



Northwest Territories Legislative Assembly

Standing Committees on Accountability and Oversight and Social Programs

Public Meeting on
Bill 12, Public Health Act
Bill 13, Change of Name Act
Bill 14, Employment Standards Act
and
Bill 15, Liquor Act

June 13, 2007
Jean Marie River, Northwest Territories

**STANDING COMMITTEES ON ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT
AND SOCIAL PROGRAMS**

Chairperson

Ms. Sandy Lee, MLA, Range Lake, Chairperson (Social Programs)

Members

Mr. Bill Braden, MLA, Great Slave
Mr. Michael Miltenberger, MLA, Thebacha

Witnesses

Chief Stanley Sanguéz, Tthedzeh K'edeli First Nation
Mr. Ernest Hardisty, Member, Tthedzeh K'edeli First Nation
Ms. Tammy Neal, Manager, Tthedzeh K'edeli First Nation
Mr. Isadore Simon, Member, Tthedzeh K'edeli First Nation

Committee Staff

Mr. Doug Schauerte, Committee Clerk
Mr. Robert Collinson, Senior Research Analyst
Ms. Regina Pfeifer, Research Analyst

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT
Public Meeting on Bill 12, Public Health Act,
Bill 13, Change of Name Act,
Bill 14, Employment Standards Act, and
Bill 15, Liquor Act
June 13, 2007
Jean Marie River, Northwest Territories
7:05 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Thank you very much. This microphone is just for recording, not for amplification. Thank you to everyone for being here. We are very happy to be in Jean Marie River tonight. You have a very beautiful community. We have already visited with Lucy and some of us spent some money to enhance your economic development in the community. He's translating? How do you want to...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Everybody understands, so we will just continue on, Sandy.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): We are here as a standing committee on Accountability and Oversight and Social Programs committee. We are a combined committee of two and we are here to ask you for public input on four bills: Bill 15, Liquor Act; Bill 12, Public Health Act; Bill 13, Change of Name Act; and Bill 14, Employment Standards Act, and all the information is at the table there. Before we go any further, I would like to just introduce everybody here. I think most of you know us. This is Mr. Michael Miltenberger, he's the Member for Thebacha, to my far left. This is Mr. Bill Braden, he's MLA for Great Slave in Yellowknife. I'm Sandy Lee, I'm MLA for Range Lake in Yellowknife, I'm also the chair of the Standing Committee on Social Programs. We also have three staff with us. This is Mr. Robert Collinson, he's our researcher. We have Ms. Regina Pfeifer, she's also our researcher. We have lots of researchers working with us. They're the brains behind us. Mr. Doug Schauerte is our clerk of the Assembly and clerk of the committee.

I'd like to also recognize Delilah St. Arnault who is following us around. She's interested in hearing about what people have to say about the Liquor Act, so she's taken time out of her busy schedule to drive from Hay River and she was also with us in Fort Smith.

Last week, Ministers Roland and Dent, who are the Ministers responsible for these bills, presented the bills to us so we could take it on the road. So far, we started our meeting in Yellowknife, then we went to Behchoko. On Monday we were in Fort Smith. Last night we were in Hay River. Today we are here and tomorrow we are going to have public hearings in Fort Simpson.

The main reason we are here, and we don't want it to be too formal, we would like to just have a nice time with us and listening to you for the next couple of hours, but we're mainly here to get your feedback on these bills. We will, if necessary, try to answer questions you may have and if we can't answer them, we can refer them to the Minister and get back to you through your MLA.

Before I ask for your input, I'd like to just explain briefly what the bills are for. Bill 12, the Public Health Act, will replace the laws that were written almost 50 years ago and it's very out of date. This is the first update on this bill. One of the reasons we need to make this change is so that if there is an emergency, like the SARS outbreak again or the bird flu, we can cooperate with other parts of Canada to manage such an incident. The bill also has more accountability for any orders made by public health officials, like for quarantines, if necessary, if there's a TB outbreak or something like that. For example, there will be time limits on quarantines and people will be able to appeal the orders if they think they're unfair. So it's a very extensive and comprehensive piece of legislation.

Bill 13 is the Change of Name Act and what this will do is it will allow people to change their names through the vital statistics office instead of having to go through court, which was very complex and cumbersome before. The process will be mostly administrative, rather than legal.

Bill 14, Employment Standards Act, will replace three pieces of legislation, the biggest being the Labour Standards Act. The bill includes things that were not formally recognized in the law before like sick leave, time off for funerals, family members and compassionate care leave for when a person needs to look after a dying family member. So it protects people who work outside of government or outside of collective agreements.

Bill 15, the Liquor Act, will change the law so that communities have more say whether and how alcohol is allowed. It should make it easier for a community to make a decision; for example, if they want to prohibit liquor, and it recognizes the differences between big communities and small communities. Also the maximum fines for bootlegging and other offences will go up substantially. It will be as much as \$25,000 for first incidents and up to \$50,000 for repeat offence and up to two years in jail for the second time or more, up to one year in jail for first time. So it's going to be really heavy-duty punishment for bootlegging. The government will be able to make regulations about people buying and shipping large amounts of alcohol into a community, as well. Also, this act has lots of different elements to that, too, but this is just some of the things that's in there.

So that's where I want to leave it just in terms of what the bills are. We welcome all of you to just give us and have a conversation with us about any of these matters, any of these bills. After that, if you have other general things you want to talk about, because you do have three MLAs with you in the room, we'll be happy to hear you out. So mahsi, thank you very much. Chief, I don't know if you want to do an introductory remark.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: First of all, I'm kind of surprised and happy that the standing committee is in this community here. Our small community has always been striving on economic development employment for our community. When I got elected, the economy of our community is so small and I'm happy that the committee is coming to our community to spend some money into our community. It's a helpful thing for our

community and for some of the MLAs and yourself to come and listen to our community. I'm really happy that you guys had an opportunity to come and visit our community. We never see you guys. Sometimes we see you on APTN. I always say to Sandy Lee when we said in the Deh Cho that she's always been almost like a check and balance for us when our government is introducing legislation. Those are the things that we see you do for us, because the smaller communities sometimes are never heard. But our government is sometimes reluctant not to listen to our communities, especially the small communities.

When the last election came in, we were promised and told by our Premier, Joe Handley, that the community needs in the small community should be a priority to us. Whatever you need in your small communities, you should be able to get. The larger centres like Yellowknife, Fort Providence, Fort Simpson, these are the ones that have the infrastructures; we don't.

Our small community has always been hurt by our government of using their legislation of how the small communities are funded. If we are over or less than 100, the standard criteria that government uses hurts our community and it's not helpful that we try to bring and raise this with the Premier. I keep raising it with the Premier, but somehow he brushes it by and I keep telling him, don't do that, because to me it will be an election issue for my small community. We have an assembly in the next two weeks in Fort Simpson. I'll make it a priority for my small communities; we have five.

Presently our government is telling us that, okay, because Jean Marie, Nahanni Butte, Trout Lake, Kakisa, Wrigley, because you guys are not a charter community, that somehow the funding that you get is not what we all want. That piece of act hurts our community. We look at the charter community a number of times, but there's an issue and concerns around that act. We ran it by our elders to find out what they think and, of course, having Ernest Hardisty sit beside me, he reads a lot of good materials and he says that this act is no good. It's not for our community; it's not ours. It's going to change our way of life, how we work with our government to run programs and services. To me, I look at that as a chief and I say I wouldn't mind accepting it because it gives us more money, more accountability.

Tammy, who started with me when I got elected on October 26th, I got elected and a couple months later Tammy came on. The accountability that we see, between myself and her, on the funding of the community is getting less now. I'm finding out that having a meeting with Rod Gunderson, the regional superintendent of Fort Simpson of the Department of Transportation. It's kind of disturbing and I shouldn't be saying it, but I need to do this, I need to raise it. It was saying we may not have any money to improve our road. I'm happy you guys drove and seen our road. We need that improvement to be done, but we're finding out that we might not have enough money for next year. Why, I don't know. What the department is doing, I don't know. We're trying to work as much as we can, but we're losing the battle here and we need you sometimes, Sandy Lee, to help us, because we raise good questions to the Premier and he says I don't know if I could fix everything within four months. We said, you had four years. How could say you'll try to fix everything in four months? You had four years to help us in the

small community and we're still suffering from that. And why, I don't know when they do this to us, and it really hurt us in the finance way. I keep bringing it up and, to me, I think we're just small communities, we're not raising it enough and I'm happy that you're here, because you need to hear that from us.

When we see, let's say for instance, our water reservoir. When you look at the water act or something that is essential to our life, it's going to cost us \$3.5 million, which EarthTech, out of Edmonton, consulting, did work with us and they said it's going to cost us \$3.5 million to have a good water system in here. We had a breakout of e-coli both in the Jean Marie River and the Mackenzie this spring. We couldn't get water. But we looked at the system that EarthTech looked at. It was like a big filter...(inaudible)...system like Tsiigehtchic has; a big filter...(inaudible)...system that comes right off the reservoir. The reservoir is too small. The sewage lagoon is too small. We need that fine system in our community here, but now I'm talking to Tammy and we're working with MACA as much as we can and we have to try to find \$3.5 million within the funding that we have to try to do this. We asked the government that before: Why couldn't you have put that system in place and it wouldn't have cost us that much? Now it's going to cost us and we're penalized as a small community. We wanted this, but you keep telling us, no, it's too expensive, you got to keep waiting; next year, next year, next year and it's always building up and building up. Now the New Deal is a good deal because it gives us more funding, but it doesn't address the issues on water quality. The life of our small community here needs to expand.

I'm happy that when we were raising this before, the other municipalities were cut so that it would benefit us; but still, in the long run, we're going to be feeling that hurt for a while. It's going to take a while, and having Tammy, Tammy will mention a little bit. Hopefully you will mention something about the administrative funding that we get from government.

Some of the programs and services that we get are getting smaller. The funding that we get is getting less and smaller, and they're asking us to live within the means that we have, but how can we live within the means that we have when we don't even have enough?

Just say for justice, for instance, we probably only get about five, six or seven thousand. What are we going to do with that money? Those kind of little programs we keep asking them, could we get the government to agree so that small communities can pool our money together and make something out of it. But because of the contribution agreement and reporting, doesn't allow us to do that. I seen that when I got elected back a few years ago when I was chief and I still see that here.

Then when you talk about the Liquor Act, that was one of the things that I think hurt us because, like you say, not all our communities, our people, are healthy. When we wrote a letter to the Minister, Floyd Roland, regarding opening up the plebiscite in Fort Simpson, and we raised it as a small community, we told him, how come we don't have a say in changing the Liquor Act for Fort Simpson, the rationing system. Our people are really suffering from it already. Why are you letting this happen in Fort Simpson,

because we have the effects from it, what happens in Fort Simpson, and we keep saying just leave it that way. But of course, the Minister kind of bluntly said, well, it's Fort Simpson, it's a Fort Simpson deal, and we said no.

Myself and the former chief, Eric Betsaka, will be writing a letter to the government telling them, no, just leave it the way it is. Leave the rationing system the way it is, because it's going to hurt our small communities. But sometimes having that kind of act, you know, what do we mean, we don't mean nothing to you? You need to listen to that.

In our communities, we're struggling to get our people back to sobriety. Even me, I still use alcohol. But you learn how to live with it sometimes, but sometimes you can't live with it because some people in our communities are hurting in the small communities. We try to see how much of this money that the government's getting to bring back to our communities and help us. How much of these monies that you guys are collecting under this act that you bring back to our communities? Sometimes we can't even do much with what we have. You know, we get some good people to come in, like the Comedy Kings, the Dakota House and his people come here, like Growing Miles (sic), these guys that came in here, help the community to talk to the kids about the alcohol and drugs. You know, it feels good that they do that, but, of course, therein again there's limited funding. Like the Comedy Kings, they wanted about \$2,500 to come to our community to do alcohol and drug, and all of a sudden they said, well, we're not coming because we want more money. But of course, I've got to talk to Tammy, the band manager. Do we have the money? Ew, I don't like it because they're raising it, but eventually they just stayed there, they just kept their price. So we have the money we're given to us from the government is how we're doing it, but it's never enough.

Hopefully you go to these small communities and really listen to us, please, because if you don't address the small communities' concerns, this election will be another one that's going to hurt my community again. If you start listening, our government listens to the small communities, which we lack infrastructure. Nobody wants to live here because we don't have the funding to build the infrastructure that we need and it's hurting the small kids here. We don't even have money to buy stuff for the gym. We have to try to squeeze a little bit of money that we have from the government to buy equipment. But now, with what's going on with the New Deal, it's a good one but it's forgetting some of those things. Sure, it cuts some areas and put in this other area, but this one got cut and moved it from here. Those cuts are going on here. That's why, hopefully, that would change in this election, because I keep raising it at our assembly, which I'm going to make it a priority because we have assemblies. We want this for us with this new election that's coming in. How is this new election going to promise me what we need for our community? You know, we need an outdoor pool.

We did a community plan. When we looked at the community plan, I think we needed about \$15 million to build some of these things in our communities and we don't have that. How does that address us for the next five to 10 years? Because if we do not fix our small communities, our community people are going to disappear and they're going to take off. They're going to live somewhere else where the facilities are. You know,

the kids are saying I'm happy I'm going to school in Simpson because they've got everything there. They've got a gym. Holy smokes, they've got everything there. But in the small communities, we don't. This gym should have been bigger, but because of the government gave us, like, this is a prime example here. This building is supposed to be really big that would fit all our communities, but because of the budgeting things that the government that we worked with said no, it's too much money. So they downsized our gym again and made it smaller.

The other stuff that needs to be done, it still hasn't been done. We're fixing let's say they call it a dead horse. The horse is dead; you can't keep kicking it until it's dead again because it's already dead. This thing that we have with the government is that real issue here. How could you guys help us turn that around for us? It's an issue here for me that I would raise.

I'm really happy, again, that you guys come here to ask our opinion on the Liquor Act, on the different acts, because we're a small community. This is the first time in my life, in this community's history, that a standing committee came here. For me, it's something different that you, as a standing committee on oversight, come to this community and I'd just like to thank you again for coming. But I don't know if Tammy could raise some issues around our administrative funding that we get on the New Deal, that accountability is more stricter than everything. I don't know, maybe Tammy wants...(inaudible)...No? Okay. Well, anyway, thanks again.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Thank you, Chief Sanguetz, for all the information you've given us. What we can do is we will take your points that you made about community funding and the formula and some of your community requirements that you've made. This is being transcribed and we will refer to them and we will bring that up with the Minister of MACA -- I think he's primarily the Minister responsible -- and get back to you on that.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): In the Legislative Assembly, we have three standing committees. Standing committee just means they're permanent committees, they're working committees. We organized them to sort of parallel with the Ministers' responsibilities. So Accountability and Oversight committee, which is commonly called AOC, is made up of all 11 Regular Members. They're all sort of quasi opposition, because it's made up of Members who are not in Cabinet. AOC oversees the Department of Finance and corporations and boards. The committee I chair is the Standing Committee on Social Programs, and part of the membership of that committee is here. That committee oversees social program committees and those are the departments of Health and Social Services, Education, Culture and Employment, Justice and Housing. So the justice issues you brought up, we'll bring that up to the Minister of Justice. Then we also have another committee called the Governance and Economic Development, and Mr. Miltenberger belongs to that committee but he's here as an AOC member, and that committee is responsible for MACA, Transportation,

Public Works and Environment and Natural Resources. So we will bring your issues up to the appropriate Ministers and we will get back to you on those.

On the issue of the Liquor Act, I'm wondering if I could ask you a question about what the issues are involving the Liquor Act or liquor issues in the communities. If you could give us any guidance as to what specific things that need to be worked on, whether it be by the government or the community, on areas that you want to do something about that you're not able to do because of legislative requirements, we would be very interested in hearing that.

The water issues are also MACA issues, too. So we will bring that up, too, with the Minister. Chief Sanguéz.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: Okay. Ernest wants to do some introductions. We'll start with you.

MS. ST. ARNAULT: My name is Delilah St. Arnault. I'm the...(inaudible)...

MR. COLLINSON: Robert Collinson. I work for the Assembly as a researcher.

---(Microphone turned off)

CHIEF SANGUEZ: It's my mom, Mary Louis Sanguéz. And Melanie; she's presently our community coordinator on the Dehcho process negotiations. Sometimes she goes to negotiations and reports back to the community on what's happening with the negotiations with the federal government and the GNWT.

MR. HARDISTY: Ernest Hardisty, a band member.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: Chief Stan Sanguéz. This is my second term. Like, I've got a three-year term. So as of October 26th I jump to the second year, so I've got one more year left. Anyway, it's good.

I don't know what specific area that you asked on the Liquor Act, Sandy. The only thing that I could raise is the amount of alcohol that comes to the small communities is an issue. Ernest is highlighting something about the yellow page. Maybe you can walk us through that, Sandy.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): I'll ask Regina to just tell us what's on the yellow page, just for everybody.

MS. PFEIFER: What the new Liquor Act does, it's going to replace the old Liquor Act and, as the old act, what it will do is it will deal with the sale, importation, production and distribution of liquor. It also allows, one of the big changes is how communities will be allowed to impose, like to make restrictions for liquor or prohibitions. Now, with this proposed bill, with the new bill, what a community could do is you could ask the Minister, as a band council, to hold a plebiscite in your community. Because now, my understanding is, your community is not restricted, so there's no limits on what people can bring in or have. So if you wanted to change that, you could ask the Minister of

Finance to hold a plebiscite, and then the votes you would need is 50 percent of the voters plus one vote. So that's a big change to what we have now, because at the moment what you would have to do is first do a petition in the community and then the petition needs to have 20 percent of the voters. If you have that petition with 20 percent of the voters, then you can ask the Minister to hold a plebiscite. Now the plebiscite would need to have 60 percent of the voters in order to make a change. So this new bill would make it much easier for a community to make changes to be restricted or prohibited, compared to what it is now.

On the yellow sheet is another point that refers to municipal governments, because what the act tries to do is acknowledge that different communities and different sizes of communities want to maybe influence different things about liquor. So municipal governments are allowed to pass bylaws where they could influence licenced premises, bars, how long they could be open, if they would be allowed to open on Sundays, and if they would allow, for example, that some places could sell beer off premises.

Also what changed, from more community input, is that if the Minister would change liquor store hours, they have to first ask the community, where a liquor store is, for their input. They couldn't change it as an administration. Another change that affects minors, that if somebody that is less than 19 years old tries to buy liquor and uses a false or a changed ID or tries to go into a bar, the fine for that has now been increased. With this bill, it would be \$200 for the first time and \$500 for when that youth would try again. What the bill also tries to do is to make it much more stronger when people do bootlegging. Like now, the first time, if somebody is caught bootlegging, the first time it's \$25,000 and if they would do again it could be up to \$50,000. Then they also have, for the first time it could be also one year in jail or \$25,000, or it could be both, \$25,000 plus one year in jail. For doing it a second time or more often, it would be \$50,000 or two years in jail, or it could be both, \$50,000 and two years in jail.

There's also changes about how liquor can be transported, and that is only spoken to in the bill and there will be more regulations that come with the bill. What is planned there, that someone who will transport liquor in big amounts, they will have to have a licence to do that. They cannot just go and buy a big amount and then bring it somewhere.

What also changed is that the bill will now recognize that there's different alcohol that is not meant to be drunk like a beverage, that that is also intoxicating and that stores that sell products like mouthwash and stuff like that, if somebody looks like they might be drinking it, they are not allowed to sell it to those people because they might be intoxicated already.

The act is also trying to make it less complicated for different types of licences that are out there. So that's like more administrative. Now we have 12 different kinds of premises' licences and there will only be four types left if that bill will come through.

Another change that is planned is if a restaurant has a liquor licence and if they would allow their customers, somebody could bring their own wine to the restaurant to drink

with their meal, and if they wouldn't finish the bottle, the restaurant could put the cork back on and they would allowed to take the leftover home.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Thank you, Regina. I think that gives you a little better idea about what the new Liquor Act has. We understand that now all these apply to every community, because there are lots of communities without a liquor store or a restaurant that sells liquor. The last point about restaurants allowing their customers to bring in their own wine, they have to apply for that licence. Not all restaurants are going to be allowed to do that. But if there is a restaurant that wants to do that, then they could apply for a licence.

We just need to remember that the Liquor Act has not been changed probably for 20, 30 years. It takes a long time for legislation to go through a change, so this is looking at lots of different areas. But for everybody present here, we are very interested in hearing about what you think about what's in here in terms of what's relevant to you and something that would affect Jean Marie River or Simpson, or what you think of whether any of these would work, or some of them may not work, or if there are some things that you think should be added in terms of liquor issues that are not here. So we're just really interested in hearing from any of you about liquor issues in general, or specific to this provision. I would just like to ask to just hold the microphone, because we're recording meetings here so that we know what was said. I need you to say your name and any organization you represent or yourself, and just go ahead.

MR. HARDISTY: Ernest Hardisty, a band member. I just have a couple of questions under the maximum penalties for bootlegging. On these liquor changes, I've never heard any maximum penalties for supplying minors.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): I'll let Regina give you that info.

MS. PFEIFER: For supplying minors would be up to \$10,000 fine and it could also be one year.

MR. HARDISTY: And this one about new regulations on transportation of liquor. What's a minimum amount? Because somebody could have six bottles in his truck and you get caught with that and he doesn't know.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): So what's the maximum you could carry without a licence?

MR. HARDISTY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Regina, do you have that info? That level of detail will be in regulation, and regulations are written up after the legislation is passed. But if you want to make a comment on that about what you would like to see in that, then you're welcome to tell us that today.

MR. HARDISTY: Um, I don't know. On the second last one on the type of licences, some of the bar owners and the restaurants, how many licences, 12 licences for one restaurant?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): No, there are just so many different classes of licences...

MR. HARDISTY: Oh, I see.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): ...so I think the government just wants to streamline it, make it simpler so that everybody will get one of four licences now. There will just be four categories of licences instead of 12. So it's just to simplify administration.

MR. HARDISTY: Okay, that's all my questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Mr. Hardisty, if you had a choice, how much liquor do you think is reasonable for people to carry without a licence, transportation?

MR. HARDISTY: I don't know; if there's a number of people in the truck, it could be over a case.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): So you would like to see some detail that tells us how much each person is allowed to carry.

MR. HARDISTY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Okay. I think Mr. Braden has a question about what Chief Sanguiez had to say about the plebiscite in Fort Simpson.

MR. BRADEN: Thank you, Sandy. It's a pleasure to be here for me again in Jean Marie River. I was here some years ago when I had another life with the Power Corporation, but that was very brief and I think it was during the winter, so...

CHIEF SANGUEZ: I still want to talk to you about that Power Corp, too.

---Laughter

MR. BRADEN: Oh, no. I'm really sorry I mentioned it. Okay, that can be after hours.

Chief Sanguiez, you brought a point forward that I haven't heard before and that is where a community can make decisions about how it wants to limit or manage the access to alcohol, or maybe it wants to choose to open it up, and that is one of the main changes for the government in this bill. They are basically saying in the past we've created one set of rules and tried to make it work for everybody, but now they're saying the communities should have a lot more control into what works for their situation, and that's one of the principal shifts in this. So I'm very interested in hearing from communities if they think this is a good idea. Do communities want to take on more control? In doing so, of course, you have to go through the decision-making process and sometimes that's not very easy. But a main advantage here is that you have to do that by plebiscite and the rules of doing that before were pretty tough. You had to get 60 percent of your people out, and 60 percent of those who voted had to make a decision one way or another. The plebiscite rules are now much simpler. I think it is 50 percent plus one, and if you have that kind of a result then you can change something.

But what I wanted to ask you about, Chief, was the effect that a decision, say in Fort Simpson, made by the people who live there, will have on your community, but you cannot be involved in making that decision because you're not on the voters list in Fort Simpson.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: This is what we were told: It's a Fort Simpson issue because the liquor is in that community, the liquor store is in that community. So of course, when they said they wanted to change or increase the rationing system, I got hold of the chief, Keyna Norwegian, and I said how do I...Do I write a letter to who so that they do not include the rationing system in Fort Simpson? We were told that we could go ahead and still write that letter. But what I told the Minister was it's an issue in our community here for me as a chief, that if you increase the rationing system in Fort Simpson, it's going to affect our community because the quantity of liquor that's going to be brought into our community. We raised it there and it just...(inaudible)...Like, it didn't make any difference if I wrote that letter or not. It just seems like it didn't mean anything to the Minister and I said, no, you have to listen to us. I said that because myself, Chief Eric Betsaka and us were the only two that wrote a letter on behalf, with Keyna. Then when I talked with Duncan, the owner of the liquor store, I said you guys know our issues here, how come you don't raise it for us? But now I think he's...(inaudible)...over there, the liquor store owner, and somehow I don't know what he does over there and I said, well, you still need to listen to us.

MR. BRADEN: What kind of suggestion would you have for us if we were to make this law work for you?

CHIEF SANGUEZ: If they're going to make any changes or anything, let's hear...I don't know what the rationing system in Simpson is like. I don't know how much is allowed for each person. I think a case of beer, bottle of wine, or I don't know too much detail about it. But when you go to the liquor store, sometimes you can hear that. You know, how much am I allowed? A lot of people don't know that. Even today, when they make those changes, some people are asking those questions: How much am I allowed? Sometimes when you go to the liquor store you hear people say that.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Chief Sanguez, you have said to us earlier that liquor is a problem in your community. You feel that the liquor availability in Simpson is a problem for your community and you trying to address it through Simpson didn't work as well as you have liked, but what about Jean Marie River? Is there an interest in putting a ration here in terms of how much liquor you could bring to the community? I'm not saying that you should or not, I'm just wanting to learn more about what Jean Marie River has been trying to do. Is there interest in making Jean Marie River a dry community or putting limits on? Because you know that most people bring liquor from either Hay River or Yellowknife or Simpson or Edmonton, maybe, I don't know, whenever you're on the road. Do you want to be able to control what people are allowed to bring? I don't even know is that's enforceable, because you will have to then check what people are bringing. But the whole point of this legislation is that we understand that there are various communities. You know, you have Yellowknife with many, many bars and restaurants and fully open, to some communities who don't want to have any liquor in

their communities and they want to be able to do something about that if the community people want that. So I'm wondering what the wish of the community of Jean Marie River has been, or have you ever had a plebiscite or something like that.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: We never really had a plebiscite to begin with. The only time that we tried to get prohibition in our community, let's say like we have an assembly here. We ask the Minister to give us a paper saying that. If we don't have that paper, nobody has the right to check anybody's vehicle because somehow they have just as much rights to have alcohol in their vehicle in their presence. But at least that prohibition order helps the community. Okay, this assembly here; I want prohibition from the Minister to say no alcohol. We had a prohibition order here when we had a family reunion in our community here a few years ago, and that really helped because a lot of our young people like to party in the evenings and doing things, but the elders more or less look at it and say if we do this as a family, respect us, don't do that here. Maybe go out of the community and do what you have to do, but not bring it here. So at least that's respect in that way. But sometimes it's not like that, people don't respect that order, people will just try to sneak it in. I'm happy that the cops were here to help us enforce that, because we break our own laws just trying to search somebody's vehicle. We will be charged with that. We don't have no rights to search my vehicle. But if you have the prohibition, it helps.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): I think with this new legislation, you could, as a community, decide to have such a prohibition for more than one day if you wanted to try it.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: I would like to raise...

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): But you have to have a discussion with the community about whether that's what the community wants and if you have enough support, you can try it and if it doesn't work, you could go back or whatever. Answering your question about Fort Simpson, the ration for the Fort Simpson Liquor Store is equivalent of one 40-ounce bottle and 12 beer per day, or variations of that. You have 40 ounces and two litres of wine, or two litres or wine and 12 beer, or 24 beer and one litre of wine. So it's a combination of that amount of alcohol. Per person per day; well, that's a lot.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: It is. Well, it's a concern to me to our young people, because when you go to parties like that there's a lot of binge drinking. Holy smoke! That's dangerous. I said, hey, you kids, don't do this. You have to try to talk to them somewhere all the time, and binge drinking is really common, it's really taken off within the last five years or so. How do we control that happening? It's something that we never really talked about in our community. We talked about how do we get our communities healthy from using alcohol, and that's where we're struggling there, too. It's kind of give and take here all the time. But it would be nice to really raise this question at a community level, how do we deal with this. Because somehow this legislation that is being worked on has to protect our small communities from that.

The other issue is because of not being recognized at the GNWT government level, that we're not a charter community so we cannot enforce anything in our communities here.

We cannot make laws or bylaws to protect our communities. But having this legislation, this act, improved and really tightened up, I think that would protect our small communities. I would think; I don't know.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Just before I go to Ms. Neal, I just want to answer your question. On this Liquor Act, even though you're not a charter community, you could still make use of this legislation. You could set up a locally elected alcohol education committee and that committee could decide how much alcohol is allowed in the community. So there's a lot that you can do. I think this legislation has been under review for a very long time and a lot of thought has gone into trying to make it easier for each community to decide on what to do with the liquor issue. So I'll just recognize Ms. Neal.

MS. NEAL: Hi there. I just have some comments. The Minister will have to seek community input before changing liquor store hours. I think for these little communities it should involve the little communities, too, because they say that we're not on their voters list or whatever, but they don't complain when we go spend our money over there. That's the only way we can go, or we can go to Hay River. So if it's going to affect Jean Marie, then I think Jean Marie should have input on the liquor store hours and how much you can buy there. We can put a ration on the community, we can make rules and committees and everything, but how do we enforce it? We can't enforce it. There's no way to enforce it. Even when we do have the odd issue, it's hard enough getting the RCMP out here, so there's no way to enforce these kind of things. So little rules like that, where the root of the problem is, would really help I think.

With regards to the penalty being \$10,000 for supplying a minor, or up to \$10,000, where we're trying to preach to our children and stop the cycles of alcohol abuse, drugs and all this. I think the penalty for supplying a minor should be higher than it is for supplying an adult, because I've seen a lot of things not here, but with the youth; I worked a lot with the youth in the another community and that was the biggest struggle, is getting the parents to understand it's not right to give their kids alcohol, or the bootleggers. So that might be something to consider.

I don't understand the purpose of being able to take your own wine into a restaurant. I think that would encourage drinking and driving. I think that would encourage a lot of problems. I could take a bottle of wine to Hay River, go to the restaurant, drink half of it and drive home with it? I'm going to get bored halfway here and start drinking it.

---Laughter

That's my opinion. I think like these little communities with the distance should really be thought about a lot when making these kinds of rules, because it would affect us if it's okay to carry open alcohol from Hay River to here or even Simpson to here.

This doesn't have anything to do with the Liquor Act, but with regards to making our community healthier, I think it would be good if there could be some more money brought into the community for A and D, for prevention and awareness and counselling.

We've been asking for a counsellor to come in here for a while now. All we get in one year is \$5,000 for A and D in awareness and prevention and it's not enough. Like Chief said, we can only bring in maybe one person or half a person in one year with that. So if we wanted to control the liquor, then we have to also work in the other areas around it to make it work. People need to have support. People need to have other things to do, and the only way to make it work is to have this kind of support.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): You make very good points there. We weren't aware of how much resources were going into this community for alcohol and drug awareness program, for example. So it is good for us to know that you have only \$5,000 allocated for that. That's the kind of stuff that we need to learn about.

The point you're making about why is it less for those who supply liquor to minors, in terms of fines, than those who bootleg with adults, that a really good point. It should be at least equal to if not more. So it should be at least \$25,000 and the same penalty, because I think a lot of people would feel it's a more serious offence to supply liquor to a minor than to an adult in a bootlegging way.

MS. NEAL: Yeah, because you could supply one bottle to one kid once every two weeks or you could sit down and drink with them every night. What's worse? It's the same thing, right? That's what I think.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): I think that's a good point there. In terms of people being able to bring wine to a restaurant, that's raised lots of discussion. I just want to play devil's advocate here and just give the other side of the story. It's only if a restaurant applies for that licence. It's up to the restaurant to decide whether that's something they want to do. The only place we could think of is in, say, some restaurants, like I'll say Chinese restaurants -- they don't know wines very well -- but the people who come to eat, they may have some special wine they want to bring, and some restaurants can't carry all the selection of wine; it's very costly to carry those. So there are some restaurants who like to not have to deal with alcohol. They may have just beer and pop or whatever, but they don't want to deal with all the fancy stuff so they want to allow their patrons to bring their own wine if they want to. But they have to apply for the licence, and then they will charge a corking fee to the people. So people have to pay more to be able to do that, so they may not want to do that.

The second thing is there are some very detailed restrictions on what you could do with that wine if you take it home. It has to be corked; it can't be accessible by your vehicle; it has to be in your trunk or areas where you can't reach while you're driving. But we take your point, that you have to consider that people drive long distances after eating in restaurants and you don't want to do anything to encourage drinking and driving and transporting open liquor. So those are very good points. Also the fact that the laws are great, but if you can't enforce them, then they don't mean anything. The call for RCMP for all the small communities is something that we hear all the time, or somebody who could enforce the law. So we take that point.

We want to hear from as many of you as possible. As you know, we don't come here very often, so you have our ears. So, Mr. Simon.

MR. SIMON: My name is Isadore Simon. I'm one of the band councillors.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): We need to record every word you say, so if you could just...(inaudible)...

MR. SIMON: I'll probably hear it on CKLB tomorrow.

---Laughter

This Liquor Act, who made the legislative changes to 19? When I grew up, you had to be 21 before you could buy or go into any liquor store at that time. It was in the '60s. Then in the '70s, that's when they started changing the law and it started getting 19 years old you could go in the bar and you get your licence. When I grew up, you had to be 21 to go into any bars or even in a dining lounge. It was kind of hard for us as teenagers growing up them days. Nowadays you talk about youth alcohol abuse. That's where it starts. Young guys, underage, drinking. That's where everything...Why can't they raise it back to 21 again like before? If it's easy to turn it to 19, it should be easy to turn it back to 21 again. A lot of young guys have been killed due to drinking. Everybody knows that, and I don't see why. They should change it back to 21. Or even better, treaties can't drink. How's that? See, they had that before in the olden days. So that was my comment about teenagers, because the teenagers, they sure do it heavy; more than adults. They're the ones that end up abusing the alcohol. They should just raise the drinking age back to 21. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): We'll bring your points forward. I'm told that the drinking age changed the last time the Liquor Act was changed, which we think goes back to about the 1970s, '72, under Commissioner Hodgson. I should also tell you that in writing this legislation, this is government's legislation and we are not the government. We are here to get public input from you on this bill, which is government's bill, and we will report it back to the government and we'll have a debate on that.

I think the fact that Alberta's drinking age is 18 and most of the provinces are around 19; I don't know if anyone is 21 anymore. In the U.S. it's 21. On the consultation process, I think the drinking age change has come up. This is a result of government did their own consultation a few years back, before they wrote this act up, and I think that issue was brought up but there was not a consensus on that.

Another thing is, a lot of people could do a lot of things before 21 now. Young people can get married now, they can do all sorts of things before they're 19; and they can vote at the age of 19. So it's hard for the government to say, okay, you can get married and you can vote and you can do all kinds of things, but you can't drink. I'm just giving you the other side of the argument, but we have heard from people saying we should raise the alcohol age to 21. So we will incorporate that into our report or our consideration. Mr. Simon.

MR. SIMON: Maybe the government just needs more voters.

---Laughter

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Chief Sanguiez.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: You mentioned something about small communities could come up with some kind of a liquor committee or something. What's that committee called you said, Sandy?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): The legislation, section 49 says, "a committee may" ... "approve the establishment of a liquor restriction or prohibition system." And a community can do any one of the following: you could have an unrestricted system, which is free alcohol, open. You could have a restricted quantities system, where you could ration, or you could have a committee system. You can do this by...It's section 49 on page 33. You could have "a committee system where a locally elected alcohol education committee decides the amounts of liquor that persons may possess, purchase, transport or bring into the community." So you could set up a committee system, but they're an elected committee system. Or you could have "a prohibition system, where the consumption, possession, purchase, sale or transport of liquor within the community is prohibited." So the legislation lays out four options. One is unrestricted, except for certain rules; or prohibited altogether; or you could put in a ration system; or you could set up a committee system where they will decide what's going to happen in the community. So I think this is something that you may want to pay attention to. Once this legislation gets through, because there's lots of good parts of this legislation. We're going to be reviewing this in August, because that's the end of this Assembly. Once the law passes, it's not going to come into practise for at least a year, because they'll have to work out all the details. I am sure that this law will be probably discussed at your Association of Communities meetings, which is where lots of government legislation gets communicated to band councils and municipal governments, just like the New Deal arrangement and such, or the MACA Minister may provide information, or the Finance Minister as the Minister responsible for the liquor system could give you more information on how communities could work under this legislation.

The reason why we are here is we have two months still to work out the details. If there are major amendments that people want us to make, we are here to hear about that. It doesn't mean it's going to be amended, it's just that we need to hear from you and then we'll bring it all to the Legislature and we'll have a debate about that.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: Anybody want to say anything on this, as users?

MR. SIMON: I just have one here about open bottles. Any liquor that's open, it could be wine, whiskey, vodka, whatever it is, even a bottle of beer, if the cops stop you, they nail you for it, an open bottle. If you happen to drive home with this open bottle of wine, which is nothing, and then you guys say it's okay to take it home, but the cop stops you on the highway and says, okay, you've got an open bottle of wine, they'll charge you,

open bottle. You said it's okay to take an open bottle of wine if the owner caps it, but he doesn't have the seal to put around that so it doesn't have a seal to seal it. So you go down the road and the cop stops you, or sometimes a cop just stops anybody for just checking, and they search your vehicle, you've got half a bottle of wine there that's been opened, so you get charged for an open bottle. A lot of people drive around -- I know they still do it -- drinking beer. Some of them get caught with an open bottle of beer and the cops confiscate all the liquor that's in the truck or in a vehicle or whatever it is; they confiscate everything and then you go to court for an open bottle. But you said here you can take it home, but it's still an open bottle. I don't think any laws have changed for an opened bottle. Okay, go ahead.

---Interjection

MR. SIMON: Yeah, that's all I had, about that open bottle business.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Thank you, Mr. Simon. I think your point is well made and it's something that we're going to have to have more discussions on. What we are told is that it's for wine only and wine has to be recorked, and it has to be secured, and it has to be unreachable by the driver or passenger. So it would have to be in a trunk. Now, there are still rules about drinking and driving. In the last couple of years, we have really restricted the level of alcohol, the legal limit of level of alcohol in your system. So basically for most people, you shouldn't be driving after even a couple of glasses of wine. So you'll have to have pretty well a non-drinking driver. Everybody will be still subject to the alcohol limit in their blood if they get stopped. I think it will be hard for people to use if they get stopped and they were drinking, that they were coming from a restaurant and they recorked the wine. But we will have much more discussion on that, because this seems to be something that everybody is bringing up because it's something very new. It's done in Alberta; it's done everywhere in Australia, but not too many places in Canada, so this is something new. It was a surprise to us, too, so we will have more discussion on that.

MR. SIMON: But the Northwest Territories is not like that. They don't have any mercy when you get caught; that's all I'm saying.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): That's right. We have the hardest drinking and driving rules in Canada. So we will look at this, because I don't know if it's contrary to all the stuff we have tried to do to stop drinking and driving. Chief Sanguéz.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: A prime example, me. I just come out of the Sub-Arctic in Fort Simpson. I was just frikin' dead drunk, but I still drove and all of a sudden the cops threw me in the drunk tank and I thought, holy shit. I tried to tell the cops and the judge it's not my fault that I drank that much in the bar. The bar should have told me, Stan, you're too drunk, you can't drive, you can't drink any more, get out. I tried to do this devil's advocate with the judge in court and I lost. But the whole point to the judge was how come they served me that much and I was that drunk, and the cop had to help me out of my vehicle and threw me in the drunk tank. I learned my good lessons on that, because they took my licence away for a year and it made me really think, sitting in that

drunk tank. I said, oh, geez, I just lost my job because I don't have my driver's licence anymore. But it made me think twice to even go behind a vehicle anymore if I had two beers or one beer, even that. So to me it's an example; me, I can't do that anymore because I need my driver's licence because it's part of my work. If that's taken away from me, then it makes individuals think harder that I'm not going to do this again because I need my driver's licence to make a living. Without it, I can't do nothing. I mean, you've had your driver's licence for so long and you've enjoyed it, but it's taken away, which is good, I like that because it helped me think that I can't do that anymore because without it I can't do nothing.

But I wanted to raise this wine issue. When I go to the liquor stores, I see a lot of people buying Private Stock. I had a shot of it one time. Holy smoke! That stuff is too much sugar in that damn thing. I see lots of people, it don't matter young or old, they drink a lot of that Private Stock and it's not a frikin' healthy thing for anybody to drink but the liquor stores sells them. I think the Private Stock should be taken off the shelf immediately, because it's, what do you call it? A diabetic issue. Too much sugar. It's just like putting four tablespoons of sugar in one cup and drinking that coffee. That Private Stock is dangerous. It's so cheap, too. I go to Hay River sometimes and I see a lot of the young people and old people buy that stuff, and I say you guys shouldn't be allowed to sell this stuff. You don't even know what you're doing to these guys when you sell it. And they say, it's not me, it's the government. It's the government that's selling this stuff. So we need to tell the government that some of those things that are on the shelf shouldn't be there. To me, the Private Stock is an issue that's dangerous, because I had a shot of it and there's too much sugar in there. I just wanted to say that. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Chief Sanguéz, we will bring that up with the Minister, because we do know that in recent years the Minister was asked to take off overproof rum off the shelf, so they have done that before. So we may be able to have discussions with the Minister that this is a concern and we want to know if other people have expressed that as well, and see if that should be reviewed for restriction.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: The other one is that I didn't know there was two types of vodka. There's a 40 percent one and there's a stronger one. They call it the Red Label and the Blue Label. I see a lot of the young people are buying the stronger one. I don't know what it's called, but I like this one because it's stronger.

---Interjection

CHIEF SANGUEZ: Anyway, that's there again. I said how come if our government is going to limit alcohol and help the small communities, geez, just keep at 40 percent, no more no less. Even just drinking a bottle of 40 vodka, you'll feel it in the morning. Everybody will feel it, everybody that drank that. How come they're selling it that way? I don't know. To me, I think it's kind of a two coin system where if I can sell anything, I can make more money off the sick people. That's the way I see our government doing that. To me, I always see the things as a corporate world. Money is the mighty dollar to all government and all communities. Where is this whole thing going to is a bigger issue

and the health issue. Our government should really look seriously because you're talking about the health act. If you look at the health act and this Liquor Act, you already see that already. It's going to increase more cost to the government at the end of the day if you just keep selling this stuff to the people that are really sick. When I first seen that movie there, Nicholas Cage act on Leaving Las Vegas. Holy smokes! This guy kind of scared me a little bit. Because when you're sick, you are sick. There's no control on that. You're an alcoholic. There's no way. Then you'll look around and you'll find it. But will this legislation help these sick people and this health issue for our government, because it's going to cost more in the next while unless we deal with this alcohol altogether. Maybe just sell wine only. I don't know. That's all I wanted to say.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Thank you, Chief Sanguetz. I think that's a big challenge for alcohol, because one thing we most often compare how to control alcohol is with cigarettes. I think the government, by and large, have been successful in the campaign to denormalize the use of tobacco. Lots of kids are saying no to tobacco and there is the Don't be a Butthead tobacco campaign that Mr. Miltenberger initiated when he was Minister of Health and Social Services. There's nothing good about tobacco and it's easy to restrict tobacco. But alcohol, for some reason, is sometimes good and sometimes bad. Nationally, there's a lot of campaigns to encourage, actually, the use of alcohol; lots of sports commercials and lots of events that are sponsored by alcohol. In Yellowknife and in many private communities there are lots of people asking for specific, specialty kind of alcohol. So it's open, it's not restricted, we don't ban alcohol 100 percent. So it's really how to control the use of alcohol, because there has not been a call to make the whole NWT alcohol free. Even if we did that, then we'll have to...I don't know; then you'll have to enforce it and we'll have to be having RCMP in every airport and every highway, and everybody will go to Alberta to have drinks and that sort of thing. So we allow alcohol in the NWT. A lot of people use it without a problem, but for many of our people it's really dangerous when it's overused and there's binge drinking and where there's addiction involved. So it's a very difficult issue for us. I think that's why the government has tried to give the control to the communities and give power to the communities to decide what they would like to do with their communities. What we are hearing is it's not something that can be handled by the community alone, because even though there is no liquor store or restaurants or bars in Jean Marie River, you get access to it from other communities and what happens there affects you. So we'll take that back to our discussion.

Are there any other councillors, band members here? You're welcome to...

---Interjection

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Absolutely. As long as it's within some...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Getting drunk.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): ...limit. Mr. Simon.

MR. SIMON: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): I'm surely learning a lot about alcohol tonight, I tell you.

MR. SIMON: Okay, this other one here, I don't have it here but you said you asked about other questions about our power rates. I'd like to find out why is it in the smaller communities that power rates are so high. The fuel riders, they have all kinds of things added to it and we always have to pay for that as communities. A few years ago, there was low water in the Snare River, so we had to pay for the water quality there, which is none of our business, and now the power rates are going up. Just a week ago it was on the radio as the Public Utilities Board to see if they can increase the power rates again. Us communities here, we're hit the hardest. Colville Lake; I'd like to see some of the Ministers of the Power Corp stay at Colville Lake for one year and see how much power bills they have to pay, because it's over \$2 there per kilowatt. Nahanni Butte, it's 94 or 96 cents; Jean Marie, here, we pay 84.9...(inaudible)...The reason why I know all about the power is because I work for them and that's how I know. Fort Smith, they're only paying 14 cents, I think, or 11 cents a kilowatt because of hydro. All the bigger centres are paying less than us, and us here, we just barely get by. These lights are on here for about two hours here and it's close to 500 bucks, over 500 bucks the lights being on here in that amount of time, hours. This community hall alone in the wintertime it's close to \$2,000, \$3,000 a month. The people around here, the residential, they, too, are pretty high. It's close to two or three hundred bucks every month. For all the activity and what jobs we have, it goes all to our bills.

Another thing, too, that they're talking about building a transmission line over to the diamond mines. I was kind of against that. I said why don't they just string a line down this way to all the communities down here? Think about us first, then the diamond mines, because those mines are not going to be there forever, but us communities here, we're going to be here longer than the mines. Look at our two major mines in Yellowknife; Con and Giant. They ran for about 40 years, now it's shut down, nothing. So the other mines are going to be like that. If they string a transmission line down this way, they're talking about 700 kilometres of transmission line and it's not even 500 to Fort Simpson. From Hay River to Fort Simpson is not quite 400. If they do build that transmission line over to the mines, after the mines shut down and everything, who's going to pull all those lines up and who's going to pay for that? That's another thing that's going to be added to our power bill for sure, I'm quite sure, because it seems like everything they can find, the Power Corp can find to add to the power bill, they do. Fuel rider, low water, all this and who's getting the pinch? Us small communities.

I'm quite sure over in the Legislature or wherever in the government office probably heard about this before. If I remember correctly, a few years back here, maybe six, seven years, maybe more, that the government was talking about one flat rate throughout the whole Territories. You probably heard about that. Yes, one flat rate. But Yellowknife, Inuvik, Smith, Hay River, all them big communities, they didn't want that because what's going to happen? Us small communities, our power rates are going to go down and those guys are going to come up. But don't forget, this is not going to be forever, then it will straighten out as the years go by, then everybody pays the same. No, they didn't want that. So they dropped that. The power rates, throughout the Territories it's all been like that.

Another thing, too, that the Power Corp likes to give out is contracts. Sure our money is good, but if you don't take care of your own end, come tax time you owe us money. It's all contracts. That's what happened; a lot of people, I got caught in that. I lost five years in contract. I'm trying to get it back, but they said, no, it's gone, it's forgotten. Those five years, what I've been doing, I'm doing the same thing as what I'm doing now in payroll. I'm quite sure a lot of people have retired. I don't know; it's quite a few people. After retirement they've got nothing because they never paid into any pension plan or anything, which they weren't told at all about things like that. If you're not on payroll, you don't pay into any benefits or anything. Contracts, sure; but when the time comes when you're retired, just like a friend of mine, he put 34 years and when he retired he said, oh, I've had enough, I retire. When he retired, the only years that he had was 17 years with the Power Corp. He did it for 34 years, he lost all the other 17. That hit that guy hard.

Not only that, there's a lot I'm quite sure throughout the western Territories and Nunavut, too, now. Before it was the Power Corp there were a lot of people on contract. Things like that has hurt a lot of people and what's the use working so many years and you end up with nothing? You figure you might have something for benefits and that for your retirement, if you don't put anything away, tough titty, you know? You're out and that hurt. When I was here when this thing first started here, I was the one that started complaining about the contracts, and finally they put us on payroll. They put us on payroll and then a few years later, they cut our hours down. They couldn't give us a round figure number to work and it's hard to get by, especially in a small community like this. You've got bills to pay and things like that, sometimes you just barely make ends meet. So the Power Corp, that's one thing I'm quite sure everybody has a concern on, even the Chief is waiving his hand here, so I'll let him have it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Before I go to Chief Sanguetz, Mr. Bill Braden wants to wade into this. He used to work for the Power Corp, so we'll give it to him.

MR. BRADEN: Thank you. I don't work for the Power Corporation anymore, so I can't speak for them.

MR. SIMON: You're lucky.

MR. BRADEN: Yeah. Okay, but when committees travel to communities, we take the time to listen to anything that anybody wants to tell us about, and the very least we can do is to bring what you're telling us back to your MLA. I'm sure that he knows about it already, but we will tell Kevin again. We can also send your comments, through this recording here, we can send your comments directly to the Minister responsible for the Power Corporation and the chairman of the board. The kinds of things that you want answers to, I would think that it's very fair for you to ask somebody from the Power Corporation to come to your community and talk to you about things like the power rates and why they are the way they are, and the concerns you have about your pension and your own terms. Now, that affects a very small number of people. I've heard about it before; I understand how serious it is for you, but that is a separate issue but there's a different process at hand. In fact, the Legislature, we as MLAs, would not get involved

with that. There's a different way of managing that kind of a problem through the collective bargaining process, and labour standards, and employment standards and things like this.

What I did want to say is that the cost of power rates, those are decided by another organization, the Public Utilities Board. They do that with their own organization. They have their own law, their own act, and they do that apart from us. The Legislative Assembly does not influence that. We've had a system in the Northwest Territories I think for about 10 years now where the rates are set for depending on the costs of delivering the service in each community. So Fort Simpson is not subsidizing you; Yellowknife is not subsidizing you; and you are not subsidizing anybody else. It's just your costs. That's basically the way the system works.

I know that the Power Corporation has brought forward its new rate application. Its costs haven't change I think in three years. I think it's a three-year period, but in that period of time, costs of diesel fuel has gone up 60 percent. They are facing a lot of very heavy pressures for skilled labour, like a lot of trades. It's costing them more to deliver a good quality of service. But those are the kinds of things that the Power Corporation can explain directly.

I would like to tell you about one thing that the Government of the Northwest Territories is doing and that is with the subsidy program that applies to everybody across the territory. For the first 700 kilowatt hours you use every month, everybody is billed at the Yellowknife rate and then your own community rate kicks in after that. We have approved I think it's \$150,000 to do a major review of that subsidy level to see is it skill adequate, could it be amended or changed so that more people could take advantage of it; I'm sorry, not more people, but could you take advantage of it, say, during the summertime when you're not using as much power and bank a little more hours for the winter? That could be one change. Anyway, the point is that we're looking at it. It's been...Okay, when was Dennis Patterson the Premier?

---Interjection

MR. BRADEN: Yeah. So it's more than 20 years that that same power subsidy program has been there and it hasn't been changed. We're going to look at it and see if we can make some changes that way so that power rates, especially in the smaller communities, can be more affordable.

MR. SIMON: So in other words, that power subsidy, at 700 kilowatts, the government looks after.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): No.

MR. BRADEN: The subsidy program is actually a government program. That is our responsibility. The Power Corporation has nothing to do with it. They're very separate. So we spend now I think it's in the neighbourhood of \$9 million a year across the territory to subsidize community power rates outside of Yellowknife, Hay River, Fort Smith and Fort Resolution. Everybody else gets a subsidy, a major subsidy. But we

need to look at...The cost to deliver the service is huge and the Power Corporation can't absorb all that, otherwise they would go broke and we don't need a bankrupt Power Corporation. We have to find a way to pay for it somehow. I think the way we'll be going is that government will try to look at helping people out more with their power rates. It's very general and very early in the process.

MR. SIMON: My other question here was couldn't they go up from 700 to, say, 900 kilowatt subsidies? Maybe that might help us.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): That's how it works right now. Your power bill, up to 700 kilowatts you pay the same rate as Yellowknife, everybody in the community. Anything more than 700 kilowatts, you have to pay a higher rate or whatever rate is in the communities. So one of the reviews is to see if we could increase that limit from 700 kilowatts to something larger. But what we don't want to do is encourage people to use more power than necessary, because sometimes, if you subsidize them, you might use more than you need to. Because 700 kilowatts is the average family use. If you stay within 700 kilowatts, you're paying the Yellowknife rate. But in the communities, it's higher than the Yellowknife rate and government is paying for that, the difference between your community rate and Yellowknife rate. In Yellowknife, say it's 80 cents per kilowatt and in your community it's 90 cents, the government pays 10 cents for the first 700 kilowatts. Anything after that, you're paying your own.

Another thing I want to say is Nunavut left us and the two mines closed in Yellowknife, and it has affected the price in that we're not using up all the power that we make or the Power Corporation makes. The more users you have, actually, you bring the cost down. So in fact it was a good thing when we had Con Mine and Giant Mine in Yellowknife, because they were the biggest consumers and they paid the most power and they actually subsidized us in a way. All the rates went down. But ever since Nunavut left and the two mines left, we have to cover all the cost of producing power. So sometimes it's good to have a big mine in your neighbourhood who would pay the big bucks to use lots of power. There's a certain amount of power you have to make and we have to pay the basic cost of producing that, and if you have a big user in your neighbourhood, they will pay the biggest bill and sometimes it helps the little guys. Do you know what I mean? Because it's so expensive to produce power for all the small communities, you just need a critical mass of people to share the cost of it. But I could assure you that the high power rates has been a big issue for us. All the small community Members, the Member for Colville Lake and Kevin Menicoche, the Member in this area, and lots of other Members have brought to us about the urgency of the high cost of power, and it's under review. Mr. Simon, did you want to do a follow-up before I go to Chief Sanguéz? Mr. Simon.

MR. SIMON: Who, me?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Yes. Did you want to speak?

MR. SIMON: No.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Okay.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: ...(inaudible)...consistence with the other three bills you have in front of us. On this Liquor Act, how much time do I have between now, before you guys wrap up this final stuff on the Liquor Act? Do I have two, three, four months of window opportunity to bring a submission to you?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): You have until July 13th. If you would like to write a letter to us about any concerns you have about the Liquor Act or anything you want to add, then that would be really good because we need to do our work and any changes that need to be made, we need to do that before we go into the Assembly in August.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: Does that mean 12, 13, 14, too?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Yes, all the four pieces of legislation you have before you.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: Okay. The reason why I wanted to say this is we're getting...Me and Margaret have been trying to get all those meetings in Fort Simpson. The liquor store is right there. We wanted to have a meeting over there with our elders: Isadore, Ernest. I try to use my elders as a kind of guiding tool, as a chief, and I wanted to raise this alcohol issue with them at our campground sitting, just to talk about this issue that you raised about these points here about the amount of alcohol coming to a community, how we control it. Now I know there's part of the legislation that helps the community. We didn't know that. But now we have a tool that we can work with to improve the Liquor Act the way we want to see fit for our communities. I'd like to at least have a first stab with the elders, see what they think about it and if they want to raise any questions, of course we'll write a letter and submission to yourself, or who do we...Is there a mailing address or anything we could send it to?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): I'll ask Doug to give you the contact address, or you could just write to Sandy Lee, Legislative Assembly, or you could send it through your MLA. We will welcome any submission you might want to make from the elders, or you may want to bring it to your Fort Simpson assembly, or even the Dehcho Assembly in Kakisa. We would love to hear from the leadership if they want to give us an input. That would be very, very helpful. Anything you would like us to consider within the Liquor Act issue, we will welcome that very much.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: Okay. Yes, I will bring that kind of issue to our assembly. By the way, the Dehcho assembly has moved to Fort Simpson. It was just kind of a sticky point for some of the leaders, because some of the leaders still use alcohol. I said, well, back in those days we were; now we have more understanding of alcohol and people are saying I don't think it should be a big issue in Fort Simpson because the liquor store and bars are there. I don't know what they're going to do over there about the assembly over there. Yes, the assembly is in Fort Simpson at the end of the month.

How do we tackle these other three bills, 12, 13 and 14, Sandy?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): You don't have to feel compelled to respond to those, only if you wanted to. It's not something we've heard a lot on.

Change of Name Act is very much administrative. You could change your name tomorrow if you want to. There's nothing barring you, unless, of course, you have a court order saying...Unless somebody is trying to hide their identity for illegal purposes or trying to run away from something that they shouldn't be running away from. But for most people, you could change your name tomorrow. But before, if you wanted to, you could call yourself Madonna tomorrow if you wanted to, actually. You have to have a first name and last name. But you had to go through the court process before and it was plugging up the court system and it was too cumbersome. Now you just have to sign a statutory declaration and send it to vital stats. They'll do all the work and they'll allow that. So it's pretty straightforward legislation and if you don't have comments on that, that's fine. If you have questions, you could always let us know.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: Okay. It's just like me. My name is Stan Sanguiez. I've got really bad credit. All of a sudden, I want to go to the government and I want to change my name just to something, and all of a sudden does those other things, those social insurance numbers that they give you, does that change? Does your identity really change just having your name changed? I'm just saying that. An example me, I want to change my name tomorrow because I have really bad credit and I can't buy a vehicle.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): I think we're learning a lot about you tonight, Chief Sanguiez.

---Laughter

Regina, could help you with that information?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Do you want to know his alias?

---Laughter

CHIEF SANGUEZ: I don't know what that word means.

MS. PFEIFER: It's not quite that easy. When you go to vital statistics and ask for a name change, you have to file different kind of documents that actually prove that...You know, they check if you are doing it for a bad purpose like fraud, so it wouldn't be that easy. Also what they do in order to make sure once a name is changed, they send that information to certain authorities, like the RCMP for example, so that they know, some of those authorities will know that before you have had this name and now you have this name. So it has some things in there to make sure that it cannot be abused like that.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: Okay. That's all I wanted to know. Because I wanted to change it tomorrow, but I guess not.

---Laughter

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): But this name change is not identity change. So name change, you would not be able to get a new social insurance number, for example, no. It's just name change.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: Geez.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): And if the kids don't like the name that their parents gave them or somebody before...

CHIEF SANGUEZ: Is there an age limit?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): No. You have to be majority age, 19. But for children, parents could do it. For example, if you were married and you took on a married name and you're divorced, you want to go back to your old name, just to sort out your documents, now with the passport requirement and driver's licence requirements, there's lots of people who need to straighten out their name legally. So they could do that. You could be actually common-law relationship and change your name to a married name if you wanted to.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: So you don't even have to go to church and get married.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): No.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: You've been living with this person for 10 years, all of a sudden I could change my name.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Under the law, whether you're married or in a common-law relationship, your legal benefits are the same, so...So that's why...

CHIEF SANGUEZ: So you don't need to get married anymore.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Well, if you love somebody, you can marry somebody. I don't know; I don't want to go there.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: No, Sandy Lee. I really like Sandy Lee, so I want to take...

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Ahhh! Okay, so now you had a question about the Employment Standards Act. No. Mr. Hardisty.

MR. HARDISTY: Could you take your wife's name?

---Laughter

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): You can if you want to. And there are men who do that; men who change it to their wife's name.

---Interjection

---Laughter

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): If you don't like the name your parents gave you, you can change that, too.

MR. HARDISTY: I'm kind of happy you mentioned it, because there has to be checks and balances in this name change act, because people may abuse it but we need to be care on there, how that's being done. I told you earlier that our community is so small and we have a lot of transients and people come and go in this community. Sometimes we don't know who they are, because sometimes we look at the cops and there's a big bunch of...(inaudible)...and everybody is criminals and stuff like that and we care for them. I just wondered if that could be something that could be looked at carefully, I guess. That's my concern.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): There are checks and balances there. But you could change your name, it's just a process you have to go through.

MR. HARDISTY: How much does it cost?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): It will probably be in regulation, but I'm sure there will be a fee to change your name.

MR. HARDISTY: I get treaty, \$5 a year; I could change it every year. Okay, Employment Standards Act. Sandy.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Robert, did you want to give us a little briefing on that?

MR. COLLINSON: The Employment Standards Act is reworking of the Labour Standards Act and it's going to recognize some things that weren't in the act before. For example, it's going to define which holidays are statutory holidays right in the act. It's going to define how overtime is calculated. It's going to allow for lieu time, so that the previous act, if you worked for your employer and he gave you time off later on, that was covered under the old act. It will be covered under this new act and they'll have to pay you lieu time at time and a half. So if you work a day, you get a day and a half off.

There are going to be allowances for different types of leave now. They will all be laid out in the act. There is compassionate care leave, where if you have a sick relative that's in the process of dying, you'll be able to take time off and help them on their final journey. You won't get paid for it. You'll be eligible for EI because the federal government allows that, but you won't lose your job while you're gone doing that. They can't fire you during that period of time.

There are provisions for sick leave. A person would be allowed to take up to seven days off without pay during the year. If after three days, if you're sick for three days, the employer can ask for a doctor's certificate from you.

The Labour Board which exists right now is going to be collapsed and they're going to have what are called individual adjudicators. So instead of if you have a complaint about your employer and how they paid you, or if they didn't pay you, or if they didn't pay your vacation pay or whatever you were entitled to and you took a complaint to the

Labour Standards Board, they would sit as a board of five people and decide whether you were treated fairly or unfairly and whether the employer owed you money now or not. Now it's just going to be one individual deciding it and the theory behind that for the government is that it will speed it up, because the board only meets four times a year. An individual adjudicator would be able to do it faster. There's some controversy over that about whether you lose the collective experience. Also, traditionally, adjudicators are people with a background in law and we don't have very many of those people in the North, so we might have to get people from the South to do this.

It also sets out restrictions on employees under the age of 16, what they can and can't do, and maximum hours of work. Before, the act was written in such a way that Sunday was defined as the preferred day off; now there's no mention of the word Sunday, it's just there's a requirement to have one day off every seven days; two days off every 14, and three days off every three weeks in a row. So that's basically, in a nutshell...

Oh, when you have wages owed to people and a company is going bankrupt, the wages have went up the scale from when they used to be. They used to be one of the last things paid. Now they're ahead of most things and they're going to have less employees being screwed -- pardon my language -- by employers going broke. That's it for that one.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: I got questions, too. One the wage, how is this act enforceable in other jurisdictions, say like B.C., Alberta, anywhere? I want to give you an example here. I've got some of our primary workers here: slashers. They're doing some seismic work in B.C. This guy, to me, this guy just laughed at them. These guys are workers and they've never got fully paid yet and they're still waiting and they're still talking to other jurisdictions in B.C. to find out how the Labour Act would protect our workers in the Territories working in other jurisdictions. These guys, they never paid our guys yet fully. How enforceable is this Labour Act somewhere else?

MR. COLLINSON: There's provisions right now. They do it right now where they cooperate between the jurisdictions. So if you get an order against somebody here, you could get it paid for out of B.C. Employment Standards Board or whatever it's called in B.C. would enforce it against that employer. Now, whether that employer still exists or whether he's one of those type of contractors that has three or four different identities he goes through, I mean there's all kinds of circumstances and I know I've heard of a lot of them. But you should be able to get some satisfaction doing this, following this process that they lay out in here. You can talk to the labour standards officers in Yellowknife -- there's a 1-800 number -- and they should be able to point you in the right direction and at least tell you the right person to talk to in B.C., if that's where you did the work.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: I know that was an issue here in the community for about three or four boys here that worked in B.C. and they still haven't received a dime yet for about three or four months of work.

The other one is under the employment act, is there anything in that provision in the act that let's say I want to protect my community from sometimes we hire people from out of

town that don't live here, that we have to bring them in because we lack the skilled workers. Having that individual sign a contract with me as a band, they say I, Stan Sanguéz, will be employed with Jean Marie under this certain contract that I sign. Having that kind of contract signed by individuals from out of the community, how will this Employment Standards Act protect me as an employer that, okay, this guy is not doing his work, I'm going to fire him. All of a sudden, I've got this act I have to worry about. This guy could come back to me and say well, Stan, I worked here for 12, 14 years; now I need some severance pay here, reverses the contract that he signed with the community. Is there anything that protects the employer, as a small community, that we could be taken to the cleaners, let's say to speak?

MR. COLLINSON: The existing act has those type of provisions in it where you can dismiss a person for just cause, but they're still entitled to certain things within the act as it is, and severance pay is one of them after a certain period of time and you'd have to pay them out all their vacation pay and any monies owed, otherwise they could go to the Labour Board or the new Employment Standards Board officer once you guys have terminated the contract. The employment contract that you sign with a person should be written up, of course, taking this act -- the existing act or the new act -- into account when you write it up. It's very clear in there what your responsibilities are as an employer and what the employee is entitled to. So it lays it out there for you. So I mean you can go right through it and once the regulations are developed, you'll know exactly what you have to do to protect yourself and make sure that the employee can't take advantage of you.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: To me, it's vice versa here.

MR. COLLINSON: It gets what he's entitled to.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: My concern here, as a chief, is I'm trying to protect my organization from wrongful dismissal or anything. Somehow some people that I don't want to work with, I've been working in Jean Marie for 20 years, I don't like them, but this act is going to protect that individual. But how does that protect me as a chief and as an employer, that relationship to the employee, that, okay, you did your time here, I think you should go because you're putting too much years in here and you might end up asking for a pension and payout and lieu time. I'm just trying to protect my community here.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): I think we may be going in to looking for legal advice here now.

---Laughter

So I just want to say that you, as a band councillor and employer, have certain obligations to employees and perhaps we could ask the Minister to let all the potential employers know what the changes are and what the employee benefits are under this legislation. There's a difference between contractor/contractee relationship and employee/employer relationship. If you hire a company to do work for you, it's a contract between you as an individual or band council and a company. So you don't

have to follow the employee rules. Those employees are employees of that contractor. But there are certain changes being made here that all employers should be made aware of, so we will ask the Minister to let that be known to the public. But you do have to follow the rules. Having said that, anybody could be let go. All you have to do is give them notice or give them pay in lieu of notice. Anybody could be let go. You don't have to have a good reason to let go. It's not impossible to let go of somebody. You could let go of somebody or just cause or you just have to give them reason, or you have to give them notice. Anyway, I don't want to get into all that because I'm not licensed to practise law so I don't want to be giving you legal advice. But I think it would be useful for you to get some more information. We'll ask the Minister to make sure that the municipalities and band councils are made aware of what the changes are.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: Okay. Under the age of 16 or younger, we have a really young population in the community here. We try to provide student employment in our community here. Some of them want to work at 12, 13, 14, but because of that we can't do it. But we did it. We broke our own rule, so to speak, because we hire every youth we have in the community that wants to work. There was no age restriction to me, I think, but we still paid them a little bit, money whatever we had from employment. But that employment for summer students had been reduced and we could only apply three or four, Tammy?

---Interjection

CHIEF SANGUEZ: Then last year, we hired all our kids as young as 14, but we still paid them. This way we teach them how to be respectful. You work your time, you put your time in, you got paid for your time and effort. But because of employment money-wise issues, I'm hoping that this act doesn't penalize communities like ourselves with such a small young population, still can hire them at the lower ages of probably 14.

MR. COLLINSON: Actually, when you say it puts out restrictions on employing persons 16 years and younger, what that means is they're not allowed to do certain things. They set out some specific examples. They can't do construction work; they can't do slashing. But you could hire them to mow the law and to paint buildings.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: A lot of it is grass cutting.

MR. COLLINSON: Yeah, and stuff like that. You can hire them to do that. But, you know, you can't have them doing...Basically they don't want them doing dangerous work where you need a little bit of maturity. Then there's some restrictions on the hours they can work.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Ms. Neal.

MS. NEAL: I don't have a comment on the act, because it sounds pretty good, but I do have I don't know what I'd call it, a comment or maybe something that you guys could look into for us. We've come across a grey area where if I call the Labour Board and ask for advice, they ask you a few questions. They refer you to Canada because you're a band. Then you phone Canada and they ask you other questions and they say, no,

you fall under the territorial government. So I've been going back and forth and for a little while we weren't even sure which one we fell under. Finally I got a hold of a lady who helped me out and she says that we fall under Canada. But then if you talk to the NWT, they say, well, because you're overseeing municipal services, you're territorial. So we're not sure what we are.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): I think you need a labour lawyer. One of the things we have been asked to look into is creating a position called the employer and employee advisor, because there are lots of specific provisions here and you're a band council but you're also an employer, so you will be subject to employer laws here, but there might be some things that you can do as a band council that other employers cannot do or some things you can't do because you're a band council that other employers could do; I don't know. But that could be helpful when you call somebody, that other people have suggested that we may want to ask for the Minister to create a position in employment benefits office that would work to assist both employees and employers about what they can do and not do under this legislation. So in a broad sense, it may help you. But we couldn't tell you right now where do you fall, because you probably fall in both, depending on what situation.

MS. NEAL: I think we do partially fall under the federal labour standards and partially under the NWT, because the Dev Corp and the sawmill fall under the NWT and then the band falls underneath the federal, but then, really, MACA falls under the NWT so there's got to be a simpler way to do this.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): That's a good recommendation. We have not heard that before and it's a good thing we came here. It's a good one. We don't know the answer to it, but we could commit to getting back to you on that.

MS. NEAL: I think there's only a few bands like that; Trout Lake, because they also do the municipal services, Nahanni Butte and us, and I think that's the only three communities around here that might have that problem. I don't know about up north.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Even for Canada being a federation, like employees of airlines for example, telecommunications, they fall under the federal labour law. So it's not just a band council situation, because Canada is a very complex federation and there are certain jurisdictions with the federal government and aviation is a federal jurisdiction, so all labour law issues there falls under that. GNWT actually doesn't have full jurisdiction of labour laws. So when there was the Giant Mine strike, we couldn't do anything. Anyway, that's a whole other issue. But we will ask Minister Dent, who is Minister for this bill, ask about that provision under this act and we will get back to you on that, as much as we can. I don't think we could clarify it completely.

MS. NEAL: That would be good.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): I understand we have a ferry deadline, otherwise we would like to stay here as long as possible.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: The only thing that I have concerns about the Public Health Act is protecting the community here because of the global warming issue. There's new bugs that are going to be coming in. When I first got elected, that's what I phoned my MLA about right away. What is our government doing about this new disease that may come in because of this big scare about this bird flu? Holy moley. We got scared, actually. How does our government protect our communities on that kind of new disease that's coming in? We know that mosquitoes... We get bites from mosquitoes, but we don't know. Can we get sick tomorrow and what protects us? All of a sudden, when I raised it, I think the government employees would get all immunized first.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Who told you that?

CHIEF SANGUEZ: Maybe the community would be the last one because there might be not enough.

---Interjection

CHIEF SANGUEZ: The chief gets immunized first? You know, this is kind of a true fact because when I raised it with Kevin, he said well, we don't know, our government might not have enough doses for everybody about this disease that's coming.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): We'll ask Robert to give you some response to that.

MR. COLLINSON: The old Public Health Act is 50 years old. It didn't contemplate things like SARS, West Nile Virus, the new bird flu, the things you're talking about here. So it didn't have kind of a recognition of the fact that you can fly from Hong Kong to here in two days. It used to be three months at a...(inaudible)...a train ride to Edmonton, dog team to here and you'd get here in seven or eight months from when you started out where the disease was. Now you can be here in two days. So this new act kind of provides for powers of quarantine; it allows the Minister to shut off travel to the Northwest Territories if there was a problem down south, to restrict travel to the Territories. It could restrict travel within the Territories. So if SARS broke out in the Yellowknife area, they wouldn't allow travel in and out of Yellowknife.

Speaking to the flu vaccine thing, well, one of the basic premises of that is you'd make sure that essential services would be the first people inoculated. The garbage truck driver would have priority over a lawyer. The chief would have priority, too, but I'm just saying...

CHIEF SANGUEZ: I'm the last one.

MR. COLLINSON: There's a lot; you know, the water plant operator, all those type of people would have priority over a lot of ordinary people that don't have anything to do with the infrastructure of running a community or running a government. This allows for a lot quicker response.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Mr. Hardisty.

MR. HARDISTY: I was watching the news the other day and they were looking for this guy with what they call untreatable TB, and there is one in Yellowknife, too. A guy was staying at the Salvation Army. How could these people get into the Territories with their disease and they come here? Is there an act in this Public Health Act that covers that?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): The TB case in the States is a different kind of TB from the TB cases that we are hearing about in the NWT. There are lots of our local people that are developing TB. For a long time, we thought we had gotten rid of TB as a prevalent disease, but it's coming back and nobody really knows why and it's developing different strains. So the public health officer here will be tasked, and they already have that duty to deal with that. So they're constantly monitoring that and they're constantly monitoring to see TB or any other infectious diseases that are coming up. We have lots of STIs and STDs in the North. We have lots of local infectious diseases and we have a medical officer, who will also be a public health officer. We have somebody who is watching that all the time and they will notify the public, they will quarantine people and they will take care of people and they will get a hold of people who have been in touch with those people who are infected. So that's all being taken care of by appropriate people. This law just makes everything more clear and it gives a lot of power for the Minister and the public health official to address that. So it's a good update, good modernizing of legislation that was needed and it hasn't been done for over 50 years.

On that note then, Mr. Simon, we'll give you the last question.

MR. SIMON: On this health act here, we're always short of doctors and things like that over in Simpson, because Simpson we have five surrounding communities that they have to look after and we can't seem to get somebody a doctor to come in and stay for a long time. Just when we get used to one medical doctor, they take off and a new one comes in. It's been going on for so many years here and it's just when it seems like we get a good doctor that's doing good for the community, he's off again. Same with the nurses. In Fort Simpson, I see that they bring a lot of students in every year, different students, and then they work here and then they get transferred someplace else. But for a doctor, we'd like to have a doctor that's going to be...maybe two. There are five communities that surround Fort Simpson, and for one doctor to go to all of that, that's lots, a lot of time, because sometimes he has to spend a week or something like that in different communities. Here, just a short distance away, he comes in and does all his thing and then goes back, but we get it once a month. But in between that, everybody is once a month but there's only one doctor. Sometimes there's two doctors if we're lucky, then one goes. To get a letter from a doctor or something, you can't get a letter because the doctor is in a different community, you have to wait until he gets back. Things like that.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Thank you, Mr. Simon. That's an issue for all of us not just in the territory, it's even an issue in Yellowknife, it's not just the small communities, and it's an issue all over Canada. We just don't have enough doctors. Alberta needs 1,200 doctors in the next 10 years. The GNWT is spending a lot of money to recruit and retain doctors. It's not that we're not funding doctors, we just can't find doctors to say, and nurses. So that's an ongoing issue and it's something that we have to work on. We

are actually funding medical students; two of them. We are paying for all their education so they will come here and be our doctor. We're doing the same for nurses. We're training our local nurses in Aurora College and we have produced lots of nurses for that, too, and we have to talk them into coming into small communities, too. So that's an ongoing issue. But this is not something that the Public Health Act is addressing. It's a funding issue; it's a recruiting issue; it's a retaining issue; it's an ongoing issue. This Public Health Act is dealing with non-doctor/nurse, but public health issues in general, not hospital issues.

MR. SIMON: Just in case there's an emergency accident or something, say a doctor is way down in Nahanni Butte, late at night you can't get in there and you need a doctor. You're stuck because there's only one doctor, unless you get a medevac from Yellowknife to come in and do the work.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): The NWT pays better for doctors and nurses than most places. We have put in a lot of money to get more doctors and nurses in, and we are doing better than a lot of rural places in other parts of Canada, but it's hard to compete with Alberta and other major centres and it's really hard for small communities. We will bring that again to the Minister of Health and Social Services, because we hear that in every community we go to.

I'm going to have to ask, Chief Sanguetz, if you could make your last comment and do a prayer for us, because I'm told that we have to go and catch the ferry.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: Okay. The last one is at quarter to 12:00.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): We don't want to be speeding anywhere. We're law-abiding citizens.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You don't have your wine, so it's okay.

---Laughter

CHIEF SANGUEZ: You didn't have your glass of wine, so you're okay. No.

---Laughter

Just for accountability on our part to make comments or submissions to your four acts, do you have any funding that you could help employ a member in our community to help us make submissions to these four acts? I need to hire somebody to...I can't give it to Tammy.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): We don't have funding, but you could call any of the staff here and they could help you with details, and we will leave you with contact information.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: Okay, if you could give that contact...

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): But you don't have to feel like you have to do a completely slick, some complicated submission. Just tell us the way you want to tell us and that's just fine. It doesn't have to be anything fancy.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: Okay. So we've got your contact numbers. I appreciate you coming and spending your big bucks over here. Hopefully we had a drum dance.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Kevin Menicoche and his assistant...There's a paid position there to help you. They should be available to help you with all of these questions, too.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: Oh, that young guy he has hired in Simpson?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Yeah.

CHIEF SANGUEZ: Okay. That's good.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): He could be your contact too, but you're welcome to contact us as well.

---Interjection

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Minimum wage will be under regulation and it was increased recently to \$8.50.

---Interjection

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Lee): Yes, it's gone up. It went up last year. With this act now it doesn't have to be done by law. The Minister could increase it at any time. He'll have to do consultation and it has to be reasonable.

---Closing Prayer

---ADJOURNMENT