



Government In - Service
Library

Government of N.W.T.
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES
DEBATES

67th. Session

8th Assembly

Official Report

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1979

pages 880 to 931

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 Health and Local
Government)

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

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

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

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

Mr. William Lafferty, M.L.A.
Box 149
Fort Simpson, N.W.T. X0E 0N0
(Mackenzie Liard)

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

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

The Honourable Thomas Butters, M.L.A.
Box 1069
Inuvik, N.W.T. X0E 0T0
(Inuvik)
(Minister of Social Services and
Economic Development and Tourism)

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

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

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

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

Mr. Richard Whitford, M.L.A.
6 Bromley Drive
Yellowknife, N.W.T. X1A 2X8
(Great Slave Lake)

OFFICERS

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

Sergeant-at-Arms
Captain F.A. MacKay C.D. (Ret'd)
Yellowknife, N.W.T. X1A 2K6

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

Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms
Major D.A. Sproule C.D. (SL)
Yellowknife, N.W.T. X0E 1H0

LEGAL ADVISOR

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

15 February 1979

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	880
Questions and Returns	880
Petitions	880
Notices of Motion	881
Tabling of Documents	881, 931
First Reading of Bills:	
- Bill 16-67 Interpretation Ordinance	881
- Bill 15-67 Certified General Accountants' Association Ordinance	882
Second Reading of Bills:	
- Bill 4-67 Legal Services Ordinance	882
- Bill 14-67 Municipal Ordinance	884
- Bill 16-67 Interpretation Ordinance	884
- Bill 15-67 Certified General Accountants' Association Ordinance	885
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Bill 1-67 All-terrain Vehicles Ordinance	885
- Bill 14-67 Municipal Ordinance	891
- Bill 13-67 Western Canada Lottery Ordinance	891
- Bill 6-67 Student Grants and Bursaries Ordinance	896
- Bill 16-67 Interpretation Ordinance	896
- Bill PM 1-67 Area Development Ordinance	900
- Information Item 5-67 Proposed Changes in CMHC Funding Arrangements	907
- Tabled Document 11-67 Policy on Single Resource Community	907
- Recommendation to the Legislature 1-67 Highway Signs Regulations	907
- Tabled Document 10-67 Proposed Ordinance Respecting Hamlets	914
- Tabled Document 13-67 Local Government, Direction for the 1980's Summary	914
- Tabled Document 20-67 Responsibility and Local Revenue	914

	<u>PAGE</u>
Report of the Committee of the Whole of:	
- Bill 1-67 All-terrain Vehicles Ordinance	890
- Bill 14-67 Municipal Ordinance	896
- Bill 13-67 Western Canada Lottery Ordinance	896
- Bill 6-67 Student Grants and Bursaries Ordinance	899
- Bill 16-67 Interpretation Ordinance	899
- Bill PM 1-67 Area Development Ordinance	899
- Information Item 5-67 Proposed Changes in CMHC Funding Arrangements	913
- Tabled Document 11-67 Policy on Single Resource Community	913
- Recommendation to the Legislature 1-67 Highway Signs Regulations	913
- Tabled Document 10-67 Proposed Ordinance Respecting Hamlets	930
- Tabled Document 13-67 Local Government, Direction for the 1980's Summary	930
- Tabled Document 20-67 Responsibility and Local Revenue	930
Orders of the Day	931

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1979

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, questions and returns.

ITEM NO. 2: QUESTIONS AND RETURNS

Are there any returns? Written questions? Mr. Lyall.

Question W70-67: Licensing Application, Altair Leasing Ltd.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the administration to determine for this House what progress is being made and when a decision can be expected in respect to the licensing application by Altair Leasing Ltd., owned and operated by Mr. Willy Laserich, which has been under consideration by the Canadian Transport Commission since November, 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: Deputy Commissioner Parker.

Partial Return To Question W70-67: Licensing Application, Altair Leasing Ltd.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Speaker, we will make inquiries immediately in this matter. I know that various Members of the Executive Committee have attempted to pursue the subject but however it lies completely within the jurisdiction of either the Canadian Transport Commission or the air transport committee, and at this stage we have no further information to offer, but as I say we will seek that information immediately.

MR. SPEAKER: Further written questions.

Item 3, oral questions.

Item 4, petitions. Mr. Lyall.

ITEM NO. 4: PETITIONS

Petition 1-67: Altair Leasing Ltd., Application For Charter Licence

MR. LYALL: Also, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members here I have with me some ten letters or so in support of the application that was made by Altair Leasing Ltd. from the people of the Central Arctic, and I would like to table that as Petition 1-67 because I think we have quite a few signatures on a lot of these letters, so Members will know what I am talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 5, reports of standing and special committees. Mr. Lyall.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, I thought we were still under petitions. I would also like to table, at the same time, the documents of intervention of two airlines against the leasing company.

MR. SPEAKER: I would think that they would more properly be tabled documents, Mr. Lyall. In other words, I think you are quite correct with respect to your petition where you have a number of people having signed a letter or submission but when you come to the interventions filed by other carriers, or copies of them, I think they should be more properly filed under Item 9, tabling of documents.

MR. LYALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will do that.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there further petitions?

Item 5, reports of standing and special committees.

Item 6, notices of motion.

ITEM NO. 6: NOTICES OF MOTION

Hon. Arnold McCallum, please.

Notice Of Motion 25-67: Firefighters Group

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on Friday, February 16, I shall move a motion regarding the firefighters group around Great Slave Lake, in support of their continued work in firefighting, as they are involved in the economy.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further notices of motion?

Item 7, motions for the production of papers.

Item 8, motions.

Item 9, tabling of documents.

ITEM NO. 9: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Lyall, please.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a document:

Tabled Document 26-67: Intervention of Altair Application. This is the interventions by two airline outfits out of Yellowknife and also all the documents written to that outfit trying to get a licence from the Canadian Transport Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 10, first reading of bills.

ITEM NO. 10: FIRST READING OF BILLS

Bill 16-67. Hon. Arnold McCallum.

First Reading Of Bill 16-67

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 16-67, An Ordinance to Amend the Interpretation and Certain Other Ordinances, be read for the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Lyall. Question. All in favour? Down. Contrary? First reading of Bill 16-67 is carried.

---Carried

Bill 15-67. Hon. Arnold McCallum.

First Reading Of Bill 15-67.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 15-67, An Ordinance Respecting the Certified General Accountants' Association of the Northwest Territories, be read for the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Fraser. Question. All in favour? Down. Contrary? First reading of Bill 15-67 is carried.

---Carried

Item 11, second reading of bills.

ITEM NO. 11: SECOND READING OF BILLS.

Bill 4-67, Legal Services Ordinance. Hon. Tom Butters.

Second Reading Of Bill 4-67.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 4-67, An Ordinance Respecting the Provision of Legal Services to Certain Persons, be read for the second time. The purposes of this bill, Mr. Speaker, are to provide for the delivery of legal aid and other legal services to persons not able or not fully able to afford the services of lawyers and programs designed to reduce the incidence of legal problems among the people.

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

MR. NICKERSON: I would like to speak briefly to the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker, and then, although of course I will support the bill, would put forward an alternative, a proposed alternative to deal with the same principles that in my opinion would be a better way, in the long run, for approaching this subject.

What we are doing here and I am now speaking mainly of civil cases rather than criminal cases, or cases where the Crown is proceeding against somebody, because in my opinion the court system we have in the Northwest Territories works out fairly well in those cases, and people who the Crown is proceeding against find themselves in more or less a passive role. They are called before the courts and in most cases that I have witnessed, the court goes out of its way to see that the person proceeded against has a fair trial and has every opportunity to defend himself.

However, in civil cases, in disputes between citizens, the situation is somewhat different. Here the person often has to initiate the proceedings and we have a very complicated legal system. What this ordinance would do would be to try and alleviate some of the hardships put onto individuals by virtue of this very complicated legal system that we have, and indeed all countries that base their legal system on the old British system have. In countries such as Canada and the United States and Australia, we have all inherited this very complex, and very difficult legal system.

Now, instead of having to hire, at public expense or private expense, if the person is able to pay, because we are talking largely of people who are unable to pay and are not themselves expert in this kind of thing, instead of having a simplified system we are spending public funds on the hiring of lawyers and paralegal people to explain to people how they should go about doing something that should, in my opinion, be accomplished easily without this great expense and great hardship.

Examining Magistrate Would Find Facts.

Now, I would like to see in the Northwest Territories a system of justice, and I am again talking mainly of in civil matters, whereby a person who thought he was suffering a wrong, instead of having to go to the native court workers, to the legal aid people and through the lawyers, could walk into an office and maybe there might be an examining magistrate who would sit at known times on certain dates. This person would be able to go into the office and state his case and if on the face of it he appeared to have a case, then the examining magistrate could very simply summon before him the parties to the dispute, or set a place and time at which a hearing would be held and the parties to the dispute would be commanded to appear before him at that time. Then instead of having the present antagonistic system, if that is the right word, or adversarial system, that is a better word, where justice is mainly a battle of wits between opposing lawyers, I would have it where the examining magistrate would be the person who would be doing the questioning to find out the facts of the case. So, it would be the court which is finding out, making the findings, finding out what had happened rather than the court being in a passive situation listening to the arguments of various lawyers.

The court would then be able to give justice almost immediately and I would hope that any orders of that court would be upheld, or would be enforced by the judicial system that the government has at its disposal, unlike the present system where you get a judgment against somebody for the payment of a certain sum of money and then you have to go through the whole rigmarole of garnisheeing his wages or taking other steps to ensure payment. I think that the Crown should take on itself the responsibility for seeing that the orders of the court are fulfilled.

Courts Too Expensive For Small Amounts Of Money.

Of course such a system would not be the complete system, there would obviously have to be mechanisms for appeal, but in countries, a lot of European countries, in Quebec in the eighteenth century, at any rate -- and I do not know what the situation is in Quebec now -- this system has been very much in use and most of the disputes between citizens are settled quickly and easily. It would appear to people who are used to our system, that there is a lot of litigation going on in these countries which have adopted that system. That might be true but the reason for this, I would think, is that very often people in Canada are denied justice because it is so complicated and so expensive that you just can not afford to go to court over relatively small amounts of money. For instance it is hardly worth your while going to court for \$250 to \$300 and so citizens do not use the courts and the courts should be open for the use of citizens and as a mechanism for resolving disputes.

So that is my view, Mr. Speaker. I would rather simplify the judicial system rather than putting in these new expensive layers of judicial bureaucracy. I do not think that I will be very successful in my attempt to have this done so as an interim measure, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to support the bill, but I thought that I would like to make the Members aware that in other parts of the world other systems of justice do exist that combine both efficiency and justice and do not deny access to the courts to citizens by reason of the difficulty and expense of engaging in proceedings under the system which we have in the Northwest Territories at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: Further discussion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. All in favour? Down. Contrary? Second reading of Bill 4-67 is carried.

---Carried

Bill 14-67, Hon. Arnold McCallum.

Second Reading Of Bill 14-67.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 14-67, An Ordinance to Amend the Municipal Ordinance, be read for the second time. The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to equate the system for electing mayors of hamlets with the system presently in force for electing mayors of cities, towns and villages but also to enable hamlets, if the voters so desire, to opt for the present system of electing mayors.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. All in favour? Down. Contrary? Second reading of Bill 14-67 is carried.

---Carried

Bill 16-67, Hon. Arnold McCallum.

Second Reading Of Bill 16-67.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 16-67, An Ordinance to Amend the Interpretation and Certain Other Ordinances, be read for the second time. The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to amend the Interpretation Ordinance to include an all-embracing definition of "Executive Member" and empower the Commissioner to perform any of the statutory powers and duties of an Executive Member and to make consequential amendments to other ordinances.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. All in favour? Down. Contrary? Second reading of Bill 16-67 is carried.

---Carried

Bill 15-67, Hon. Arnold McCallum.

Second Reading Of Bill 15-67.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 15-67, An Ordinance Respecting the Certified General Accountants' Association of the Northwest Territories, be read for the second time. The purposes of this bill, Mr. Speaker, are to provide for a certified general accountants' association and to enable the association to regulate the professional conduct and discipline of its members and to prescribe the qualifications for membership.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder? Mr. Evaluarjuk. Discussion? Question. All in favour? Down. Contrary? Second reading of Bill 15-67 is carried.

---Carried

Item 12, consideration in committee of the whole of bills, recommendations to the Legislature and other matters.

ITEM NO. 12: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS, RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE LEGISLATURE AND OTHER MATTERS

What is the wish of the House, Hon. Arnold McCallum?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, that we consider Bill 1-67, All-terrain Vehicles Ordinance.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Stewart, are you prepared to take the chair?

MR. STEWART: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: This House will resolve into committee of the whole for consideration of Bill 1-67, All-terrain Vehicles Ordinance, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into committee of the whole for consideration of Bill 1-67, All-terrain Vehicles Ordinance, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL 1-67, ALL-TERRAIN VEHICLES ORDINANCE

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The committee will come to order to study Bill 1-67, An Ordinance Respecting All-terrain Vehicles. Would Hon. Peter Ernerk like to give an introduction of this bill?

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, I think that the purpose of the bill explains it well enough that the Members might wish to make some comments with respect to this particular ordinance. I understand there is a witness who is on his way right now. Also, as I indicated during second reading of this bill, the purpose of it is to indentify certain classes of vehicles, to be known as all-terrain vehicles, and to relieve them from the provisions of the Vehicles Ordinance applicable to motor vehicles, to make certain general rules applicable to them including a general prohibition against their use on roadways outside municipalities and settlements, to enable municipalities and, through

Commissioner's regulations, settlements to regulate their uses in the communities and to make certain minor amendments to the Vehicles Ordinance. Other than that, just reading out the purpose of it, Mr. Chairman, I really do not have too many comments at this point.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Hon. Peter Ernerk. Could you give me the name of the witness you are calling?

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, the witness is on his way. It is Mr. Bill Johns. He is not here at the moment, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Is it agreed that we call the witness, Mr. Bill Johns?

---Agreed

In the interim I will accept comments of a general nature on Bill 1-67. Mr. Lyall.

Standing Committee Comments On Bill

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to report on the meeting we had in the standing committee when we were looking at Bill 1-67. This Bill 1-67, the All-terrain Vehicles Ordinance, which would identify certain classes of vehicles and exempt them from provisions of the Vehicles Ordinance, which would enable municipalities and settlements to regulate their use by bylaw and it was suggested that we refer this bill to the committee of the whole and I have some clauses that we changed. I will get to them as we go through the bill.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Mr. Lyall. Comments of a general nature. Mr. Lyall.

MR. LYALL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This ordinance is not very long so I will give you these. In clause 2 we amended it to permit registration of vehicles which fall within the definition of all-terrain vehicle, Bombi, Messerschmitt bubble car and others. And the words "during the winter season only" be deleted from subclause 3(3). That the term of imprisonment provided for in subclause 3(6) be reduced from six months to three months. That paragraph 4(3)(b) be amended to permit a passenger to ride in an all-terrain vehicle under tow where someone is required to steer it. Paragraph 4(1)(c) which permits two all-terrain vehicles when riding side by side on roadways, be amended to read "to permit one such vehicle to pass another". The first ordinance we looked at did not allow for one to pass another vehicle when you have two riding side by side. We figured we would have to put in that so that the person would be permitted to pass another all-terrain vehicle when it is on the road. In paragraph 5(1)(c) the words "rates of speed" be replaced by "speed limit" and then we are ready to go clause by clause, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Mr. Lyall. Any other comments of a general nature? Hon. Peter Ernerk.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, the witnesses are here now and available to appear before the committee, Mr. Bill Johns and Mr. Al Brien.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The committee will call Mr. Bill Johns and Mr. Al Brien. Mr. Johns and Mr. Brien, do you have any comments you would like to make before we go any further with this particular ordinance?

MR. BRIEN: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could indicate our respective offices before starting. I am the chief of registries in which the motor vehicles branch is included. Mr. Johns is the acting registrar of motor vehicles under whose department the initiation of the instructions with respect to the ordinance originated.

Initiation Of Ordinance

Perhaps by way of some very preliminary remarks, the ordinance was initiated as a result of problems which were encountered in the small settlements in the territories with respect to vehicles which, under this ordinance have been classified as all-terrain vehicles but with specific reference to vehicles such as the three-wheeled Honda type of vehicle which is being used for hunting purposes. As a result of the problems which had been encountered, the requests were made for enabling legislation so that these vehicles could be controlled, not only through the legislation but regulations with the aspects of controlling their use in the communities and on roads, as well as the question of their insurance, as to whether or not they were to be required to be insured before they could be operated.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Mr. Brien. Comments of a general nature. Mr. Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: I wonder if the Northwest Territories Association of Municipalities have anything to say with respect to this bill, Mr. Chairman. It is going to impose on the member municipalities a certain amount of work and the association has, I know, been interested in this matter and I wonder if they have anything to say or have communicated anything to the Executive Member respecting this ordinance.

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

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, a discussion took place with a member of the Northwest Territories Association of Municipalities, Mr. Paul Nind, and myself some weeks ago and my understanding was that there were no hard feelings towards this particular bill.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Comments of a general nature.

MR. NICKERSON: They had no recommendations to make regarding the bill did they, Mr. Chairman?

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

HON. PETER ERNERK: My understanding is no, they had no recommendations to make.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Comments of a general nature. Hon. David Searle.

Distribution To Municipalities

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, my line of questioning was to have been much the same as Mr. Nickerson's, however I will take it a step further. Apart from not having received any adverse comment from the Association of Municipalities, was this ordinance in its current form as it appears before us first of all, circulated to the Association of Municipalities and secondly to its members? In other words, I would be particularly interested to know, as Yellowknife has a problem in the same way, whether the city of Yellowknife received a copy of this bill and has had an opportunity to comment and whether indeed it has commented.

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

HON. PETER ERNERK: I would rather ask one of the two witnesses whether or not Yellowknife has received a copy. It would be my understanding that if in fact, Yellowknife did receive a copy, they would have gone through either the office of the Clerk or Public Services.

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

MR. BRIEN: Yes, Mr. Johns has had discussions with Mr. Nind and perhaps he can relate the extent of those for the Honourable Member's question.

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

MR. JOHNS: I discussed this with Mr. Nind and gave him a copy of the regulations just prior to his trip to Frobisher, to an association meeting he was having there. He briefly discussed it with the members at the meeting and what he came back with was that he could see no problems with it.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Further comments of a general nature? Are you ready to go clause by clause? Mr. Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: We have been told, Mr. Chairman, that one of the recommendations of the standing committee on legislation was that certain types of vehicles which are designed both for highway operation and for off-road operation, at the request of the owner, should be able to be registered as a motor vehicle. I see that under subclause 12(3) of this bill, this has been dealt with by way of regulations. I wonder if we could have made available to us, while we are discussing the bill, those regulations which are to be ordered pursuant to subclause (3) of clause 12.

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

Regulations In Draft Form

MR. BRIEN: Mr. Johns has been working on the preparation of the regulations and they are considered to be in a partial draft form. However they are available and we could make copies as long as it was accepted that they are in that form.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Comments of a general nature. Are you ready to go clause by clause?

---Agreed

Page 1, clause 2, interpretation. Is it agreed? Mr. Evaluarjuk.

MR. EVALUARJUK: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I do not have my paper. I do not have my book with me.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Is there another copy of the book for Mr. Evaluarjuk? Hon. Peter Ernerk.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, the legislation, the Inuktitut version was supposed to be on its way down and while it was on its way down it got lost between upstairs and here.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The committee will stand recessed for five minutes.

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): This committee will come back to order as the Chair recognizes a quorum. Hon. Peter Ernerk.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to indicate to this House that during the five minute break I had the opportunity to speak to the executive director of the Northwest Territories Association of Municipalities and he tells me that he has no objection to this bill at all, and while I am at it the draft regulations have been distributed to each of the Members.

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

Clause 2, interpretation, on page 1. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 3, restriction on use outside communities. I believe this clause had some amendments proposed by the legislation committee but Mr. Lyall is not here. I am advised that we understand the amendments have been made, so clause 3, is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 4, general rules of operation and equipment requirements, on page 3. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 5, municipal bylaws, on page 3. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 6, unincorporated areas, on page 5. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 7, enforcement, on page 5. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 8, application of Vehicles Ordinance. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 9, impoundment. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 10, power to stop and inspect. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 11, time limit for prosecution. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 12, regulations. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 13, general penalty. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 14, amendments to Vehicles Ordinance. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 15, repeal and transitional, on page 8. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 16, commencement. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

The schedule. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 1, short title. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

The bill as a whole. Agreed?

---Agreed

Shall I report Bill 1-67 ready for third reading?

---Agreed

I would take this opportunity of thanking Mr. Brien and Mr. Johns for appearing before us. Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Stewart.

Report Of The Committee Of The Whole Of Bill 1-67, All-terrain Vehicles Ordinance

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been studying Bill 1-67, All-terrain Vehicles Ordinance, and wish to report that this bill is now ready for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Arnold McCallum, what is the wish of the Executive please?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, we would now like to consider Bill 14-67, An Ordinance to Amend the Municipal Ordinance, in committee of the whole.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there anything else there which could be conveniently put in with it at the same time?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I propose that we would then go into committee of the whole for Bill 13-67 followed by Bill 6-67, and then Bill 16-67. They do not bear much relationship to one another but they would all be in committee of the whole.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any objection by any Member to that, to putting a couple of those in at the same time and save us popping in and out?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreeable?

---Agreed

That being the case let us try it and put Bill 14-67 and Bill 13-67 into committee of the whole at the same time. Mr. Stewart, do you wish to take the chair?

MR. STEWART: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

---Legislative Assembly resolved into committee of the whole for consideration of Bill 14-67, Municipal Ordinance and Bill 13-67, Western Canada Lottery Ordinance, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL 14-67, MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE AND BILL 13-67, WESTERN CANADA LOTTERY ORDINANCE

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The committee will come to order to study Bill 14-67, An Ordinance to Amend the Municipal Ordinance. Hon. Arnold McCallum.

Bill 14-67: Municipal Ordinance

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, this proposed amendment for the election of mayors in the hamlets is in response to a motion presented to this Assembly by the Honourable Member, Mr. Evaluarjuk. These amendments provide that mayors of hamlets will be elected by the electorate at large in the same manner as mayors of cities, towns and villages. The amendment further includes a provision whereby the residents of a hamlet may, at their option through a plebiscite, cause the council to pass a bylaw to have mayors elected by the councillors from amongst themselves as is the present procedure. This can be accomplished under the procedures set out in section 150 of the Municipal Ordinance and that particular section permits the initiative to be taken by the council or the electorate. Twenty-five per cent of the electorate must submit a petition to cause first reading of the bylaw and then four copies of the bylaw are posted in conspicuous places in a community for a minimum of two weeks prior to the date set for voting on it. If the majority of the electors voting, vote in favour of the bylaw, the council must finally pass the bylaw within four weeks from the date of the plebiscite vote. The amendment provides that the same process is required to reverse the procedure and/or rescind any such bylaw. Also, Mr. Chairman, any such bylaw must be finally passed at least four months prior to the closing of nominations of candidates for election. This is to ensure that the bylaw is in place before the annual election process begins. I have no further comments to make, Mr. Chairman. I am not sure if the standing committee on legislation has any report on this particular bill.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Hon. Arnold McCallum. Do you have any witnesses you might want to call on this?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Not at the moment, sir, although if it does become necessary through questions on technical matters, I would then have people prepared to appear as witnesses.

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: He is in and out like a fiddler's elbow.

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

MR. NICKERSON: The Minister of Local Government has just told us there are two ways in which it can come about that a mayor can be elected directly in a hamlet. The first one would be for the council to decide that that is what they want to do, give a bylaw to that effect first reading and then put it

before the voters and it would require a simple majority to put it into effect. The other similar but slightly different method would be for the local people to take the initiative and 25 voters petition the council to arrange such a plebiscite. I wonder if we could be directed where in the ordinance this provision for local initiative, the provision for 25 members to request such a plebiscite is to be found?

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I indicated, Mr. Chairman, that section 150 of the Municipal Ordinance sets out the procedures that permit the initiative to be taken by the council or the electorate.

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

MR. NICKERSON: I have one question here and it was a similar question to the one that was raised when we were talking about liquor plebiscites. In section 150 of the Municipal Ordinance it states that 25 electors are needed to sign this petition but how do you determine who the electors are? The list of electors is only published in preparation for an election, so when the 25 people in the community want to get together they do not know whether they are electors or not. The way I believe we got around this with respect to liquor plebiscites was to say that the petitioners need only be residents but, of course, when the plebiscite is actually taken then those people voting in the plebiscite would have to be duly qualified electors and listed as such on the list of electors. I wonder if the same difficulty arises here, Mr. Chairman.

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

Qualifications For Voters

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, this proposed amendment allows the mayors of hamlets to be elected in the same way as the mayors of cities, towns and villages. Twenty-five per cent of the electorate submit a petition. The qualifications are laid out to become part of an electorate, to become a voter. They are simple qualifications under the Municipal Ordinance. I can not quote the section, but there is a residency clause involved in those qualifications.

MR. NICKERSON: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, this is a question more properly addressed to the Legal Advisor, whether she foresees with the present wording, the same types of difficulties that we did foresee with respect to liquor plebiscites, where there was not a list of electors at the time the petition was to be made.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, just before that, the qualifications to become part of the electorate -- again I do not know the section, but I think they are simple in nature and are three; a resident for six months, Canadian citizen and 19 years of age.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Hon. Arnold McCallum. Madam Legal Advisor, do you have any comments?

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Mr. Chairman, I believe that the procedure used would probably be simply to adopt the latest list of electors.

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

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, could the Legal Advisor advise us of the difference in wording with respect to petitions made under the liquor plebiscite provisions and those included in section 150 of the Municipal Ordinance?

Question Out Of Order

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I wonder, Mr. Nickerson, whether this is really in order on this particular bill inasmuch as section 150 is already in the Municipal Ordinance. We are dealing with an amended section that is not part of section 150. You are getting into a part that is already in place and is really not up for debate. It is already a matter of fact. We are not dealing with that today within the Municipal Ordinance, so I really think it is out of order, that line of questioning at this time. I think we are dealing with -- it is mentioned in here but it is already a matter of law. We are not approving section 150 today. It is already in place, Mr. Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: Would you care to debate that point, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I feel somewhat safe at the moment, Mr. Nickerson.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I would think that what we are doing here is simply using an existing section of the Municipal Ordinance whereby this particular amendment can be accomplished as a result of a motion put forth at this particular Assembly to allow the mayors of hamlets to be elected in the same way as mayors of cities, towns, and villages. I think you are absolutely correct.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Relative to the Liquor Ordinance, to answer your question, "Notwithstanding any provision of this ordinance, where at least 20 persons in a settlement or area petition to hold a plebiscite to determine whether the position, purchase..." It is 20 persons resident. However, inasmuch as we are not dealing with section 150 I do not see that it is really any part of the work that is before us under Bill 14-67. It is already in place. Any other comments of a general nature? Are you ready for clause by clause?

---Agreed

Page 1, clause 2. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 3. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 4. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 5. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 6. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 7. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 8. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 9, commencement. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 1. Agreed?

---Agreed

The bill as a whole. Agreed?

---Agreed

Shall I report Bill 14-67 ready for third reading?

---Agreed

We will turn our attention now to Bill 13-67, An Ordinance to Authorize Participation in the Western Canada Lottery. Hon. Peter Ernerk.

Bill 13-67: Western Canada Lottery Ordinance

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to make brief remarks with respect to this bill. Perhaps I should indicate what we have done in the Executive or in the Government of the Northwest Territories. There are four or five major points that I would like to bring before this committee before I go on to other remarks. First of all, the Government of the Northwest Territories will make an application to the Western Canada Lottery Foundation to become a partner in the foundation. Secondly, this piece of legislation would be, if passed, to legalize the sale of Western Canada Lottery tickets in the Northwest Territories.

Thirdly, the Sport North Federation would be designated as a territorial marketing organization and, fourthly, a new agreement would be developed to provide core funding for three to five years to allow the Sport North Federation sufficient time to implement the lottery operation and recognize predictable profit patterns.

Fifthly, during the first year of operation, the Western Canada Lottery ticket offices would be set up in seven communities which would include Yellowknife, Fort Smith, Pine Point, Hay River, Inuvik, Rankin Inlet and Frobisher Bay.

Brief Prepared By Sport North

Now, I would like to make a few further introductory remarks and I would like to read out a paper that has been prepared by the Sport North Federation: Since the incorporation of the Sport North Federation in 1976 its membership has grown by 40 per cent, from 15 in the Northwest Territories to the present 25. In the Sport North agreement the Commissioner agreed that all program grants for Sport North be turned over to Sport North to administer. There are two of them. They include coaching technical clinics for \$15,000. Secondly, annual general meetings of \$22,000. Another part of the agreement placed on Sport North the responsibility for the selection and preparation of the Northwest Territories teams to the Arctic Winter Games and Canada Winter and Summer Games. The growth of our member associations and increased travel costs for athletes over the past two years are placing a severe strain on the funds available through grants from the Northwest Territories government which have remained at the same level. The Sport North executive realizes that they can not meet their fund raising expectations from the present sources. Therefore, they have come up with an alternate source of funding.

After consulting with the 11 other sport federations across Canada, it was found that the two best funding vehicles were found to be, first, as territorial marketing agent for the Western Canada Lottery and secondly, as an agency for Loto Canada. Sport North has obtained an agency for Loto Canada from which is derived a small source of funds. The main source of funds would be obtained through Western Canada Lottery.

To obtain the territorial marketing organization for the Western Canada Lottery, legislation has to be passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories to make legal the sale of these tickets in the Northwest Territories. So far plans have been made to establish a lottery authority to administer the sale of tickets, set up an office for administration, and to establish accounting controls. Tickets would be sold in major population centres in the Northwest Territories. Eligible retailers would include the Northwest Territories sport associations, community sport teams, community recreation committees, service clubs and other community non-profit organizations. Half the profits would go to the community groups selling the tickets and the other half would go towards the growth of sport programs across the Northwest Territories.

Mr. Chairman, these are the few remarks that I would like to present to the committee and if I may be allowed to ask the committee to ask Mr. Al Smith, who is the general manager of the Sport North Federation to appear before this committee to answer any questions that might arise as a result of this bill.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Hon. Peter Ernerk. Is it agreed that we should call Mr. Al Smith as a witness?

---Agreed

Mr. Al Smith. Hon. Peter Ernerk.

HON. PETER ERNERK: Mr. Chairman, are we to have a brief report by the chairman of the committee on legislation before asking Mr. Al Smith to make a short presentation?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I can call for a report from the legislation committee. No one appears to have a report, Hon. Peter Ernerk. Comments of a general nature on Bill 13-67, An Ordinance to Authorize Participation in the Western Canada Lottery. Are you ready to go clause by clause? Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 2, Commissioner may make agreements. Is it agreed, gentlemen?

---Agreed

Clause 3, Commissioner may implement agreement. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 4, regulations. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 1, short title. Agreed?

---Agreed

The bill as a whole. Agreed?

---Agreed

Shall I report Bill 13-67 ready for third reading?

---Agreed

Thank you, Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Shall I report Bills 13-67 and 14-67 ready for third reading?

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Stewart.

Report Of The Committee Of The Whole Of Bill 14-67, Municipal Ordinance And Bill 13-67, Western Canada Lottery Ordinance

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been studying Bill 14-67 and wish to report that this bill is ready for third reading.

We have also been studying Bill 13-67 and wish to report that this bill is also ready for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Arnold McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, that went so well maybe we could try it again. Bill 6-67, Student Grants and Bursaries Ordinance, and Bill 16-67, Interpretation Ordinance.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Hon. Arnold McCallum. This House will resolve into committee of the whole for consideration of Bill 16-67, Interpretation Ordinance, and Bill 6-67, Student Grants and Bursaries Ordinance, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into committee of the whole for consideration of Bill 6-67, Student Grants and Bursaries Ordinance, and Bill 16-67, Interpretation Ordinance, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL 6-67, STUDENT GRANTS AND BURSARIES ORDINANCE, AND BILL 16-67, INTERPRETATION ORDINANCE

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The committee will come to order. Hon. Arnold McCallum, I understood you wanted to go first with Bill 6-67, is that correct?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: That is correct, Bill 6-67, Student Grants and Bursaries Ordinance.

Bill 6-67: Student Grants And Bursaries Ordinance

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The committee will come to order to study Bill 6-67, An Ordinance to Provide Grants and Bursaries for Certain Post-secondary School Students. Hon. Arnold McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, the bill provides for the awarding of grants and bursaries to certain students to enable them to attend post-secondary school institutions that are approved to carry out courses of study. It is a new ordinance, there are not very many particular parts to it, Mr. Chairman, and I would expect that if there are questions though, that Deputy Commissioner Parker would be able to field those.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Hon. Arnold McCallum. Mr. Lyall, have you any comment on this ordinance from your standing committee on legislation?

MR. LYALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The committee studied Bill 6-67, Student Grants and Bursaries Ordinance, which would provide for the awarding of grants and bursaries to certain students to enable their attendance at post-secondary school institutions and would repeal existing student grant ordinances. We thought it should be referred to committee of the whole for consideration, subject to certain changes we made.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Mr. Lyall. Comments of a general nature on Bill 6-67. Are you ready to go clause by clause?

---Agreed

Clause 2, interpretation. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 3, student grants and bursaries board. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 4, funding. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 5, applications for grants and bursaries. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 6, grants. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 7, appeals in relation to grants. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 8, bursaries. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 9, applications to be disapproved. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 10, absence of appeal. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 11, regulations. Mr. Lyall.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, one of the things that was supposed to be available to Members during consideration of this bill was the proposed regulations. Are they here now for the Members?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Clerk, are the proposed regulations available? They are on their way around, Mr. Lyall.

Clause 11, regulations. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 12, repeal. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 13, transitional. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 14, commencement. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 15, short title. Agreed?

---Agreed

The bill as a whole. Agreed?

---Agreed

Shall I report Bill 6-67 ready for third reading?

---Agreed

Bill 16-67: Interpretation Ordinance

I direct your attention to Bill 16-67, An Ordinance to Amend the Interpretation and Certain Other Ordinances. Hon. Arnold McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, as indicated in the statement of purpose of the bill, it includes an all-embracing definition of "Executive Member" and empowers the Commissioner to perform any of the statutory powers and duties of an Executive Member. It of course, makes consequential amendments to other ordinances. I think, Mr. Chairman, that this is something we have been doing when we have been bringing into force new bills or amendments. We have indicated within these bills, in the definition section or in other sections, reference to the Executive Member so that the Executive Member is then recognized as such and part of the government in the administration of particular ordinances.

In order to make sure that this is recognized in all the ordinances, and rather than making or bringing back amendments to every particular ordinance which will, of necessity, have to be done, there is then the all-embracing definition of "Executive Member" being placed in the Interpretation Ordinance itself. I have nothing further to add to that, Mr. Chairman, as the other consequential changes or amendments to various ordinances are all listed in section 3 of this proposed amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Hon. Arnold McCallum. Mr. Lyall, has your committee any report on Bill 16-67?

MR. LYALL: The provisions of this bill, Mr. Chairman, were generally originally found as a section in the services bill and the committee recommended the preparation of this bill so that an explanation of it would apply more generally to all territorial ordinances.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Mr. Lyall. Comments of a general nature on Bill 16-67. Are you ready for clause by clause?

---Agreed

Clause 1. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 2. Agreed?

---Agreed

Clause 3. Agreed?

---Agreed

Bill 16-67 as a whole. Agreed?

---Agreed

Shall we report Bill 16-67 ready for this reading?

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Stewart.

Report Of The Committee Of The Whole Of Bill 6-67, Student Grants And Bursaries Ordinance And Bill 16-67, Interpretation Ordinance

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been studying Bills 6-67 and 16-67, and wishes to report both of these bills ready for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Arnold McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully suggest that we break now for coffee and then go into Bill PM 1-67, Area Development Ordinance, after our return from coffee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Nickerson, as it is your Private Member's Bill, have you any objection to dealing with it right after coffee?

MR. NICKERSON: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: That being so, this House will resolve into committee of the whole for the consideration of Bill PM 1-67, Area Development Ordinance, with Mr. Stewart in the chair, and I will let Mr. Stewart adjourn for coffee.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into committee of the whole for consideration of Bill PM 1-67, Area Development Ordinance, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL PM 1-67, AREA DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The committee will come to order to study Bill PM 1-67. In view of the hour we will recess for 15 minutes for coffee. Is that agreed?

---Agreed

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The Chair recognizes a quorum and calls this committee meeting to order. We are dealing with Private Member's Bill PM 1-67 put forth by Mr. Nickerson. You will find it on the last page of your book. Mr. Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: This is a very simple matter, Mr. Chairman. All this amendment would do would be to limit the maximum size of a development area as defined under the Area Development Ordinance. Although this is a Private Member's Bill, it is brought forward on the wishes of the Legislature. Motions were passed at a previous session requesting that these amendments be made. The only reason for it is that when the Area Development Ordinance was originally passed there was presumably an oversight in that there was no restriction on the maximum area set forth in the legislation and as a consequence it would be possible for the Commissioner to tie up the whole Northwest Territories as a special development area which would, of course, be contrary to both the wishes of the Legislature and stated government policy.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Mr. Nickerson. Comments of a general nature on Private Member's Bill PM 1-67. Are you ready to go clause by clause?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I am just trying to -- it must be in this particular separate binding, is it?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): It is the last page in this book.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Fine.

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I just want to get the 25 kilometres, is it roughly 38 square miles or 40 miles? Is that it roughly?

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

MR. NICKERSON: To the best of my knowledge, one kilometre comprises about .6214 miles so therefore, to find the ratio with respect to square measure you would have to square it.

Restricting Provincial-type Power

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: It is 35, 36 or 38. Mr. Chairman, I guess there is some concern that we would have in here. The amendment as it is proposed presents some concern to the government in light of existing boundaries of communities now. There are some communities, of course, that have a larger boundary than the 25 kilometres and that would mean here that we would have to deal then with communities and there are a number of them. I could list a number of them that are affected by this that are greater than what is being asked within the amendment.

There were other concerns I think that we would have in regard to this. To a degree I think it could be retrogressive in that we would as an Assembly be limiting or restricting our use of provincial-type of power that we have in fact received from the federal government. The federal government because of its interest in areas and in particular federal acts such as the act on inland waters, Territorial Lands Act to a highway system they would of course then step in and exercise the right, their full right to regulate in the areas where this government has not fulfilled the responsibility delegated to it.

Communities below hamlet status would be limited in their desire to control land use within their boundaries and this ordinance, the Area Development Ordinance, is the only means they have for legalizing the zoning requirements. The purpose of the Area Development Ordinance basically is to provide the Government of the

Northwest Territories with the authority to zone and/or regulate development in any area and using the particular term, obviously develop in the public interest. The public interest is more than often indicated by a community council's request for the issuance of regulations under this ordinance. There are many instances where the ordinance has been used to regulate development in particular sensitive areas, the Yellowknife watershed, Yellowknife River watershed being roughly 900 square kilometres, whatever. The ordinance has been used to regulate and to zone land in the settlements at the request of communities, Norman Wells, for example, with 280 square kilometres. It is used to control the development along highway systems such as the Mackenzie highway system. If this government fails to regulate adequately under the ordinance, the obvious results are that the federal government would then issue regulations pursuant to its acts and I refer specifically to the act on inland waters; the Yellowknife River watershed, the Mackenzie highway and in many communities the uncontrolled or unplanned development of land with initial high servicing costs and the long-term problems of incompatible but adjacent lands.

Bill PM 1-67, Reworded

However, I would wonder whether the Honourable Member would consider going beyond the 25 kilometres. I was wondering in this section "An area designated under subsection (1) after the commencement of this subsection shall not exceed 100 square kilometres..." I would wonder whether the Member would be open then to an amendment to enlarge that particular amount and of course then the straight line joining the two points on the perimeter again being amended to extend that. I would hope that we would be able to come to some kind of agreement on that and I may be able to suggest certain other figures to it. I would like to hear what other Members possibly may have on this. I would hope that then we would not return the authority to the federal government, but would rather propose amendments to the Member's amendment of the Area Development Ordinance to more realistically, I think, and more properly try to retain some of that authority for this government. I wonder if I may, Mr. Chairman, simply put out the figure in that section to change 100 square kilometres to 150 in subsection (2), Mr. Chairman, then the straight line joining any two points on the perimeter be extended, to have that particular part read "Shall not exceed 30 kilometres."

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

MR. NICKERSON: I have no objection to that whatsoever, Mr. Chairman.

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Perhaps I should say where we are concerned with areas that are larger than that, I am sure the committee would agree that that then comes back to this House for approval and with those suggestions, Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Member would agree to those, I do not think then it presents that much difficulty to the government.

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

MR. NICKERSON: Not at all, Mr. Chairman. The figures 100 and 25 were more or less drawn out of a hat. They are just nice round figures. If a need could be demonstrated for 150 square kilometres and 30 kilometres in a straight line I have no objection whatsoever. The second part of Hon. Arnold McCallum's comments about coming back to this Legislature when larger areas are required, that is what I am trying to get at. This is what I want to see happen. I, of course, share Hon. Arnold McCallum's feelings that the last thing that we want to do is to allow the federal government to come in and regulate us under their Territorial Lands Act. What I would like to see happen is if larger areas of land need to be regulated such as the Liard highway, for instance, what I would like to see happen is a separate ordinance be drawn up where you could have a Liard highway authority ordinance which is then presented to this House. I am sure that the administration would agree with that way of

doing things, and then we could have a public debate on what should be included and what should be regulated within such an ordinance. I think that is what the people of the Northwest Territories would like us to do so that all these things are not done by regulation and public discussion is had on it and the representatives of the people are able to have their say as to how the regulation should take place. I am in complete agreement with Hon. Arnold McCallum.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Mr. Nickerson. The next speaker I have is Mr. Lyall.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, the question I was going to ask has been answered already so I have nothing further to say.

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

Areas Designated As Area Development Areas

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, much of what Hon. Arnold McCallum said, I am sorry I did not understand. I would just like to say that as I see the wording of this it says "after the commencement of this subsection..." that seems to me to suggest that for those area development areas that have been already set aside they presumably would remain. The effect of Mr. Nickerson's amendment I take it would be to limit in size only areas designated as area development areas in the future. Am I correct in that?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): That is the way I read it. Mr. Nickerson. Madam Legal Advisor.

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Mr. Chairman, I believe Hon. David Searle's interpretation is correct.

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

HON. DAVID SEARLE: That is why I did not understand much of what Hon. Arnold McCallum was saying about existing areas that would be affected and great confusion would reign. Now that he has the benefit of that I assume that those parts of his argument do not apply, and would I be correct in that, Hon. Arnold McCallum, or did I misunderstand you?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, what I was referring to when I talked about areas that are already in existence, I was using these as examples of what has gone on in the past. I have no real qualms or difficulties with it here, I simply point these out or just use them to point out particular instances in the past. I recognize that the wording is "after the commencement of this subsection" and that obviously refers to future use. My main concern where we had been using these examples of communities that have larger boundaries is that there was the need to enlarge them because the city of Yellowknife for example has a boundary I think somewhere in the vicinity of 75 miles, however that works out which is more than what had been proposed within the subsection. However I was using these primarily in terms of examples. If I have confused the Member, mea culpa.

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

Number, Size And Location Of Designated Development Areas

HON. DAVID SEARLE: I wonder if the Member could outline to the House since this is one of those ordinances that essentially gives the administration the power to declare these areas development areas, in other words in looking at the act to see what you are really talking about. I am wondering if the Minister could tell us how many development areas have been designated by the Commissioner, their size and location.

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, the regulations in existence pursuant to the Area Development Ordinance would be the Yellowknife River watershed, a development area by regulation, and it is 900 square kilometres and was requested by the city of Yellowknife and federal government; an area on each side of the Mackenzie highway from the Alberta/Northwest Territories border to Tuktoyaktuk and Fort McPherson along the Dempster to the Yukon border, approximately 12,875 kilometres, and that was through an Executive Committee request. There is the Resolute Bay area put into effect by the Government of the Northwest Territories. There is Norman Wells and that was by the community council and the Strathcona Sound development area by the government and in conjunction with the community the government has the Rae-Edzo development area, and that is already under regulation and there is one in Inuvik from the town council.

Some regulations were in existence in the past that have since been revoked as the communities became municipalities and some areas that we would have proposed to protect or regulate under this ordinance would have been the protection and zoning of airport lands and surrounding areas, community watersheds, land uses and zoning in unincorporated settlements, single resource communities and other areas on federal land which would require protection and Northwest Territories government participation and planning.

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

HON. DAVID SEARLE: I hope I did not hear correctly. Hon. Arnold McCallum, would you run that by us one more time, start at the Alberta/Northwest Territories border, where did it start and from each side of that highway how far does it go?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: There is an area on the Mackenzie highway from the Alberta/Northwest Territories border and it is an area that is eight miles wide; about 1000 to 1100 miles long, except areas within community boundaries. It approximates about 8000 square miles all the way to Tuktoyaktuk and then another area from Fort McPherson along the Dempster to the Yukon border. That was the Mackenzie development area and if the Mackenzie development area regulations had not been put in effect along the highways by the territorial government the feds would control under various acts and various federal legislation that particular area.

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

HON. DAVID SEARLE: I rather suspect that that example is the best example that could have produced exactly why Mr. Nickerson is proposing this amendment to prevent exactly that sort of thing. It seems to be a corruption of term to call it a development area when I suspect it is designed to make sure there is not any. I would have thought that the purpose of the ordinance was to control development, or at least to encourage it and make sure that it is done in an orderly fashion rather than to prevent it. I am just sorry now that there is contained in the amendment the words "after the commencement of this subsection".

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Comments of a general nature on Private Member's Bill PM 1-67?

Motion To Amend Subsection (2)

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Having heard that Mr. Nickerson was in agreement with the figures I had suggested, I wonder then if I may move that as an amendment to the bill so that it would read, in the fourth last line: "...shall not exceed 150 square kilometres of land,..." and the last line shall read "...not exceed 30 kilometres".

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): You said "move", Hon. Arnold McCallum.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Question. All in favour? Opposed, if any? The amendment is carried.

---Carried

Comments of a general nature on Private Member's Bill PM 1-67. Are you ready for clause by clause?

---Agreed

Clause 1, as amended. Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Private Member's Bill PM 1-67, is it agreed that I report it ready for third reading?

---Agreed

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, now that the bill is ready for third reading I have an ancillary question to put to the Minister and that is whether or not the Executive will return with a bill specifically dealing with the right of way and protection thereto of the Mackenzie highway through to the Dempster so that we can deal with that in a forthright manner before this House, and ultimately then withdraw it.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I would accept what the Member has indicated and we will attempt to come back as quickly as possible with that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Shall I report that Private Member's Bill PM 1-67 is now ready for third reading? Is it agreed?

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Stewart.

Report Of The Committee Of The Whole Of Bill PM 1-67, Area Development Ordinance

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been studying Private Member's Bill PM 1-67 and wishes to report that this bill is now ready for third reading as amended. Do you wish me to read the amendment at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I think you should, Mr. Stewart. Thank you.

MR. STEWART: Subsection (2) "An area designated under subsection (1) after the commencement of this subsection shall not exceed 150 square kilometres of land, and the straight line joining any two points on the perimeter shall not exceed 30 kilometres."

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Arnold McCallum, what is the wish now of the Executive?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I would wonder if the committee would now want to deal with Bills 12-67 and 15-67, the Institute of Chartered Accountants Ordinance and the Certified General Accountants' Association Ordinance.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Lyall has Bill 15-67 been dealt with by your committee, Bill 12-67 and Bill 15-67, and secondly is Bill 15-67 in your books gentlemen? I rather suspect and think it is still at the print shop.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, I think Bill 15-67 was looked at in about 1975 but it has not been before this committee. However, Bill 12-67 has been through the committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, Bill 15-67 it appears, Hon. Arnold McCallum, has not been vetted by the standing committee and indeed it is not even in our books here. We could however proceed with Bill 12-67 if you wish.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I apologize I thought it had been. I think it was our intention at the time to bring these two bills in tandem rather than to deal with one and perhaps then we could go on to some other particular aspect of the agenda, and may I suggest that we do Recommendation to the Legislature 1-67, Highway Signs Regulations.

MR. SPEAKER: Did you have a point of order?

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, I was going to say that it was our belief that we were going to deal with both of those bills.

MR. SPEAKER: We seem to be in agreement we will leave Bills 12-67 and 15-67 until both are ready to go in tandem. Now Recommendation to the Legislature 1-67, Highway Signs Regulations, that is the item being suggested. Is there anything else we could put in there at the same time? How about the proposed amendments to the Indian Act, Hon. Arnold McCallum?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could do Information Item 5-67, Proposed Changes in CMHC Funding Arrangements and Tabled Document 11-67, Policy on Single Resource Community.

MR. SPEAKER: You would like all three of them in would you? Mr. Stewart, are you prepared to take the committee for those three items, Information Item 5-67, Tabled Document 11-67 and Recommendation to the Legislature 1-67?

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lyall has offered to take the chair during this period.

MR. SPEAKER: That being so, this House will resolve into committee of the whole for consideration of Information Item 5-67, Tabled Document 11-67 and Recommendation to the Legislature 1-67.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into committee of the whole for consideration of Information Item 5-67: Proposed Changes in CMHC Funding Arrangements; Tabled Document 11-67: Policy on Single Resource Community and Recommendation to the Legislature 1-67: Highway Signs Regulations, with Mr. Lyall in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER INFORMATION ITEM 5-67: PROPOSED CHANGES IN CMHC FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS; TABLED DOCUMENT 11-67: POLICY ON SINGLE RESOURCE COMMUNITY AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE LEGISLATURE 1-67: HIGHWAY SIGNS REGULATIONS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): The committee will come to order, Information Item 5-67, Proposed Changes in CMHC Funding Arrangements. Comments of a general nature.

Information Item 5-67: Proposed Changes In CMHC Funding Arrangements

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, it occurred to me that this subject was dealt with yesterday during the time when the House was examining the Housing Corporation. At that time yesterday, that is, Mr. Forrest advised that for this year, as the information item indicates, we have a reprieve with regard to funding arrangements and for next year we are in the midst of further negotiations. Mr. Forrest is meeting with the president of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation next week in an effort to seek continuation of our present funding arrangements. I am not just sure what was required in the way of additional information when this item was put on the order paper.

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

MR. NICKERSON: When the request was made, Mr. Chairman, that this matter be put on the order paper it was requested at the time that it be dealt with at the same time as the estimates for the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation. For some reason or another that was not the case. That was not done. It is true that Mr. Forrest did yesterday answer some questions relating to the funding of the organization he manages, but the answers were of a very cursory nature and did not go into any detail. I think the type of information that we would like in discussing this information item is exactly what the concept of global funding was all about. We have never had a clear explanation. We have been given to understand I think that it is something to do with the guaranteeing of funds lent for mortgage purposes by the federal government or guaranteeing by the federal government of funds lent for such purposes. We have never had it clearly defined what it is all about and we have never been given any explanation as to how we were able to circumvent this global funding system. There would certainly seem to be certain advantages at least nationally and possibly even territorially to the global funding system if it could be worked out. I think a little bit more detail would be required than we had yesterday.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Thank you, Mr. Nickerson. Deputy Commissioner Parker. Representing A Degree Of Autonomy.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: The proposal for global funding is one that was worked out between CMHC and the provinces. To the best of my knowledge, the provinces are supporters of this arrangement and one of the reasons being that they have the ability and, of course, the right to issue debentures and to borrow money on the open money market. I think that to the provinces it represents a further degree of autonomy in this field and I am not certain if that observation is right, but I think that it is an accurate observation.

The problem that it creates for the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation and in fact for the territorial government, is that we do not have the authority under the Northwest Territories Act to borrow money from sources outside of the federal government. This would, therefore, mean a change in our governmental funding approach. The corporation has no particular concern with that other than the fact that it does not have the authority and it is not certain if that authority can be easily won. To the very best of my knowledge it requires a change to at least one federal act for us to do this.

The corporation then is very much concerned that until the consequential changes are made, if indeed they are to be agreed to at all, we could be placed in the position of having our major funding source cut off. I guess that is it in a nutshell. What the corporation is trying to do is to arrange for an exemption so that we may continue to borrow from the Government of Canada under the National Housing Act until such time as all of the lines are cleared for some further different funding arrangements, until such time as either the corporation or the territorial government would be in a position to issue its own debentures.

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

MR. NICKERSON: So I am correct in my understanding of the global funding proposal at least as far as it is applicable to the provinces that the province would go to the normal money markets for the raising of money which they could then relend or otherwise use for the construction of housing and that the CMHC would no longer loan these funds to the provinces but they would guarantee them, they would guarantee the provincial loans. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

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

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, I am not certain about the guaranteeing side of it and I regret I do not have my notes on global funding here. I should have had them but I do not have them. What Mr. Nickerson says is right up to the point of guaranteeing the debentures and I am not certain on that point.

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

The Ginnie Mae System

MR. NICKERSON: That is the point I want to get at, Mr. Chairman. You will forgive me if I am thinking in national terms now rather than territorial terms, but it would appear to me that it would be in the national interest to operate in that fashion and I would look forward to the establishment in Canada of a similar system to what they have in the United States of America with federally guaranteed loans of this nature and the establishment of a market giving liquidity to what in the United States is called Ginnie Mae, the Government National Mortgage Association. I think it would be desirable to have a similar system in Canada and although of course we might have to make certain exceptions in the case of the Northwest Territories because of our authority to borrow on the free market. I would appreciate it very much, Mr. Chairman, if I could be informed of what exactly this funding arrangement is; maybe not at the present time, maybe even privately, but the second question I have, Mr. Chairman, is properly addressed to the Legal Advisor and that concerns the constitutional authority of the Northwest Territories to borrow funds. I understand this matter is covered in the Northwest Territories Act and I would be most grateful if we could be advised of the circumstances under which we can borrow funds and what the required authorization is if we are to do that.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Any more comments? Deputy Commissioner Parker.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, no.

MR. NICKERSON: That was a question of a legal nature that I think the Legal Advisor would be able to deal with.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Could you repeat your questions to the Legal Advisor?

MR. NICKERSON: The question was, Mr. Chairman, what is our constitutional authority to borrow funds and how do we acquire the necessary authorization from the federal authorities?

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

Constitutional Authority To Borrow Funds

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Section 24 of the Northwest Territories Act authorizes the Commissioner in Council to make ordinances for a number of purposes which are listed. The first is for the borrowing of money by the Commissioner for territorial, municipal or local purposes on behalf of the territories. The other two sections actually deal with the lending of money rather than the borrowing, so subsection 24(1) allows the Commissioner in Council to make an ordinance for borrowing money and subsection (2) states that no money shall be borrowed under the authority of this section without the approval of the Governor in Council.

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

MR. NICKERSON: If for some reason and we have every reason to believe this will not be the case, but if CMHC absolutely forbade us to borrow directly from them and insisted that we become part of the global funding arrangement, there would be constitutional authority, although it would need an order in Council, for us to borrow money on the open market and to relend that money to the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation, is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

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

LEGAL ADVISOR (Ms. Flieger): Yes, Mr. Chairman, provided the approval of the Governor in Council were obtained. I think that is the case.

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

Borrowing Arrangements

MR. NICKERSON: A final question on the matter of funding of the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation, Mr. Chairman, is: Are we to continue borrowing funds from CMHC in the identical manner to which we have been borrowing before, or the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation has been borrowing such funds before, or is there going to be any difference apart from fluctuations in interest rates? Are we to maintain the present system or is the system to be changed at all?

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

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, for this year, that is, the year 1979, the borrowing arrangements will be the same as they have been in the past. I am not just sure what the Member is getting at because that is the subject that is under discussion right now as to whether our funding arrangements may be continued under the same circumstances or whether indeed they will have to change. I do not know.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Thank you, Deputy Commissioner Parker. Any more comments or questions? Shall I report this as completed?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, I will get the information and pass it on to Mr. Nickerson and any other Members who might desire it on the question of guarantees, guarantees by the federal government or an agency of the federal government under the global funding system and further following the remarks of the Legal Advisor, it seems quite clear to me that the territorial government is not prevented by the act from borrowing from a source other than the federal government but we are restrained by having to gain Governor in Council approval. I suppose I had the feeling that we were governed that way because that has been the practice and of course we have been able to borrow money at a slightly preferred rate of interest, and therefore I have not had any occasion to seek funding from outside the government.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Thank you, Deputy Commissioner Parker. Shall I report this information item completed? Is that agreed?

---Agreed

Tabled Document 11-67: Policy On Single Resource Community

The next item is Tabled Document 11-67, Policy on Single Resource Community. Hon. Arnold McCallum, have you any comments?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, this particular topic arose after some discussion in the Assembly, and I forget the exact session when this came up but I think it first arose from the Honourable Member from Yellowknife North, Mr. Nickerson, and I think Mr. Lafferty, from Mackenzie Liard. He talked about this as well. I think in the beginning it was to deal specifically with services but upon taking the recommendation of the Members to inquire into this the administration felt it necessary to expand on that direction and deal more generally with many other things in single resource communities. This particular policy has, the work, has been underway for some time. We are very pleased to be able to bring this proposal to the House and the committee. The document is I think four and a half pages or so in length and it defines or gives a definition for single resource communities. It states the objective of the policy as regards the position of the Government of the Northwest Territories in providing services and the availability of these services to such communities. It then makes a policy statement, talks about statutory services and a special service agreement. There were concerns about the administration within the single resource community as we on occasion visited these particular communities. The drafting of the policy involved consultation with governments and of course consultation was carried out with the particular industry, or various industries where they were affected.

Other than that, Mr. Chairman, without reading directly the total policy, and I do not think it is necessary to have it read orally to the committee, the administration presents this proposal, this policy for consideration by the committee and hopes that it will meet with their approval.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Thank you, Hon. Arnold McCallum. Are there any further comments? Mr. Nickerson.

Statutory Services

MR. NICKERSON: I have read through this, Mr. Chairman, and I generally approve of it. I congratulate the Minister of Local Government for putting it together for us and I think that it will prove to be a reasonable and realistic policy. I have only one question on it and that is to be found on page two under "Statutory Services" where it says "The Government of the Northwest Territories will, in accordance with territorial ordinances and consistent with current program criteria, provide universal statutory services to new and existing single resource communities." I would like to know what the words "consistent with current program criteria..." mean. Does that mean the exclusion of anything?

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I am just trying to recollect if in fact there is anything untoward to this. I guess there is nothing underhanded-- I should not say underhanded, I guess, I know there is nothing underhanded involved here, but I say that because Mr. Nickerson has that impression, but the only thing that I would feel is as the Deputy Commissioner has indicated, obviously it would refer to a program of financing within the available budget. Anything else, I can not think of anything that is involved in here.

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

MR. NICKERSON: How would Tungsten be treated now for purposes of medical services, would it be treated any differently now from other communities?

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, no, I do not think it would be treated any different than other communities. In fact they are better off I would think under this than they would have been, they are better off under this policy than they would have been. We made particular trips to Tungsten to talk to the industry and the people living in the community, and we also met with them in Yellowknife prior to developing this particular policy, and I know that because I was there personally and was talking with them, the community people, the people involved in the community. So, the answer then to his question is, in my opinion, no, although I treat it as other communities and I would think that they are better off than they had been.

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

MR. NICKERSON: That is what I am trying to get at. I see these words in here and I would not have interpreted them as being underhanded, I know the administration just would not do things like that. I would like a kind of guarantee if it is possible to get one that the people of Tungsten, if they are otherwise eligible, will be able to get a medical card the same as people living in Yellowknife or Inuvik or Resolute Bay and the doctors resident in that community will be treated in the same manner as doctors resident in Yellowknife or other places. Can we have that guarantee, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Yes, I will give you the guarantee.

---Laughter

Hon. Arnold McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I thought he was asking you to guarantee it. Again, without using the stack; yes. I think that should then set at ease any apprehension that the Member has or has had.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Any further comments of a general nature, comments or questions? Shall I report this discussion concluded on Tabled Document 11-67? Is it agreed?

---Agreed

Recommendation To The Legislature 1-67: Highway Signs Regulations

Now, Recommendation to the Legislature 1-67, Highway Signs Regulations. The floor is open for discussion. Hon. Arnold McCallum.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: Mr. Chairman, this is a highways matter or a regulation of highways matter. The House at its last or at a recent sitting asked that we review the highway signs regulations with a view to permitting a few more signs than are now permitted and what this regulation, or pardon me, what this recommendation to the Legislature says in a word is that we propose to do this.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Any further comments? Mr. Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: Years ago, Mr. Chairman, when you were driving back home from Alberta it used to be very reassuring once you crossed the sixtieth parallel and could see the signs all over the highway, you knew you were back home. In many ways I was sorry to see them go but I guess as it says in this document we have before us that a continual battle against sign pollution is being waged by the environmentalists who unfortunately appear to be winning. That being the case, I would imagine that this policy we have before us is the best we could hope for. All I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, is if somebody applies to the department to have a sign erected how long will it take for that to be done; is it a matter of continuous negotiation over a period of two years or is it very easy to have this done?

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

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: If the Member refers to the length of time necessary to gain approval I would think that that should be possible within any given 30 day period.

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

MR. NICKERSON: In the case where the government would erect on behalf of someone else a sign and the government is responsible for the erection of a sign, and it must be made by themselves or made for themselves so that it complies with keeping the highways neat and tidy in having signs of a similar design, does it take a long time to manufacture and erect a sign in that case?

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

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: I suspect it will depend on the complexity of the sign and to some extent on weather conditions, whether it can be erected or not or if it is the middle of winter, but bearing those sort of things in mind I would think that we should work to a maximum of a couple of months.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Any more comments? Hon. David Searle.

Motion That Recommendation To The Legislature 1-67 Be Approved.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that the recommendation be approved.

Motion Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lyall): Any further discussion? Question. All in favour? Contrary? Is it agreed?

---Carried

Shall I report the discussion completed?

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Lyall.

Report Of The Committee Of The Whole Of Information Item 5-67: Proposed Changes In CMHC Funding Arrangements; Tabled Document 11-67: Policy on Single Resource Community; And Recommendation To The Legislature 1-67: Highway Signs Regulations.

MR. LYALL: Mr. Speaker, your committee has considered Information Item 5-67, Proposed Changes in CMHC Funding Arrangements, and I wish to report the discussion is concluded. Your committee also considered Tabled Document 11-67, Policy on Single Resource Community, and I wish to report that this discussion concluded also. Recommendation to the Legislature 1-67, Highway Signs Regulations, was considered and in that respect I would like to report that the recommendation was accepted as submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Arnold McCallum, what is the recommendation of the Executive now?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, it has been indicated to me by the Honourable Member from Mackenzie Liard, Mr. Lafferty, that the Information Item 4-67, Distinct Native Groups in the Northwest Territories, that he does not want to bring that forward so may that be stricken from the agenda, the orders of the day? I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to go to Tabled Document 13-67, Local Government, Direction for the 1980's Summary and Tabled Document 20-67, Responsibility and Local Revenue. Mr. Speaker, within the latter of the two items it may be necessary for me to have technical assistance in dealing with this and at that time I would want to request bringing in some members of the departmental staff if that would be in order.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Arnold McCallum, so that I understand it, you want to deal with Tabled Document 13-67 and Tabled Document 20-67, is that correct?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Yes, Mr. Speaker. That is correct.

MR. SPEAKER: I notice Tabled Document 10-67, Proposed Ordinance Respecting Hamlets, also deals with local government.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and we could put that into committee of the whole as well. I would prefer obviously, of course, to deal with Tabled Document 13-67 and then Tabled Document 20-67 and then go into the Tabled Document 10-67 in that order.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Stewart, you have had a rest. This House will resolve into committee of the whole for consideration of Tabled Documents 10-67, 13-67 and 20-67, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

---Legislative Assembly resolved into committee of the whole for consideration of Tabled Document 10-67: Proposed Ordinance Respecting Hamlets; Tabled Document 13-67: Local Government, Direction for the 1980's Summary; Tabled Document 20-67: Responsibility and Local Revenue, with Mr. Stewart in the chair.

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER TABLED DOCUMENT 10-67: PROPOSED ORDINANCE RESPECTING HAMLETS; TABLED DOCUMENT 13-67: LOCAL GOVERNMENT, DIRECTION FOR THE 1980'S SUMMARY; TABLED DOCUMENT 20-67: RESPONSIBILITY AND LOCAL REVENUE

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The committee will come to order to study Tabled Document 13-67, Local Government, Direction for the 1980's Summary. In view of the hour is it your desire to recess for 15 minutes for coffee?

---Agreed

---SHORT RECESS

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The Chair recognizes a quorum and calls the committee back to order. Tabled Document 13-67, Local Government, Direction for the 1980's Summary. Mr. Minister, have you any comments with regard to this paper?

Tabled Document 13-67: Local Government, Direction for the 1980's Summary.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, some very brief comments if I may. The document that Members have I would hope they have read through it and have some idea of what in fact they see that should occur as regards development of local government in the Northwest Territories. I am particularly pleased to bring this document to the House because it is I think a most important one in relation to political development at the primary level. There were some major emphases noted within the document and it is the belief of the Government of the Northwest Territories that local government must continue to be developed and it must be strengthened and it must remain a high priority for this government. We believe that local government is the best way to ensure competent government at all levels that represents all northerners and which would reflect the priorities and meet the needs of residents of the territories. We believe it to be the base of all government in the territories. There are a number of emphases that must be followed, which we believe must be followed, and we make specific recommendations dealing with local government structure and framework with responsibility and local revenue.

Finally, the involvement of a local council in municipal and non-municipal activities. So, as a result of those emphases, we have made certain basic recommendations and I would hope that Members of this committee would agree with those recommendations under those three basic headings, that is, on the structure and framework of local government and the responsibility and local revenue for which there is a separate document and the concern as it has been expressed in the past in this House about the involvement of a municipal government at all levels in both municipal and non-municipal activities. I can not overemphasize, Mr. Chairman, what I think to be the importance and significance of these two documents because without the acceptance of these kinds of documents I think that we will have a difficult time in promoting local government and hence government at all levels in the territories. I have little to add to that, Mr. Chairman, other than to again say that if we get into technical matters I would appreciate being able to have some of the department's staff come in as witnesses.

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

All Council Members Should Be Elected

MR. LYALL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This Tabled Document 13-67, one thing I object to is the fact of recommendation 6, I do not agree and never have agreed that we should have appointed members to any governing body. Recommendation 6 reads: "That to form one local government council where there is both a band council and a settlement or hamlet council, the option exists for one local governing body to be formed as follows: (a) council to consist of a combination of band council members and representatives of the remainder of citizens in the community in proportion to their percentage of the community population; (b) band members on the local governing council to be selected by the band council; (c) other council members to be chosen through election."

I think every governing member, whether you have band councils, settlement councils or hamlet councils, all council members should be elected and this is one recommendation I do not agree with where you are going to put somebody on a governing body. As I say, everybody as a council member should be

chosen through an election. The thing is we finally did that with this territorial Assembly. It used to be appointees from Ottawa, from Toronto and Edmonton and we finally got a fully elected Assembly and Local Government recommends in their Direction for the 1980's to go back to this again. I do not believe it. I think if anybody wanted to serve as a council member he should be chosen by election, not to be recommended that he be put in to be a part of the governing body by anyone who is in the band council. That is all I have to say about this recommendation, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Lyall, did you want to move that we disagree with recommendation 6?

MR. LYALL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if the time comes I will make the motion that we do not agree with recommendation 6.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Mr. Lyall. Any comments?

Historical Development Of Band Councils

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I would have thought we would have gone not so much into the background but certainly go through the book in more detail. There may well be comments of other people to any of the recommendations, but I think one of the parts of the background to this, one should read that. We have to recognize that there has been an historical development of band councils. They in fact elect their members and we have to recognize that at the present time there is a major emphasis of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to strengthen band councils, to broaden their sphere of authority and responsibility. Notwithstanding that band councils were developed by the government, by the federal government, band councils are a well established structure throughout Canada and because of the thrust to strengthen those, to provide them with greater autonomy, to give them more responsibility, I think that we have to recognize that that is so.

We are talking about options throughout the paper and it would seem to me that we would be better served by it by going through, recognizing that we have provided a background with not too much detail but that we as well talk about certain major emphases. I would hope that we would agree on those before we get into the recommendations.

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

The Funding Of Band Councils

MR. FRASER: Mr. Chairman, to just briefly comment on Mr. Lyall's statement on recommendation 6, I do not know if this is worded wrong but it seems to me like it is. I can not see Local Government getting into the business of the band councils because they elect their own chief, they elect their own councillors and I can not see where Local Government has anything to do with it, that is their business, they can do what they want. As long as they are not using Local Government funds, they have their own funds, the band council have their own funds and in every community where you have a band council they select the members who will be on that band council, they elect their own chief, and I can not see that unless they are funding them, and I do not know if they are funding them or not, but the practice has been for years that the Indians elect their own councillors, their own chief the whole thing and it has nothing to do with Local Government.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Mr. Fraser, did you ask whether or not this government was funding band councils, was that the question?

MR. FRASER: According to this it looks that they are funding them but I understand they have their own funds through the federal government, unless the Minister could tell me if they are funding band councils now. I thought they were funding settlement councils.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Hon. Arnold McCallum, can you clarify this point please?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, the Government of the Northwest Territories funds local community councils and the federal government provides core funding for band councils.

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

MR. FRASER: Then how is it entered into Local Government? Where does Local Government come in if the federal government is funding them directly with core funding, every settlement along the Mackenzie Valley, and Fort Franklin has a hamlet council which is funded by the territorial government and they hold their elections by ballot, the same as we do and so does Fort Norman and Fort Good Hope, but the band councils are funded by the federal government and that is their business how they want to select their members, they do that themselves and Local Government I do not think has anything to do with it. Am I right, Mr. Chairman?

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: There is nothing in this document that indicates that the Department of Local Government or the Government of the Northwest Territories funds band councils. You are confusing the terms "local government" and when we are talking about local government we are talking about the settlement government and do not confuse it with the Department of Local Government.

The Band Structure

MR. FRASER: Mr. Chairman, if I can read this right, "To more fully recognize and accommodate the band structure in Indian communities", the "band structure", and perhaps the wording is wrong, Mr. Chairman, then it goes on to say "create a body responsible for local government in the Indian communities", and that part is all right, on page four.

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

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, I would just, or I was stating, that if we have settlement councils or hamlet councils they should all be elected by an election to that position. I do not think, even if they have a band council in the settlement, I do not think that they should be able to put one guy in there. If they want somebody out of that band, they are all band members there anyway, pretty well, and somebody from the band council should run him in the settlement council elections. If he does not get in, too bad and if he does get in, fine but we do not just appoint someone to go into the settlement council because it is a band council, that does not mean that they would like to see him on the settlement council. The reason I disagree with this is because I do not believe in people being appointed to that kind of position.

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

MR. FRASER: Maybe if I could just comment on that. In most settlements that I have been in, and take Fort Franklin, the chief there is the chief of the band council, he was up until last fall the chairman of the hamlet council and he was the chairman of the co-op federation and there was another one.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Justice of the peace?

Strong Band Councils In The Settlements

MR. FRASER: He was everything and in most of the settlements, if you take the people who are on band councils, most of them were on the hamlet council too and that goes back to Fort Norman and Fort Good Hope as well. A lot of people on the band council are also on the settlement council, so there is nothing stopping them running for the territorial Legislative Assembly, anybody can run, and in a lot of cases they are elected for the simple reason that in some of the communities, not all of them, but some of them, the chief, they usually try and pick a chief who is a non-drinker and he usually picks the guys for his council who are non-drinkers too. So, they have a pretty strong band council in some of the settlements and they try and get those guys into the settlement council as much as possible so there is no discrimination against them getting into the settlement council or hamlet council, but this recommendation on page eight it mentions the band members forming a local government council to be selected by the band council, and under recommendation 6(1)(b), and I do not understand as it says "band members on the local governing council to be selected by the band council". I understand now Mr. Lyall's comments that they are selected by the band council and I do not think that that is right myself, because they are usually selected, or they did try and select a council by a show of hands but it did not work so they had to go back and hold an election. However anybody in the community can run as long as he is nominated, there is no problem. Mr. Chairman, would you say that that wording is wrong in recommendation 6(1)(b)?

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): No, I just think it smells bad.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Oh, come on! Put your nose the other way.

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

MR. LYALL: Does Local Government, Hon. Arnold McCallum, do you agree with this?

Major Emphases In Local Government

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I indicated in the beginning that we saw certain major emphases in local government, and the reason why we saw those. We believe that these emphases, and they are there in front of everybody, from page three on to page five that we have to develop among local government bodies and people, greater responsibility, economic, social and political, for the efficient management of their communities and the delivery of their programs and services. As a second emphases we have to relate more closely the level of programs and services in a community to local willingness to contribute towards the cost of those services. As a third emphasis we said to develop greater flexibility in the local government structure and framework to better recognize differences in geographic areas, community differences in their priorities, cultural differences and differences in the means of livelihood from community oriented wage employment to seasonal resource harvesting. We said we must develop incentives for the effective and efficient delivery of local government programs and services.

We said another emphasis must be to strengthen local government councils and to clearly establish the prime importance of the councils in providing over-all direction and guidance for the well-being of the community. We said as a sixth emphasis to more fully recognize and accommodate the band structure in Indian communities, so as to create a body responsible for local government in the Indian communities that has the support of all residents. To go on, to encourage and facilitate the process of transferring responsibility for programs and services from the territorial government to local government councils.

Finally, we said to develop an understanding among local government councils that the pace of constitutional development or political development, will depend in part, on their willingness to accept financial responsibility along with increased authority.

Recommendations To Effect Emphases.

Now, from those eight major emphases we put forward certain particular recommendations, recommendations dealing with local government and structure. We recommended in that particular area that to form one local government council where there is both a band council and a settlement or hamlet council, the option exists for one local governing body to be formed as follows -- and you have options for it. Now, you asked me if I agreed with that and of course I do or I would not have brought it here in the first place. Those options are there.

MR. FRASER: Are you getting mad?

MR. LYALL: Mr. Chairman, now I know that you agree with that but I think it is a stupid thing to put into a paper like this because we are as Canadians trying to run our country the best we can and so should the people at the local level.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I will not argue with that.

MR. LYALL: The only way you will do that is to get in the people who the people want and the only way you can do that is by election. What will we say next, that the Indian Brotherhood could put a person in this House? Perhaps we should say that so should the Metis Association, maybe they should put a person in this House and the rest of them, we will have an election for the rest of them and that is not right either, but that is exactly what this is saying, that is the recommendation and I just do not believe it. So, if you think it is good -- this is one recommendation I am against, I do not want anybody to throw a punch at me, or something, because I do not believe in that recommendation.

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

Establishment Of Boundaries By Communities.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to speak specifically to the recommendation but I guess it relates to local government in the Northwest Territories. What I am concerned about is the undermining of local government in the communities with relation to the Committee for Original Peoples Entitlement land claims. As I said the other day the boundaries, the community boundaries of the hamlet of Tuktoyaktuk have been reduced, they have been reduced. What I am trying to say is that that is after we have been working so hard over these past years to encourage local government in the communities to get them going, to give them a little bit of freedom to run their own community, to establish or to have some say in their own boundaries or boundaries within their own area. We have been working very hard.

For about 12 years now we have been trying to get the community to have a little bit of say in their own boundaries, but here the federal government disregards what we are doing in the North, disregards what we have been doing. They have not got a clue what we are doing. It seems to me that when they shrink the boundaries of a settlement or the hamlet of Tuktoyaktuk, that takes away the power we have been trying to give to the people in the community to run their own show. I will give you an example of just what happened a few days ago. Imperial Oil operates on one side of the harbour and that area now is out of the hamlet boundaries according to the federal COPE land claim. It used to be within the boundary. Imperial Oil ran out of water. They could not get water to make tea or coffee. They had to have a permit to go to the lake behind their base to get water and to get that permit they had to go to COPE instead of going to the local settlement council. COPE, which is established in Inuvik, did not give them an answer at all. They refused, so they had to make coffee out of salt water from the harbour. Mr. Chairman, are we going to scare industry away by that kind of stuff?

Protection Of Boundaries

We have been hollering all this time trying to get some direction as to the economic development in communities and here we find that the power is not with the community any longer. It is with somebody else, somebody who is not even in the community. Even though the settlement of land claims in the Western Arctic have not been approved officially, they are already starting to throw their weight around. What I would like, Mr. Chairman, is to make a motion that all settlements in the Northwest Territories be protected, the boundaries be protected, perhaps even a plan to accommodate community growth before land claims are settled so that we can live with the settlement of land claims and also live with the community, but, Mr. Chairman, it will take me a little while to draw up such a motion.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart); We will not accept this as a motion at this time. We will give you time to put the motion together and bring it back, Mr. Steen. Mr. Lafferty.

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, I think there is a question arising here which is a question of principle that this House has endorsed in its Priorities for the North paper. We had at one time said we supported the principle of enshrining native rights. We have a group of people who have an enshrinement with the federal government and these people are Indian people. Whether I like it or not, I respect their rights. Mr. Chairman, I am here because many of those people have voted and participated in the election processes. When I think of this, Mr. Chairman, then I say to myself if a small settlement anywhere in the Northwest Territories has a right to govern itself, then that right should be extended to every Indian community that is Indian and there are Indian communities.

Secondly, if this is true, then if the Indian Brotherhood or the Dene Nation or whatever, decided to sponsor or support a member and have representation in this House, then so be it. These are the principles I believe in and I support.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see anything here that says anything about an Indian government in recommendation 6. I understand that recommendation to read that if I, as a non-treaty Indian or Metis person, lived at Trout Lake and the band council there decided that it was the local government then I have a right to participate in it. I think that is fair if we are to respect democracy. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Deal With Recommendations Singly.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we might deal with the recommendations one at a time by way of motion to approve or reject them and record the results because I think the paper is set out in a clear form and it can be dealt with in that manner. I notice it seems we are all talking about recommendation 6 at this point in time. Maybe the thing to do is get discussion with respect to that one over with since we are partly into it in any case and vote on it and then revert to dealing with them in some order.

I had a couple of questions, however, of a preliminary nature that do not deal with any of the recommendations that I would like to put if I may and that is whether the Department of Local Government after the preparation of this paper have consulted with the Northwest Territories Association of Municipalities and in particular the city of Yellowknife? If so, what are their views, if any?

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, the association is aware or has been made aware of the major recommendations of this paper. There has been consultation with communities, although I am not sure in point of fact whether there has been direct consultation with the city of Yellowknife.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I would simply say these are major policy decisions that we felt should be given here in this House. This is where they should have been ratified. I would concur with the Hon. David Searle's suggestion here to start with the basic, the first recommendation and go on.

Recommendations In Conflict

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I think that would probably be the best and hold off until we get down the line because I think if you pass recommendation 1, I do not see how in the world you can pass recommendation 6. They just do not agree with one another. They are in complete conflict in my opinion. Are you ready to go to the recommendations which are found on page five, recommendation 1, or do you want comments of a general nature? These are not of a general nature. We are zeroing in on a particular section. Mr. Lyall.

MR. LYALL: I have my motion ready on recommendation 6.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Maybe you could hold it until we get to recommendation 6. Mr. Whitford.

MR. WHITFORD: I talked to Mr. Anderson on the phone about this and we have only seen this in sort of a draft and they have never seen it again. They wanted to discuss the thing before it was put on the order paper. I see Mr. Nind here and maybe he could explain some of this as well as a witness. We have not seen this.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Whitford, for the benefit of the House, could you tell us the first person you named, what his position is?

MR. WHITFORD: I would first have to ask him, Mr. Chairman.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, this is a paper of the Government of the Northwest Territories under Local Government. It is not a paper of the Association of Municipalities. There has been discussion. It would seem to me that we are the ones who should decide on it. I think we have indicated to communities, and maybe not them all, about what we were planning, but it would seem to me then if the communities were to ratify this and then we were to come in, that is going

backwards. I would further suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if we do accept recommendation 1, the basic democratic principles, that recommendation 6 does not cause any difficulty then. That is in my humble opinion.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Hear, hear! I agree.

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

MR. LYALL: Could I ask a question? Could you repeat what in your humble opinion you said about recommendation 6?

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I said in my humble opinion, although I used that phrase after I made the statement, but I will switch it and it means the same thing. In my humble opinion if you accept the basic democratic principles that are indicated in recommendation 1, you can not have any difficulty with recommendation 6.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart); Would you clarify the words "You can not have any difficulty"? Are you saying you can not approve it?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: You can not have any trouble in accepting recommendation 6.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. I direct your attention to page five, recommendation 1, basic democratic principles. Mr. Nickerson.

Tabled Document 20-67 Deals With Subject

MR. NICKERSON: In reviewing these recommendations I notice that recommendations 7 to 10 all deal with responsibility and local revenue under section 8 of part III, recommendations. As this particular subject matter is dealt with in much greater detail in Tabled Document 20-67 entitled "Responsibility and Local Revenue", would it not be in order to defer consideration of recommendations 7 to 10 until such time as Tabled Document 20-67 is dealt with? Otherwise we will find ourselves going over the same thing twice.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): It seems reasonable to me. What is the direction of the House?

---Agreed

The numbers were recommendation 7 to which?

MR. NICKERSON: Recommendations 7 to 10, all those in part B of the recommendations.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Are we ready then to look at recommendation 1, on page five? Are we agreed with recommendation 1? Hon. David Searle.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I agree with recommendation 1 to the extent of the items 1 to 4, discussing the basic principles of everyone and anyone. But when you get to age and residency, I have no problem with age but residency, it seems to me, to let the local councils establish residency requirements, and by that we all know what that means, it means to be entitled to vote and seek elected office at the community level, then to permit the councils to set residency requirements of not less than six months but not more than three years seems to me to be a little excessive. To have lived in a community for as long as three years before you are entitled to vote or to be an elected official at the local level, in my humble view, is excessive. I do not mind for instance going six months to 18 months, but to go as long as three years in most communities you would be in effect cutting out the white people, the teachers and the others who tend to turn over every couple of years and I am not so sure that that is fair.

I think you would have to look at that and ask yourself if that is really what you want to enable a community council to do because as soon as you give them this power, and assuming that they exercise it, then I could foresee many, many communities going almost immediately to the three years residency. Then you will get some terrible screams from people who are in those communities, posted there to do a job, teachers, policemen, whatever, and finding that they do not have a say at all in the community, not to vote, not standing for local election. It bothers me because surely the majority will have its way in any case. Why not let those small few have a vote?

Three Years Residency Too Long

So, Mr. Chairman, I think people should have to be in a community long enough to be knowledgeable about what is going on but I am sure that those of you who live in small communities are able to say that you pretty well get to know everybody and you know what the local issues are far before three years. So, Mr. Chairman, that is my comment, I think we would be doing a great injustice in going back, in fact, on the principles of everyone in the community can participate, anyone in the community can stand for election, everyone in the community votes in secret only after they have been there for three years. If your postings came up frequently enough you could live in the North for 20 years and never be entitled to vote. I wonder what other Members think about that. It seems to be a very basic and fundamental point.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you, Hon. David Searle. Have you an amendment to make to that three years?

Motion That Residency Requirement Be Altered

HON. DAVID SEARLE: To stimulate discussion I would move that that recommendation be altered to read "Not less than six months and not more than 18 months".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The question being called.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Just a comment on it since it is open for discussion or to promote discussion and the comment I would make is that if in fact communities believe, as Hon. David Searle does, then obviously that is what they opt for. I do not suggest that he is alone in his thinking in fact, but there are people within many of the communities that would think as well but again the whole situation deals with options for people. There have been concerns expressed by others, in other communities that in point of fact you need be in a community for longer than a year or 18 months to do it, and those are the comments that we as a department have received. So, in order to accommodate these kinds of comments that have been made to us that is why we put that particular scope within it. However, if a large number of communities think, or if a number of communities think as the Honourable Member does here, then obviously that is what they will opt for. I have no difficulty, that is only a comment on it.

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

MR. LAFFERTY: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to support that motion because I was going to express this view, and I was unable to catch your eye, but Mr. Chairman, it is important that we do not give too much leeway to people because as Hon. David Searle ably pointed out, given the option most communities would go for three years. I think that in the smaller communities, especially along the Mackenzie River, there is a lack of expertise which is necessary to run a good local government and if we are going to pass on more responsibility to these settlement councils and so on they need all the available expertise they can have in the community. On that basis I think that it is necessary. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Motion That Residency Requirement Be Altered, Carried

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Thank you. Recommendation 1. The question. The

recommendation has been amended so that it reads -- I am sorry, to the motion rather. The residency requirement in recommendation 1 should read "not less than six months and not more than 18 months". To the motion? The question being called. All in favour? Opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Now, recommendation 1 as amended. Mr. Nickerson.

Motion To Change "Should" To "Shall", Carried

MR. NICKERSON: I have been reading through here and I notice that in the basic democratic principles, principle 1, principle 2 and principle 4, the wording there is in the indicative mood, whereas principle 3 is worded in the subjunctive mood. Now, that would appear to maybe be an oversight but I think we should bring them all into line, especially since subrecommendation 3 deals with the basic democratic principle of the right to a secret ballot, a very important basic democratic right and I would move, Mr. Chairman, that the word "should" be taken out and replaced by the word "shall".

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): The motion reads that, section 3, "Anyone in the community, with Canadian citizenship and a certain age and residency, shall have the privilege of voting in secret in the selection of the councils." To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

---Carried

Recommendation 1, Tabled Document 13-67, Approved As Amended

Recommendation 1 with two amendments, as amended. The question being called. All those in favour? Opposed? The recommendation is carried.

---Carried

Now, recommendation 2 on page six. Mr. Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: I have a question on this recommendation, Mr. Chairman. It would appear at the present time that we have unincorporated settlements, and the first level of incorporation is a hamlet and then you go to village, town and city. There seems to be inherent within recommendation 2, a setting up of a new kind of municipality, that of the incorporated settlements, so that you would now have unincorporated settlements, incorporated settlements, etc. I wonder if we really need this additional subdivision and if it could be explained to the committee what would really be the difference between a hamlet and an incorporated settlement.

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

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, the setting up of a separate ordinance for hamlets is recognized as being a request, an outstanding request from Members here. We would hopefully get into that later. The provision to establish incorporated settlements basically is as we have indicated there, so that they become legal entities to whom responsibilities can be given, whereas now that is not the case. There are communities that attempt to assume responsibilities but are not assigned, but they have only the status, and we believe it should be a gradual evolution up the ladder of local government and we believe that communities, we should have this incorporated settlement because of the discrepancy that exists now, because of the difficulties that exist in various communities throughout the North.

It is kind of ironic because we went through this business of new communities and old communities, or settlements, etc., and we believe that this would be a proper step. I do not know if I am all that capable of indicating that there is a major difference between the incorporated, or this, the incorporated settlements and hamlets, as obviously the hamlet takes on more responsibility and we would come into that as we go along with these papers, that they do assume greater responsibilities in much the same way as a village would assume or have more responsibilities greater than that of a hamlet.

More Responsibility With Incorporation

We think that by incorporating settlements, and making them legal or giving them legal status, we can thereby go about the business of gradually assigning to them certain responsibilities, assigning greater responsibilities to these hamlets, and assigning again greater responsibility and taking over more programs and services in village status, town status, etc. I think that it is because of existing difficulties which some communities who are simply a settlement or a community, if you like, now and there does not seem to be a kind of incentive to build into hamlet status and this we would hope, would be one step in getting to take on more responsibility and in fact providing incentives, because as we get into hamlets and talk about them and their ability to assume certain responsibilities they do in fact have more authority.

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

MR. NICKERSON: With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, the remarks by the Honourable Minister are what it says in the paper. I was hoping for examples and if we could be told in concrete terms what the difference is between differences in authority and responsibility of the hamlet and this new idea of an incorporated settlement, what they would be. Perhaps it would be necessary for the Honourable Minister to bring in some of his advisers to be able to tell us, but before we accept this recommendation -- the main part of this recommendation as I see it is to sanction this new form of municipal organization, incorporated settlement. Before I am prepared to vote on the issue, I want to be assured that there is a need for something between the present settlement and the hamlet as we have at the present time.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, basically what we are attempting to do would be to give legal status to particular communities now that have not a legal status. We would anticipate giving to these communities fewer responsibilities than obviously we would give to hamlets. In terms of the kinds of responsibilities that would be given to them, in hamlets we propose as we go into the responsibility and local revenue, responsibility in the hamlets to take over or to participate in the tax schemes in their particular communities, for one example. The turning over by the territorial government of responsibility to carry out a particular program within that community. That is the kind of people program we normally

refer to in terms of education, social services, etc. I would take the suggestion of the Honourable Member then, if I may, sir, to call in some of the people within the department. I would like to ask if I may have Mr. Elkin, the director, at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): I understand you are asking to bring in Mr. Elkin as an adviser. Is that agreed?

---Agreed

Mr. Elkin, please. We have a witness here now, Mr. Nickerson. Are you satisfied with the answer you got or do you want to direct another question?

Responsibilities Of New Organization

MR. NICKERSON: I would like it if the committee could be told, Mr. Chairman, what will be the responsibilities or authorities of this new form of municipal organization, the incorporated settlement, and how it will be distinct from those authorities and the responsibilities of a hamlet?

MR. ELKIN: I think the best way that I can clarify this area for you is if the House would allow me to get into a little bit of the philosophy behind this proposal.

We are finding now that hamlets have acquired a level of responsibility for several programs, that in fact for many hamlets they end up with a range of programs that they are responsible for that are very, very broad and they are required to manage funds in the neighborhood of \$600,000 to \$800,000 per year. Some communities who have not achieved that level of management skill and problems in moving from a settlement where they have limited responsibility to a hamlet.

One of the reasons for the proposal that we have put before you here and which several communities have asked for is that there be a step between a settlement and a hamlet where a community can move toward greater responsibility and in doing so take responsibility for two or three programs rather than for six or seven programs. If in fact they were able to achieve responsibilities in those areas, the distinction besides the number of programs that they controlled as compared to a hamlet would be something along the following lines. A hamlet, as I believe you are aware at this time, is provided with funds for each of the programs they are responsible for. The funds for each program are provided under a standard agreed set of guidelines beforehand. Once they have those funds, the hamlets have the authority to move money between the programs to reflect the kind of community priorities they have. For an incorporated settlement that we have suggested here, they would not have the same level of authority...

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Mr. Elkin, slow down. Our interpreters are having a problem.

MR. ELKIN: They would not have the same level of authority. They would receive funding for the programs which they were responsible for and they could not transfer the money they receive from one program to another. For those programs that they wanted to take responsibility for at this time, they would in fact, have control of the staff and any mobile equipment that was required to carry out the programs they had. But they would not, as hamlets have, ownership of all capital facilities that they require to administer the community, including their warehouses, their bathhouses, their offices, their council chambers. An incorporated settlement would not have that level of responsibility at this point.

Funding Once A Month

One further distinction between the two is that where hamlets get their funds as a quarterly contribution at this point, because the incorporated settlement is clearly going through a learning process, that it would be once a month that the funding would be provided and that broadly speaking, is the concept behind the incorporated settlements at this point.

One further thing that I think I should point out, although the legal authority does not exist, there are several communities, particularly in the West that really exercise that level of authority now but the proper responsibility that should accompany it can not be achieved as the legal framework does not exist at this point.

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

MR. NICKERSON: Thank you very much. That was the information I wanted, Mr. Chairman, and I am now fully satisfied and prepared to support recommendation 2.

Recommendation 2, Approved.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Question being called on recommendation 2 on page six. All those in favour? Opposed? The recommendation is approved.

---Carried

Recommendation 3, on page seven. Mr. Nickerson.

MR. NICKERSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There would appear to be a consequential amendment needed in this particular recommendation in that subrecommendation (2)(b) ought to be deleted, in that we have in recommendation 1 specified that people shall have the right of private secret ballot.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Who wants to catch that fly ball?

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I think that what recommendation 3 says is that with respect to the settlements and hamlets there shall be an exception or at least there may be an exception to that. In other words, a settlement or hamlet has the option to do things in a less cumbersome manner if they wish. I think that is the same argument that has to be advanced with respect to some of the recommendations in recommendation 6. Frankly I do not think any change need be made, but if Mr. Nickerson wants there not to be the sort of exception that is envisaged here, he should put a motion forward asking that that be deleted, that is, part (2)(b).

Objections To Formality

For my own part, however, I may say one of the big objections by people in small communities to our particular form of local government is that formality with which business has to be carried on. As Mr. Nickerson has so often pointed out, the undesirability of having to have a lawyer at your right hand at this ridiculous cost that they charge. Surely he should in this circumstance follow that line of argument and be supporting the less formal and less cumbersome approach to life which only we lawyers, of course, usually advocate.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Hear, hear!

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stewart): Could I have the committee's approval to ask Hon. Tom Butters to take the chair? I am into a situation where I would like to say a few words and I can not very well say what I want to say from here. Agreed?

---Agreed

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Tom Butters): Do any Members of the committee wish to comment? Mr. Stewart.

Inconsistencies In Parts

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly about this and if we look at page one, part 1(3), "The need to ensure that local government in the Northwest Territories is developed in a manner which is consistent with democratic principles under the Canadian Constitution". That is point 1, and then on recommendation 1 which we have approved, it also sets a right with regard to the way elections are to be held. Then we come down to recommendation 3 and we find there the reverse. Surely if there is going to be anything that is going to follow a line of reasoning we can not have it both ways. Either the first part of the book should not be there or this should not be there, one or the other, you can not mix them up, you are trying to mix apples and oranges. They are not consistent. So, I can not support the business of voting by a show of hands and a nomination orally on the floor. I can not see that, that is not consistent with the Canadian Constitution. There are democratic rights as far as the Canadian Constitution is concerned. Personally I can not support that section of Part III.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Tom Butters): I have Mr. Steen and then Hon. David Searle.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that the department seems to feel that the people in the communities are sort of dumbheads pertaining to recommendation 3 (2)(b), that they are not educated enough, they have just come out of the boondocks or something. I think the people are educated enough to vote without a show of hands. I will not accept this. Mr. Chairman, to make it short, I move that we delete this subrecommendation (2)(b). Mr. Chairman, also delete subrecommendation (2)(a) so that would be (a) and (b) of (2) or you might even say, delete (2).

Motion To Delete Recommendation 3(2)

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Tom Butters): Mr. Steen, am I correct in believing that your motion is: I move that the committee delete part (2) of recommendation 3?

MR. STEEN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Tom Butters): To the motion.

Mr. Nickerson and then Hon. Arnold McCallum.

MR. NICKERSON: Mr. Chairman, I completely agree with Mr. Steen and Mr. Stewart with respect to subrecommendation (2)(b). This concerns the actual election procedure whether it shall be by a show of hands as induced by coercion, alcoholic or any other means, and I would agree completely with them that citizens should have the right to a secret ballot. I do not know if that right is enshrined in the Canadian Constitution, I rather suspect that it is not, but nevertheless it is throughout Canada now accepted as being one of the basic rights of citizenship.

However, with respect to subrecommendation (2)(a) I would tend to differ somewhat because this only applies to nominations and I do not really see where you could have the same coercion or whereby you could have the same influence upon people. If a person wanted to be nominated, and he has any kind of a candidate at all, he could always get someone to nominate him publicly. So, I do not really object to subrecommendation (2)(a) but I certainly agree with Mr. Steen and Mr. Stewart with respect to subrecommendation (2)(b).

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

HON. ARNOLD MCCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, just taking it in order, on subrecommendation (2)(a), obviously I daresay that at a nomination meeting, at most nomination meetings nominations are made orally without getting into more personal aspects of it and I suggest that when one is nominated to run for a particular office or to run for a particular reason, or to represent people, that this is done orally. It need not be done in a written form and we are giving -- this can be an option, you can do it either of two ways and I do not think that that detracts anything from a person being nominated.

Secret Ballot Not A Right

As far as subrecommendation (2)(b) is concerned a secret ballot is not a right. There is nothing in the Canadian Constitution that indicates that a secret ballot is a right. It may be in a lot of places where it is an accepted practice but it is not a right. People can be elected by a show of hands or in a number of ways, an agreement, either by majority or consent. We decide issues ourselves by a show of hands. We vote and it may not be at most times for the purpose of electing, and there is nothing in here that indicates that the Government of the Northwest Territories or the Department of Local Government is condemning the ability of people in communities to make a proper selection. We are not downgrading their ability at all, we are simply recognizing what in point of fact exists now, and it does. Now, whether you want to recognize it or not it does. I think again we are giving people an option for it. Obviously we want to move towards the privilege where everyone has a secret ballot but it is not the right of an individual for a secret ballot. Places all over the world, various places, their voting is done by a show of hands and it is not always by a secret ballot. You can not say that you have to vote by secret ballot because it is not an accepted practice all over.

There is no difficulty in this, we are going to recognize people in various parts of the Northwest Territories as belonging to different cultures, having different ways of living, having different means by which they conduct their business and if we are really serious about bringing people together in the Northwest Territories towards a common goal then I suggest that by blocking these kind of things that you will lose that. I think it is time, and we have said it before, I have heard Members say it all the time, different Members, that we have got to get people involved. Now, I do not see this as the end-all or be-all, I think it is a step in the right direction and to shut off people from it, by doing that I think we would be doing a disservice to them.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Tom Butters): Thank you, Hon. Arnold McCallum. To the motion. Hon. David Searle first and then Mr. Steen.

HON. DAVID SEARLE: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering in view of the hour and with the number of speakers we have yet to go if we are really going to get very far with this. I would rather think that everyone is going to want to comment on it and that we might be well advised to simply report progress at this time, and pick it up tomorrow.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Tom Butters): Is it the wish of the committee that I report progress?

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Tom Butters.

Report Of The Committee Of The Whole Of Tabled Document 10-67: Proposed Ordinance Respecting Hamlets; Tabled Document 13-67: Local Government, Direction For The 1980's Summary; Tabled Document 20-67: Responsibility And Local Revenue

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been studying Tabled Document 13-67 and I wish to report progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Hon. Tom Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, there were motions made during the session but as we are coming back to them I guess we can report them at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder, Mr. Stewart, if we would not be wise to have you report out the motions that were made when you were in the chair, so we do not let that slip between today and tomorrow if you have them at hand.

Motions Reported Out

MR. STEWART: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Dealing with recommendation 1, part 3 of recommendation 1 was amended to read "anyone in a community with Canadian citizenship and certain age and residency shall have the privilege", the word "shall" in place of the word "should". After age and residency requirements, part 2 was amended to read "the minimum community residency requirements shall be established by councils but shall not be less than six months and not more than 18 months." This replaces the three years. Both of these amendments, or recommendations, were passed with these amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: For the record, Mr. Stewart, you are dealing with the recommendations contained in Tabled Document 13-67, Local Government, Direction for the 1980's Summary.

MR. STEWART: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: A caucus at 9:30 a.m., Hon. Arnold McCallum?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, yes. While I have the floor may I ask for consent to go back to tabling of documents. If I do not table them we can not discuss them tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Please proceed, Hon. Arnold McCallum.

REVERT TO ITEM NO. 9: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: I wish to table the following:

Tabled Document 27-67: Discussion Paper, Revisions to Indian Act: Introduction.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. With respect to caucus tomorrow, that is in Katimavik A, Hon. Arnold McCallum, is it?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further announcements? Mr. Clerk, orders of the day.

ITEM NO. 14: ORDERS OF THE DAY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Remnant): Orders of the day, February 16, 1979, 1:00 o'clock p.m., at the Explorer Hotel.

1. Prayer
2. Questions and Returns
3. Oral Questions
4. Petitions
5. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
6. Notices of Motion
7. Motions for the Production of Papers
8. Motions
9. Tabling of Documents
10. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills, Recommendations to the Legislature and Other Matters: Bills 5-67, 4-67, 12-67, and 15-67, Proposed Amendments to the Federal Indian Act, Tabled Document 10-67, Tabled Document 13-67 and Tabled Document 20-67
11. Third Reading of Bills
12. Assent to Bills
13. Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER: Gentlemen, may I congratulate you on your diligence today. That was a very good days work.

This House stands adjourned until 1:00 o'clock p.m., February 16, 1979, 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