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ITEM 1: PRAYER
---Prayer

Speaker's Ruling

SPEAKER (Hon. Paul Delorey): Good afternoon, colleagues. Before we begin, yesterday in the House, the Member for Yellowknife Centre, Mr. Hawkins, tabled a number of documents dealing with a land dispute between two residents of the Northwest Territories and the Government of the Northwest Territories. Article 43 of the rules of the Legislative Assembly permits a Member to table “any document which is required to be tabled in the House by any act or order of the Assembly, or which may be in the public interest.” On initial review of the documents tabled, and there are many, I am not yet satisfied that they meet the test laid out in article 43 of the rules. It would appear that much of the correspondence is between two parties to a specific land dispute and the responsible government agencies. I am not satisfied that all the correspondence tabled was intended to be public in nature by the respective authors. In order to ensure the protection of those individuals who are not able to protect themselves in this House, I am ruling Tabled Document 52-15(6) out of order until such time as I can conduct a thorough and complete review of the matter. Members should refrain from referencing these documents in the House until such time as I have made a final ruling on the matter. Thank you, Members.

Orders of the day. Ministers’ statements. The honourable Minister responsible for the Workers’ Compensation Board, Mr. Krutko.

ITEM 2: MINISTERS’ STATEMENTS

Minister’s Statement 35-15(6): Prevention Services

HON. DAVID KRUTKO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Workers’ Compensation Board recently redefined its mission to reflect not only its duty to care for injured workers, but also its commitment to the promotion of workplace safety. We need not only simply care for workers once they have been injured; it is equally important to help northern workers prevent those injuries from happening in the first place. The WCB will continue to stress the importance of prevention as part of workplace safety, striving to reduce injuries and suffering as a result of workplace incidents.

To further show its commitment to prevention, and in response to its stakeholders, the WCB recently made changes to its organizational structure. As of July 3, 2007, the mine and industrial safety units, formerly housed separately under NWT and Nunavut operations, are now part of the new prevention services unit, reporting to a common vice-president.

WCB safety officers and inspectors will continue to be responsible for helping to keep northerners safe by ensuring compliance with the Mine Health and Safety Act and Industrial Safety Act. The goal of the division is still to reduce workplace injuries and promote workplace safety. The new protection services unit will now share their knowledge, experience and resources.

The WCB will continue to help northerners build a safer culture that includes a strong emphasis on prevention. Through safety education and training, and dedication to the well-being of the clients it serves, the WCB continues to work toward making the North a safer place to live and work. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Krutko. Ministers’ statements. Members’ statements. The honourable Member for Hay River South, Mrs. Groenewegen.

ITEM 3: MEMBERS’ STATEMENTS

Member’s Statement On Supports For Persons With Disabilities

MRS. GROENEWEGEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk about some good news and some still outstanding issues regarding program services and support for persons with disabilities.

First, the good news. I was pleased to participate in an event to mark the start of the demolition of the Dene K’onia Young Offenders building recently in Hay River. It was only good news because the removal will allow the construction of a new assisted living complex in Hay River.

For many years, we have talked about the need to keep northerners who require assisted living in our communities and in the North. These new facilities will provide for that opportunity as well as repatriate northerners currently living in southern placements. I would like to thank Minister Roland for his commitment to this valuable initiative and his support for locating it in Hay River. We look forward to the details for the programming for permanent residents and day program clients.

I have previously spoken in the House about the office which was opened last year by the Committee for Persons with Disabilities in Hay River. This summer saw the start of our first summer day camp program for persons with disabilities and we look forward to more of this programming. Thanks to the many participants and contributors to our first summer day camp. I welcomed the news from the Minister of Human Resources that a position within the department is now dedicated to ensuring diversity in the workplace of the GNWT. Current affirmative action policy supports the inclusion of persons...
MR. SPEAKER: The Member is seeking unanimous consent to conclude her statement. Are there any nays? There are no nays. You may conclude your statement, Mrs. Groenewegen.

MRS. GROENEWEGEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, colleagues. Mr. Speaker, in follow-up to something Mr. Hawkins raised yesterday regarding a constituent who was unable to work and care for a family member, along that same vein, this government must do more to accommodate employees who are caring for family members with disabilities. More discretionary latitude must be given to managers to make allowances in schedules to consider the possibility of work that could be performed from home to accommodate these employees. It's difficult to quantify the value to the family's stability and the real savings to this government when we can do a little to accommodate as opposed to incurring the cost of full-time care, institutional care and when Members are willing and capable of taking care of family members with disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, later today I will have questions about our government's policy surrounding accommodation of employees who are caregivers for family members with disabilities. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mrs. Groenewegen. Members' statements. The honourable Member for Range Lake, Ms. Lee.

Member's Statement On SideDoor Youth Centre Skateboard Ministry

MS. LEE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak today in support of the new program called The Roc Skateboard Ministry established by the SideDoor Youth Ministry. Mr. Speaker, this program currently has the youth of Yellowknife at the arena for the summer months and want to run this program year round. They are looking to secure a portion of the government warehouse building to continue this ministry and are asking for this government's and city council for support.

Mr. Speaker, they have already had a very good response to the program with over 350 youth attending the King of Kings "Revolution Tour" skate demo held between April 27th and 28th. This event was able to draw five professional skateboarders from across the U.S. and Canada.

The SideDoor has now contracted with the King of Kings to supply a professional skateboarder for the summer months and they look forward to a mutually beneficial and longstanding relationship with them. They feel that having this calibre of athletes and well-established organizations supporting this ministry in its grassroots stage is a true blessing and they wish to have role models like this year round to connect with the youth. These riders have made lasting impressions in the lives of the youth they have connected with in the short time they've been here.

Mr. Speaker, consistent numbers of 40 to 50 youth have attended The Rock since it has been open during the best outdoor skate weather Yellowknife has, confirming the youth's desire for an indoor program. This is in spite of having to have the ramps removed periodically for other community events going on in the arena and a difficulty in communicating the return of the ramp with the youth.

Mr. Speaker, what's really good about this program is the numbers seem to be growing from word of mouth on the street. With a set location and consistent days and times, they can only see these numbers increase. Their goal is to provide the youth of Yellowknife a mentored environment with healthy boundaries and limits set in an atmosphere of nurturing and acceptance. This program would continue to provide role models to reflect what it means to be a good person, with a long-term focus on helping the youth of our community reach their highest potential and encourage spiritual development and character.

Mr. Speaker, over the years, I have been a strong supporter of many grassroots programs in Yellowknife and two in particular. One is the program at the SideDoor. Mr. Speaker, I would like to seek unanimous consent to conclude my statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member is seeking unanimous consent to conclude her statement. Are there any nays? There are no nays. You may conclude your statement, Ms. Lee.

MS. LEE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have supported two programs in particular; one is the SideDoor program and the other is the COPs program. Mr. Speaker, I believe strongly the real work and real difference can only be made by governments working and supporting the grassroots organizations and programs like these from the bottom up, rather than introducing a solution from top to bottom. In my opinion, the government has not done enough to support these initiatives and I urge the Minister of Justice and the Minister responsible for Youth to work with its partners and put some real money and support behind it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause
MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Ms. Lee. Members’ statements. The honourable Member for Montfwi, Mr. Lafferty.

Member’s Statement On Positive Working Relations In The Tlicho Region

MR. LAFFERTY: Mahsi, Mr. Speaker. (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I will make a statement regarding working together within the government. Today is a celebration that our government in our territory, the Tlicho Government, and the territorial government and the agency is celebrating today. (Translation ends)

...territorial government, Tlicho Government and the Tlicho Community Services Agency. We are working as a remarkable accomplishment building upon our positive working relations during this last leg of our session.

Mr. Speaker, first let me highlight how we got here. A skidoo journey throughout the Tlicho region back in April was the first initiative to build a positive working relationship with the GNWT and Tlicho Government. The purpose of the trip was to get the Ministers and senior staff to familiarize themselves with the trails of our ancestors in the Tlicho region and how we travelled from community to community. Because of this, they would have a better idea of the Tlicho way of life when I speak in the House, Mr. Speaker.

Secondly, there was a government-to-government, GNWT and Tlicho, meeting in Wekweeti back in June. The two parties were going through some tough times dealing with some very critical issues they were faced with. Their mission: they needed to compromise, cooperate and work collectively. They achieved that goal, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, thirdly, we had the privilege of having our Commissioner, Ministers, MLAs and MP go on a canoe journey just last month during the Dene National Assembly in Behchoko. This is an annual event where youth, elders and community members join in on the journey, some from as far away as Wekweeti, that takes up to 10 days to paddle, Mr. Speaker. It is an ideal time for the elders to tell old stories, stories of the river, stories of the land, grave markers and so on, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, finally, just yesterday again we saw three levels of government cooperate and collaborate for the good of the people. The territorial government was struggling with the school expansion project in Gameti, a challenge we’ve been having for the past two years. Mr. Speaker, may I seek unanimous consent to conclude my statement?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Lafferty. The Member is seeking unanimous consent to conclude his statement. Are there any nays? There are no nays. You may conclude your statement, Mr. Lafferty.

MR. LAFFERTY: Mahsi, Mr. Speaker. Mahsi, colleagues. Mr. Speaker, the Tlicho Government and the community government decided to pitch in and invest in this important project. After numerous calls, e-mails and making errands across the hallway, both parties agreed to proceed with the project. The end result: a true partnership and driven initiative. All parties contributed. The high school in Gameti will finally become a reality.

Mr. Speaker, to conclude, I would like to thank the Cabinet Members, my fellow colleagues around the table here for their generous support....

---Applause

...and consideration during our heated deliberations. I would especially like to thank the Tlicho Government for their commitment in building a positive working relationship with GNWT as a whole. This is a great day for the Gameti students, parents and elders. Mahsi.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Lafferty. Members’ statements. The honourable Member for Tu Nedhe, Mr. Villeneuve.

Member’s Statement On Delivery Of Social Housing Programs By Local Authorities

MR. VILLENEUVE: Mahsi, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today I use my Member’s statement to talk about some of the housing delivery issues and how the delivery of the housing pertains to this government’s new approach to program delivery, especially with the new income security model.

Mr. Speaker, the income security model has clearly stated that monitoring, evaluation and reporting are vital operational elements in order for this program to be successful and is based on the best available data, evidence and analysis of program recipients. I can only hope that this accountability process is diligently enforced and acted upon should there be changes required for future delivery and program success. Just as important, Mr. Speaker, the delivery of our social housing by our LHOs should also be diligently monitored, evaluated and reported by the NWT Housing Corporation’s regional offices to ensure fairness of delivery and transparency of spending our public dollars on social housing that will ensure that those most in need of social housing can receive assistance as soon as possible.

I can easily point out many situations in many communities, Mr. Speaker, especially here in Yellowknife and all of the other smaller communities, where LHOs continue to provide social housing to clients who are not in need. Many public housing clients have new vehicles, new boats, quads, skidoos and RVs parked around their social housing units and have never provided the LHOs with accurate information on the present circumstances related to their income or options that may be available to them through family support networks. This is the monitoring I am talking about, Mr. Speaker. This government has to regain responsibility of our public dollars we provide to our LHOs to operate the public housing sector of our society so that we do not see more families, like the mother of six camping at Fred Henne Park, who are in dire need of social housing left out in the cold, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Villeneuve. Members’ statements. The honourable Member for Pokiak.
Member’s Statement On Federal Infrastructure Projects In Canada’s Far North

MR. POKIAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Right Honourable Prime Minister Stephen Harper visited Nunavut to announce the deepwater port. During his visit to Nunavut, he made two announcements for a deepwater port in Nanisivik, Nunavut, and the military training base in Resolute Bay, Nunavut.

Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to see the federal government is concerned about the Northwest Passage and Canada’s claim for the Far North. It appears that the fellow government will move forward with a deepwater port and military training centre because of this announcement. However, Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate the Prime Minister did not consider establishing a deepwater port for military training as well in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. Speaker, a logical location by the deepwater port for a military training facility would be Tuktoyaktuk, as Tuktoyaktuk already serves as a major transportation centre for the Canadian Coast Guard and NTCL operations. With regard to a military training facility, Tuktoyaktuk would also be an appropriate location because we have the facilities available to accommodate over 200 personnel at two camps located at Tuktoyaktuk.

Mr. Speaker, although the announcements made by the Prime Minister establishes a deepwater port and military training facility in Nunavut, I would like this government to lobby, on behalf of the Beaufort and the Northwest Territories, to request the federal government to reconsider establishing a deepwater port for military training facility in Tuktoyaktuk or Sachs Harbour, Northwest Territories. First, by establishing a deepwater port or a military training facility, it will bring economic and business opportunities to the Beaufort-Delta.

In closing, this will enable the Beaufort-Delta residents not to rely on the oil and gas activities presently taking place. This will bring much needed long-term employment and business to the region. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

--- Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Pokiat. Members’ statements. The honourable Member for Inuvik Twin Lakes, Mr. McLeod.

Member’s Statement On Support For Front-Line Addictions Workers

MR. MCELeod: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we talked about our concerns with addictions across the Northwest Territories. We have studies on addictions across the Northwest Territories. We have people, Mr. Speaker, who work the front lines. They not only talk about all of these concerns, but they want to do something about it. They are hard working and caring people who do their job 24/7, Mr. Speaker, because they care about the clients they serve. They do this, for the most part, very cheaply. We have board members who are volunteers who do it for nothing.

It came to my attention, Mr. Speaker, last night as we went through the budget process. We go through the supplementary appropriation process, and I see all of this money that is thrown around, Mr. Speaker. I see thousands of dollars on a trip to China and yet we make these people who work the front lines, they scratch, claw and beg for every nickel they can get. It just doesn’t make sense, Mr. Speaker. They have enough on their plate with the work that they do to worry about where their next dollar is coming from. The transition house in Inuvik is always having to wait for their funding. The Inuvik Interagency Committee ran out of funding. They can’t operate anymore and now they are trying to access the community capacity building fund just so they can keep going. Family Counselling Centre closed after 23 years because they couldn’t compete with what the government was paying out. They couldn’t compete with it, so they had to close their doors after 23 years of providing a service for Inuvik. Mr. Speaker, these front-line workers work in the trenches and they not only talk about doing something about problems with addictions, but they want to go and charge these problems head on. What do we do? We arm them with a squirt gun to go charge the problems.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we took a serious look at how we do business here. It is time that we put our money where our mouth is and not just talk about these problems across the NWT and pay thousands of dollars to tell us about these problems for the NWT. We have to support the NGOs who provide a valuable service because they care about the well-being of the residents of the Northwest Territories. It is about time that we did, too. Thank you.

--- Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. McLeod. Members’ statements. The honourable Member for the Sahtu, Mr. Yakeleya.

Member’s Statement On Regional Wellness Centre For Sahtu Region

MR. YAKELEYA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, several months or weeks ago, I heard the federal government make an announcement on the patient wait guarantee time in Canada. I was quite delighted to hear about this, Mr. Speaker. I wasn’t too sure how the interpretation was going to be interpreted or how it was to be translated into our region. The way I looked at it is this region here I am talking about is the Sahtu region. Patients are guaranteed to wait for health services, Mr. Speaker. Patient wait guarantee time for us. We are asking again in terms of like the highway, in terms of other issues that we are looking at this government to start planning a regional wellness centre like any regional centres they have in the Northwest Territories. Put it high on their priority, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, our region here is being left out so many times that it is ludicrous when we go into a community like Tulita when we see the health centre where they have a sign that says Inuvik Regional Health Authority. Now, Mr. Speaker, three years ago the Sahtu assumed the authority of its own health services, yet they still haven’t changed that sign on the health centre, so we are far back. Some people call us the catch-up region, catch up on this and catch up on that. We always seem to be catching up on things, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this government look at putting this agenda in terms of a regional wellness centre into our region. We deserve the same programs and services as other regions in the Northwest Territories. It is time to get
Mr. Speaker, I will have questions for the Premier at the appropriate time. I do thank him for my invitation to the ceremony in Fort Providence on Friday. Mahsi.

---Laughter

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Ramsay. Members’ statements. The honourable Member for Yellowknife Centre, Mr. Hawkins.

Member’s Statement On Poor Condition Of Highway No. 3

MR. HAWKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am hearing from RVers and others who have been bottoming out on the Highway No. 3’s dips and ruts. My concerns are twofold. Firstly, this is a newly paved road. I don’t think we should be experiencing these kinds of problems so soon after completion. Secondly, I am concerned about what is being done to our tourism industry image. RVers are in contact with each other about facilities and road conditions. It is a huge community, Mr. Speaker. We would do well to pay attention to their concerns. The Japanese are being turned away from Canada and they are looking elsewhere for vacations. Can we afford to turn away the RVers too? I am concerned about the poor highway conditions of Highway No. 3 between Yellowknife and Behchoko. I don’t accept climate change as the excuse that they keep flogging. The same climate conditions happen on both sides of Behchoko on Highway No. 3, but I am not sure what they are doing about it because the answers addressing the dips seem to be disingenuous.

Mr. Speaker, ITI document Tourism 2010 mentions the need to provide world-class services if the NWT wants to move forward by tracking a vibrant tourist community. The older RV group is becoming an increasingly dominant group of tourists. They form what ITI calls the general touring group. They spent over $6 million in the NWT in 2004 and 2005. More and more baby boomers are retiring and taking that lifelong dream of travelling all around Canada. This is a booming industry. However, with the cost of fuel and the condition of Highway No. 3, Mr. Speaker, what are we doing to attract them? Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I am prepared to turn away $6 million of tourism revenue, new money for opportunity for northern businesses or tourism operators. I would certainly hope that the Minister of Transportation would feel the same.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago we had the launch of what was called the completion of Highway No. 3. I certainly hope no one had a little sign out there that said mission accomplished, because we are going to have to go back and airbrush that photo because this highway needs a lot more work. We need a plan to start fixing it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Hawkins. Members’ statements. The honourable Member for Great Slave, Mr. Braden.

Member’s Statement On GNWT Caribou Management Practices

MR. BRADEN: Mahsi, Mr. Speaker. In January of this year, along with many other territorial leaders and wildlife
professionals and outfitters, I attended the most successful Caribou Summit in Inuvik hosted by the former Minister of Environment and Natural Resources. There was a strong sense of a need for urgent collective action in the face of substantially declining caribou herds in the NWT, the Yukon and Nunavut.

Mr. Speaker, caribou is an absolutely essential part of the lifestyle, economy and the livelihoods of people here in the NWT, all northerners who have come to rely on this remarkable natural resource.

Prompted by this, the Minister undertook a number of prompt and dramatic actions. One of them was to bring a request before this Assembly to believe almost double our budget for surveying caribou herds this year to over $800,000 and that was readily accepted by this Assembly. The Minister also took prompt and dramatic action to cut allocations to caribou sport hunting outfitters, Mr. Speaker, reducing the allocation by almost half this year to 750 and half again next year to some 350 tags in total.

Mr. Speaker, the government also promptly, dramatically and unfortunately locked horns with the Wkweezhii Resource Management Board by going into some very unknown and confusing territory and frustrating dispute. Mr. Speaker, based on the Tlicho land claim, that put our government at odds with the Tlicho over who is responsible for management of this resource in Tlicho land.

Mr. Speaker, the survival of caribou is a paramount issue across the North and all of our communities. It is also a real source of cash and opportunity in our tourism industry. I am going to be asking some very carefully worded questions for the Minister of ENR later today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you, Mr. Braden. Members’ statements. The honourable Member for the Deh Cho, Mr. McLeod.

Member’s Statement On Condolences To The Gargan And Teasdale Families

**HON. MICHAEL MCLEOD:** Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise to mark the passing of two members of the same family from my home town of Fort Providence. Elise Gargan and her daughter, Rose-Marie Teasdale, or Rosa as she is better known in Fort Providence, passed away within a week of each other in July of this year. Elise Gargan was 81 years old. She was born in 1926. Her daughter Rosa was 61. Elise was married to Baptiste Gargan. During her long life, she gave birth to 17 children. The couple lived a very traditional life, hunting, fishing and trapping along the Mackenzie River and more specifically lived around the Redknife River area. In their later years, along with their children, they moved to the community of Fort Providence so their children could attend school.

Rosa lived most of her life in Fort Providence and also lived in the community of Pine Point. She had four children: Ricky, Barb, Bobby and Colleen. My condolences go out to all of them and also to her partner, Morris Nadli. Mr. Speaker, both of these women will be greatly missed by the Gargan and Teasdale families, by their many friends and by the community that they were such a big part of. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you, Mr. McLeod. Members’ statements. Returns to oral questions. Recognition of visitors in the gallery. The honourable Member for Range Lake, Ms. Lee.

**ITEM 5: RECOGNITION OF VISITORS IN THE GALLERY**

**MS. LEE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a number of visitors I would like to recognize. First, two teachers from St. Joe’s who are spending part of their summer holiday to visit us. I don’t think we could see from this side, but it is my constituent Rosemarie Critch and her friend Linda Nickerson.

---Applause

I would also like to recognize my family, my mother-in-law who is visiting from England, Peggy Radcliffe; my brother-in-law, Steve Radcliffe, and my other half, Mr. Dave Radcliffe, who is also a teacher.

---Applause

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you, Ms. Lee. Recognition of visitors in the gallery. The honourable Member for Kam Lake, Mr. Ramsay.

**MR. RAMSAY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to recognize all of the visitors in the gallery today. In particular, I have a constituent, Mr. Allen Hartman, with the Department of Transportation. Welcome, Allen. Also a former co-worker at the former Department of ED&T, Mr. Glen Abernethy. Welcome.

---Applause

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you, Mr. Ramsay. Recognition of visitors in the gallery. If we have missed anyone in the gallery today, welcome to the House. I hope you’re enjoying the proceedings. It’s always nice to have an audience here. Acknowledgements. The honourable Member for Montwi, Mr. Lafferty.

**ITEM 6: ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

**MR. LAFFERTY:** Mahsi, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, 2007, the Tlicho Community Services Agency was once again recognized for their innovative management, this time internationally. They were recognized by the 7th Global Forum in Vienna, Austria. Mr. Speaker, we were honoured and privileged to have attended the celebration in Austria. Members who joined the journey were myself; Mr. Charles Dent from ECE; Alphonse Nitsiza, the chair of the Tlicho Community Services Agency; Joseph Mackenzie, vice-chair; and Anna Beals, the director of Health and Social Services. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the Tlicho Community Services Agency staff and board members for their contribution and commitment to make this happen. Without them this would not have been a reality. Mahsi cho.

---Applause

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you, Mr. Lafferty. Acknowledgements. Oral questions. The honourable Member for Sahtu, Mr. Yakeleya.
ITEM 7: ORAL QUESTIONS

Question 161-15(6): Regional Wellness Centre In The Sahtu

MR. YAKELEYA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Services, Mr. Roland. In terms of the Sahtu’s wish to...I don’t know how you interpret the patient wait time guarantee in terms of what does it take in terms of our board, our community here, communities in the Sahtu, to look at the possibility of having a regional wellness centre in the planning stages of the upcoming government in terms of we want to have regional wellness centres?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Yakeleya. The honourable Minister responsible for Health and Social Services, Mr. Roland.

Return To Question 161-15(6): Regional Wellness Centre In The Sahtu

HON. FLOYD ROLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of items there. One, although the Member’s had a play on words with the patient wait times guarantee process we’ve set up with the federal government, our goal is to get nurses into our smaller communities through our community health nurse initiative. That’s ongoing and that’s targeted at the front line where people in our communities don’t have doctors, so that they can see the nurse in there and making sure those are fully operational. The other area the Member is speaking about is a regional facility as the Sahtu area is taking on more and more responsibility. The Sahtu now has the Sahtu Health and Social Services Authority and the department is working with them on a master development plan as well as community development plans. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Roland. Supplementary, Mr. Yakeleya.

Supplementary To Question 161-15(6): Regional Wellness Centre In The Sahtu

MR. YAKELEYA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, would the department look at an initiative brought by the Sahtu leadership in terms of looking at a P3 model in terms of helping out with this government? We want to be part of the government. Would something like that be feasible by this government to look at a P3 model in terms of building a regional wellness centre?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Yakeleya. Mr. Roland.

Further Return To Question 161-15(6): Regional Wellness Centre In The Sahtu

HON. FLOYD ROLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, before we can look at a proposal, we have to work with the Sahtu Health and Social Services Authority on that master development plan and look at the infrastructure we have in the region, then at that point decide if further steps need to be taken, then look at how we can build that into our plan as a department and requesting funds from this Assembly. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Roland. Supplementary, Mr. Yakeleya.

Supplementary To Question 161-15(6): Regional Wellness Centre In The Sahtu

MR. YAKELEYA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, some of the responses from the other Ministers in terms of the work that we want to do in the Sahtu, we want to ask this Minister what it would take for them, for this department to say this is urgent, this is a need that needs to be happening right away in the Sahtu in terms of establishing a wellness centre? What does it take from the Sahtu people to say we want something like the Deh Cho, something in the South Slave, something they can...(inaudible)...to say we want a regional wellness centre, also? What will it take, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Yakeleya. Mr. Roland.

Further Return To Question 161-15(6): Regional Wellness Centre In The Sahtu

HON. FLOYD ROLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, first and foremost it would take having a master development plan agreed with between the Sahtu Health and Social Services Authority and the Department of Health and Social Services. That would be a starting point. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Roland. Your final supplementary, Mr. Yakeleya.

Supplementary To Question 161-15(6): Regional Wellness Centre In The Sahtu

MR. YAKELEYA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in light of that, getting the process in place with the department and the Sahtu regional health board, would the Minister look at committing to put together a feasibility study in terms of looking at a regional wellness centre and putting that on the agenda with the next government?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Yakeleya. Mr. Roland.

Further Return To Question 161-15(6): Regional Wellness Centre In The Sahtu

HON. FLOYD ROLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I can’t speak for the next government but on our process as we’re working, we are working, from a department level, with all of the authorities and we continue to review our development plans. We have a master development plan with every group that looks at community infrastructure and regional infrastructure. So first things first is we need to get agreement on a master development plan with the Sahtu Health and Social Services Authority which would take into consideration the population served and the facilities they have at their disposal for providing programs and services to residents. So that would be the first part. Once we have that, then we can, as I stated earlier, as a department if that priority comes through, is bring it forward in our departmental plans and then bring forward a plan that would require the approval of the Assembly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Roland. Oral questions. The honourable Member for Yellowknife Centre, Mr. Hawkins.

Question 162-15(6): Condition Of Highway No. 3

MR. HAWKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I highlighted in my Member’s statement today, there are a
lot of concerns, as I see it and RVers see it coming to Yellowknife, with that Highway No. 3. Mr. Speaker, some sections are very good; I'll say that for a fact. But some sections are very less good let me tell you, Mr. Speaker...

---Laughter

Mr. Speaker, that highway cost us approximately $200 million and I'd say that's probably $200 million well spent on a dust control program but not a highway, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know, has the Minister of Transportation done any work in finding out what it will cost to fix those dips in that highway? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Hawkins. The honourable Minister responsible for Transportation, Mr. Menicoche.

Return To Question 162-15(6): Condition Of Highway No. 3

HON. KEVIN MENICOCHE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Transportation takes concerns raised by the travelling public very seriously.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

---Applause

HON. KEVIN MENICOCHE: The concerns raised on Highway No. 3 have been raised by the chief of Behchoko as well as the MLA...

AN HON. MEMBER: Numerous times.

HON. KEVIN MENICOCHE: ...numerous times and I just have to remind the Member, as well, that the Government of the Northwest Territories has invested millions of dollars over the past many years and the highway is now wider, straighter and safer overall. We continue to monitor any major concerns and we'll address them as such, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Menicoche. Supplementary, Mr. Hawkins.

Supplementary To Question 162-15(6): Condition Of Highway No. 3

MR. HAWKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation reads that script very well. I almost believe him. But I didn't. So, Mr. Speaker, the fact is the warranty of this project seems to have gone by the wayside. I'd like to know was there a warranty in place or did we get a second-rate job at a second-rate price? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Hawkins. Mr. Menicoche.

Further Return To Question 162-15(6): Condition Of Highway No. 3

HON. KEVIN MENICOCHE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The department takes great pride in all its projects. We complete them to the best of our ability and we will continue to do so. We pride the contractors that work for our department as well. The Member did mention that climate change is affecting the highway and we do maintain that, as well, Mr. Speaker. There are many, many ice lenses that were discovered during construction and we continue to repair those and mitigate them as conditions dictate. Mahsi.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Menicoche. Supplementary, Mr. Hawkins.

Supplementary To Question 162-15(6): Condition Of Highway No. 3

MR. HAWKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the Minister with his very thorough answer on the lenses and climate change problem, but it's interesting because on one side of Behchoko, the side that Yellowknife is on, the highway goes up and down like a roller coaster and the other side between Behchoko and Fort Providence is relatively smooth; it's a great quality highway. So, Mr. Speaker, maybe the Minister of Transportation can enlighten this House on why our side of Highway No. 3 is in such poor condition in reference to why the other side is in so much better condition. Can he help me with that? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Hawkins. Mr. Menicoche.

Further Return To Question 162-15(6): Condition Of Highway No. 3

HON. KEVIN MENICOCHE: Mr. Speaker...

---Laughter

...the Member's asking for enlightenment and I'll try my best to do that.

---Laughter

He's got to remember that the new Highway No. 3, there were some major realignments which means we had to cross some new sections; some of them had these ice lenses in them. So that's what's causing the slumping and erosion that's going on to this date, Mr. Speaker. Also, because it's a fairly new highway, it will take about seven to 10 years it's estimated for it to settle and maintain that solid base. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Menicoche. Final supplementary, Mr. Hawkins.

Supplementary To Question 162-15(6): Condition Of Highway No. 3

MR. HAWKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think all through this we've missed the answer of how we're going to fix this and how we're going to deal with it. We're going to hear just sit and wait, but we just had a mission accomplished or a big celebration last year. Well, Mr. Speaker, yes, it was a great celebration that it sort of got done, but when are we going to actually go back and just finish the job? So how much is it going to cost to fix and when are we going to get started on that? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Hawkins. Mr. Menicoche.
Further Return To Question 162-15(6): Condition Of Highway No. 3

HON. KEVIN MENICOCHE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Our Chipseal Program is something that we monitor. There is a five-year cycle for it; it takes about five years for the chipseal...It does deteriorate. We do have an annual budget to address this on Highway No. 3, that's about $650,000 to $700,000. The first sections that were done on Highway No. 3 were about five years ago and we're addressing those right now, Mr. Speaker. Mahsi.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Menicoche. Oral questions. The honourable Member for Mont à Li, Mr. Lafferty.

Question 163-15(6): Status Of Staff Housing Initiative In Behchoko

MR. LAFFERTY: Mahsi, Mr. Speaker. (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to talk about the transfers of some positions to the Tlicho region. I'm not sure when this will happen. I'm talking about the staff housing. We're still not sure about what's happening with that so I'd like to ask the Premier a question. (Translation ends)

I raised an issue on the North Slave staff being transferred to Behchoko, the soon-to-be headquarters for the Tlicho region. Mr. Speaker, today I'd like to focus on a staff housing initiative that the Executive department is currently undertaking. The question is to the Premier. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier for the current status of the proposed staff housing in Behchoko for all of these new GNWT employees who are supposed to be transferred. Where are they at with their discussion and plan? Mahsi.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Lafferty. The honourable Premier, Mr. Handley.

Return To Question 163-15(6): Status Of Staff Housing Initiative In Behchoko

HON. JOE HANDLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The regional director has been dealing with this issue; he has been looking at which staff positions can be transferred, the availability of staff housing and the availability of office space. Mr. Speaker, I don't have an up-to-date report on exactly where that's at. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Handley. Supplementary, Mr. Lafferty.

Supplementary To Question 163-15(6): Status Of Staff Housing Initiative In Behchoko

MR. LAFFERTY: Mahsi, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my next question was to get into detailed questions, but I can probably wait. The next question I have is the Tlicho Government continues in effect as in all two years ago. It is imperative that the GNWT respects the self-governance of the Tlicho people. How soon can we anticipate the building of this staff housing? Mahsi.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Lafferty. Mr. Handley.

Further Return To Question 163-15(6): Status Of Staff Housing Initiative In Behchoko

HON. JOE HANDLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are continuing to build houses in all of the regions through the affordable housing initiative. We don't build housing specifically for staff but we're building affordable housing that people can either rent...We also build public housing that people could continue to rent. Mr. Speaker, I can give the breakdown of where we are with the whole North Slave and possibly by community. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Handley. Final supplementary, Mr. Lafferty.

Supplementary To Question 163-15(6): Status Of Staff Housing Initiative In Behchoko

MR. LAFFERTY: Mahsi, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, would these staff houses I'm referring to, those GNWT North Slave regional office being transferred to our region, specifically under staff housing, has the Department of the Executive been working with the Tlicho Community Services Agency? Are they working with the Behchoko Development Corporation, the community government of Behchoko? Where are they with that? I understand the regional director is working on it but I'd just like to get a feeling of how far we're at with that. Mahsi.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Lafferty. Mr. Handley.

Further Return To Question 163-15(6): Status Of Staff Housing Initiative In Behchoko

HON. JOE HANDLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that the regional director is working with the Behchoko leadership on this one. I'm not sure exactly what the Member is asking. When it comes to housing, then, yes, we definitely are working through the local housing authority, community services agency and also with the Behchoko government on that. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of units going into each of the communities. In Behchoko there are 33 units that will be going in there over the next couple of years. On office space, I'm not sure of any specific discussions that are happening on that front. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Handley. Final supplementary, Mr. Lafferty.

Supplementary To Question 163-15(6): Status Of Staff Housing Initiative In Behchoko

MR. LAFFERTY: Mahsi, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, yes, on the office space and also the accommodation for the staff that would be transferred to the community, I'm sure they will be needing some accommodations instead of commuting back and forth. As my colleague highlighted, the road is in bad shape so I don't think they will be commuting back and forth. Mr. Speaker, my final question to the Premier is, when could you provide that information to myself so I can sit down with my chiefs and move forward with this? Mahsi.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Lafferty. Mr. Handley.

Further Return To Question 163-15(6): Status Of Staff Housing Initiative In Behchoko

HON. JOE HANDLEY: Mr. Speaker, I will undertake to have a report, an update to the Member, before the end of the month from the regional director on where we're at with the discussions on the transfer of positions, the creation of more job opportunities in Behchoko. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Handley. Oral questions. The honourable Member for Great Slave, Mr. Braden.

Question 164-15(6): Caribou Management Issues

MR. BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a couple of carefully crafted questions for Mr. McLeod, the Minister for Environment and Natural Resources. It concerns the very high profile debates and work that has gone, so far, into the plight of our caribou herds and our role as stewards of the caribou to see what we can do to better manage them. Mr. Speaker, we got into a jurisdictional dispute between our government and the Wekeezhii Renewable Resources Board over who has jurisdiction for allocating tags and harvest levels in Tlicho land. My question is, will the GNWT recognize the Wekeezhii board’s claim to jurisdiction in allocating caribou harvest in the Tlicho region? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Braden. The honourable Minister responsible for Environment and Natural Resources, Mr. McLeod.

Return To Question 164-15(6): Caribou Management Issues

HON. MICHAEL MCLEOD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Member for his carefully crafted question and I’ll craft my answers accordingly. Mr. Speaker, we work with all aboriginal groups, all aboriginal governments and we respect and abide by all the land claim settlements and all the agreements that are out there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. McLeod. Supplementary, Mr. Braden.

Supplementary To Question 164-15(6): Caribou Management Issues

MR. BRADEN: Mr. Speaker, $800,000 was allocated by this Assembly for additional work to conduct surveys to confirm, determine, and keep a much closer eye on the trends and circumstances that are affecting the health of the herd so we can make better management decisions. I would like to ask the Minister if he can advise, have those surveys been undertaken yet and what indicators, if any so far, are the caribou counters bringing back to us in terms of the health and the status of the herds? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Braden. Mr. McLeod.

Further Return To Question 164-15(6): Caribou Management Issues

HON. MICHAEL MCLEOD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There’s been contact with all the different regions regarding the situation with the caribou herds in those specific areas. We’ve had action plans discussed with the different resource management groups and aboriginal governments. Some of the actions have been readily accepted, others we’re still discussing on if there’s better ways to do and implement some of these actions. Mr. Speaker, they’re all at various stages and I certainly could provide that information to the Member if he wanted. It’s quite a lengthy process and there’s a lot of different actions. Some apply to some areas and others don’t. So, Mr. Speaker, I’ll have to commit to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. McLeod. Final supplementary, Mr. Braden.

Supplementary To Question 164-15(6): Caribou Management Issues

MR. BRADEN: Thanks for the information. Mr. Speaker, given the high profile, the seriousness, the significance of caribou in our economy and our lifestyle up here, can the Minister advise is there a solid communications strategy in place that will be distributing this information and helping to inform everybody of the results and the steps as they are developed, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Braden. Mr. McLeod.

Further Return To Question 164-15(6): Caribou Management Issues

HON. MICHAEL MCLEOD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are action plans that we’re working jointly in the Beaufort-Delta and the Sahtu. There is still some concern in this area where we’ve made recommendations to the Wekeezhii board and we don’t anticipate that we’ll hear back from that board until the end of September, Mr. Speaker. Then certainly if our legal division has a review, we can provide what we can make public at that time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. McLeod. Oral questions. The honourable Member from Range Lake, Ms. Lee.
Question 165-15(6): SideDoor Proposal For Youth Programming

MS. LEE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today my questions are in following up to the Member’s statement I made about the proposal being put forward by the SideDoor in support of a program that would, I think, create another opportunity for the youth in the community to spend their time productively. Mr. Speaker, I have to say that in my time as an MLA, I’ve had the good fortune of meeting and working with a lot of young people who are doing great things, a lot of positive things, taking full advantage of all the financial assistance and everything available to reach their potential, but we all know that there are youth who could use help with being in more productive places. We need to organize programs that are attractive to them and skateboarding seems to be something that is really attractive to young people. The SideDoor has a good program to do that. They have already done a pilot program on this in April and they want to continue to do this. I know that they have already submitted a proposal to the government, through the Premier, and I’d like to ask either the Premier or any Minister responsible about where they are with this proposal. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Premier, Mr. Handley.

Return To Question 165-15(6): SideDoor Proposal For Youth Programming

HON. JOE HANDLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have taken this issue up with the Department of Public Works who are responsible for the government warehouse, which is the facility the ministry was interested in. I want to acknowledge first the good work that the ministry does with young people and the efforts they’ve made on this skateboard park idea and King of Kings competition that they’re putting on. Mr. Speaker, it’s all good work for young people.

Unfortunately, when we took a look at the government warehouse then, there were several issues; the primary one being just space. There just was not the space to be able to accommodate what they were wanting to do there. There were also issues that could have been overcome; things like security and safety and liability and insurance and so on. Those are all things we could resolve, but the problem was with space. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, we don’t want to let this drop. I want to see if there are ways that we can encourage the city to make more space available. Mr. Speaker, I just signed a letter to the proponents of this proposal just before noon saying that we would not be able to make space available in the warehouse. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Supplementary, Ms. Lee.

Supplementary To Question 165-15(6): SideDoor Proposal For Youth Programming

MS. LEE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I’m glad the Premier mentioned that because I checked with them prior to noon and at that time I was not aware that they had made a decision. So it was somehow criss-crossed in our communication. Regardless, I think this is a good issue that the SideDoor ministry is working on and it’s something that the government and all municipal governments should look at; especially our city. So I would like to ask the Premier if he would employ what resource is available in the government, whether it’s somebody in the youth department or MACA, to see if there are any other options we can look to to implement this, The Rock program, because I think it’s a very good program. Could he look into that for me? Thank you.


Further Return To Question 165-15(6): SideDoor Proposal For Youth Programming

HON. JOE HANDLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, we will take a look at it. As I said, it is a good program. I like what they’re doing with young people. Mr. Speaker, I don’t think the government warehouse is the only space. We do have other space in the GNWT. We might be able to look at something else or work out a deal with the city somehow. I don’t know and without knowing too much about what’s out there, you know, we have facilities out at the airport, we’ve got something that we would like to work with this group on. But, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately there’s no easy answer to this one right now. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Supplementary, Ms. Lee.

Supplementary To Question 165-15(6): SideDoor Proposal For Youth Programming

MS. LEE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Without having had a chance to look at the letter I don’t know how final it was, but listening to Mr. Premier I think that there might be a wee little tiny bit of room open there. So could I ask the Premier, could I take his answer to mean that he’s encouraging his department to work with this group to see if there are any other avenues and perhaps he could commit to asking the MACA department to look at that further? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, she can take my answer to mean that we will not let this one drop. We will see if there’s another way of helping this group. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Oral questions. The Honourable Member from Kam Lake, Mr. Ramsay.

Question 166-15(6): Deh Cho Bridge Project

MR. RAMSAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I thanked the Premier for my invitation to the ceremony on Friday, that was my effort at humour and it’s a good thing I’m not a stand-up comedian, Mr. Speaker, because it wasn’t that great. I wanted to ask the Premier some questions today about the Deh Cho Bridge project again. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to be able to stand up here and defend this project. I want to be able to stand by the government and say that this project makes sense, but it’s much like the discussion we had in Committee of the Whole yesterday about the trip to China. The government expects us to make decisions without giving us the information to make the decision with. The same is true with the Deh Cho Bridge, Mr. Speaker.
I want to ask the Premier, once again, how come there is no cost-benefit analysis on the Deh Cho bridge project based on the $150 million and the $6.75 per tonne? Mahsi.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Ramsay. The honourable Premier, Mr. Handley.

Return To Question 166-15(6): Deh Cho Bridge Project

HON. JOE HANDLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I’m glad to hear the Member has a sense of humour and I certainly hopes he takes up the offer to come to the opening.

Mr. Speaker, I don’t know what happened. I think the Member has convinced himself that there’s some devious plan here and that the cost to consumers has gone up. Well, he’s listening to himself too much.

Laughter

Mr. Speaker, let me say again, let me say the cost to consumers, the cost to industry, is $6 a tonne based on 2002 dollars, or $6.75 per tonne. It doesn’t matter what the total cost of the bridge is. That’s how much it’s going to cost those who use it. It’s $6.75. It doesn’t matter what the total cost is. Mr. Speaker, the balance is paid for by others. Let me explain that again. It’s $6.75 a tonne to consumers. There was a report done by the co-op stores and others in 2002 saying this is a savings. That remains.

Mr. Speaker, the other money that goes into it, we, as a government, are putting the costs for operating the ferry and the costs for building and maintaining the ice road into the pool of money to pay for this bridge. That will go in annually. That is indexed, as is the $6.75.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, the federal government are putting a little bit of money right now through the Aboriginal Business Development Corporation. They are also considering the P3 money and we hope they provide that. In the event that they don’t provide that, the government, out of our increased fiscal resources, are putting up to $2 million in to pay for our additional costs to balance it out. So this doesn’t go directly on the backs of consumers. Mr. Speaker, how much is that $2 million worth? Well, if you took 25,000 people living north of the river, then that’s roughly $80 a person per year, but you can’t do that simply because there’s also the benefit to the mines. So that $2 million could be argued it costs somebody something, but it’s going to be marginal, Mr. Speaker, but that’s the only piece that’s in addition to what was there in 2002. It’s still the $6 in 2002 dollars, Mr. Speaker. It’s very simple. It’s easy. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Handley. Supplementary, Mr. Ramsay.

Supplementary To Question 166-15(6): Deh Cho Bridge Project

MR. RAMSAY: Yes, I thank the Premier for his economics lesson, Mr. Speaker, but the problem is, and the fact remains, that the last cost-benefit analysis that was done on the project was done in 2002 at 60 to 70 million dollars. The project has more than doubled in price. The totals were, at the time, $4.50 to $5 a tonne, that’s what the cost benefit analysis was based on in 2002. Totals now are going to be $6.75 a tonne. All I’m asking, Mr. Speaker, is where is the evidence? If the Premier can stand up here today and say that that is in fact the truth, show us. I haven’t seen anything that would indicate that prices aren’t going to increase here in Yellowknife. The reason why is because the government, now that the project has changed in scope, hasn’t gone back out to the transportation companies, hasn’t gone back out to industry, hasn’t gone back out to the chambers of commerce, hasn’t gone back out to the municipalities. That’s why, Mr. Speaker. So where is the evidence? Where is the proof? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Ramsay. Mr. Handley.

Further Return To Question 166-15(6): Deh Cho Bridge Project

HON. JOE HANDLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We don’t have to go back to the trucking companies or the industry again. It’s still the same amount as we said it was in 2002 indexed. So that $6 is now $6.75 or so. By the time the bridge is built in 2010 it will be something different. That’s the same deal that was offered to the industry and trucking companies in 2002, it’s still the same deal. Mr. Speaker, it’s very simple. It’s not hard to figure out.

What has the cost of the total project gone up? Well, there was a presentation done to the committee on it. I can give the Member another copy of it if he wants to take another look. If he wants to come to my office, I’ll lead him through it. Mr. Speaker, if the whole committee wants to come to my office, I’ll do it with the whole committee, but, Mr. Speaker, we know the cost has gone up. We also know that the population’s gone up; we know that there are now soon to be three diamond mines operating north of the river; they’ve gone underground; they’re using more fuel. There’s lots of reasons why or how there’s going to be the dollars to pay for the bridge. There’s more tonnage going over that bridge than we ever expected. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Handley. Supplementary, Mr. Ramsay.

Supplementary To Question 166-15(6): Deh Cho Bridge Project

MR. RAMSAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, going back five years, and I’ve been a Member of the House for four years and I’ve asked questions in the past about the Deh Cho Bridge project, the Deh Cho Bridge Corporation, how it was being funded by the government. You know, we stand here today and the project is over $150 million. Sure, they had to go through an environmental review of that project. That took a year. It has been almost five years since the inception of that Deh Cho Bridge Corporation that we’re here today trying to make a decision on a bridge. So somebody has got to bear the responsibility for taking so long to get this project where it is, Mr. Speaker.

I want to switch gears here a little bit and talk about liability of the Deh Cho Bridge project. I’m to understand that there’s a statement of claim, which was filed in the Supreme Court of the Northwest Territories against the Deh Cho Bridge Corporation, and I’d like to ask the Premier if that is a liability, an ongoing liability for the
Government of the Northwest Territories, Mr. Speaker?

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The question is leaning a bit toward asking the Premier's opinion on something, but I'm going to allow the question if the Premier is willing to answer it. I'll put the question to the Premier. The honourable Premier.

Further Return To Question 166-15(6): Deh Cho Bridge Project

**HON. JOE HANDLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I’ll answer in a general way. Up to now and including the time when the financing is in place for the bridge for the bridge corporation, then the GNWT has been up-fronting the costs. We have taken out a loan in advance of it, but that will be recouped once the bridge is built. All of the costs are to be borne by the operation of the bridge, and, Mr. Speaker, I’d venture to say that includes any liabilities, would be borne by the Bridge Corporation and would be paid for out of their profits from operating the bridge. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you, Mr. Handley. Final supplementary, Mr. Ramsay.

Supplementary To Question 166-15(6): Deh Cho Bridge Project

**MR. RAMSAY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess just a follow-up question to that. Who is currently paying the Deh Cho Bridge Corporation’s legal fees, Mr. Speaker? Mahsi.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you, Mr. Ramsay. Mr. Handley.

Further Return To Question 166-15(6): Deh Cho Bridge Project

**HON. JOE HANDLEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I already answered that one, but the GNWT has loaned the Bridge Corporation money to pay all of their costs up to now and will continue to do that to the point that the financing is in place for the bridge. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you, Mr. Handley. Oral questions. The honourable Member from Inuvik Twin Lakes, Mr. McLeod.

Question 167-15(6): Funding For Non-Government Organizations

**MR. MCLEOD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions today, well they’re regarding money and funding so I’ll direct them to the Minister of Finance. It’s regarding the NGO funding. I’d like to ask the Minister if all requests for NGO funding have to go through regional offices? Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you, Mr. McLeod. The honourable Minister responsible for Finance, Mr. Roland.

Return To Question 167-15(6): Funding For Non-Government Organizations

**HON. FLOYD ROLAND:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, first and foremost it would depend on the relationship between the NGO. If they’re in our regions, they would go through the appropriate department, the regional staff there. For example, if it’s an NGO working with the Department of Health and Social Services or a regional health and social services authority, they would go through that initiative. If it’s Education, they would go through the DEC process and then up to the departments on that basis. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you, Mr. Roland. Supplementary, Mr. McLeod.

Supplementary To Question 167-15(6): Funding For Non-Government Organizations

**MR. MCLEOD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I’d like to ask the Minister if it would be an option to have all NGOs apply directly to the Finance Minister’s office and have it show up as a line item in the budget? Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you, Mr. McLeod. Mr. Roland.

Further Return To Question 167-15(6): Funding For Non-Government Organizations

**HON. FLOYD ROLAND:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, that would be difficult as right now we review on a department basis the requests for budget. For example, during budget planning processes we work with the departments, departments bring their forced growth initiatives up through those avenues. For example, the Department of Health and Social Services would work with every authority on some of the forced growth requests and there would be some back and forth on that side before it comes as a departmental plan. It would be difficult to break out each NGO organization, their involvement, and separate them and then come directly to the Finance Minister. We look at department initiatives through that process. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you, Mr. Roland. Supplementary, Mr. McLeod.

Supplementary To Question 167-15(6): Funding For Non-Government Organizations

**MR. MCLEOD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When the departments bring their requests for funding forward, is there a particular line item in there for all the NGO funding that they propose to give out during the year? Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you, Mr. McLeod. Mr. Roland.

Further Return To Question 167-15(6): Funding For Non-Government Organizations

**HON. FLOYD ROLAND:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, they would fall into a number of categories specific to what area of the programming the funding was provided under. If it was provided under strictly contribution agreements to groups and regions or if it was a contract basis, delivering part of a service on behalf of the Government of the Northwest Territories. So it falls into a number of areas. So there isn’t a clear line item that would just say NGO contribution agreement. What we would do, for example, if it was a new initiative or highlighting, departments would highlight when they presented to committees the amount that was presented or being requested for authority to committee and then to the House. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you, Mr. Roland. Final supplementary, Mr. McLeod.
Supplementary To Question 167-15(6): Funding For Non-Government Organizations

MR. MCLEOD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the people that work for the NGOs are a resilient bunch, but you can only bend something so far and eventually it is going to break. We are just fortunate that we have these people in the front line. I would like to ask the Minister if there are any steps that we can take to ensure that these folks get their funding in a timely manner so all they have to do is concentrate on working with the clients that they serve? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. McLeod. Mr. Roland.

Further Return To Question 167-15(6): Funding For Non-Government Organizations

HON. FLOYD ROLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of initiatives that we have undertaken, as the Government of the Northwest Territories, to improve our working relationship with NGOs. As we realize, they are an integral part of the delivery in a number of areas. So we have looked at a number of factors of working with them. There have been requests made for multi-year funding. We have started to look at that in areas. As well, the government has looked at the overall NGO area where there are requests being included into forced growth. We have done some work in that area and have allowed, starting with this year’s budget in 2007-08, items for forced growth to NGOs; in particular, the ones that fall into category A of our relationship. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Roland. Oral questions. The honourable Member for Nunakput, Mr. Pokiak.

Question 168-15(6): Deep Sea Port And Military Training Facility In Western Arctic

MR. POKIAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in my Member’s statement today, I talked about the deep sea port and military exercise facility that was announced by the Prime Minister to be located in Nunavut. We all appreciate that our community rangers do a lot of exercises with the military in the wintertime. But at the same time, I think it is important that the West be considered for one of these facilities, either a deep sea port or a military exercise facility. The Premier has been talking with the Prime Minister on occasion with regard to Canadian sovereignty. I would like to ask the Premier, in his discussions with the Prime Minister, on whether he raised the issue about a deep sea port in the West? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Pokiak. The honourable Premier, Mr. Handley.

Return To Question 168-15(6): Deep Sea Port And Military Training Facility In Western Arctic

HON. JOE HANDLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have raised the merits of that port on the western end of the Northwest Passage and promoted Tuktoyaktuk as both a port for Arctic sovereignty reasons as well as economic reasons since it is in the centre of the offshore oil and gas. I raised it with the Prime Minister, with Minister Prentice at various venues that I have spoken at over the past months. I continue to believe it is a good proposal, one that we, as a territory, should continue to promote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Handley. Supplementary, Mr. Pokiak.

Supplementary To Question 168-15(6): Deep Sea Port And Military Training Facility In Western Arctic

MR. POKIAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Premier with regard to the Prime Minister’s recent announcement. I am sure that the Prime Minister, with his colleagues in Ottawa, probably talked about a deep sea port and military facility over the past few months or so. They probably decided at that time that Nunavut would be an ideal place. Given the recent announcement by the Prime Minister that Nanisivik and Resolute Bay would be identified for these two applications, I would like to ask the Premier if he will continue to work with the Prime Minister and his Cabinet to lobby for the West. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Pokiak. Mr. Handley.

Further Return To Question 168-15(6): Deep Sea Port And Military Training Facility In Western Arctic

HON. JOE HANDLEY: Mr. Speaker, without taking anything away from Nunavut or seeming to take things away from that territory, I will certainly lobby for the development of our capacity in the Western Arctic. I believe that any shipping that is going to happen through the Northwest Passage is going to have to be between Banks Island and the mainland. That is a relatively narrow body of water and it is an area that would be quite simple, in my view, to monitor.

Mr. Speaker, the other reason I continue to lobby for the West is because of the oil and gas and the interest by both United States, through Alaska, and our government on who owns what water in the Beaufort. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Handley. Oral questions. The honourable Member for Great Slave, Mr. Braden.

Question 169-15(6): Deh Cho Bridge Project

MR. BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to probe a bit more on the Deh Cho Bridge. My question would be directed to the Premier. I, too, would like to thank him for the invitation to attend his celebration on Friday, but it came as quite late notice. I am afraid I have some other engagements that day. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier for some detail on exactly what is that will be signed on Friday. Can he outline the particulars and the extent of the commitments that will be made on Friday by this government, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Braden. The honourable Premier, Mr. Handley.

Return To Question 169-15(6): Deh Cho Bridge Project

HON. JOE HANDLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry the Member can’t attend the celebration, but if he wishes to send a message, then I would be happy to deliver that on his behalf.

---Laughter
I say that most sincerely, because I think the people in Fort Providence that combine the community alliance would appreciate that from Members.

Mr. Speaker, the GNWT is not signing anything at the celebration, but there is a conditional contractual agreement. That is the term they use. It is being signed between the Deh Cho Bridge Corporation and the contractor at that ceremony. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Handley. Supplementary, Mr. Braden.

Supplementary To Question 169-15(6): Deh Cho Bridge Project

MR. BRADEN: Conditional contractual. Mr. Speaker, the Deh Cho Bridge Corporation, to the best of my knowledge, has an extremely limited equity that they have been able to put forward for this project. It is all on the basis of collecting tolls and of the additional investment that we are going to make through the costs we are otherwise putting into the ferry, the ice road and the additional $2 million.

I have to continue asking. Just what are the commitments, then, that the GNWT is either directly or indirectly put on the line here when this agreement will be signed by the Deh Cho Bridge Corporation, who, in effect, are agents of the GNWT in constructing this bridge, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Braden. Mr. Handley.

Further Return To Question 169-15(6): Deh Cho Bridge Project

HON. JOE HANDLEY: I am not sure I understand what is meant by who is our agent. We don't have an agent as such. The bridge is being built and is going to be owned by the Deh Cho Bridge Corporation for a period of 35 years. During that time, they will, as the Member has said, collect tolls and do the maintenance and so on.

During the construction, they are the ones who will sign a contract with the construction firm, Adcon, who is doing the building of the bridge. Mr. Speaker, when they sign the agreement this week, then it is for the beginning. The contractor wants to begin the construction this fall in order to complete it by November 2010. If he doesn't start this fall, then it pushes everything back next summer. So we have, as a government, given an additional $5 million advance to the Bridge Corporation to enable them to be able to sign on and start some of the work this fall. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Braden. Mr. Handley.

Supplementary To Question 169-15(6): Deh Cho Bridge Project

MR. BRADEN: Thank you for the information. Now we know that $5 million is what we have on the table for the initial start of the construction. Mr. Speaker, looking back at some files from the previous debate on the Bridge Corporation from 2003, in March of 2003, the NWT Association of Communities passed a resolution. It is in support of the construction of a bridge. It resolved that the NWT Association of Communities supports the proposal so long as the benefits to users can be shown to significantly exceed the costs. Can the Premier produce information that would support and endorse the Association of Communities' support for this as long as there are significant benefits? Where are those benefits, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Braden. Mr. Handley.

Further Return To Question 169-15(6): Deh Cho Bridge Project

HON. JOE HANDLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said earlier, the cost to the users of the bridge is $6 a tonne in 2002 dollars, or roughly $6.75 today and some other figure in 2010 when it is completed. Nothing has changed that. Mr. Speaker, I expect that, because nothing has changed, the Association of Communities will still take the same position they had before, because their costs have not increased relative to everything else that is going up, of course, in life and the cost of living in the North.

Mr. Speaker, let's go beyond communities. The additional benefit is to the mining communities. Mr. Speaker, that is essential. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that even this fall, we are under pressure to operate the ferry 24 hours a day starting this fall in order to keep up with what industry needs coming across with the ferry. They are concerned. There is going to be a backlog of vehicles starting in October on the ferry. The ferry is not going to be able to keep up. So this is important to industry. It is important now. They need it not just for cost but also to be able to run their increased number of mines on this side of the river. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Handley. Final supplementary, Mr. Braden.

Supplementary To Question 169-15(6): Deh Cho Bridge Project

MR. BRADEN: Mr. Speaker, those are all very valid arguments and discussions. It is precisely the kind of thing that I and other Members of this Assembly are pleading for. Get this information out here so that we have some sense. I can't believe that the Premier is saying to us that nothing has changed. Mr. Speaker, this thing has gone from $60 million to $150 million. That is still just an estimate. That has changed. He has suggested that the toll fee isn't going up from that originally projected. Arguably he is right. But we are going to be paying the same fee for twice as long. Twice as much money is going to go into the same thing. That is what has changed. It is astonishing that the Premier does not at least recognize that and give us some of the information to back up why this is a good project.

In 2003, Mr. Speaker, a significant study, well over 50 pages, was produced on the cost-benefit analysis of the Deh Cho Bridge. Why doesn't the Premier give us the same thing updated five years later with a project that has doubled the cost to show us that this is still a good one? That is what we are asking for. Prove it.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Braden. Mr. Handley.
Further Return To Question 169-15(6): Deh Cho Bridge Project

HON. JOE HANDLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The cost of the bridge has gone up; there is no doubt about that. The cost to the public has not gone up. It is still $6, or $6.75. I don’t know how many times I can repeat that. That has not changed. Mr. Speaker, why has the bridge gone up? How is it being managed? How are we dealing with all of this? We did a presentation to the committee on July 12th. I don’t want to go through all of those pages, but I will give the Member a copy of it. That can help him to understand why it has gone up and how it is being handled.

Mr. Speaker, while the costs have gone up on the bridge, the costs of everything else has gone up too. Mr. Speaker, the number of tonnes going over that bridge has gone up and will continue to go up as there are more mines and other economic activity. Mr. Speaker, there are more people living on this side of the river. All of that is changing, but that doesn’t mean that we have to change from $6 or $6.75 a tonne. That amount to the public is still the same as it was in 2002. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Handley. Oral questions. The honourable Member for Tu Nedhé, Mr. Villeneuve.

Question 170-15(6): Construction Of Seniors’ Housing Unit In Fort Resolution

MR. VILLENEUVE: Mahsi, Mr. Speaker. I just have a request from the Minister responsible for the NWT Housing Corporation. This is just with regards to the new senior six-plex that is currently being constructed in Fort Resolution. The seniors’ society is grateful for the NWT Housing Corporation moving forward expeditiously on this project and getting it done really quickly in the last few months. It has been moving forward really quickly. This is just a request from some seniors that are looking to move into this new seniors’ unit. A lot of these seniors currently live in their own housing units right now, but they require home care services just for the fact that some of them just can’t get in and out of their bathtubs, Mr. Speaker, no matter how many rails and hand bars they have. These fairly cheap bathtubs that the Housing Corporation does provide in these government housing units are slippery and small. Seniors have a hard time getting in and out. I just want to request if the Minister can make a recommendation to his department to look at maybe replacing the standard bathtub and tub surround with the handle bars and everything in these units to putting in these walk-in bathtubs that you see on television? One of the seniors did bring this up to me. He said, if I had one of those Ed McMahon bathtubs, I wouldn’t need home care services and the government wouldn’t have to provide me with money.

---Laughter

I just want to see if the NWT Housing Corporation would consider looking at maybe some cost-benefit analysis of eliminating home care and providing some Ed McMahon bathtubs in all of these units. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Villeneuve. The honourable Premier, Mr. Handley.

Return To Question 170-15(6): Construction Of Seniors’ Housing Unit In Fort Resolution

HON. JOE HANDLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member is obviously watching the same television channel I am. I have seen those premier bathtubs advertised for ever and ever. Ed McMahon calls them premier. They look very comfortable. They look very nice for people to step into. Mr. Speaker, I can say that the Housing Corporation is doing a review of those tubs to see whether or not they are what Ed McMahon says they are.

---Laughter

Are they really that good a product? If they are, then definitely we would consider them. I don’t think they will eliminate the need for home care, but they will certainly help some seniors who have difficulty stepping into a regular tub. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Handley. Supplementary, Mr. Villeneuve.

Supplementary To Question 170-15(6): Construction Of Seniors’ Housing Unit In Fort Resolution

MR. VILLENEUVE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am glad that the Housing Corporation is reviewing that. When can we expect this? I don’t see any real rocket science in this review, Mr. Speaker. There is a 1-800 number there. It is on the Internet. I have looked at it myself. It is not very expensive. Can the Minister seriously direct his department before they start installing these tub surrounds in those seniors’ units? Would they consider those premier bathtubs to be installed in all seniors’ units in the NWT? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Villeneuve. Mr. Handley.

Further Return To Question 170-15(6): Construction Of Seniors’ Housing Unit In Fort Resolution

HON. JOE HANDLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Some Members are suggesting that the Premier should test one, but I am not interested right now. Mr. Speaker, we are looking at them. I will have to get back to the Member on when we can have a review done, but, all joking aside, seriously, we are looking at them. They look like tubs that would be much more convenient for some seniors. I will let the Member know as soon as I can how soon we can get a definite answer. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Handley. Supplementary, Mr. Villeneuve.

Supplementary To Question 170-15(6): Construction Of Seniors’ Housing Unit In Fort Resolution

MR. VILLENEUVE: Thank you. I just want to make a point that a lot of these seniors that do live in their own houses do require home care visits just for the very fact that they need a bath, Mr. Speaker, nothing more and nothing less. A bathtub like that for a lot of seniors that have mentioned it, say I wouldn’t need the home care to come over for three hours a day just to give me a bath because if I had one of these walk through ones, I could do it myself. I just want to make sure that the Housing Corporation really takes a serious look at it. It is not very much more than what the money we would save in home
care visits and the old bathtubs and the health risks associated with the seniors stepping in and out of these small, slippery, cheaper tubs, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn’t hear a question there. Oral questions. The honourable Member for the Sahtu, Mr. Yakeleya.

Question 171-15(6): Great Bear River Bridge Project

MR. YAKELEYA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transportation. Can the Minister tell me in the House to the people in the Sahtu when will the Great Bear River Bridge be built?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Yakeleya. The honourable Minister responsible for Transportation, Mr. Menicoche.

Return To Question 171-15(6): Great Bear River Bridge Project

HON. KEVIN MENICOCHE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bear River Bridge project had to be delayed as of last year. We are assessing right now the new federal infrastructure money, how to invest it in our plans in the near future, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Menicoche. Supplementary, Mr. Yakeleya.

Supplementary To Question 171-15(6): Great Bear River Bridge Project

MR. YAKELEYA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell me that the plans that are going forward to the federal government for whatever plans they are making, why doesn’t it include the Sahtu people in terms of looking at some real solutions in terms of building this bridge? Can the Minister commit to this House here, this day here, that the Bear River Bridge is a high priority as he said it is -- it is on the shelves -- to take it off the shelves to be constructed just like the Deh Cho Bridge project?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Menicoche. Mr. Menicoche.

Further Return To Question 171-15(6): Great Bear River Bridge Project

HON. KEVIN MENICOCHE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I’d just like to say to the Member that it was my pleasure to accompany him to travel to the Sahtu region in July. It was great to be there and see the country and meet with the communities there, especially in Tulita. They were very concerned about the Bear River Bridge project and I indicated to them at that time it was once again due to inflationary pressures. So I had to red flag the project, we had to put it aside and we have to assess our current budget and the current federal announcements of new funding of how we’re going to best move this project forward. And he’s right; we are short $15 million. We had originally been approved and budgeted at $25 million to build the bridge, we went and bought the steel, were just about to build a bridge and then, for whatever reason, in this part of our world there, Mr. Speaker, and this segment, the bridge costs almost doubled. They went from $25 million to $40 million. In a government of our size, we just cannot find that kind of money to do a bridge. We had to put it aside and we’re looking at current ways of financing and constructing that bridge, but it is a priority, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Menicoche. Time for question period has expired. I’ll allow the Member a short supplementary, Mr. Yakeleya.

Supplementary To Question 171-15(6): Great Bear River Bridge Project

MR. YAKELEYA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think we’re going to change the name of the Bear River Bridge to the Red Flag Bridge. You got red flagging going on on that side of the government here, Mr. Speaker. On this specific issue on the Bear River Bridge, the Deh Cho Bridge is going ahead. Why not the Sahtu? Certainly someone has taken our money from the Bear River Bridge and put it somewhere else.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Ooh.

MR. YAKELEYA: We want to know when that bridge is going over the Bear River. So can the Minister, again, look at plans to start phasing in parts of the work of the Bear River Bridge? I appreciate the Minister and Mr. Roland coming into my region and looking and we had to go across by boat because we had no bridge across. So I wanted to ask the Minister, can he look at his department to phase in parts of this and that we see a bridge in a couple of years? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Yakeleya. Mr. Menicoche.
Further Return To Question 171-15(6): Great Bear River Bridge Project

HON. KEVIN MENICOCHE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to assure to the Member that the money that was designated for the Bear River Bridge did not get reallocated somewhere else. Well, the money in the bridge program stayed in the bridge program for our roads north up the Mackenzie Valley, Mr. Speaker. Of the $25 million from the Bear River Bridge, that had to be reallocated to three other bridges on our Mackenzie Valley winter road system, Mr. Speaker, and that’s where the allocations got reallocated to. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Once again, the Bear River Bridge is a priority in this government and we’ll work towards it and be constructive about finding funding opportunities and funding arrangements to get that bridge built. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Menicoche. Written questions. Returns to written questions. Replies to opening address. The honourable Member from Kam Lake, Mr. Ramsay.

ITEM 10: REPLIES TO OPENING ADDRESS

Mr. Ramsay’s Reply

MR. RAMSAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank you, colleagues, for allowing me a few moments of your time here this afternoon. It just seems like yesterday that Members were gathered here as Members of the 15th Legislative Assembly to be sworn in and it’s just amazing how fast four years goes by. Before we go our separate ways, some seeking re-election, others new pursuits, I just wanted to take a few moments to speak today about the experience of being a Member of this House, what it has meant to me and to look ahead to our territory’s future, which, gentlemen and ladies, looks very bright.

As many of you know, my interest in politics began when I came to work as a Page in the Legislative Assembly when I was 12 years old. The Page Program that brings youth from across the territory to our Assembly is a program and an opportunity for young people from our territory to be exposed to how government works. Mr. Speaker, when you take the Page Program, our Youth Parliament Program and the Speaker’s Outreach Program, I believe we’re doing some great things when it comes to getting our message out there and involving youth in the process.

The new legislative broadcast solution coming soon will open up proceedings of this House to residents across the territory. I’m looking forward to that happening, Mr. Speaker, and we should also look at opening up committee proceedings to this broadcast as well.

Mr. Speaker, I will be forever thankful to the constituents of Kam Lake who four years ago gave me the opportunity to represent them here in the Legislative Assembly. I’ve worked hard on their behalf. I feel blessed that I am able to serve them in the fashion that I do. I enjoy the work. Most of all, I enjoy helping people. Mr. Speaker, it’s the best part of the job when you know you’ve made a difference in somebody’s life. I look forward to continue the relationships I’ve established with my constituents as things move forward.

I want to thank my family and all of my supporters for their help, their guidance and their advice over the past four years, especially my wife, Amanda, and my colleagues are well aware spouses play a special part in our lives.

--- Applause

They are special people who put up with the demands that the job of being an MLA puts on our home life and they deserve special recognition from us. The job of an MLA is certainly not a one man show, Mr. Speaker. In order to be effective and to get anywhere in this building, you need to work well with other Members. You need to respect others and their views.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say it’s been a pleasure working with all of my colleagues over the past four years and I wanted to especially mention my neighbours in the House, Mrs. Groenewegen and Mr. Pokiak. They’re both very great neighbours, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. GROENEWEGEN: Thank you.

--- Applause

MR. RAMSAY: Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to travel to other communities is something that has been especially enlightening for me. I’ve enjoyed meeting people in Inuvik, Hay River, Tuktoyaktuk, Fort Smith, Behchoko, Norman Wells, Tulita, Colville Lake, Deline, Sachs Harbour, Paulatuk, Lutselk’ee, Tsiigehtchic, Fort Resolution, Garnett and Whati. Mr. Speaker, this territory is a vast and beautiful land and its people are truly our greatest resource.

I want to express my thanks to our outgoing Premier, Mr. Handley, who has been a very hard working and dedicated Premier and a person who I’ve learned a great deal from, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Handley. I do wish both the Premier and his wife, Theresa, well in all their future endeavours.

Mr. Dent, you and I have certainly had some disagreements over the past four years. However, what happens in this House should remain all about having a job to do, and I do mean that. I have a tremendous amount of respect for Mr. Dent's steadfastness and his ability to stand up day in and day out and defend his departments.

AN HON. MEMBER: And they need defending.

AN HON. MEMBER: Whether they need it or not.

MR. RAMSAY: I want to wish Mr. Dent, his wife, Eileen, and son, Tyler, all the best as he enters a new chapter in his life.

To my colleague Mr. Bell, who is widely rumoured to be pursuing other goals, I want to than...
Mr. Speaker, to my friend Mr. Braden, who is pursuing a new path in life as well, I want to thank him for all of his sage advice and guidance over the past four years. As Members will know, Mr. Braden and I sit next to each other in committee and it’s very interesting how the two of us got along so well and it’s perhaps because we’re both there at 9 o’clock every morning.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Bravo! Bravo!

---Applause

---Laughter

MR. RAMSAY: Mr. Braden, you will certainly be missed and I’ll miss you.

I want to thank you all for your hard work in committees, especially Mr. Braden and his hard work in committees especially on the Liquor Act and the WCB legislation. Good luck and best wishes to you, Bill and Val and your family, as you venture off in a new direction.

To my other colleagues, I want to thank you for helping me be an effective Member of this Assembly. I’d like to wish you all the best in the upcoming election, those of you who are seeking re-election. Should my constituents give me another opportunity to represent them once again in this House, I look forward to working with you again after the election.

Our work here as Members is made so much easier by the dedicated staff we have in this building. I want to thank each and every staff member for all of their help the past four years. The Clerk of the House, Mr. Tim Mercer, is to be commended for the first-rate staff and services that this building has offered Members...

---Applause

...all the way from the Clerk’s office, research, the library staff, security, corporate services, the cleaners and the cafeteria staff.

I just wanted to also thank my constituency assistant, Lynda Comerford, for her four years of dedicated service to my office. She has been truly a great employee and I’m very lucky to have had her as my constituency assistant.

Mr. Speaker, I’m very honoured to have been a partner in governing this great territory the past four years. The future is very bright. As a territory, we have so much to look forward to. We are moving ahead on devolution and resource revenue sharing negotiations and, as we know, this government has done a great deal in advancing our position and we are close to getting a deal done.

The next government is going to need to find peace with our regions and our aboriginal governments. We cannot afford to have differences that lead to inaction. We need to work together to achieve results for our people. We cannot work in isolation. We must work with one another because we need one another. We need to examine what public government is going to look like here in the Northwest Territories 10 years from now, 20 years from now. Mr. Speaker, my advice would be that we should not deviate from our current consensus style of government until all outstanding issues of land claims and self-governments are dealt with. My fear is any shift toward party politics will further alienate the Government of the Northwest Territories. Mr. Speaker, we will need to take a look at reinventing ourselves and including everyone in a discussion that will lead to a Government of the Northwest Territories that everyone will, and should be, comfortable with.

As the government moves forward, there are issues that will be need to be addressed. The first order of business for the new government should be a zero-based budgeting exercise so we get a grip and a handle on how effective our current spending patterns are. Also, the work must continue on the review of boards and agencies. The 16th Assembly must conclude this important piece of work. Also, work will need to be done to develop a new corporate capital planning program with more accurate cost and time estimates.

Mr. Speaker, the environment, of course, should and will be front and centre, with new legislation, hopefully coming in the 16th Assembly, like SARA, the Wildlife Act, and hopefully these things will be moved forward. The next government will again have to balance resource development and opportunities for our residents with protecting our environment. Mr. Speaker, I’m a big supporter of the whistleblower legislation that is coming forward and should be pursued by the next government. The next government will also have to come up with a plan to tackle addictions. We need to put more resources in place that will benefit those needing the help. Programming and education should be the primary focus of the next government’s dealing with our addictions issues. The next government will need to continue to address the high cost of living and look for ways to help residents cope with that cost of living.

Certainly challenges lie ahead, Mr. Speaker; that is true. But our economy is strong; our people are getting stronger, and we must look to the future with great interest. The future of this territory and our people require all of us working together to ensure that opportunities are provided for anyone and everyone who desires them.

Thank you again, Members, for your indulgence this afternoon. Mahsi cho, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Ramsay. Replies to opening address. The honourable Premier, Mr. Handley.

HON. JOE HANDLEY: Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to return to item number 5, recognition of visitors in the gallery.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member is seeking unanimous consent to return to item 5, recognition of visitors in the gallery. Are there any nays? There are no nays. Return to item 5, recognition of visitors in the gallery. The honourable Member for Weledeh, Mr. Handley.

REVERT TO ITEM 5: RECOGNITION OF VISITORS IN THE GALLERY

HON. JOE HANDLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I’m honoured to recognize some guests who have flown and driven here for the NWT Dog Sledding Symposium this past weekend. None of them travelled by dog team, by the way, I don’t think. Mr. Speaker, with us today are Dr. Caroline Griffiths, a doctor in veterinary medicine from
Mr. Dent's Reply

HON. CHARLES DENT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For four consecutive elections and nearly 16 years I've been honoured to be selected by the constituents of Frame Lake to represent them in this Legislative Assembly. To this day, I am awed to have had that level of trust. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear that even though I've got 16 years under my belt, I have no intention of trying to win the record for the amount of time on replies to opening address.

Applause

Mr. Speaker, while I'm moving on and it will be up to subsequent assemblies to determine what consensus government looks like, I would like to take this time to reflect a bit on the operation of consensus government.

When I first got elected, I thought that we should move to incorporate some of the trappings of party politics to improve accountability. After just a while in the Assembly, I came to realize that there is some significant advantage to the system that we call consensus. In no other government with ministerial responsibility to a House, do non-government Members have so much power; so much information about how and when government decisions are being made. And that's an important point and I think it's one that many people, probably because they're used to our system, forget.

I had been active in party politics in the South before moving to the Territories. In fact, I was very active in my university for years so I understood how the federal and provincial governments worked. After getting elected here, I was astounded at how much information Regular Members were given. Nowhere else in Canada do Regular Members get to see a budget before it was presented to a House, and have the opportunity to press the Minister of Finance to make changes before it was introduced. Nowhere else did Regular Members have the opportunities to propose changes to legislation while it was under consideration, like we do here. In no other jurisdiction can Members support the government on one issue and the next day oppose the government on another. This is still true today. Other than Nunavut, there is no jurisdiction in Canada that comes close to giving non-government Members the power and independence and how they represent their constituents than they have in our system of government.

Mr. Dent's Reply

HON. CHARLES DENT: As I said, Mr. Speaker, I think it's because we are used to it that so many of us forget it. But when I talk to Members of provincial legislative assemblies, they are astounded to hear about the power of Regular Members. When I tell elected officials from other jurisdictions that when I was Regular Member I worked with other Members to get the government to make significant changes to budgets, like adding $1 million to a program that all Regular Members agreed should be a priority, they're incredulous. In a party system, that could never happen. Members would not be able to vote according to whether a proposal or legislation was good for their constituency; all votes would be controlled by party discipline. I still don't think we need that in our small jurisdiction. We need to be able to work together in the interest of our constituents.

Some have called for open committee meetings, and I agree that government should do as much as possible in public, but there has to be some balance, of course. Budget issues will always have to be considered behind closed doors or it would be impossible for the government to disclose all the information.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that our consensus system will continue to evolve over time. Subsequent governments will make decisions about what it should look like. Right now, the system we have isn't perfect, but in my opinion it's better than the alternatives I see across Canada.

Mr. Speaker, being a Member of this Assembly has been a great experience. Over the years, I have chaired and participated in many committees. I am proud of the achievements. There has been a tremendous amount of legislation that has been passed over the last 16 years, way too much to mention, but our human rights legislation is a very good model for the rest of Canada and I am proud of the role I played as a member of committee sitting on the other side and seeing that come forward.

The same can be said for the Protection Against Family Violence Act. Those two acts speak to what this Legislative Assembly and past Legislative Assemblies have seen as important in protecting the rights of individuals and those who may not have access to protection in other ways.

I have also been very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to be on Cabinet for two terms. Over the years, I have had a lot of different responsibilities. I am especially proud of the time I have had as Minister of Education, Culture and Employment. What I found really interesting in reading a study not long ago, Mr. Speaker, is that in Canada the average span of time that a person spends on Cabinet as...
Mr. Speaker, I have also enjoyed a tremendous amount of support from the staff in this Assembly. Going back 16 years, there has been almost complete turnover in staff. I have seen almost every position filled by different faces, but the competency and the level of support either by the Clerk’s offices, research and library staff, administrative staff, they have all provided tremendous support to me and to others over the years and I thank them for that.

In the eight years I have been Minister I have also found that the public service is incredibly dedicated. I know it’s too often too easy for the public to take shots at the public service, but I know how many of my staff show up for work at 6:00 or 7:00 in the morning often seven days a week. I have been proud to have the people support me in the departments who have put in those extra hours and make sure things are done when they should be. Whether it’s clerical staff, directors, ADMs, DMs, I have been impressed by the work ethic we have by the public service. I would say that our public service in the North is second to none.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take a moment to say a special thanks to those who have worked in my office while I was Minister. My executive assistants, especially over the last four years; Katherine Robinson and Alison Welch; the executive secretaries, Kathy Wind and Heather Bibby. Over the 16 years I have had more constituency assistants than I could mention, but Pearl Benyk has been the one who has been most recent and has lasted the longest. I thank her for the work that she’s done in helping me keep my constituents informed about the work that we do here.

Mr. Speaker, to be effective in this job, you need not only the support from your colleagues, constituents and staff, but even more you need support from your family. Mr. Speaker, it’s probably no secret to people who know Eileen, but my wife has never really been a fan of me being a politician.

---Laughter

Pretty well every election, she has said that she prefer that I not run. But once the race was on and the papers were filed, she was always a formidable part of the campaign team. I appreciate that.

Not only has she helped during campaigns, once elected, Eileen has always supported my political activities. She even had to take over running my business. That meant she had to run her jewellery store as well as operate a staff intensive 24/7 operation like a radio station. Then, after she started running two businesses, we had a son. So now she had three jobs and all of them full time. While, as she occasionally pointed out, just occasionally, I only had one job.

---Laughter

And this one job meant that I travelled a lot. So I wasn’t there when Tyler was sick and she still had the two businesses to run. It eventually got to the point where Eileen decided something had to go. Thankfully, it wasn’t me.

---Laughter

---Applause
Mr. Baile’s comments ultimately led to many of the 37 amendments the committee brought forward during its clause-by-clause review with the Minister.

Because of the unusually large number of detailed issues raised during the hearings, the committee felt it necessary to conduct follow-up meetings with the Minister and representatives of the Governance Council, the Workers’ Compensation Board (WCB), the office of the worker’s advisor, and the Appeals Tribunal to attempt to work out solutions jointly. The committee chose to do this in a workshop format, as the usual formal committee hearing process does not lend itself well to exploratory discussions. These meetings took place on June 4th and 5th in Yellowknife. Committee representatives took part in a follow-up meeting on June 19th with the NWT and Nunavut Ministers, the chair of our counterpart Nunavut committee, the chair of the Governance Council, and WCB officials. We are pleased that, through this process, we were able to come to a consensus on several amendments to the bill that we believe will make substantial improvements to the workers’ compensation system.

Although there was insufficient time for a full second round of public hearings on the amendments to the bill, the committee did advise employer and employee representatives of the two major changes under consideration that were likely to have a direct impact on their constituents. These changes, which are explained in more detail later in this report, concerned the structure of the Appeals Tribunal, and the standard of causation that must be met for a worker’s injury or disease to be compensable. We would like to thank the Union of Northern Workers, the NWT Federation of Labour, the Public Service Alliance of Canada, and the NWT Construction Association for their written submissions in response to our letters.

**Purpose Of The Act**

Over the last several years, Members have participated in many discussions with WCB officials, Ministers and, most recently, the Auditor General of Canada, about communications and other operational concerns that we believe ultimately originate with the corporate culture of the organization. Although Bill 6 as introduced did include a preamble, the committee felt strongly that a purpose statement, which is contained in the body of the act itself, was necessary. During the clause-by-clause review of the bill, the committee moved, and the Minister concurred with, amendments to delete the preamble and replace it with a reworked statement of purpose. In addition to the principles already contained in the preamble, the new purpose section adds the concepts of openness, fairness, compassion, respect, and accountability, which we believe are critical for the workers’ compensation system. While it is impossible to legislate corporate culture, the committee believes that a strong purpose statement at the outset of the act could go a long way toward guiding the attitudes and actions of all persons involved in the workers’ compensation system. We urge all officials and employees to consider this statement carefully and to make every effort to align their work with it.

Also, in considering the purpose of the act, the committee did not believe that the term “safety fund” accurately captured the reason for the fund’s existence. During the clause-by-clause review, the committee and Minister
agreed to amend the bill to change the name to the "Workers' Protection Fund."

**Governance**

The issue of governance, and in particular the respective roles and responsibilities of the Legislative Assembly, the Minister, the Governance Council and the WCB administration, has been a source of confusion and frustration for many years. Although the workers' compensation system must be allowed to function at arm's length from government, it is an important public body and needs to be accountable not only to its stakeholders, but also to the Minister and the Legislative Assembly. While Bill 6 did go some way to better explain the roles of the Governance Council and administration, the committee did not believe it adequately addressed the need to clarify the role and authority of the Minister. The Minister himself expressed concerns about this during the public hearing process.

During the clause-by-clause review of the bill, the committee proposed, and the Minister agreed, to amendments giving the Minister explicit powers to direct the Governance Council to consider any issue that is, or could be, the subject of a policy, and to require the Governance Council to report on any matter requested by the Minister within the time specified. The intent of these new provisions is not to allow the Minister to intervene in individual cases, but to allow the Minister to provide very high-level direction to the Governance Council, and to have access to information needed to meet accountability requirements.

Other governance-related amendments agreed to during the clause-by-clause review of the bill: removed the requirement for the commission’s headquarters to be in Yellowknife; reinstated the requirement for the Governance Council to establish a consultation process for its policies; clarified the provision respecting the information the commission must provide to the committee on its annual report; and added a requirement for the Minister to table the worker's advisor’s reports.

**Claims And Compensation**

As mentioned earlier in the report, the committee advised several employer and employee stakeholder groups of its intent to consider a change to the provision that set out the standard of causation that determines which injuries and diseases can be compensated. Subsection 13(3) of Bill 6 as introduced provided that an injury or disease that appears to have more than one cause and that is prevalent in the general population is only compensable if work is the “dominant cause” of the disease. Members were concerned that this would leave some workers without any compensation where work played a significant, but not dominant, role in their condition. The committee proposed a more inclusive provision based on the approach taken in several other Canadian jurisdictions, including Alberta, Ontario, Quebec, Saskatchewan and the Yukon.

None of the stakeholders contacted raised objections to this change. The NWT Construction Association, Union of Northern Workers and NWT Federation of Labour all expressed support for it in their written submissions.

During the clause-by-clause review of the bill, the committee proposed, and the Minister agreed, to an amendment that removes the concept of “dominant cause” and provides instead that diseases and injuries will be compensated as long as work contributed in a material way.

The committee proposed, and the Minister agreed to, several other amendments to improve the provisions on claims and compensation. Four of these amendments removed the term “invalid” from the bill, as this word is considered by many to be outdated and offensive. Another amendment reinstated a provision in the existing Workers’ Compensation Act that establishes a presumption that certain severe injuries, such as the loss of both hands or the loss of sight in both eyes, constitute a permanent and total disability. This provision had been left out of Bill 6 to avoid perpetuating negative stereotypes of persons with disabilities. While the committee appreciates the intent of avoiding negative stereotypes, we believe this concern is outweighed by the benefit of making it easier for people with very severe injuries to get compensation.

A further amendment establishes a clearer process for resolving conflicting medical opinions, which have been at the heart of many disputes between claimants and the WCB. The amendment requires that the Governance Council establish a policy that sets out the procedure for seeking third party medical opinions; provides that the selection of the third party physician and questions to be determined by that person are based on written submissions from the medical advisor, the worker’s health care provider and the worker; provides that both the medical advisor and worker’s health care provider may make submissions to the third party physician; and provides that the worker will be examined by the third party physician when requested by the worker.

The committee also brought forward amendments: to strengthen the provision that makes it an offence to obstruct a claim; to require that the commission provide financial information to claimants who request lump sum payments in the place of a pension, and offer to pay for them to obtain independent financial advice; to change the requirement that workers cooperate with “suitable productive” employment to “suitable meaningful” employment; and, to ensure that claimants receive the full amount of any pain and suffering awards ordered by a court before the WCB recovers its own legal costs. The Minister concurred with all of these amendments. At the Minister’s request, a further amendment was made to exclude mental stress as a result of labour relations matters from the list of compensable injuries, in keeping with recent case law on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask Mr. Ramsay if he would carry on with this report.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mrs. Groenewegen. The honourable Member for Kam Lake, Mr. Ramsay.

**Appeals Tribunal**

MR. RAMSAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As indicated at the outset of this report, the committee advised stakeholders in late June that it was considering a change to the structure of the Appeals Tribunal. The Ministers currently make appointments to the tribunal with the requirement that there be a balance between members recommended by employer representatives and members recommended by employee representatives. The
Ministers also appoint public interest representatives. Appeals are heard by panels of three, which must include at least one member from each of these three constituencies.

Over the last several years, Members have heard several complaints about the length of time required for appeals to work their way through the system. The committee understands that one of the reasons for these delays is the difficulty in scheduling hearings that require the availability of three panel members who live in different communities and have other employment. A solution proposed by the worker’s advisor was to shift to a model where only one adjudicator hears each case, similar to what is currently in place under the Human Rights Act as well as several workers’ compensation appeals tribunals across Canada. In this system, tribunal members would have to be appointed based on professional qualifications, rather than the recommendation of labour or employer groups to avoid perceived or actual bias.

In response to the committee’s letter, the NWT Construction Association expressed support for this change. The NWT Federation of Labour, Union of Northern Workers and Public Service Alliance of Canada all stated their opposition to the change, and requested that the current system, which they view as more balanced and transparent, remain in place. As alternatives to changing the appeals system, they suggested appointing a full-time chair, better resourcing the tribunal with staff support, and appointing more members, possibly including a vice-chair. The Public Service Alliance further suggested that the GNWT should relax restrictions that make it difficult for its employees to participate on tribunals.

The committee strongly agrees with the need to increase the capacity of the tribunal both by appointing a full-time chair and by ensuring adequate staffing and resources, and urges the Minister to take the necessary steps for this to occur.

After carefully weighing the comments of all the stakeholders who provided their views on the structure of the Appeals Tribunal, the committee decided to pursue the sole adjudicator model. The committee proposed, and the Minister agreed, to an amendment that requires the chair of the tribunal to designate one member of the tribunal to hear each appeal, while allowing the chair to convene a panel of three members if the chair considers this more appropriate, for example, if a case is especially complex. The committee and Minister also agreed to amendments adding transitional provisions for the change from the existing tribunal to the new one, and requiring that the chair and vice-chair of the tribunal be appointed by the Minister in consultation with the Nunavut Minister rather than on the recommendation of the tribunal. The committee intended to make an additional motion to amend the bill to remove the requirement that the Minister appoint tribunal members representing the respective interests of the public, employers and employees, with a requirement that tribunal members have either five years’ experience as a member of an administrative tribunal or court, or five years’ good standing as a member of a law society in Canada. However, as the Minister advised the committee that he would not concur with this amendment, the committee did not pursue the motion at that time.

Many of the delays in the appeals process are outside the control of the tribunal itself and involve, for example, difficulties scheduling the parties or expert advice. One factor that is within the tribunal’s control is the length of time required for decisions to be rendered once all the evidence has been heard. During the clause-by-clause review of the bill, the committee moved, and the Minister agreed to, an amendment which will require the tribunal to render its decisions within 90 days of a hearing.

Clause 131 of Bill 6 as introduced would have allowed the Governance Council to order the Appeals Tribunal to rehear a matter more than once until the Governance Council was satisfied that the tribunal had properly and reasonably applied policy and legislation. The committee was concerned this provision would have compromised the independence of the tribunal and could have put some appeals into an endless cycle of re-hearings with no prospect for a final decision. The committee and the Minister therefore agreed to an amendment that limits the number of re-hearings the Governance Council may direct to one.

Also in keeping with the need to reinforce the independence of the tribunal, the committee and Minister agreed to delete a provision that would have allowed the tribunal to ask the commission to determine whether a Governance Council policy applied in a given case. This type of determination should be made by the tribunal itself.

Finally, the committee also passed two motions to amend the bill to remove the one-year limitation periods for requesting reviews and appeals of commission decisions. The committee was of the view that these limitation periods would cause unnecessary hardship to some claimants. The Minister did not concur with these motions.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the deputy chair of the Governance and Economic Development committee, Mr. Villeneuve, if he could conclude the report.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Ramsay. The honourable Member for Tu Nedhe, Mr. Villeneuve.

Other Issues

Mr. Villeneuve: Mahsi, Mr. Speaker. During the public hearing in Hay River, Mayor John Pollard voiced concerns with clause 160 of the Bill, which continues the requirement for municipal governments to notify the WCB of building permits for projects in excess of an amount prescribed by regulation, which is currently set at $10,000. In his view, this provision places an excessive burden on municipalities. When the committee raised this issue with the WCB, they replied that they had not received any complaints from municipal governments that the provision is too onerous, but that a potential solution would be an amendment to the regulations to raise the amount that triggers the requirement for the municipalities to notify the commission of a building permit. The committee urges the Governance Council to initiate discussions with the NWT Association of Communities to determine what, if any, changes should be made.

Another concern raised at the public hearing in Hay River was the commission’s involvement in safety, both because of the additional cost to employers, and the potential for conflict when the same body that provides safety advice to employers is also investigating compliance and enforcing the act. As safety matters are
addressed in other legislation and fall outside the scope of this bill, the committee did not investigate the possibility of amendments on this issue, but did research practices in other jurisdictions. We found that WCBs across the country have a mandate for safety education and promotion, and also have an investigation and enforcement role in British Columbia, New Brunswick, Quebec and the Yukon. As this issue is of concern to at least some employers, the committee encourages the government to initiate consultations with stakeholders on the appropriateness of continuing to have the safety investigation and enforcement function remain with the commission.

Conclusion
Bill 6 is the culmination of several weeks of work...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Years.

MR. VILLENEUVE: Years of work, sorry, which began in the 14th Assembly with the Act Now report and first set of amendments to the act. The committee believes that the bill as amended represents a significant improvement over the existing legislation and will pave the way to addressing many longstanding concerns of employers, workers and Members, including those highlighted in the 2006 Auditor General’s report.

During the clause-by-clause review, the committee and Minister agreed to four amendments of a minor and technical nature in addition to the amendments already referenced earlier in this report.

Following the clause-by-clause review, a motion was carried to report Bill 6, Workers’ Compensation Act, as amended, as ready for consideration by Committee of the Whole.

This concludes the committee’s opening comments on Bill 6. Individual Members may have questions and comments as we proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Villeneuve. The honourable Member for Hay River South, Mrs. Groenewegen.

Motion To Receive Committee Report 5-15(6) And Move Into Committee Of The Whole, Carried

MRS. GROENEWEGEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That concludes the report of the Standing Committee on Governance and Economic Development on the review of Bill 6, Workers’ Compensation Act. I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Tu Nedhe, that Committee Report 5-15(6) be received by the Assembly and moved into Committee of the Whole for consideration. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mrs. Groenewegen. The motion is on the floor. The motion is in order. All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Committee Report 5-15(6) is received by the Assembly and moved into Committee of the Whole for consideration.

---Applause

The honourable Member for Hay River South, Mrs. Groenewegen.

MRS. GROENEWEGEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to seek unanimous consent to waive Rule 93(4) and have Committee Report 5-15(6) moved into Committee of the Whole for today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mrs. Groenewegen. The Member is seeking unanimous consent to waive Rule 93(4) have Committee Report 5-15(6) moved into Committee of the Whole for today. Are there any nays? There are no nays. Committee Report 5-15(6) will be moved into Committee of the Whole for consideration today. Reports of standing and special committees. Reports of committees on the review of bills. Tabling of documents. The honourable Minister of Justice, Mr. Bell.

ITEM 14: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS


HON. BRENDAN BELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the following document entitled Annual Report on the Activities of the Rental Office, January 1 to December 31, 2006.


Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the following document entitled 2006-2007 Annual Report of the Legal Services Board.

Tabled Document 57-15(6): Package Of Information Pertaining To Safer Communities And Neighbourhoods Legislation

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the following package of documents: Frequently Asked Questions about Safer Communities and Neighbourhoods Act, as well as a letter from the Minister of Justice, Yukon, and the acting commanding officer of the RCMP “G” Division. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Bell. Tabling of documents. The honourable Minister of Environment and Natural Resources, Mr. McLeod.


HON. MICHAEL MCLEOD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the following document entitled Take a Kid Trapping Program Report 2005-2007. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. McLeod. Tabling of documents. Notices of motion. The honourable Member for Kam Lake Mr. Ramsay.

ITEM 15: NOTICES OF MOTION

Motion 12-15(6): Appointment Of Sole Adjudicators

MR. RAMSAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that on Thursday, August 23, 2007, I will move the following motion: Now therefore I move, seconded by the
honourable Member for Yellowknife South, that Mr. Ted Hughes be approved by the Legislative Assembly as a sole adjudicator.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Ramsay. Notices of motion. Motions. First reading of bills. Second reading of bills. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of bills and other matters: Bill 15, Bill 6, and Committee Report 5-15(6). By the authority given me as Speaker by Motion 9-15(6), I hereby resolve the House in Committee of the Whole to sit beyond the hours of adjournment until such time as the committee is ready to report progress, with Mrs. Groenewegen in the chair.

ITEM 20: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS AND OTHER MATTERS

CHAIRMAN (Mrs. Groenewegen): I will call Committee of the Whole to order. What is the wish of committee today? Mr. Lafferty.

MR. LAFFERTY: Mahsi, Madam Chair. The committee wishes to consider Bill 15, Liquor Act, and Bill 6, Workers’ Compensation Act. Mahsi.

CHAIRMAN (Mrs. Groenewegen): Thank you, Mr. Lafferty. Is committee agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mrs. Groenewegen): Agreed. Then we will take a long overdue break.

---SHORT RECESS

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): I didn’t even notice the bills. We left off yesterday on the Liquor Act and we had had the opening comments from the Minister. We’re ready to move on to general comments, but I’ll ask Minister Roland first if he would like to bring witnesses into the Chamber today.

HON. FLOYD ROLAND: Yes, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Thank you, Minister Roland. Is committee agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Agreed. Thank you. I’ll ask the Sergeant-at-Arms, please, if he would escort the witnesses to the table.

I’ll ask the Members to consider their general comments. Minister Roland, for the record, could you please introduce your witnesses today. Minister Roland.

HON. FLOYD ROLAND: Thank you, Madam Chair. Madam Chair, joining me at the table here is the deputy minister for the Department of Finance, Ms. Margaret Melhorn, and to my left is Mr. Joseph LaFerla, director, policy and planning for Finance. Further to my right is Mr. Mark Attken, director of legislation, Department of Justice. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Thank you very much, Minister Roland. General comments, Bill 15, Liquor Act. First I have Mr. Braden.

MR. BRADEN: Madam Chair, thank you. My remarks will be brief. First of all to acknowledge the willingness of the Minister, Mr. Roland, to accept the pleas from a number of us on this side, myself included, to engage in the review and in the modernization of this bill. I believe we are the third Assembly in more than a decade to have attempted to do this and we can actually check this one off as something that was long overdue. So I want to acknowledge, again, the Minister’s willingness to engage, and, of course, the work that he and his staff and contractors have done to get us to this day.

Madam Chair, I believe that the greatest achievement, if you will, in this bill is not so much in the technical areas or the modernization or even the areas in which we’re focusing on offences and penalties and where we want to make changes in how those are regarded. You know, we’re bringing in minimum fines, we’re bringing in more attention to illegal supply and distribution of liquor. I think the greatest thing here, Madam Chair, is that we have come off almost, I think, sort of a philosophy of government that a set of centralized rules and standards will work for all situations in all communities in all regions in the NWT. We have dispensed with that. We are enabling communities through an improved plebiscite mechanism to take more control of the way liquor will and can be distributed and managed in their own communities. I think that is a real leap forward, Madam Chair, in the way government is allowed to be managed and directed by the people who are closest to its results. So I think that’s a considerable achievement. In that, Madam Chair, I hope that communities will undertake to engage in debates, engage in discussion in community action about how they can change the way liquor is administered in their communities. I don’t think this is going to be easy, Madam Chair. We have so many, sort of, I think, conventions and systems, if you will, tolerances that have been built up in communities about the way that we put up with bootlegging, with various kinds of behaviour. This is a way the communities can take at least some control for themselves in the way this can be changed. As I say, I don’t anticipate this is going to be easy, but it’s going to be very necessary, Madam Chair, if the people of the NWT are going to do a more effective job of curbing the abuse and the cost that alcohol brings in this society. Those are my comments, Madam Chair. It’s a very good piece of work. I’m proud to have been part of it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Thank you, Mr. Braden. I didn’t hear any question there. Those were truly general comments. Great. Thank you. Next on the list I have Mr. Robert McLeod.

MR. MCLEOD: Thank you, Madam Chair. I want to lend my support to this bill as I think it’s a very well written piece of work. I spoke with a resident of Inuvik who follows this type of stuff very closely and they mentioned that this was very well written and the fact that it was written in the NWT by the NWT and for the NWT is something that I’m quite proud of. It’s not something that we’ve borrowed from somewhere. We put the bill in committee’s hands and took the bill out, people spoke to us for the most part; well, I think everyone spoke in favour of the new Liquor Act. There were a couple concerns about stiffer penalties and I think you tried to address those and that’s much appreciated because it shows these people that we’re not just going out there and going through the motions. We are listening to what they have to say and if they do make reasonable requests, they’re usually acted on. People appreciate that and people
remember that. So I want to just commend the department on this piece of work.

One I liked in the opening comments is the recognition that the attitude toward alcohol cannot be legislated and it's everyone's responsibility and something that I've always believed. I think we're getting there. It's been a long, slow process but I think we're getting to the point where a lot of people are taking responsibility for their attitude toward alcohol and it's starting to show. So with that, Madam Chair, I just wanted to lend my support to this bill. I think it's well written and I was glad to be a part of the northern group that took this out and listened to what people had to say. We heard them and they appreciate that and we appreciate that. I look forward to seeing this come into play. Helping the communities make decisions regarding alcohol, I think, is a huge step. Communities are always saying we want the power to do this, we want the authority to do that; now we've given them that authority and I think they will use that wisely. So, Madam Chair, those are my general comments. No questions, just my support to the bill and the work that went into it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Thank you, Mr. McLeod. Any further general comments? Okay. Detail it is; 144 clauses of detail. Okay. Clause 1.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Licences and permits, clause 2.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 3.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 4.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 5.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 6.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 7.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 8.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 9.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 10.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 11.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 12.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.
CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 31.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 32.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Sale, transportation and importation. That would be clauses 33 to 44. Clauses 33 to 44.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Community control would be clause 45 to clause 58.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Administration is clause 59 to clause 64.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Eligibility, prohibitions and enforcement. That is clause 65 to...That's too many. Let's go back. Let's take clause 65 to 70.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 71 to clause 76.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 77 to clause 82.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 83 to clause 86.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 87 to 89.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 90 to clause 97.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 98.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 99 to 102.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 103 to 105.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 106 to 108.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.


SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 110 to 112.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 113 and 114.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 115 to 120.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 121.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 122.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 123.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 124. Mr. Lafferty.

Committee Motion 13-15(6): Amend Clause 124 Of Bill 15, Liquor Act, Carried

MR. LAFFERTY: Mahsi, Madam Chair. Madam Chair, the Liquor Act. I move that clause 124 of Bill 15 be deleted and the following substituted:

124.(1) Every person who contravenes section 74 is guilty of an offence and liable for summary conviction

(a) if an individual,

(i) for the first offence, to a fine not less than $500 and not exceeding $25,000 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year or to both; and

(ii) for each subsequent offence, to a fine not less than $1,000 and not exceeding $50,000 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years or to both; and

(b) if a corporation,

(i) for the first offence, to a fine not less than $1,000 and not exceeding $50,000, and

(ii) for each subsequent offence, to a fine not less than $2,500 and not exceeding $100,000.

(2) Not withstanding subsection (1), every person who contravenes paragraph 74(c) by selling or offering to sell liquor to a minor is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction

(a) if an individual,
(i) for the first offence, to a fine not less than $1,000 and not exceeding $50,000 or to imprisonment not exceeding one year or to both, and

(ii) for each subsequent offence, to a fine not less than $2,500 and not exceeding $100,000 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years or to both; and

(b) if a corporation,

(i) for the first offence, to a fine not less than $2,500 and not exceeding $100,000, and

(ii) for each subsequent offence, to a fine not less than $5,000 and not exceeding $200,000.

(3) A court that makes a probation order upon the conviction of the accused for a contravention of section 74 shall prescribe, as a condition of that order, that the accused cannot consume or possess liquor, subject to such exceptions as the court may specify.

(4) For the purposes of subparagraphs (1)(a)(ii) and (b)(ii), a conviction for a contravention of paragraph 74(c), referred to in subsection (2) is deemed, for greater certainty, to be a conviction for a prior offence. Mahsi, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Thank you, Mr. Lafferty. The motion is order. To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Question is being called. All those in favour of the motion? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried.

Clause 124, as amended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 125.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 126 to 128.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 129 to 132.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 133 to 135.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Clause 136 and 137.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Regulations, clause 138.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Transitional, consequential amendments, repeal and commencement. Transitional, clause 139.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Consequential amendments, clause 140 to 142.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Repeal, clause 143.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Commencement, clause 144.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): To the bill as a whole, as amended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON (Mrs. Groenewegen): Bill 15 is now ready for third reading, as amended. Thank you, Minister Roland and his staff.

---Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pokiak): Thank you, committee. We are now on Bill 6, Workers’ Compensation Act. At this time, I would like to ask the Minister responsible for the WCB, Mr. Krutko, if he has any opening remarks.

HON. DAVID KRUTKO: Yes I do.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pokiak): Go ahead, Mr. Krutko.

HON. DAVID KRUTKO: Mr. Chair, I am pleased to speak to Bill 6, Workers’ Compensation Act, which gives the Northwest Territories progressive workers’ compensation legislation and replaces the existing Workers’ Compensation Act.

Act Now, a report generated by the Legislative Review Panel, made recommendations to amend outdated provisions of the Workers’ Compensation Act. In 2004, the Workers’ Compensation Act was amended to address more than 70 percent of the recommendations. The second phase would address those remaining recommendations.

Following the implementation of the phase I amendments, the Workers’ Compensation Board conducted further consultations and research. The result of this consultation and research is Bill 6. This now brings phase II to a close.

Bill 6 repeals the current Workers’ Compensation Act. The old act will be replaced with legislation that uses clear, simple language. To better reflect the needs of northern stakeholders, the legislation is required for a
more user-friendly way. The bill also clarifies the accountability of all parties in the workers' compensation system through clearer designation of their roles and responsibilities. The bill specifies who is responsible for what area and to whom they are accountable for their actions. The rights of worker and employers are also recognized.

The Workers' Compensation Board's name will be changed to Workers' Safety and Compensation Commission. This name change reflects the need to avoid injuries in the first place by emphasizing safety and prevention.

The bill provides for increased benefits to surviving spouses, seasonal workers and new workers. The changes also provide the board added flexibility in calculating benefits to be more responsive to the individual needs of injured workers.

Bill 6 reflects the fundamental shift in Canada's attitude toward workplace injuries and illnesses. Workplace injuries and illnesses must not be accepted as part of our working lives. Every workplace injury can be prevented if safety is the first priority.

I would be pleased to answer any questions the Members may have on this bill. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pokiak): Thank you, Mr. Krutko. It is time, Mrs. Groenewegen, to have a report of the Standing Committee on Governance and Economic Development, report on Bill 6, Workers' Compensation Act, report of the Committee. At this time, I would like to ask the Minister if he would like to bring in some witnesses.

HON. DAVID KRUTKO: Yes, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pokiak): Thank you. Can the Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms bring in the witnesses, please.

Thank you. Thank you, Minister Krutko. At this time, can you introduce your witnesses, please? Thank you.

HON. DAVID KRUTKO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, to my right is John Doyle, the director of corporate services of the Workers' Compensation Board. To my left is Mark Aitken, director of legal services, Department of Justice, and to my far left is Adrian Wright, WCB legal counsel.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pokiak): Thank you, Mr. Krutko. General comments on the bill? Mr. Braden.

MR. BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The bill before us now is like the one we just previously considered, one that has been long anticipated. I want to acknowledge that it was back in 2000 or 2001 when the comprehensive survey undertaken by a special panel resulted in the report called Act Now. So we know we have at least six years of work, review and anticipation involved in the bill that is now before us. Many people have had a hand in the matter that we are going to be considering today and one that I am very happy to be saying to committee, Mr. Chair, that I would be supporting.

In the past term, especially the last term that I have served here, I have come to know the issues of the WCB especially through the eyes of injured workers and those workers who have fallen through the cracks of our system. When they have been challenged with less conventional injuries, diseases or disabilities, our WCB has not been the kind of organization that I would have liked it to be. In other words, a responsive and compassionate organization, one that does not give away everything that is expected, anticipated or asked for, of course. There is very much an onus of due diligence and due process, but there were, Mr. Chair, a very large number of issues, as supported by the findings of our Supreme Court of the NWT, the Auditor General for Canada, where there was indeed room for improvement.

Mr. Chair, I know that the Minister and the Board of Governance, the executive of the WCB, has already engaged in making many of those changes. It gives me optimism that, combined with this new act, we will indeed have a Workers' Safety and Compensation Commission that is going to be the kind of responsive, professional and compassionate organization that our whole labour sector requires. We must be able to rely on this and to expect the highest level of service and it is with those comments, Mr. Chair, that I welcome getting into the detail of the bill. I know this is not going to happen over night that our workers' compensation system that we share with our sister territory Nunavut is indeed going to be one that we can all count on and rely on to deliver the kind of services that our workers, employers and especially our families require, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pokiak): Thank you, Mr. Ramsay. At this time, I would like to recognize Mr. Ramsay.

MR. RAMSAY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to welcome the Minister and his officials to the proceedings this afternoon. I want to start off by saying that it is a great thing that we are here today to discuss this Bill 6, new legislation for the Workers' Compensation Board. It has been a work in progress for a number of years, as some of my colleagues have been here a lot longer than I have will know, going back to the Act Now reports.

I wanted to start off by thanking the Minister for working with our committee to see to it that the legislation was what we had intended it to be. He was very flexible in getting this legislation to the state it is in. I think he should be commended for that. In addition to that, I wanted to mention specifically Mr. Braden. He has been a champion of injured workers for a number of years here in the Northwest Territories. He is not a member of our Standing Committee on Governance and Economic Development but he spent a tremendous amount of time, effort and energy in seeing to it that the legislation met the requirements of both the injured worker and the employers here in the Northwest Territories. So I wanted to extend a special thanks to him and, as well, Ms. Lee who is not a member of our standing committee but she too spent a great deal of time and effort on this legislation. I wanted to thank her as well.

In addition to that, I think the worker's advisor, Mr. Colin Baile, as well spent a great deal of time putting together briefs for us. I really appreciated the work that Mr. Baile put into that. After the Auditor General's report in 2006, starting to work towards this new legislation, we also got to work closely with the Governance Council of the WCB. I think they deserve a pat on the back as well for their ability to come together with us. We had some meetings. We worked together on trying to get this legislation to where it is today. It is because of that cooperation and working together that it is what it is. So again, I know there is a new president at the Workers' Compensation
Board. There are going to be some changes here with the new legislation as it comes through. I really hope there is some continuity in the Governance Council as well, Mr. Chair, to see through the legislation as it moves forward. With that, I will leave it at that, Mr. Chair, but it is a good day for both the employers and the injured workers in the Northwest Territories. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pokiak): Thank you, Mr. Ramsay. Mr. Krutko.

HON. DAVID KRUTKO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank the Members for their comments. I think it is important that we did build that working relationship. I think there have been several steps to this process. As we know, this process has been going on for some time in regards to the act. Now, the committee hearings that took place back during the 12th Assembly coming forward. Also, I would like to commend the Auditor General in regards to her staff and the work they did in regards to reviewing and assessing the workings of the Workers’ Compensation Board, but also in regards to the efforts that were made by the standing committee and the staff of Workers’ Compensation along with my colleague from Nunavut, Mr. Netser, in regards to being kept abreast of all activities that were taking place during these hearings and also in regards to where things were at. Again, it is with this legislation, it will improve what we have in place right now. More importantly, from the other actions that have been taken by way of the other interventions, like I mentioned, the Auditor General and other parties. I think, if anything, we will have better legislation. I think that the other jurisdictions across Canada are also watching us curiously to see exactly what we are going to come out with. I think this is probably one of the most advanced compensation legislation in the country right now. Because of that, we will be setting out not only a milestone for ourselves but I think for the rest of the country to look at. Again, I would like to thank the Members for their comments and look forward to clause by clause.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Minister. Next on the list for general comments I have Ms. Lee.

MS. LEE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, I don’t mean to be redundant, but I don’t want to pass the opportunity to also acknowledge and say some thanks for where we are with respect to this new Workers’ Compensation Act and the work that has come before that.

Mr. Chair, I want to, first of all, thank the committee because I think that the report that the chair, Mrs. Groenewegen, read into the House this morning says everything about what we have been able to include in this legislation. I am hoping that the workers, the employers and anybody out there who had an interest in what is going on with respect to this legislation will take the time to read that. I think it really speaks well. It really speaks to a lot of work that has gone on in terms of I was listening to what we were being told about the things that needed to be changed, not just from the injured workers but all the stakeholders. I think that report just speaks for itself. I am really proud of what little role that I have had to play in that.

Mr. Chair, I also want to thank Mr. Braden. I guess when you choose to leave politics, you get more thanks than if you are not, so maybe everybody is thanking Mr. Braden because of it. But I have to tell you that things get pretty hectic around here and we are all juggling different priorities, but Mr. Braden is always there as the last man standing fighting for the last word to make sure that we go through all the highs and lows and the exciting parts and the boring parts. I have other duties in other areas where I couldn’t be there. I always knew that he would be there to make sure that the work gets done.

Mr. Chair, I also want to thank the committee because, as the chair mentioned in the report, this legislative review process tried a method of working through these changes, something that has not been done before, and that was the workshop that the chair, Mrs. Groenewegen, talked about. That was a really useful exercise. In that, we had the Minister, the board of the Governance Council; we had the CEO; we had all the staff. We had 12 or 15 people in there working out all the clauses. I think we should all be very proud of the work that we did in that regard. I think that also speaks to what Mr. Dent spoke of earlier about how we can do things differently as a consensus government to make laws, not in a confrontational and partisan manner, but talking about how we can build this line the best way possible. It is not a win-win or lose-lose scenario, but it is something that we can all work together to make as ready and as finished a legislation as we possibly can. I would like to really acknowledge that process.

I would like to, in particular, thank the staff of WCB. I know that, in this House, over the last eight years, Mr. Braden and I were there in 1999 when, for some reason, a lot of cases...We were both getting more WCB cases. We went through the Act Now, a consultation process under Mr. Handley when he was the Minister responsible for WCB. This is the latter part of that eight-year exercise. Of course, Minister Krutko was there throughout the process. In that process, I know that there were some pretty strong words spoken here. I know that the WCB staff that work at the WCB and all the people that work in our government structure, we know them personally. We go to school together. We use the same retail businesses. In talking to them personally, I know for some of them it was puzzling to them why we did what they did was not as clearly understood or criticized so much, but I hope that there will be enough communication from the management of WCB to explain to the staff and maybe if they saw the report that we have worked on in the new legislation, everybody could understand that we had to make the motions to bring the Auditor General in. We had to do lots of statements, motions and actions taken in this House to get us this far. It was all in the interest of the public interest that we serve here. I do really want to thank the new CEO and all of the other senior staff that was involved, as well as the medical and legal advisors.

When we do work like we have done here, I am very proud and I think we should all be proud. This doesn’t get done without a lot of people being involved. I think this was a really good exercise. It is different than any other way we have done in making laws. We should all be proud of that.

I just want to finish by saying I have been trying to explain to some of the injured workers that I have been working with, about the changes we are making. While I am very proud of what we have done and I think we have gone a very long way in addressing some of the deficiencies, I am not sure that this will ever be enough. I guess the real essence of it will be when this legislation comes into effect.
and how it is implemented. It has been said often that we cannot legislate corporate culture or lots of actions that we do. We could do a lot of good with or without legislation. If we don’t have the intention to do good, no legislation could make you. But I am very confident that this legislation could achieve that. From the perspective of injured workers, I think that is yet to be proven. I just spent, two nights ago, 77 minutes on the phone with somebody who was convinced that there was nothing we could do anything good about WCB legislation. I am hoping that not with the WCB legislation but the whole compensation system, even that individual will give us a chance and give us an opportunity to have this implemented. I’m very confident that this is a new beginning for all of us and it’s a culmination and it’s a good conclusion to all the work that we have done. I forgot to thank the worker’s advisor, but he was thanked very loudly earlier. So later on I’m going to have some specific comments to make on some clauses, but I’d just like to end there. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you very much, Ms. Lee. Next on the list for general comments I’ve got Mr. Hawkins.

MR. HAWKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. One of the problems about following a whack of people means most of the stuff has already been said. So I won’t be as long as they are. I’ll try to be succinct, though, in my own way.

As we all know Act Now, someday we thought this is going to turn to “Act Soon,” and then I think people were even begging, up until a couple of years ago, “Act Some Day,” and certainly some day is finally here before us. It’s taken a lot of years, as we all know. I don’t think we need to go into length on how long, but the fact is that what we have before us today is a new step in philosophy and I think it really is putting the workers first and I think that’s a new step forward in the way we should be doing business. I also think it’s a good balance all the way through.

A lot of people have come through a lot to get this act before us. As mentioned before, the Minister has been very flexible. The staff have been reasonable. They’ve worked well with our committee staff and researchers to make sure that committee opinions were heard and understood. I think we have a better product. I think it’s certainly very important to highlight the work Mr. Baile has offered committee and sort of to the whole process as a whole. We have him here, fortunately, in the gallery today. I don’t think he can get enough credit for how much he did for committee. He provided plain language information, real life experience and sort of helped us interpret sort of how this really works. So to Mr. Baile we owe a great thanks from a committee point of view.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. HAWKINS: Mr. Chair, protection of the worker and falling in the direction of the worker when it’s sort of a judgment call needs to always be a philosophy and this act works to achieve that direction. I won’t go into length about some of the adjustments, but some of the changes that we’re now making new strides are we’re now putting money into expert medical advice, legal advice. WCB has become sort of an innovator, I’d like to say, because as presumption of occurrence and diseases have changed. I mean dealing with conflicting medical opinions is a new stride on how we are moving forward.

So, Mr. Chair, without me of course reading the whole act, I just want to cite in closing here that we have a better product before us. It doesn’t say enough, but putting the workers first always needs to be highlighted because it’s their lives that have taken the beating and it’s the unfortunate circumstance when they need to call upon this legislation to be there for them. It’s our jobs, as legislators, to make sure that we have a good product and an understanding product that we’ll hear their concerns and deal appropriately.

So in closing, Mr. Chair, I’m happy we’re bringing this to the House in my time and happy to see the product that’s been produced by both the staff at WCB and, again, committee, as well as with Mr. Baile’s solid advice. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Hawkins. Mr. Minister, any comments to those general comments?

HON. DAVID KRUTKO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, I think it’s crucially important that we do develop legislation that’s not only there to enforce the law but, more importantly, to workable. I think by the comments of the Members, that also we have to put a human face on the legislation and make sure it does serve the people it’s supposed to serve. Again, more importantly, to assess versus the people that are implementing this legislation and working along with the workers and the employers to improve a system that has been some time in coming, but again, I think we’re there. So with that, I do look forward to clause by clause.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Minister. We don’t have anybody else on the list for general comments. What is the wish of the committee? Detail?

AN HON. MEMBERS: Detail.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, committee. We’ll turn our attention to Bill 6, Workers’ Compensation Act. If we start, committee, on page 16, Bill 6, Workers’ Compensation Act, part 1 is the interpretation, purpose and application. Clause 1.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Perhaps we can read a few clauses at a time. Does committee agree with that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you. So to clause 1.1, clause 2, clause 3 and clause 4.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you. Page 22, clause 5, clause 6, clause 7.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, committee. Page 23, clause 8.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you. Page 24, clause 9, clause 10 and clause 11.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Committee Motion 14-15(6): Amend Clause 12 of Bill 6, Workers’ Compensation Act, Carried

MRS. GROENEWEGEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move that clause 12 of Bill 6 be amended by renumbering paragraphs (a.1) to (c) as paragraphs (b) to (d) respectively. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mrs. Groenewegen. The motion is in order. To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Question has been called. All those in favour? All those opposed? Motion is carried. Thank you, Mrs. Groenewegen.

---Carried

Thank you, committee. Clause 12, as amended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.


MS. LEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, this is a clause on causation, which obviously is one of the crucial components in this new legislation. As was indicated in the committee report, there have been amendments to this legislation to make the standard of proving cause as being something that’s dominant in the workplace. I’m wondering, regarding dominant causes of workplace injury, and I’m wondering if, for the interest of those who are listening to this, the Minister or his staff could explain how this would be implemented in the real cases? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Ms. Lee. Minister Krutko.

HON. DAVID KRUTKO: Thank you. Mr. Chair, I’ll have Mr. Doyle answer the question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you. Mr. Doyle.

MR. DOYLE: This particular amendment or this change to this clause will require some policy changes by the Workers’ Compensation Board. What it does is it changes from using a dominant cause to a material cause. So in doing so, it still requires that the work related cause of injury is not a trivial cause but is still a material cause. So it should not cause a large change in the way we do business, but, at the same time, it may actually reduce some of the administrative effort in trying to determine what the dominant cause is of the injury.

MR. RAMSAY: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Doyle. Ms. Lee.

MS. LEE: Thank you very much, Mr. Doyle. Ms. Lee.

MS. LEE: Thank you. I think my question might have been confusing, so I just wanted to get more. I think I would like to hear some more specifics from Mr. Doyle. I guess how the bill was written and presented to the House, it suggested a dominant cause to be a factor in determining cause of injury. We have changed that. We have done away with that dominant cause and we have made it, I think to my mind, a lesser burden to say if there’s a material cause to workplace being the case of injury or diseases, then one would be compensable. Now, that’s how I read it. I’m willing to be corrected if I’m wrong in that. I am interested in hearing, from either Mr. Doyle or any of the panel members, as to how this will be different than how it has been done before without this law being there. Mr. Doyle mentioned that he didn’t think there was a whole lot of difference, but I’d like to think that there is still a difference in terms of how the causation is determined. For the record and for the interest of those who are listening to how we are changing this legislation, I would like to hear what the change will be. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Ms. Lee. Mr. Krutko. Mr. Doyle. Sorry, Mr. Doyle.

MR. DOYLE: The best answer would be that, yes, it is a lower threshold the worker has to achieve in order, from his standpoint, to show that the injury is compensable, and that is the intent of the change.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Doyle. Ms. Lee.

MS. LEE: Okay. For the record, I’d like to say that these changes were supported by not only the PSAC, UNW and NWT Federation of Labour, but also the NWT Construction Association, and that was, I think, mentioned in the report. Let me just say this again. From what I understand, if someone gets injured in a workplace, if they could prove that that happened in the workplace, doesn’t have to prove but there’s enough through medical opinion or whatever that the work had something to do with it. That doesn’t have to be dominantly work, but if work had something to do with it, then you will be compensated. Am I correct in understanding that in a simple way? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Ms. Lee. Mr. Doyle.

MR. DOYLE: The answer to that would be it would still have to contribute to the injury, or contribute to the disease, death or injury in a material way. It can’t be something that is just trivial in its relationship to the injury.

MR. RAMSAY: Thank you, Mr. Doyle. Ms. Lee.

MS. LEE: Right. Trivial. I never use the word trivial. But let me try this again because I’d like to get more clarification. Say if somebody has carpel tunnel syndrome, as an example, and say if he could prove that...I mean I think from a layperson’s point of view -- you don’t have to be a doctor -- as I understand it, carpel tunnel syndrome could come from repeated use of a computer keyboard. But in modern days, a lot of us use computer keyboards at work and at home. Say if it was under proof of...I mean if the standard proof was something like dominant cause or something else, you would have to prove, not prove, but the fact that you might have been using keyboards at home might affect the fact that your injury happened at work because, you know, you’re using computers in both places. How I understand it, from a layperson’s view, is the fact that you’re using computers at work should help you to determine that that injury, carpel tunnel syndrome, if you could prove that it’s from repeated use of a keyboard, that it happened at work. I’m trying to simplify how I understand this. Is that a correct...that one should be able to say that carpel tunnel syndrome happened from work because of repeated use
of keyboards at work, and would this provision make it easier to prove that?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Ms. Lee. Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: I think the Member is correct, that if the work contributes to the injury, then that would be a casual link that might give rise to a claim. But I think what this section is intending to deal with is to deal with a situation where the work component of the injury is small and a worker might perhaps argue that working at a computer is not a very significant portion of his or her injury in your example, that the dominant cause had nothing to do with the work they're doing, then this section would say that that would not be contributing cause. In other words, the work part of the injury has to be significant, but it's also saying that it's not the only cause. There could be some non-work cause, some work cause. It has to be significant but it can't be trivial. If you have a worker that, say, has worked one day in his or her life on the computer and has a lot of time working at home, then that would be a trivial cause. After that, it's really a question of fact. I hope that helps.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you very much, Mr. Wright. Ms. Lee.

MS. LEE: I realize that we may be...I guess the lawyers here might want to err on the side of caution and we don't want to be too definitive in interpreting this clause. But I think Mr. Wright has basically said what I was looking for, but I'm just going to confirm this again in my remaining seconds. Am I right in thinking that if, say, this clause requires the workplace to be a dominant clause, dominant factor of the injury or the disease, your burden of proof would have been lot higher than what we have here, which is a little lower but higher than trivial cause? I could look in that step-by-step way. This clause sort of goes to the middle or maybe a little lesser burden than the middle, which was agreed to by all stakeholders. Thank you.

MR. RAMSAY: Thank you, Ms. Lee. Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: I'm agreeing with Ms. Lee.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Wright. Thank you, committee. We are on clause 13, page 25. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, committee. Page 26, clause 14, clause 15, clause 16, and clause 17. Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 27, clause 18, clause 19, clause 20, clause 21. Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 28, clause 22, clause 23. Agreed.


MS. LEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just need some assistance here. I have a question on the section on conflicting medical opinion and we're going by lumps of clauses, so could I just get some advice as to when I could raise that question? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Ms. Lee. I'm calling each clause on each page. If you have a specific question to a clause, just mention the clause that I've just called and that would be sufficient. Have you got a question on a specific clause on page 29? Clause 24, 25 and 26.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.


MS. LEE: Thank you. Very conveniently, section 27 deals with the question I had in mind and it's in regards to conflicting medical opinion situations. I'd like to ask either the Minister or whoever on the panel, Mr. Wright, just to explain to the people out there how does this section address situations of conflicting medical opinions.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Ms. Lee. Mr. Doyle.

MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The way that it addresses conflicting medical opinions is if there's a disagreement between the medical advisor and the health care provider, they can seek the opinion of another medical professional who specializes in the area, and that decision of that professional is binding on all parties.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Doyle. Ms. Lee.

MS. LEE: Thank you. What sort of input do the workers and his or her medical advisor or health care provider have in choosing who that third person, opinion, might be?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Ms. Lee. Mr. Doyle.

MR. DOYLE: I'm sorry; I didn't hear the question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Doyle. For a response, I'll go to Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Subsection (4) provides that the Governance Council can establish a policy that deals with things like how the medical professional is selected and submissions that the medical advisor of the board and the worker's medical person have to the third medical opinion, so that it requires that the Governance Council establish a policy to deal with that issue.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you very much, Mr. Wright. Ms. Lee.

MS. LEE: Thank you. Before I move to subsection (4), I have a question on subsection (3), which speaks to the capacity under this clause to go to a third opinion. It says in there in 27(3) that this resolution is binding, so whatever the third opinion is, it's binding to both parties, subject to new medical evidence. So I have a question about what that new medical evidence means exactly, because it could happen in either case. You could have binding resolution on a conflicting medical opinion where both the medical advisor, WCB and the worker agree to a...Let me
just ask first whether they have to agree on who the third party is. Then they get a decision and it could be in favour of the worker or not. Say the decision is in favour of the worker, found the claim to be valid or whatever, but he says it's subject to new medical evidence. What does that mean? Could a decision be overturned on the new medical evidence and what is the standard of that new medical evidence?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Ms. Lee. Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. On the first issue, which was how the medical person is selected, the policy has to deal with that. That is not addressed specifically in the section. Obviously, there may be a number of ways that could be done. As far as the opening words of 27(3) are concerned, I think what that is saying is that the third opinion is binding but it's always possible that there may be new medical evidence. For example, there may be new technology available. So when the third opinion comes out, perhaps in the meantime there is some new technological means that can give a definitive opinion that is otherwise questionable, whether taking it from a question of opinion to something definitive. So that's saying that if there is some such evidence that's available, then that would put precedence over the third opinion.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Wright. Ms. Lee.

MS. LEE: Thank you. I want to reserve my question about subsection (4) again, but just following up on what Mr. Wright said, what assurance do workers have in listening to this explanation of subsection (3) that the new medical evidence will only be about something that was unknown, something totally new that would change your resolution, but it would not be another third opinion that would just reverse your decision? Do you know what I mean? That's what the workers are concerned about...or maybe WCB side, too. That there is some standard on what that new medical evidence should be that would put the question into new light, that it would not be...Could I just get the industry standard on that? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Ms. Lee. Mr. Aitken.

MR. AITKEN: I would have thought that the new medical evidence would be, as Mr. Wright described, something that resulted in a change in technology or a change in how it's evaluated, but I would also think it would be medical evidence relating to the person themselves, some change to their medical condition that can be traced back to the workplace injury or disease. So there has been some change in their medical status that has to be reconsidered. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Ms. Lee. Mr. Aitken. Ms. Lee.

MS. LEE: Thank you. I take that to mean that somebody...So if there is no condition change on the person...Oh dear, this is so hard. If somebody had a back injury and one doctor says no, it's not caused by work and another doctor says yes, it's caused by work, the WCB medical advisor says we don't think it's caused from work. Another doctor says you have an injury and it's caused by work and it should be compensable. You go to a third party and the third party agrees with the worker's side. No change in condition, no medical opinion or anything. There is no change in the worker's condition, but you cannot use a third opinion that agrees with the workers' compensation side to change that decision. I think that's what the people are concerned about. What assurances can be provided that that is not going to happen?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Ms. Lee. Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: The section says "new medical evidence being acquired." So it's not like you are bringing in a fourth doctor because you don't like the third doctor's opinion until you keep stacking opinions until you get one you like. You have a new test or something new has come up that is new that three doctors who have looked at it already haven't seen. It's a new piece of evidence that might cause them to change the way they look at things. It's not a third or fourth or fifth or sixth opinion.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Wright. Ms. Lee.

MS. LEE: Thank you. I do understand that and I approve that interpretation. I think that's what we meant to do. I think it's the difference between medical opinion and medical evidence. I just wanted to make sure that we put it on record, so that people out there could feel comfort in how this legislation will be interpreted. In the remaining seconds, I just want to ask the panel on subsection (4). It states there that much of how this will be implemented will be written out in the policies and procedures. First of all, would the Minister and Governance Council be willing to set up some sort of stakeholders' consultation group to see how this policy will be written? It's really hard to ask what is going to be in that policy because I don't think anybody in that panel will have a say on that in the level of detail that I like to look at. I would like to know, for example, would the injured worker have a say on who the third medical opinion person will be? How can we be assured that it's somebody who is neutral or somebody who is going to be seen to be objective, somebody who could have that level of distance and objectivity? That's a big concern, whether justified or not. The workers want to make sure that when they go to a third party binding resolution process that they will get a full, fair hearing. So any information the Minister could give me to assure me, just any information on this section would be helpful. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Ms. Lee. Mr. Minister.

HON. DAVID KRUTKO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The present practice of the board with regard to any revised policy or introducing the new policy, they do err on the side of the workers and other partners in this where they do run it by them before they make a final draft. So they do run it through the different organizations, the workers, employers and vice versa. I think it's important that we stress that we put on consultation and ensure that we are transparent. That aspect with regard to establishing that policy will be done through that process which is being used today. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Minister Krutko. Clause 27, committee? Ms. Lee.

MS. LEE: Can I ask the Minister to commit to...Could I ask the Minister whether there's any intention under this
legislation to give workers a chance to have a say on who that third medical opinion will be?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Ms. Lee. Minister Krutko. Mr. Aitken, please.

MR. AITKEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The way I interpret this when I look at 27(2), it states that the medical advisor to the worker, sorry, the medical advisor, is to seek the opinion of another medical professional. So I take this to mean where they can agree on a third medical practitioner who they concur is an expert. The two of them choose that medical professional. Presumably if there is a disagreement as to who would be a third medical professional, they would rely on the policy in 4(a) and seek some mechanism to determine who it would be. In the first instance, if they are able to agree in the instance, maybe -- maybe the person has a skin condition and they think it's caused by chemicals at work and the two doctors agree on a third doctor who is a dermatologist -- that would be acceptable. That would be the first step to be taken to see if they can agree. Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Aitken.

MS. LEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I read that subsection 2(2) and it says, "they shall seek the opinion of another medical professional who specializes in the area of the conflict." It says they shall seek but it's not clear to me whether the medical advisor or the worker will have the same say on who that third medical opinion should be. Is that the correct way to do that? Is that the sound medical opinion to say that both parties have equal power? It doesn't say they have to agree.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Ms. Lee. Mr. Minister. Thank you, Mr. Minister. I am not sure who you are pointing to, Mr. Aitken or Mr. Wright? Mr. Aitken. Thank you.

MR. AITKEN: Sorry, Mr. Chairperson. I was speaking with Mr. Doyle and I missed the question, so I didn't hear the follow-up question. I apologize.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Aitken. Would you mind restating the question, Ms. Lee?

MS. LEE: Thank you. Yes, the question to Mr. Aitken: Does he read subsection (2) to mean that both parties have equal say on who the third party will be?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you for clarifying that, Ms. Lee. Mr. Aitken.

MR. AITKEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I read it to mean both of the doctors have an equal say in how the third medical expert would be selected.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Aitken. Anything further, Ms. Lee? Thank you, Ms. Lee. Back to clause 27, committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 32, clause 33, clause 34,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 33, clause 35, clause 36, clause 37 and clause 38.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 34, clause 39, clause 40 and clause 41.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 35, clause 42 and clause 43.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 36, clause 44, clause 45, clause 46.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 37, clause 47, clause 48.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 38, clause 49, clause 50.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 39, clause 51, clause 52 and clause 53.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed. Page 40, clause 54, clause 55 and clause 56.

Committee Motion 15-15(6): Amend Clause 56 Of Bill 6, Workers' Compensation Act, Carried

MRS. GROENEWEGEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move that clause 56 of Bill 6 be amended by renumbering subsections (1.1) to (3) as subsections (2) to (4) respectively.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mrs. Groenewegen. The motion is in order. To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Question has been called. All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion has been carried.

---Carried

To page 40, clause 56, as amended?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 41, clause 57 and clause 58.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 42, clause 59, clause 60 and clause 61.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.
CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 43, clause 62 and clause 63.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Clause 64.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 44, clause 65. Mrs. Groenewegen.

MRS. GROENEWEGEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I move that subclause 96(3) of Bill 6 be amended by striking out “may direct” and substituting “may, in writing, direct”.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mrs. Groenewegen. The motion is in order. To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Question is being called. All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Thank you, committee. To clause 65, as amended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you. Page 46, clause 66 and clause 67.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 47, clauses 68, 69 and 70.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 48, clause 71, clause 72.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, committee. With unanimous consent, can we return to clause 65 to hear another motion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): That left us on page 48, clause 71 and 72.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 49, clause 73, clause 74 and clause 75.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 50, clause 76, clause 77, clause 78 and clause 79.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 51, clause 80.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 52, clause 81 and clause 82.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 53, clause 83 and clause 84.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 54, clause 85 and clause 86.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 55, clause 87, clause 88, clause 90 and clause 91. Ms. Lee. Thank you, Ms. Lee. Which clause? Thank you, Ms. Lee. Committee has agreed to clause 91. Committee, we will go to page 57, clause 92. Ms. Lee.

MS. LEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a question on clause 92 which deals with the presumption in favour of injured workers and this is a very important and often controversial component of the workers’ compensation legislative system. I know the workers who go through the claim process, some of them feel that they’re not always treated with the presumption in favour of them as injured workers, and probably the workers in the system don’t agree. Anyway, I would like to ask the Minister how this section will be different than what was in place prior to this legislation in a specific term. I don’t need it to be so opened-ended. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Ms. Lee. Mr. Minister.

HON. DAVID KRUTKO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, with regard to improving the wording in legislation and making it easier to understand, I think that this clause in there definitely states that in regards to reviewing an individual’s case, you should consider looking at it in light of the hearing from the client but, more
importantly, prescribing to be in favour of the client ensuring that when reviewing those cases you are, hopefully, improving this legislation and the wording. The wording that was there previously was somewhat similar but this goes just a little further, so it is an improvement for what the wording was there before. I think with that we’re hoping it will improve our ability to process with that individual’s claims.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Krutko. Ms. Lee.

MS. LEE: Further to that, Mr. Chairman, I think we have an important section that we added to which is section 1.1, the purpose of this act, which was intentional inclusion and it says “The purpose of this act is to establish an open, fair and comprehensive system of compulsory no-fault mutual insurance for workers and employers,” and it has five subsections that we, as Members, wanted to add into it to state and articulate how we would like to see this legislation implemented and followed in practice. I was hoping the Minister would say that this section 92 will be read and interpreted in the context of that purpose clause. So I’d like to ask the Minister if that would be possible in their implementation of this legislation. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Ms. Lee. Mr. Minister.

HON. DAVID KRUTKO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In regards to the preamble and the intent of the legislation, I think the Member is correct. I mean when we have the insurance system that we do have and basically it is a no-fault insurance and you try to err on the caution by way of trying to assist workers so we don’t find ourselves in the predicament of having to go to court every time we want to settle a case. I think in regards to the preamble, it has been implemented and the change in regards to the statement is, hopefully, going to be consistent all the way through. I think with the changes that we are making, it is an improvement. I think by improving that, we are improving the system for injured workers to make it clearer and more precise to how we’re trying to resolve their cases. I think this is an improvement and it does fall in line with the preamble in the general statement that is in the front of the bill.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Minister Krutko. Anything further, Ms. Lee.

MS. LEE: Could I get the Minister to commit that section 92 will be read in context of section 1.1? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Minister Krutko. Ms. Lee.

HON. DAVID KRUTKO: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I will commit to that.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Minister Krutko. Thank you, committee. We’re on clause 92. Ms. Lee.

MS. LEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further to that then, section 92, subsection (2), subsection (b), reads that, and I quote, “draw all reasonable inferences and presumptions in favour of the claimant when determining any matter related to compensation.” Now, when you read that from a layperson’s point of view, workers have every right to feel that when you’re injured, you go through a claim process right away from the beginning that your case will be dealt with with presumption in favour of you as an injured worker. I’m not sure if that has always been the case and the workers that have come into our lives will tell you that that hasn’t been the case. So I would like to know, and from listening to the people who are in the workers’ compensation field, I understand that the way this has been interpreted throughout the case law history is that that presumption only kicks in when there is sort of a tie in the medical evidence or situation. Whereas, you know, from a layperson who walks in, they say that every step of the way presumption will be in favour of the worker, not a situation where it kicks in only when necessary, you know, kicks in as a default system. It should be always prevalent, present and the overarching operating principle. So I want to ask the Minister to give me a commitment that, in fact, with the inclusion of section 1.1, which was very intentional on the part of this Assembly and really clearly states what we want to accomplish under this legislation, that there be a direction to the board in interpreting this clause that presumption of reasonable inference in favour of the worker has to kick in from the beginning, throughout the process to the end and not just when it’s necessary and it’s determined to be necessary by the process. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Ms. Lee. Mr. Minister.

HON. DAVID KRUTKO: Thank you. I’ll refer the question to Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: The Member is correct that this provision, section 92(2)(b)...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Wright. I just have to acknowledge you first. Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: I apologize. The Member is correct that section 92(2)(b) has been in the legislation previously. In fact, it’s in the present legislation in section 7(4) and it’s a consistent provision throughout workers’ compensation legislation throughout Canada. I think I differ with Ms. Lee if she’s saying that it only kicks into place when there’s a tie. I think that the way I would describe it is that the normal rule, if you’re talking about a court proceeding, is you have to prove something on the balance of probabilities and what this section is saying is that if it’s equally likely that one set of affairs is possible as opposed to the other, that the worker gets the benefit. So if it’s 50/50 as opposed to 51/49, the worker gets the benefit of that. That rule exists all the time throughout any matter where compensation is an issue, which is what this section says. That’s the way that’s been interpreted throughout Canada.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Wright. Ms. Lee.

MS. LEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do appreciate that we have to go against sort of the established machinery of that case law interpretation, but in his legal opinion, would section 1.1 make any difference whatsoever in interpreting that clause that’s interpreted that way everywhere over time? Can we do anything differently here? Are we doing anything differently because of that? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Ms. Lee. We are on clause 92, not clause 1.1; however, I will allow the
question as it does relate somewhat to this clause. Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: I think, if the Member looks at 1.1(c), the principle that’s expressed is that the compensation system will treat workers and claimants fairly, compassionately and respectfully. That’s consistent with section 92(2)(b), which says that you don’t have to… I mean the effect of it is that if the worker can’t prove that what he’s trying to establish is more likely than not, then he or she gets that benefit. As long as it’s 50/50, and that’s consistent with the principle in section 1.1(c), which is treating workers compassionately and fairly. You’re saying if you can’t disprove what the worker’s saying, then the worker gets the benefit.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Wright. Anything further, Ms. Lee?

MS. LEE: Thank you. Just a short one. Could I get the Minister to ask the, refer the matter, or however you want to put it, could I get the Minister to commit to having the government’s counsel look at section 92(2)(b) in the context of section 1.1, as Mr. Wright just stated? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Ms. Lee. Mr. Minister.

HON. DAVID KRUTKO: Well, I can do that but they’ve probably already done it. So I think unless we have the legislation… (inaudible)… once the legislation is there, they’ll have to enforce it.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Minister. Clause 92. Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Clause 93.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): On page 58, clause 94 and clause 95.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Clause 96. Mr. Villeneuve.

Committee Motion 17-15(6): Amend Clause 96 Of Bill 6, Workers’ Compensation Act, Carried

MR. VILLENEUVE: Mahsi, Mr. Chair. I move that subclause 96(3) of Bill 6 be amended by striking out “may direct” and substituting “may, in writing, direct”. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Villeneuve. The motion is in order. To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Question has been called. All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Thank you, committee. To clause 96, as amended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.
(1) The Appeals Tribunal is composed of at least four members appointed by the Minister in accordance with this section.

(2) When selecting persons for appointment to the Appeals Tribunal, the Minister shall ensure that

(a) each member of the Appeals Tribunal has experience and an interest in workers’ compensation issues, and

(i) has been a member, of at least five years good standing, of a law society of a territory or province;

(ii) has at least five years experience as a member of an administrative tribunal or a court; or

(iii) has other qualifications that can reasonably be considered to be the equivalent to those described in subparagraphs (i) and (ii); and

(b) a sufficient number of members are appointed for the Appeals Tribunal to effectively perform its functions.

(3) If an agreement with the Government of Nunavut under subsection 168 is in effect, the Minister shall

(a) consult with the Minister of the Government of Nunavut responsible for the Workers’ Compensation Act (Nunavut) prior to appointing the members of the Appeals Tribunal; and

(b) appoint two of the members of the Appeals Tribunal on the recommendation of the Minister of the Government of Nunavut responsible for the Workers’ Compensation Act (Nunavut).

(4) For greater certainty, subsection (2) applies to the Minister making a recommendation under paragraph (3)(b).

(5) The following persons are not eligible to be members of the Appeals Tribunal:

(a) directors of the Governance Council and staff of the commission;

(b) the Workers’ Advisor, a deputy workers’ advisor and a staff of the Office of the Workers’ Advisor.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Hawkins. The motion is in order. To the motion. Mr. Braden.

MR. BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In this area and related to it was a considerable piece of change in here in going from a three person panel with the expectation that there would be a chair and a nominee from the employer sector and a nominee from the workers’ sector to hear appeals and thus have more assurance that there was going to be balanced decision-making through this process.

We are, in this bill, making a shift from a multiple person panel to sole adjudicator process for the appeal mechanism. I am speaking in favour of this. It also reflects what we have already done, I believe, Mr. Chair, with our human rights appeal process and also, much more recently, with the employment standards process. The sole adjudicator model is one that has some consistency here and it is also reflected in this act.

Mr. Chair, I would like to reflect in this clause and in this amendment the interests that were expressed at least to me and to the committee as reflected in the report that has already been read and tabled by three labour organizations, the NWT Federation of Labour, the PSAC, the Public Service Alliance of Canada and the Union of Northern Workers, who expressed their opposition to the sole adjudicator model. They wanted to retain the security of knowing that in an appeal there was going to be somebody from the labour, their sector, who would be hearing the whole course of a worker’s appeal or potentially an employer’s appeal. It works for both sides, of course. I spoke with a couple of the labour leaders. I wanted to make sure I understood very carefully what their position was. I am going to support, though, the motion to amend and continue on with the sole adjudicator model as it is being proposed here. Also, Mr. Chair, I want to express my confidence in the Minister in being able to appoint people who indeed are going to be professional, unbiased and objective in hearing the case and making their rulings.

The amendment proposes that we want to see people with broad experience in administrative tribunals or courts or who have equivalencies that can reasonably expect to give us that same skill level. So I wanted to put it on record, Mr. Chair, that I listened. I know that other committee members did as well to those concerns, but I do believe that the model that is being proposed here and, of course, thorough consideration by the Ministers in making these appointments is indeed going to give us a workable system; I very much would like to think an improved system through the sole adjudicator model. That is my comment, Mr. Chair. I have no question. My endorsement is for the amendment as proposed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Braden. We will go back to the motion. To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Question has been called. All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Thank you, committee.

---Applause

To clause 118, as amended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you. Page 67, clause 119.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Clause 120. Mr. Hawkins.
Committee Motion 20-15(6): Amend Clause 120 Of Bill 6, Workers' Compensation Act, Carried

MR. HAWKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I move that clause 120 of Bill 6 be amended by renumbering subsections (1.1) to (3) as subsections (2) to (4) respectively.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Hawkins. The motion is in order. To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Question has been called. All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Thank you, committee. To clause 120, as amended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Clause 121 and clause 122.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 68, clause 123, clause 124, clause 125 and clause 126.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 69, clause 127.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Clause 128. Mr. Hawkins.

Committee Motion 21-15(6): Amend Clause 128 Of Bill 6, Workers' Compensation Act, Carried

MR. HAWKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move that subclause 128(2) of Bill 6 be amended by striking out “one year” and substituting “three years”.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Hawkins. The motion is in order. To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Question has been called. All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Thank you, committee. To clause 128, as amended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Clause 129 and clause 130.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 70, clause 131 and 132.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 71, clause 133, clause 134 and clause 135.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 72, clause 136.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 73, clause 137 and clause 138.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 74, clause 139, clause 140.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 75, clause 141.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 76, clause 142 and clause 143.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 77, clause 144, clause 145 and clause 146.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 78, clause 147 and clause 148.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 79, clause 149, clause 150, clause 151, clause 152 and clause 153.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 80, clause 154, clause 155 and clause 156.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 81, clause 157, clause 158, clause 159, clause 160 and clause 161.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 82, clause 162, clause 163, clause 164 and clause 165.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 83, clause 166, clause 167 and clause 168.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 85, clause 169 and clause 170.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 86, clause 171.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 87, part A, transitional, consequential amendments, repeal and commencement, clause 172 and clause 173.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 88, clause 174 and clause 175.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.
CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Page 89, clause 176, consequential amendments, clause 177, repeal, clause 178, and commencement, clause 179.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, committee. Page 90 to the schedule, consequential amendments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, committee. To Bill 6 as a whole, as amended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Does committee agree that Bill 6, as amended, is ready for third reading?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Bill 6 is now ready for third reading, as amended. I would like to thank you, Mr. Minister, Mr. Wright, Mr. Atiken and Mr. Doyle, for being with us this afternoon. Thank you.

---

Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, committee. What is the wish of committee? Mr. Braden.

MR. BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move we report progress.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsay): Thank you, Mr. Braden. Motion is in order. All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

I'll now rise and report progress. Mahsi.

MR. SPEAKER: Can I have report of Committee of the Whole, please, Mr. Ramsay?

ITEM 21: REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. RAMSAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Your committee has been considering Bill 15, Liquor Act; Bill 6, Workers’ Compensation Act, and Committee Report 5-15(6) and would like to report progress with nine motions being adopted and that Committee Report 5-15(6) is concluded and that Bill 15 and Bill 6 are ready for third reading, as amended. I move that the report of Committee of the Whole be concurred with.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Ramsay. The motion is on the floor. Do we have a seconder? The honourable Member for Nahendeh, Mr. Menicoche. The motion is in order. All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Third reading of bills. The honourable Minister of Finance, Mr. Roland.

ITEM 22: THIRD READING OF BILLS.

Bill 18: Supplementary Appropriation Act, No. 2, 2007-2008

HON. FLOYD ROLAND: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Frame Lake, that Bill 18, Supplementary Appropriation Act, No. 2, 2007-2008, be read for the third time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Roland. The motion is on the floor. The motion is in order. To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question is being called. All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Bill 18 has had third reading. Third reading of bills. Mr. Clerk, orders of the day.

ITEM 23: ORDERS OF THE DAY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Mercer): Mr. Speaker, orders of the day for Wednesday, August 22, 2007, at 1:30 p.m.:

1. Prayer
2. Ministers’ Statements
3. Members’ Statements
4. Returns to Oral Questions
5. Recognition of Visitors in the Gallery
6. Acknowledgements
7. Oral Questions
8. Written Questions
9. Returns to Written Questions
10. Replies to Opening Address
11. Petitions
12. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
13. Reports of Committees on the Review of Bills
14. Tabling of Documents
15. Notices of Motion
16. Notices of Motion for First Reading of Bills
17. Motions
   - Motion 10-15(6), Socio-economic Impacts and Benefits of the Deh Cho Bridge
   - Motion 11-15(6), Extension of Appointment of Mr. Denny Rodgers as Chair of the Workers’ Compensation Board Governance Council
18. First Reading of Bills
19. Second Reading of Bills
20. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills and Other Matters
   - Bill 7, Safer Communities and Neighbourhoods Act
   - Committee Report 4-15(6), Report on Community Consultations on Proposed Safer Communities and Neighbourhoods Legislation

21. Report of Committee of the Whole

22. Third Reading of Bills
   - Bill 6, Workers’ Compensation Act
   - Bill 15, Liquor Act

23. Orders of the Day

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until Wednesday, August 22, 2007, at 1:30 p.m.

--- ADJOURNMENT

The House adjourned at 18:19 p.m.