

the witness has stated that the matter did not come up before the Northwest Territories council; that he learned about this question himself by reading *Hansard* only a few months ago, presumably as a result of the intervention of Mr. Gregoire in the house, that his constituents do not presently have a view on the matter. No matter what line of questioning Mr. Gregoire feels he was able to obtain, I feel that the committee might perhaps get on to other matters more within the immediate competence of the witness.

Mr. GREGOIRE: I completed my remarks.

Mr. RHEAUME: On a point of order, it is important not only to the committee members but to these witnesses that they have an opportunity to talk not only about their constituencies but about parts of the Northwest Territories including the offshore islands that are not in their constituencies. If we even establish for one second that these men are not able to tell us what they think about Rankin inlet or Belcher islands, then we have to discard any of the evidence they give us on Nunassiaq by the same token because they do not represent any constituency in the proposed new territory. My point of order is that the suggestion that an elected councillor not be asked to give opinions on parts of the Northwest Territories not in his immediate responsibility will restrict not only the members but the witnesses.

Mr. TURNER: On a matter of order, that was not, as Mr. Rheaume appreciates, the burden of my objection. The witness is asked to give answers within his knowledge and within the relevance of the discussions that preceded this bill in the Northwest Territories and within the competence of what his constituents have been considering. It is not within the competence of this committee to ask Mr. Lang to conjecture what the opinion would be or to hazard an opinion on something that hitherto has not been considered by him, his constituents or the Northwest Territories council.

Mr. RHEAUME: I agree.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions to be put to Mr. Lang?

Mr. NIELSEN: I am afraid so. Mr. Lang, are you in favour of the Mackenzie territory, if established, having its own consolidated revenue fund rather than having it in Ottawa as it now is? Let me put it this way: are you in favour of the territories council having the power to spend territorial tax revenues for territorial purposes without intervention from Ottawa?

Mr. LANG: Territorial taxes you mean? That is a rather difficult question for me to answer because I know at the present time we are very highly dependent on federal funds to keep going, and that is a natural state of affairs with the territory as it gradually comes on to its own feet. As far as strictly territorial taxes are concerned, for instance liquor revenues, I would be in favour of letting the territories have authority to spend that on territorial issues. That would at least be my conclusion.

Mr. NIELSEN: That is the way it is in the Yukon. Are you for or against the territorial council in the new territory having the power, or any of its members having the power, to introduce a money bill which, as you know, you are not allowed to do now?

Mr. LANG: Would there be any limit on the amounts?

Mr. NIELSEN: By way of explanation I would say that I am sure you know that now the territorial council does not have that power. The only way that a money bill can be introduced is by the commissioner, but the territorial council, under the new legislation, would have the authority to accept or reject it. At the moment the only bill that a member of the council under the proposed legislation can introduce is a private member's bill. Would you be in favour of council members having the power to introduce a bill which would have the effect, if passed and accepted by the commissioner—because I do not suggest doing away with the checks there—of spending money?