a question. Is this association, how would they regulate themselves from say -- I do not know what I am trying to say here really, but what I am trying to say is, is there anything to prevent the association once they are empowered by this House to regulate themselves from going to and acquiring large pieces of real estate just for the purposes of the members?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The Legal Advisor tells me that it must be at the approval of the association itself, although that is not a complete answer. Mr. Minister, have you any comments?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I am afraid I can not answer that question directly. I would assume that this would give the association a place to build an office or to acquire a home as it were. It does not see them setting up a mineral co-operative or something like that but I can not answer the Member's question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Would you like this clause 5 set aside until we have expert advice here to answer your question?

MR. LAFFERTY: Yes.

President Of The Society Of Professional Engineers Of The N.W.T.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Van Hees, would you join us at the table, please? Mr. Van Hees, the Legislative Assembly recognizes you as an expert in this field and we are dealing with Bill 10-65, An Ordinance Respecting Engineers, Geologists and Geophysicists. Would you like to make any general comments as we are partly through the clause by clause, but if you would like to make a general statement, we can carry on.

MR. VAN HEES: Yes, I would make a first comment. I am the president of the Society of Professional Engineers of the Northwest Territories. I am a consulting engineer and a professional engineer registered in Alberta and Saskatchewan. I have lived here in the territories for five years and practised engineering. I think the purpose of the proposed ordinance is well covered in the statement of purpose. The bill I believe has been fashioned to bring us as close into harmony with what happens in the other jurisdictions in Canada as is possible. It is patterned particularly after the act in Alberta and that was done because a large number of our members are in Alberta and we have some assistance offered from Alberta in dealing with internal matters. This is probably the last place in North America where engineers are not covered by some form of ordinance that regulates who may practise and that governs the quality of their practice. I am not quite sure, Mr. Chairman, what section you are at or if there is a specific question. In appearing here I am hoping to answer any questions you may have on the ordinance as proposed.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you very much, Mr. Van Hees. Just a comment from the Chair. I have been involved with engineers for quite some time and is there any place you can find an engineer who is still not practising?

MR. VAN HEES: Probably not.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Mr. Van Hees, we are dealing with clause 5 which you will find on page five.

MR. VAN HEES: I have that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Would you repeat your question, Mr. Lafferty?

Engineers Acquiring Property.

MR. LAFFERTY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. My concern here is on page five, clause 5, the powers of the association, where it says: "In addition to the powers vested in it by the Interpretation Ordinance and this ordinance, has the power to (a) acquire and hold real property and sell, lease or otherwise dispose of it at pleasure,". Mr. Chairman, what I would like to know is, for instance, could an engineer operating in the Northwest Territories under this section, could he, or would the association in his interest as a member purchase, lease or hold real property?

MR. VAN HEES: The answer to that; it is certainly not the intent that in any way the association either as a group or as individual members would acquire or hold land or property for other than, say, a headquarters building, an office where the association could operate from. The members would be of quite widely varied interest, engineers, geologists, geophysicists and they could be employed by government or the private sector and they might be in mining or municipal or any other field. I do not think that such a group could get together with any intent to acquire a large tract of land for any purpose. The intent of that clause was to acquire real estate as an office for the association.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Does that satisfy your question?

MR. LAFFERTY: That satisfies my question but if it is fairly loose and I am not a lawyer but as I interpret it, it is fairly loose. What I am told here by the gentleman is that the purpose of this clause is for the acquisition of real estate for purposes of office or buildings that are necessary to the operation of the society or this association. I feel, Mr. Chairman, as a representative person of a very contentious area that these things should be clearly spelled out for what purpose this clause is. It is too broad and it could be misinterpreted by a lot of people, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I assume you are dealing with a professional group and they will act in a professional manner. Most of the legislation with regard to other professions is written in the same way. There is no way to suspect that doctors might not decide to invest in real estate if they think there are mineral claims on it and there is no reason to suspect that this group would be any different than the rest but if you feel there should be something on there would you wish to make an amendment or pose a motion? Hon. Tom Butters.

Amount Of Money Available

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, just to say, and the Legal Advisor could correct me, but I believe that the limitation here in the clause is that the amount of money available to the association, the amount of money that the association will have will be a result of the soliciting of dues from the membership. There would not be what you might call investment capital. There would be operating capital to operate the association's functions but there would be a limitation on the amount of money available for anything in the investment sense.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Lafferty, does that satisfy you?

MR. LAFFERTY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. FRASER: I have a tendency to agree with Mr. Lafferty, it is not spelled out and the Minister explains to us that they do not have any money but that does not mean that they could not get money. The association is made up of different geologists and geophysicists and it says in that paragraph that in addition to the powers vested they can acquire and hold real property and sell, lease or otherwise dispose of it at pleasure. Now, that is a pretty broad paragraph, Mr. Chairman. I would say that it is a very sensitive statement and if the Chair wishes a motion made to change this, these powers, I wonder if it would be to any disadvantage of the association to change the wording in that, if we can get the Legal Advisor to change it in such a way. Would it be of any disadvantage to the association?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I presume that you again are of the opinion that it might allow them to get into the mining business indirectly. That is your concern. So, I will suggest if you think of changing it, there is nothing wrong with the paragraph because if they buy a building and wish to sell it as an office or something they should have that right. So, I would suggest possibly if you want to give some protection that you would be thinking in terms of adding a paragraph (c) which would prohibit them from dealing directly in mining claims and this type of thing, if that is your intent. Hon. Tom Butters.

Layperson On Board Of Directors

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, I think it is a fallacy to believe that the mining people are necessarily rich. While we recognize that the mining industry is the second largest industry in the territories after the government, certainly we should permit the professionals taking part in that industry to associate, a right we have provided or given to other professionals, to lawyers, to chartered accountants, to nurses. The phraseology which occurs in this draft is exactly the same as we have developed for the other professions. To place strictures on the mining industry might be an insult which I know none of the Members are suggesting. But if there is any concern of Members that the association might act in a way which was contrary to the interests of the general constituents in the territories, this association has agreed, as did the others, that they would have on their board of directors a layperson.

As we know, there sits on the professional bodies of other associations in these territories an independent layperson who acts as a window on what occurs within the profession and if there is any concern that a direction might be taken by a body that is contrary to the general wishes of the people of the territories it would be this person's responsibility to act and prevent such from occurring. So I think that with the layperson on the board and with the knowledge that we have given no more and no less to other associations to restrict the mining industry in this manner at the present time might be a bit demeaning and very much unnecessary in view of the professional capacity of the people who would be forming this body.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Hon. Tom Butters. Any further comments on clause 5? Mr. Lafferty.

Problems Of A Layperson

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, my comments are more or less directed for public purposes and public information and for the records. I am not in any way demeaning or mistrusting the people but when I look at these powers of the associations I begin to think of personalities. We are presently saying we are empowering people here first of all and secondly professionals. They are still people and you can not guarantee safeguards. Here we are empowering the people to police themselves with the idea that a layman from somewhere around Timbuktu liaises between the public and this body of professionals. Supposing you get a person like myself as a board member sitting amongst these professionals, how do I understand what they are doing? Supposing the professionals under this authority or appointment by this Assembly or by the Commissioner of a layperson, a native guy from somewhere down around Timbuktu again, supposedly representing the public of the Northwest Territories which is greatly needed, how does he understand? How does he cope with these problems?

All I am saying is I am not mistrusting or disrespecting any interest nor have I any intention to hinder the activities of these professional men. We need them. It is obvious that we need them just as much as we need the doctors but at least when we are dealing with a doctor and he is mistaken

we get our heads chopped and we are dead and we have no more problem but we are dealing with another professional area with which we must cope and our children must cope. In the bylaws here I just noticed that the executive of that association will have the management of its property. In this case supposing we get several people who may graduate into this professional field from within the Northwest Territories and there was an ambitious person, what guarantees have we got they will not use the vehicle that they need to acquire properties, for example, an engineer who is a developer? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Acquiring Property Only For The Affairs Of The Association.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. We have been looking at this possibility and I would like your advice, Mr. Van Hees, to see whether we can restrict your organization in any manner. We have two possible solutions. On clause 5, the Interpretation Ordinance and this ordinance, "has the power to (a) acquire and hold real property, for office and administrative purposes only, and sell, lease or otherwise dispose of it at pleasure, and..." Would that in any way put your organization in a problem? These are the types of things the Members are concerned about.

MR. VAN HEES: The words you have added would not be objected to in any way by the association. As a member I would hope they could not acquire land other than for conducting the affairs of the association. I have pencilled similar words myself on the Interpretation Ordinance and this ordinance "has for the purpose of conducting the affairs of the association the power to..." which is somewhat similar so we have no objection to the insertion of a clause to ensure we could only acquire that property for conducting the affairs of the association by way of an office or headquarters.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): There is another suggestion from the Legal Advisor by way of something we were using yesterday and that is we could in that place put "acquire real property not to exceed 0.8 hectares." That limits the area. Which would be the best as far as the Legislative Assembly is concerned? Mr. Lafferty.

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, I think your first suggestion is what I was looking at.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): What is the Assembly's wish?

Property By Way Of Bequeaths.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I guess what worries me by limiting that power to hold property, what if one of you had a particularly dedicated professional engineer who on his death bequeathed property to the professional engineering association to use for professional and educational and other purposes by way of grants and bursaries, etc.? I am just a little afraid if you start limiting that you may make the society unable to accept those bequeaths and that to my mind would not be in the interests of public education or in the interests of the public generally. I think obviously as a professional association as long as your object is not to get into the business of acquiring and disposing of property in a business sense, it could do so obviously in connection with its professional responsibilities. I foresee in that sense their leaving it wide enough so that they can acquire property for office space, whether it be by lease or building their own building or whatever, but as well permit them to proceed to hold property by way of bequeaths for other purposes. Anyway, I would be repeating myself if I said anything more. I think we should just leave it alone.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Hon. David Searle. Clause 5, paragraph (a), do you wish it to be amended? If so, I will accept the amendment from the floor. Mr. Lafferty.

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate Hon. David Searle's comments and bringing up another problem area that I think that we can word our amendment, which we can have the Legal Advisor do, to allow for these types of things that Hon. David Searle mentioned. Inasmuch as I have certain fears on the various powers that are being vested in various organizations, that this Assembly will lose control over them or for that matter the politicians refusing to recognize the abuse of much of the powers that we have dedicated, I think that it is high time that in the public interest we act responsibly and safeguard the public interest. All I am saying is that this society before we give it all the power which is exclusively theirs under this ordinance, there should be safeguards. That is not very much to ask for. I feel this clause is too broad.

Motion To Amend Paragraph 5(a) Of Bill 10-65.

Mr. Chairman, I move the amendment as you have suggested to be drawn up by the Legal Advisor.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): We have a motion to amend clause 5, paragraph (a), to read as follows: "...acquire and hold real property for offices and other administrative purposes only and sell, lease or otherwise dispose of at pleasure, and ..."

HON. DAVID SEARLE: I did not get the motion, Mr. Chairman. I did not understand you. Could you repeat it?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): All right. We are dealing with clause 5 on page five at the bottom of the page, paragraph (a), and the amendment as I understand, would read: "...acquire and hold real property for offices and other administrative purposes only and sell, lease or otherwise dispose of at pleasure, and ..." Is that your motion, Mr. Lafferty, as I understand it?

MR. LAFFERTY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): To the motion. Deputy Commissioner Parker.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, would it be the opinion of the Legal Advisor that within that wording you could accommodate the ownership

of property for staff accommodation, supposing the association had one resident person and wanted to provide that person with a staff house? Would that be considered administrative?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Madam Legal Advisor.

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): I believe it would, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): To the motion, Hon. David Searle.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Again to the Legal Advisor, would the powers be broad enough to permit the society to accept bequeaths set up, educational scholarships as previously discussed?

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Mr. Chairman, I do not think it would unless the land that is bequeathed to the association is an office or some other piece of real property that could be used for administrative purposes. I do not think that a program of scholarships for engineering students would be considered an administrative purpose of the association.

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

Authority To Hold Personal Property

HON. DAVID SEARLE: The other question I have, Mr. Chairman, normally I see the wording would say "acquire, hold, real and personal property" which is money, bonds, furniture, things that are not of a real property nature. I do not see any authority there to hold personal property. Is that an omission?

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Mr. Chairman, the section refers to the powers vested in a corporation by the Interpretation Ordinance and the Interpretation Ordinance in section 14 gives to any body incorporated as a body, corporate and politic, the power to acquire and hold personal property or movables for the purpose for which the corporation is constituted.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Thank you. Do those powers in the Interpretation Ordinance also give a society the power to receive bequests, scholarships and set up other funds?

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Mr. Chairman, would you like me to read section 14 of the Interpretation Ordinance?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): If you would, please.

Section 14, Interpretation Ordinance

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): "Words in an enactment making a number of persons a corporation (a) vest in the corporation power to sue and be sued, to contract and be contracted with by its corporate name, to have a common seal and to alter or change it at pleasure, to have perpetual succession, to acquire and hold personal property or movables for the purposes for which the corporation is constituted and to alienate the same at pleasure; (b) vest in a majority of the members of the corporation the power to bind the others by their acts; and (c) exempt from personal liability for its debts, obligations or acts such individual members of the corporation as to not contravene the provisions of the enactment incorporating them."

It seems to me that the question of whether this association would have the power to set up a scholarship fund would depend upon the powers given in the ordinance incorporating them. That is to say, whether scholarships are within the purpose for which the corporation exists and my recollection is that there is a power in there for encouraging the profession, development of the profession. I would have to look.

Motion To Amend Paragraph 5(a) Of Bill 10-65, Carried.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): To the motion. The question being called on the motion. The motion is that clause 5, paragraph (a), of Bill 10-65 would be amended to read: "acquire and hold real property for office and administrative purposes only, and sell, lease or otherwise dispose of it at pleasure, and". That is the amendment. The question is being called. All in favour of the amendment? Five. Opposed? One. The motion is carried.

---Carried

Clause 6, bylaws. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 7, council and membership. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 8, election of officers and presiding officer. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 9, executive director and duties of executive director. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 10, prohibitions. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 11, on page 13, board of examiners and review. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 12, qualifications generally, education and examination. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 13, appeal. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 14, registration. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 15, on page 16, appeal, notice and decision of court. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 16, certificate of registration and ownership of certificate. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 17, use of title and seal and acquisition of seal. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 18, permits, issue of permit, professional representative to be resident, stamp and revocation. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 19, permit holders, and stamping of documents. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 20, registrar's certificate as evidence. Agreed?

---Agreed

Has the right side of the House all got laryngitis? I am only getting "agrees" from one side and I would like to know if things are going through properly. Clause 21, annual fee and annual permit fee. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 22, review of qualifications, non-registered person. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 23, review of member's or licensee's qualifications and cancellation based on qualifications. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 24, discipline committee, membership, quorum, rules, service on committee. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 25, on page 22, unbecoming conduct question of fact and unbecoming conduct defined. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 26, review of complaints. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 27, inquiry and report and procedure after investigation. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 28, notice of preliminary investigation, content of notice and defense by written submission. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 29, procedure after investigation. Agreed?

---Agreed

Now, on page 24, clause 30, directions to discipline committee. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 31, notice of hearing and service of notice. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 32, assistance in investigation or hearing and hearings in camera. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 33, non-attendance at hearing. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 34, notice to attend hearing, issue of notice on request, natural justice, rules of evidence and witness fees. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 35, penalties on witness. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 36, member or permit holder as witness. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 37, disciplinary action after hearing and reprimand. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 38, suspension, etc. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 39, notice to complainant. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 40, effect of suspension, striking off or revocation, permission to continue practice temporarily, effect on student. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 41, right to appeal, basis of appeal and copy of proceedings. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 42, order of confirmation or reversal. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 43, application for rehearing and rehearing. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 44, protection from liability. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 45, fraud. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 46, general penalty. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 47, commencement of prosecution. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 48, members and licensees. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 49, temporary council. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 50, commencement. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 1, short title. Agreed?

---Agreed

The bill as a whole. Agreed?

---Agreed

Shall I report that Bill 10-65 is ready for third reading as amended?

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Stewart.

Report Of The Committee Of The Whole Of Bill 10-65, Engineering, Geological And Geophysical Professions Ordinance

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been studying Bill 10-65 and wish to report that it is ready for third reading with the following amendment to clause 5, paragraph (a), the addition of the following words: "The Interpretation Ordinance and this ordinance has the power to (a) acquire and hold real property for offices and administrative purposes only, and sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of it at pleasure."

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 2-65, is that the next one, Hon. Peter Ernerk?

HON. PETER ERNERK: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: We will stand recessed for 15 minutes for coffee.

---SHORT RECESS

MR. SPEAKER: Gentlemen, this House will resolve into committee of the whole for consideration of Bill 2-65, Child Welfare Ordinance, with Mr. Lyall in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into committee of the whole for consideration of Bill 2-65, Child Welfare Ordinance, with Mr. Lyall in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL 2-65, CHILD WELFARE ORDINANCE

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): This committee will come to order to study Bill 2-65, An Ordinance to Amend the Child Welfare Ordinance. Are there any comments of a general nature? Hon. Arnold McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, this bill is a bill to amend the present Child Welfare Ordinance. As I indicated in the second reading, in the purposes of it there are a number of changes that we are proposing to particular clauses. One of the changes more clearly defines the manner in which matters may be brought to court and in point of fact, in some cases it would increase notice periods. It, as well, in another section, will enable a judge to reduce the required period of notice or service where it is appropriate. It has an amendment that will allow the superintendent to make a right of appeal where in fact this was not so under the present ordinance. The period of time in relation to the probationary period or the period for adoption is reduced to six months from what is now a year. In all cases, Mr. Chairman, these amendments were done to upgrade the ordinance, to make it in some cases compatible to existing legislation in other jurisdictions and it does in fact make reference specifically to amendments we feel are pertinent to this area, the area of the Northwest Territories.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Thank you, Hon. Arnold McCallum. Comments of a general nature? Bill 2-65, Mr. Whitford.

MR. WHITFORD: No, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Shall we go clause by clause? Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 1, child to be brought before justice. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 2, notice. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 3, further order. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 4, order, other powers. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 5, reduction of service and notice periods. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 6, appeals. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 7. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 8. Agreed?

---Agreed

The bill as a whole. Agreed?

---Agreed

Is it the wish of this committee that we report the bill ready for third reading?

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Lyall.

Report Of The Committee Of The Whole Of Bill 2-65, Child Welfare Ordinance

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been studying Bill 2-65 and wishes to report that the bill is ready for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Gentlemen, I am advised by Hon. Peter Ernerk that none of the other matters shown under Item 16, that is Bills 4-65, 7-65 or 14-65 are ready. Is Bill 4-65 ready? I only go by what I am told. If you are ready for Bill 4-65 -- are you? It looks like the information is changed. Therefore, this House will resolve into committee of the whole for consideration of Bill 4-65, Territorial Hospital Insurance Services Ordinance, with Mr. Lyall in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into committee of the whole for consideration of Bill 4-65, Territorial Hospital Insurance Services Ordinance, with Mr. Lyall in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL 4-65, TERRITORIAL HOSPITAL INSURANCE SERVICES ORDINANCE

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): This committee will come to order. Bill 4-65, An Ordinance to Amend the Territorial Hospital Insurance Services Ordinance. Comments of a general nature? Hon. Arnold McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, this provides for three simple amendments to the existing Territorial Hospital Insurance Services Ordinance. The first amendment is more definite in wording and not as cumbersome as the wording in the present legislation. That is the first change. The second change is to amend the ordinance by adding new subsections that would disqualify certain persons from membership on a board where there is a potential conflict of interest. The final amendment would allow for a date of resignation of persons now serving on boards of management or other bodies that look after medical facilities, to allow them to resign by a particular date because now they would be disqualified from serving on those particular boards. They are very simple amendments, a matter of just tightening up the ordinance. That is about all I can add to that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Any comments of a general nature? Mr. Whitford.

MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Chairman, the first question I have is to the Minister. Does this refer to nursing stations as well, sort of as an example in Rae?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: The ordinance, Mr. Chairman, refers to hospitals under THIS, not federal nursing stations, no. The facilities in Yellowknife, Fort Smith, Hay River. I think there are just those three; Yellowknife, Fort Smith and Hay River.

MR. FRASER: Mr. Chairman, this bill was gone over by the standing committee on legislation and you are in the chair and maybe I could just read out the recommendations of that committee. The Legal Advisor said that the term "financial adviser" is included in regard to the amount of pay increase to be sought. Perhaps she said the concern that the term "financial adviser" was too broad and should be met by substituting something along the lines of the other persons involved in the negotiating process. Further, this is subject to the foregoing. The committee recommend that the bill be considered in committee of the whole.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Thank you, Mr. Fraser. Any comments of a general nature? Mr. Stewart.

MR. STEWART: I was wondering whether or not the people involved relative to the hospitals have had any input into this bill or have been advised of the nature of the bill?

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, yes, they have.

MR. STEWART: Has there been any opposition from any of the hospitals?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, no.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Any more comments of a general nature? Is it the wish of the committee we go clause by clause?

---Agreed

Clause 1, membership. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 2, disqualifications for membership. Agreed? Mr. Nickerson.

Disqualification Of Union Employees

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, the second clause is the clause that deals with persons who are to be excluded from serving on the board of a health facility. I think that we are going a little bit too far in these exclusions. When we get down to paragraph (d) "an employee, financial adviser or official of an organization that represents any employees..." that seems to be in my opinion much too broad. I can see a very good reason for excluding an official but I can not for one minute see why we should really be excluding an employee of that union. It could be an employee, secretary or janitor or something like that who just works in the union offices. I can see a possible reason why you might want to exclude union employees from sessions of the board that deal with collective bargaining. I think it should be left up to the board itself under its bylaws to make provisions for that type of exclusion. I think the terms "employee, financial adviser" go much, much too far. I am not particularly known as a staunch advocate of unionism. I am certainly not, that is not my persuasion but I do not like to see such organizations in law being discriminated against so to speak.

Motion To Amend Paragraph 2(4)(d) Of Bill 4-65.

I would move, Mr. Chairman, that the words in paragraph (d) "employee, financial adviser or" be deleted.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): The motion is to delete in clause 2 paragraph (d) "an employee, financial adviser or...". To the motion? Mr. Stewart.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I do not really understand the implication of the unions with regard to the change in this particular area. Possibly Mr. Nickerson could expand on that. What does this have to do with unions?

MR. NICKERSON: I think it is quite clear. Clause 2 sets out a list of classes of persons who are ineligible to serve on the boards of management of health facilities. The first exclusion is an employee of the health facility. That certainly makes a lot of sense. You would not want an employee serving on the board. It is common practice, for instance, in paragraph (c), "a medical practitioner or a dentist having privileges etc.," at the hospital in question, why you want to exclude them. It also makes a lot of sense to exclude officials of unions that represent employees at the hospital but I can not for the life of me see why they want to exclude employees of the union or why you would want to exclude the union's financial adviser. I would imagine that the financial advisers to unions in Yellowknife, for instance, are probably the various accountants around town and they are not only the financial advisers to the unions, they are financial advisers to many people and organizations. I can not for the life of me see why you would want to exclude any accountant in Yellowknife from serving on a hospital board so long as he was not their auditor also.

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

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I think I am going to have to disagree with my friend on this and vote against the amendment simply because the officials of a union, for instance, are the officers of the locals and they in turn employ as employees a person who conducts negotiations and who is the negotiator really on the union's behalf. The reason you have to have the employee prohibited as well as the financial adviser is because if you otherwise have him elected to your board you have got him on management's side on the one hand advising as to what salaries and pay scales should be and then on the other hand he is heading up as an employee of the union, the negotiating team, which consists of him and other union officers who are the members of the union. I think that that is the guy particularly that you have to have off your board. I could like the union officers being on there more easily than I could that full time paid organizer.

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

Maintaining Confidentiality Of Negotiations

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether the unions have in fact financial advisers but I certainly would concur with Hon. David Searle that an employee, or an official of an organization that represents employees would be placed in a very difficult position herself or himself as to the keeping of the confidentiality of negotiations that may or may not be going on. How would one possibly be able to handle that as a member of a board of management of a medical facility and still be a full time employee of a union who are negotiating with the board of management? For that reason I think that the term "employee" at the very least has to be retained within this particular subclause. There are negotiations ongoing now in terms of medical facilities and it would be very difficult for one to be on both sides of the table at the same time.

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

MR. NICKERSON: I guess it depends upon your interpretation of the word "official", Mr. Chairman. If the interpretation is meant to exclude the person who would normally be called secretary manager of a union or something like that then I guess what Hon. David Searle said is correct. Obviously you would not want the full time manager of the union office to be involved as a member of the hospital board. However, I can not see why you would want to exclude the maintenance man. I can not see why you would want to exclude a lady whose job was that of a secretary or typist who does not really get involved in the policy making decisions of the union. I guess it all depends upon your interpretation of the word "official" and certainly in my mind I could see an interpretation which would include all those people in high union offices or union offices that would include people who should, quite properly, be excluded.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Thank you, Mr. Nickerson.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): I think in our committee meeting, Mr. Fraser, when we were talking about this we decided that we would come into the House here to see if they would leave it out or not.

MR. FRASER: Yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): The question. The question being called. The motion is to amend clause 2, paragraph (d) to remove the words "employee, financial adviser or...", that they be deleted. Does everyone understand?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion To Amend Paragraph 2(4)(d), Defeated

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): All in favour of the motion? One. Contrary? The motion is defeated.

---Defeated

Clause 2. Mr. Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: I would like to ascertain the feeling of the other Members of the committee about the exclusion of spouses if people are otherwise excluded. Now, we have now by virtue of the fact that I lost my motion excluded the accountant who renders financial advice to the union, who shows them how to invest their funds at the greatest profit, we have got rid of him but now should we get rid of his wife, or her husband if that be the case? Does the committee feel that we may be pushing things a little bit too far here?

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I thought he was asking everybody and I was going to wait and be the last one. Why me? I obviously feel as the document is here. If the couple are alienated I do not see much problem possibly but if they are together I think there would be some kind of conflict of interest. The way I would think about it is that hopefully the two go together in their line of thought and I obviously feel as the document is here. Try it on somebody else.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): You are stickhandling around it..

---Laughter

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I gave that up. I am too old to play.

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

HON. DAVID SEARLE: You are actually missing, Mr. Minister, if I may say so through the Chair, an important body of people who would have a serious conflict of interest if they were on that board and I think we should clear that by adding a paragraph (g) after paragraph (f) and that is "patients".

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Was that a motion?

---Laughter

Any comments on paragraph (f)? Mr. Stewart.

MR. STEWART: In view of Hon. David Searle's remarks I would like to add that our "patientses" are wearing a little thin at the moment but basically I was really interested on this togetherness the Minister was referring to with regard to spouses. I wonder if he would care to clarify that?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: No, no.

MR. STEWART: I think though the way this thing stands at the moment it seems to be reasonably good. I do not see why you should try and tie down a board too restrictively. Certainly there are instances where a spouse or husband of an employee might be a real asset on the board but I think the boards have their own discretionary ways of dealing with these things and I do not see how you could possibly by legislation tie things up too tight. I think the board has to have a little bit of leeway.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Any comments of a general nature? Clause 2, disqualifications for membership. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 3, transitional. Agreed?

---Agreed

The bill as a whole. Agreed?

---Agreed

Is it the wish of this committee that I report?

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Lyall.

Report Of The Committee Of The Whole Of Bill 4-65, Territorial Hospital Insurance Services Ordinance

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been studying Bill 4-65, An Ordinance to Amend the Territorial Hospital Insurance Services Ordinance and wish to report progress. I should say that the bill is ready for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Lyall. Gentlemen, we have again run off the order paper. Mr. Lyall.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, there was also a motion in that while we were discussing that bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Go ahead.

MR. LYALL: The motion was: "I move that in clause 2, paragraph (d) the words 'employee, financial adviser or...' be deleted" and that was put by Mr. Nickerson and that motion was defeated.

MR. SPEAKER: You do not have to report out defeated motions, just the ones that are passed but that is all right. You nearly caused heart failure on the Legal Advisor's part. She thought you were reporting out a successful amendment, if I read her face correctly.

Gentlemen, as I was saying we have run off the order paper but there are however, with unanimous consent if you wish to do it and I am not encouraging you one way or another, it is up to you, but Bills 7-65 and 18-65 apparently are now in your books but we would have to go back with respect to both of them to Item 7 and give notices of motion for first reading and then first reading and second reading etc. The question I guess I have of you is whether at this hour you feel that you would like to do that. Again it is entirely up to you. If there is a single nay then we can not. Is there a nay? Two nays. Mr. Clerk, orders of the day. I am sorry, announcements. There is a caucus meeting tomorrow morning at 9:30 a.m., in Katimavik A. Mr. Clerk. Hon. Peter Ernerk, have you an announcement?

HON. PETER ERNERK: I was going to ask the House to let me return to Item 7, notices of motion for first reading of bills.

MR. SPEAKER: They just said nay to that, Hon. Peter Ernerk. That is what I was asking them. I sometimes get the impression there is an echo in this room. Mr. Clerk, orders of the day.

ITEM NO. 17: ORDERS OF THE DAY

CLERK ASSISTANT OF THE HOUSE (Mr. de Vos): Orders of Day, May 12, 1978, 1:00 o'clock p.m., at the Explorer Hotel.

1. Prayer
2. Replies to Commissioner's Address
3. Questions and Returns
4. Oral Questions
5. Petitions
6. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
7. Notices of Motion for First Reading of Bills: Bill 19-65
8. Notices of Motion
9. Motions for the Production of Papers
10. Motions
11. Tabling of Documents
12. Introduction of Bills for First Reading: Bills 7-65, 11-65, 18-65 and 19-65
13. Second Reading of Bills: Bills 7-65, 11-65, 18-65 and 19-65
14. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills, Recommendations to the Legislature and Other Matters: Bills 11-65, 7-65, 19-65 and 18-65, Information Item 2-65, Problems Related to Marketing of Freshwater Fish, Motion 5-65
15. Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER: This House stands adjourned until 1:00 o'clock p.m., May 12, 1978, at the Explorer Hotel.

---ADJOURNMENT

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