

Fourth Session – Forty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
Official Report
(Hansard)

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Myrna Driedger
Speaker*

Vol. LXXVI No. 61 - 1:30 p.m., Wednesday, June 1, 2022

ISSN 0542-5492

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Forty-Second Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
AL TOMARE, Nello	Transcona	NDP
ASAGWARA, Uzoma	Union Station	NDP
BRAR, Diljeet	Burrows	NDP
BUSHIE, Ian	Keewatinook	NDP
CLARKE, Eileen, Hon.	Agassiz	PC
COX, Cathy	Kildonan-River East	PC
CULLEN, Cliff, Hon.	Spruce Woods	PC
DRIEDGER, Myrna, Hon.	Roblin	PC
EICHLER, Ralph	Lakeside	PC
EWASKO, Wayne, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	PC
FIELDING, Scott, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
FONTAINE, Nahanni	St. Johns	NDP
FRIESEN, Cameron, Hon.	Morden-Winkler	PC
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Lib.
GOERTZEN, Kelvin, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
GORDON, Audrey, Hon.	Southdale	PC
GUENTER, Josh	Borderland	PC
GUILLEMARD, Sarah, Hon.	Fort Richmond	PC
HELWER, Reg, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
ISLEIFSON, Len	Brandon East	PC
JOHNSON, Derek, Hon.	Interlake-Gimli	PC
JOHNSTON, Scott, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
KHAN, Obby	Fort Whyte	PC
KINEW, Wab	Fort Rouge	NDP
LAGASSÉ, Bob	Dawson Trail	PC
LAGIMODIERE, Alan, Hon.	Selkirk	PC
LAMONT, Dougald	St. Boniface	Lib.
LAMOUREUX, Cindy	Tyndall Park	Lib.
LATHLIN, Amanda	The Pas-Kameesak	NDP
LINDSEY, Tom	Flin Flon	NDP
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MARCELINO, Malaya	Notre Dame	NDP
MARTIN, Shannon	McPhillips	PC
MICHALESKI, Brad	Dauphin	PC
MICKLEFIELD, Andrew	Rossmere	PC
MORLEY-LECOMTE, Janice	Seine River	PC
MOSES, Jamie	St. Vital	NDP
NAYLOR, Lisa	Wolseley	NDP
NESBITT, Greg	Riding Mountain	PC
PEDERSEN, Blaine	Midland	PC
PIWNIUK, Doyle, Hon.	Turtle Mountain	PC
REYES, Jon, Hon.	Waverley	PC
SALA, Adrien	St. James	NDP
SANDHU, Mintu	The Maples	NDP
SCHULER, Ron	Springfield-Ritchot	PC
SMITH, Andrew, Hon.	Lagimodière	PC
SMITH, Bernadette	Point Douglas	NDP
SMOOK, Dennis	La Vérendrye	PC
SQUIRES, Rochelle, Hon.	Riel	PC
STEFANSON, Heather, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
TEITSMA, James	Radisson	PC
WASYLIW, Mark	Fort Garry	NDP
WHARTON, Jeff, Hon.	Red River North	PC
WIEBE, Matt	Concordia	NDP
WISHART, Ian	Portage la Prairie	PC
WOWCHUK, Rick	Swan River	PC
<i>Vacant</i>	Thompson	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, June 1, 2022

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

Madam Speaker: O Eternal and Almighty God, from Whom all power and wisdom come, we are assembled here before Thee to frame such laws as may tend to the welfare and prosperity of our province. Grant, O merciful God, we pray Thee, that we may desire only that which is in accordance with Thy will, that we may seek it with wisdom and know it with certainty and accomplish it perfectly for the glory and honour of Thy name and for the welfare of all our people. Amen.

We acknowledge we are gathered on Treaty 1 territory and that Manitoba is located on the treaty territories and ancestral lands of the Anishinaabeg, Anishininewuk, Dakota Oyate, Denesuline and Nehethowuk nations. We acknowledge Manitoba is located on the Homeland of the Red River Métis. We acknowledge northern Manitoba includes lands that were and are the ancestral lands of the Inuit. We respect the spirit and intent of treaties and treaty making and remain committed to working in partnership with First Nations, Inuit and Métis people in the spirit of truth, reconciliation and collaboration.

Good afternoon, everybody. Please be seated.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Madam Speaker: Introduction of bills?

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Standing Committee on Rules of the House First Report

Mr. Andrew Micklefield (Vice-Chairperson): Madam Speaker, I wish to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Rules of the House.

Clerk (Ms. Patricia Chaychuk): Your Standing Committee on the Rules of the House—

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense.

Your Standing Committee on Rules of the House presents the following as its First Report.

Meetings

Your Committee met on May 31, 2022, at 4:00 p.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative Building.

Matters under consideration

Amendments to the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Committee Membership

- *Hon. Mrs. DRIEDGER (Chairperson)*
- *Ms. FONTAINE*
- *Hon. Mr. GERRARD*
- *Hon. Mr. GOERTZEN*
- *Mr. LAGASSÉ*
- *Mr. MARTIN*
- *Mr. MICKLEFIELD*
- *Mr. MOSES*
- *Mr. NESBITT*
- *Mr. WASYLIW*
- *Mr. WISHART*

Your Committee elected Mr. MICKLEFIELD as the Vice-Chairperson.

Officials Speaking on Record

- *Ms. Patricia Chaychuk, Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba*
- *Mr. Rick Yarish, Deputy Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba*

Amendments to Rules Considered and Reported

At the May 31, 2022 meeting your committee agreed to report the following amendments to the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba:

THAT the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba be amended as follows:

THAT sub-rule 1(3) be amended by adding the following definitions in alphabetical order:

"distributed" means the provision of a document to the House, either by providing a physical copy in the Chamber or committee rooms, or by providing an electronic copy;

"document" means either a hard copy version or electronic version of a document referenced in the House (in the event of a discrepancy between the two versions of a document, the hard copy version will be considered the correct version);

"tabling" means the provision of a document to the House by any Member during a House or Committee proceeding, either by providing a physical copy to the Clerks' Table in the Chamber or committee rooms, or by providing an electronic copy;

THAT sub-rule 1(3) be amended by deleting the current **"supply Bill"** entry and replacing it with the following:

"Supply Bill" means a Bill relating to interim, main or supplementary supply, such as an Appropriation Act.

THAT sub-rule 2(1) be amended by deleting the current sixth paragraph and sub paragraphs and replacing it with the following:

On the last Thursday sitting prior to the Remembrance Day Week, the House will not adjourn until the questions have been put and Royal Assent granted for the following items:

- (a) the Designated Bills;
- (b) the Business of Supply set out in sub-rule 76(1) including The Appropriation Act; and
- (c) The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act.

THAT sub-rule 2(10) be repealed and replaced with the following:

Second Reading Completion Days for Specified Bills

2(10) On the same sitting day identified in sub-rule (9), and after Bills have been designated by the Opposition parties, the following provisions shall apply:

- (a) if Routine Proceedings has not concluded 90 minutes prior to the usual adjournment hour, the Speaker must terminate Routine Proceedings and proceed to Orders of the Day;
- (b) at 60 minutes prior to the usual adjournment hour, the Speaker will interrupt debate and call for Second Reading of all remaining Specified Bills in an order that is to be announced by the Government House Leader, or in the order listed on the Order Paper;
- (c) the House shall sit until midnight to consider Second Reading of Specified Bills, and the House may sit past midnight only with unanimous consent;

(d) for each Specified Bill that has not yet been called for debate by this day, debate shall proceed as follows:

- (i) the Minister must move the Second Reading motion and may speak for a maximum of 10 minutes,
- (ii) a question period of up to 15 minutes may occur according to the provisions of sub-rule 136(5),
- (iii) Critics and each Independent Member may speak for a maximum of 10 minutes,
- (iv) the Speaker shall then put the question;

(e) for each Specified Bill that has been called for debate previously, debate shall proceed as follows:

- (i) if the question period has not yet occurred, it shall take place as described in paragraph (d)(ii),
- (ii) if the question period was previously interrupted, it shall continue as described in paragraph (d)(ii),
- (iii) any Member identified in paragraph (d) who has not yet spoken in the debate shall be afforded the opportunity to speak,
- (iv) the Speaker shall then put the question;
- (f) Matters of Privilege and Points of Order will be deferred until all votes are completed;
- (g) despite sub-rule 14(4), divisions on these Specified Bills cannot be deferred.

THAT sub-rule 2(11) be repealed and replaced with the following:

2(11) On the sitting day following the sitting day identified in sub-rule (9), if there are any remaining Specified Bills at Second Reading or Debate on Second Reading, the House is not to see the clock until the question has been put on all outstanding Specified Bill Second Reading motions and the following provisions are to apply:

- (a) at the beginning of Orders of the Day the provisions outlined for limited debate on Specified Bills in Rule 2(10) will apply;
- (b) if Routine Proceedings has not concluded 90 minutes prior to the usual adjournment hour, the Speaker must terminate Routine Proceedings and proceed to Orders of the Day;
- (c) at midnight, Ministers shall move the Second Reading motions for any remaining Specified

Bills and the Speaker shall put the questions immediately, without debate. Despite sub-rule 14(3) the division bells shall ring for no more than one minute on each question;

- (d) Matters of Privilege and Points of Order will be deferred until all votes are completed;*
- (e) despite sub-rule 14(4), divisions on these Specified Bills cannot be deferred;*
- (f) the House shall rise following the consideration of the last motion and any deferred Matters of Privilege or Points of Order.*

THAT sub-rule 2(12) be repealed and replaced with the following:

Committee Completion Day for Specified Bills

2(12) *Standing Committees must complete consideration of any Specified Bills that have been referred to those Committees no later than the fourteenth sitting day after the sitting day identified in Rule 2(10). Those Specified Bills must then be reported to the House on the following sitting day.*

THAT sub-rule 4(9) be repealed and replaced with the following:

4(9) *Despite sub-rule 91(7), 10 calendar days' notice is required for intersessional committee meetings with the following exceptions;*

- (a) meetings of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House*
- (b) meetings of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.*

THAT sub-rule 18(2) be repealed and replaced with the following:

Offence in Committee

18(2) *When an offence to which sub-rule (1) applies is committed in any Committee of the House, the Chairperson:*

- (a) shall be authorized to no longer recognize the Member in question to speak in debate for the duration of the meeting;*
- (b) shall have the ability to suspend the proceedings;*
- (c) shall present a report on the circumstances to the House immediately or on the next sitting day;*
- (d) if the Member in question refuses to comply with the direction of the Chairperson referenced in (a), the Chairperson shall be authorized to have the Member removed from the Committee room for the duration of the meeting.*

THAT the following be added after Rule 19:

Members' Dress Code

19.1(1) *When participating in a Sitting of the House, Members shall dress in one of the following types of attire:*

- (a) professional contemporary business;*
- (b) traditional Indigenous;*
- (c) traditional cultural or ethnic;*

that does not offend the dignity of the Assembly.

19.1(2) *In Committees of the House a business casual dress code is permitted, in addition to the provisions allowed in 19.1(1) (b) and (c).*

19.1(3) *The Speaker shall oversee dress code expectations for Members, and may provide guidance and authorize exceptions to the dress code in appropriate circumstances.*

THAT rule 22 be repealed and replaced with the following:

Prayer and Indigenous Land Acknowledgment

22 *Each sitting day before any business begins the Speaker shall read the Prayer, followed by an Indigenous Land Acknowledgment.*

THAT sub-rule 30(15) be repealed and replaced with the following:

Debate limited to one sitting day

30(15) *Debate on an Opposition Day Motion is to be limited to one sitting day. The House shall not adjourn until all Members have had an opportunity to speak to the motion. When there are no further speakers in the debate, the Speaker shall put the question.*

THAT sub-rule 34(9) be repealed and replaced with the following:

Exceptions

34(9) *The 20-minute limit does not apply to:*

- (a) Leaders of Recognized Parties;*
- (b) a Minister moving the Budget motion.*

A Leader who has not yet spoken in this debate may, by giving written notice to the Speaker before speaking in the debate, designate one Member of their caucus who may speak in the debate with unlimited time. In this instance, the 20-minute limit will then apply to the Leader.

THAT sub-rule 40(5) be repealed and replaced with the following:

Tabling documents quoted from

40(5) Where in a debate a Member directly quotes from private documents, including digital representation or correspondence, any other Member may require the Member who is speaking to table a copy of the document quoted.

THAT sub-rule 44(2) be repealed and replaced with the following:

Exceptions

44(2) The 30-minute limit does not apply to:

- (a) Leaders of Recognized Parties;
- (b) a Minister moving a motion;
- (c) a Member moving a motion of "no confidence in the Government", or the Minister replying to the motion.

A Leader of a Recognized Party who has not yet spoken in a debate may, by giving written notice to the Speaker before speaking in the debate, designate one Member of their caucus who may speak in the debate with unlimited time. In this instance, the 30-minute limit will then apply to the Leader.

THAT sub-rule 47(5) be repealed and replaced with the following:

Exceptions

47(5) The 20-minute limit does not apply to Leaders of Recognized Parties.

A Leader who has not yet spoken in this debate may, by giving written notice to the Speaker, designate one Member of their caucus who may speak in the debate for as long as the Member wishes. If the Member then speaks in the debate, the 20-minute limit applies to the Leader.

THAT rule 58 be repealed and replaced with the following:

Reading the question

58 When the question under discussion does not appear on the Order Paper, or has not been distributed, any Member may require it to be read at any time of the debate, but not so as to interrupt a Member while speaking.

THAT rule 75 be repealed and replaced with the following:

COMMITTEES OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Membership and Quorum

75(1) All MLAs are considered Members of a Committee of the Whole House, and a quorum of at least 10 Members is required for the Committee to sit and conduct its business. For the Committee of Supply, quorum consists of 10 Members in total participating in the proceedings in all three sections.

Rules observed in a Committee of the Whole House

75(2) The Rules of the House shall be followed in a Committee of the Whole House, as applicable, with the following exceptions:

- (a) Members are not required to rise in their place to speak;
- (b) a Seconder is not required for moving motions;
- (c) there is no limit on the number of times a Member may speak in a debate;
- (d) with the exception of opening statements in the Committee of Supply (see sub-rule 77(2)), speeches in a Committee of the Whole House shall not exceed five minutes.

Relevance in debate

75(3) Speeches in a Committee of the Whole House must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under discussion.

Order in a Committee of the Whole House

75(4) The Chairperson of a Committee of the Whole House shall maintain order and decide all questions of order, and such decisions are not subject to appeal, in accordance with sub-rule 52(4). Subject to Rule 18(2), disorder in a Committee of the Whole House may be censured by the House only after it has received a report on the disorder.

THAT sub-rule 76(1) be repealed and replaced with the following:

Business of Supply

76(1) The business of supply for a fiscal year consists of:

- (a) motions to concur in interim supply, main estimates and supplementary estimates;
- (b) motions to reduce, restore or reinstate any item in the estimates;
- (c) motions to introduce supply Bills or to pass them at any stage.

THAT sub-rules 77(7) and (8) be repealed and replaced with the following:

Estimates Sequence

77(7) The sequence in which the Estimates of Expenditure are to be considered by the Committee of Supply will be established by agreement of the House Leaders of all Recognized Parties. If the House Leaders are unable to come to an agreement on the sequence, the Speaker shall determine the sequence in consultation with House Leaders of all Recognized Parties.

Tabling of Estimates Sequence

77(8) Once the Estimates Sequence has been determined, the Government House Leader must table in the House a written agreement listing the sequence, signed by the House Leaders of all Recognized Parties. In the event that the Speaker is required to determine the sequence, they will sign and table the document.

THAT sub-rule 77(14) be repealed and replaced with the following:

Reports from the Committee of Supply

77(14) The Chairperson of the Committee of Supply shall report to the House items passed during the consideration of interim and main supply, and shall also report at the conclusion of the estimates process, all resolutions passed and the concurrence motion. The Chairperson shall report Matters of Privilege referred by the Committee as well as incidents of grave disorder.

THAT sub-rule 78(1) be repealed and replaced with the following:

Concurrence motion in Committee of Supply

78(1) After all supply resolutions have been considered, a concurrence motion must be moved in the Committee of Supply sitting as a full Committee in the Chamber.

THAT rule 82 be repealed and replaced with the following:

Standing Committee Size and Composition

82(1) At the beginning of the first session of each Legislature the House Leaders or designates of all Recognized Parties must meet to consider the size and composition of all Standing Committees of the House (listed below).

Agriculture and Food
Crown Corporations
Human Resources
Intergovernmental Affairs

Justice

Legislative Affairs

Private Bills

Public Accounts

Rules of the House

Social and Economic Development

Statutory Regulations and Orders

The representation of Members on each Committee shall be based on the number of seats each Recognized Party holds in the House. The House Leaders must report this information in writing to the Speaker. In the event of an impasse, the Speaker shall determine the size and composition of all Standing Committees of the House and report that in writing to all Members.

Changes to Standing Committee Size and Composition

82(2) If the House Leaders determine that a change in Standing Committee size and composition is required at any time due to changes in House composition, they must report these changes in writing to the Speaker. In the event of an impasse, the Speaker shall determine the new size and composition of all Standing Committees of the House and report that in writing to all Members.

82(3) Standing Committee size and composition is effective upon receipt of a letter from the House Leaders by the Speaker, or in the event of an impasse, once the Speaker reports to all Members. At the next Sitting, the Speaker must table the Standing Committee membership size and composition.

Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson

82(4) Each Standing or Special Committee shall elect a permanent Chairperson and a permanent Vice-Chairperson at its first meeting in each Legislature, and in the case of a vacancy of either the Chairperson or Vice-Chairperson by reason of the incumbent dying, resigning their seat in the Assembly, becoming disqualified from sitting or voting in the Assembly, or resigning from the Committee, the Committee shall forthwith elect a successor.

Vice-Chairperson to act

82(5) If at any meeting of the Committee, the Chairperson is not present, the Vice-Chairperson shall act in the place of the Chairperson.

THAT sub-rule 91(2) be repealed and replaced with the following:

Hearing presentations on Bills

91(2) After First Reading of a Bill is adopted, members of the public may register to make presentations to a Standing or Special Committee considering a Bill, with the following rules to apply to each presentation:

- (a) each presenter may use a maximum of 10 minutes to present to the Committee;
- (b) with the unanimous consent of the Committee, a presenter who has spoken for 10 minutes may be granted additional time to conclude their presentation;
- (c) following each presentation a five-minute question and answer period between the presenter and Members may occur. Questions shall not exceed 30 seconds each.
- (d) during question and answer periods on presentations to Government Bills, questions may be addressed to presenters in the following rotation:
 - i. the Minister sponsoring the Bill,
 - ii. a Member of the Official Opposition,
 - iii. a Member of a third recognized party (if present),
 - iv. an Independent Member.
- (e) during question and answer periods on presentations to Private Members' Bills, questions may be addressed to presenters in the following rotation:
 - i. the Member sponsoring the Bill,
 - ii. a Member of another recognized party,
 - iii. a Member of a third recognized party (if present),
 - iv. an Independent Member.

THAT sub-rules 110(1) and 110(2) be repealed and replaced with the following:

Steering Committee and Meetings

110(1) At the start of a new Legislature, a Steering Committee consisting of the PAC Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson, Auditor General, Committee Clerk and Research Officer must be established.

110(2) The Steering Committee will meet in camera at the call of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson to: set meeting agendas, propose witnesses to be

called, review sensitive documents, monitor the progress of the Committee's work and other responsibilities as deemed necessary.

110(3) Once a meeting agenda has been set and jointly agreed to by the Chairperson and the Vice-Chairperson, the Chairperson, or Vice-Chairperson if the Chairperson is absent, shall give notice of a meeting of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

110(4) A minimum of nine PAC meetings shall be called per year.

THAT sub-rule 137(1) be repealed and replaced with the following:

Three readings before passing

137(1) Every Bill, other than a Supply Bill, shall receive three separate readings on different days before being passed.

THAT rule 144 be repealed.

THAT sub-rule 148(2) be repealed and replaced with the following:

Duties of Law Officer

148(2) The Law Officer shall

- (a) advise upon legislation and prepare and draft Bills as required by the Executive Council or a Member thereof;
- (b) render to the Private Members such assistance in the preparation of Bills as the time at his or her disposal permits;
- (c) revise and put notes on all Bills, including Private Bills, and cause them to be published and, where necessary, republished in paper and electronic form, and be responsible for the correctness of the Bills in their various stages;
- (d) report to the Executive Council, or a Member thereof, any provisions in Bills that are deserving of special attention or that appear to affect the public interest prejudicially or that require amendment;
- (e) as may be instructed by the Speaker, be present at the sittings of Committees at which Bills are being considered;
- (f) prepare the resolutions required in connection with measures to which Rule 66 applies;
- (g) prepare and deliver to the Queen's Printer the copy for the volume of the statutes, including a Table of Contents and a comprehensive index, as soon after the closure of each session of the Legislature as is practicable.

THAT sub-rule 150(3) be repealed and replaced with the following:

Maximum remittance

150(3) The remittance of any deposit or fees paid in accordance with this Rule shall not exceed the amount of the deposit or fees, less the actual cost of preparing the Bill in both hard copies and electronically.

THAT Appendix D is amended by repealing the MAIN AND CAPITAL SUPPLY PROCEDURE and replacing it with the following:

MAIN SUPPLY PROCEDURE

1. **Government House Leader** moves Concurrence Motion and Committee of Supply considers it (debatable motion - 100 hour time limit does not apply).
2. **Chairperson of the Committee of Supply** presents the report of the Committee to the House and moves that it be received (not debatable).
3. **Government House Leader** moves Concurrence Motion in the House (cannot be debated, amended or adjourned).
4. **House** considers and adopts motion regarding The Appropriation Act (no notice required).
5. **Finance Minister** moves First Reading of The Appropriation Act (may not be debated, amended or adjourned).
6. **House staff** distributes copies of The Appropriation Act immediately after adoption of the First Reading Motion.
7. **Finance Minister** moves Second Reading of The Appropriation Act, and referral to a Committee of this House (debatable motion – may be agreed to without debate or adjourned).
8. **Speaker** announces that the House will resolve into Committee of the Whole to consider and report on The Appropriation Act for Concurrence and Third Reading.
9. **Committee of the Whole** considers The Appropriation Act (debatable matter, but no debate if 100 hour time limit has expired).
10. **Chairperson of the Committee of the Whole House** presents report of the Committee to the House and moves that it be received (not debatable).
11. **Finance Minister** moves Concurrence and Third Reading of The Appropriation Act (debatable motion – may be agreed to without debate or adjourned).
12. **Lieutenant Governor** gives Royal Assent to The Appropriation Act.

THAT Appendix E be repealed and replaced with the following:

APPENDIX E

SPEAKING TIMES

Rule	Debate	Speaking Time	Notes
34(8) 34(9)	Budget Debate	20 minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unlimited speaking time for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Leader of Recognized Parties (may be transferred) ○ Minister moving the Budget motion
51(2)	Closure Motion – after adoption of motion	30 minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Member shall speak more than once in any adjourned debate
77(1)	Committee of Supply	5 minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member may speak more than once
77(2)	Committee of Supply – Opening Statement	10 minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minister and Critics
75(3)	Committee of the Whole	5 minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member may speak more than once
44(1) 44(2) 44(5) 138(14)	Concurrence and Third Reading – Government Bills	30 minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unlimited speaking time for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Leaders of Recognized Parties (may be transferred) ○ Minister moving the Concurrence and Third Reading motion (may speak first or at the end of the debate) • Member may divide speaking time equally with another Member of same party
2(20)	Concurrence and Third Reading – Government Designated Bills (Completion Date)	10 minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minister, Critics and each Independent Member
2(14)	Concurrence and Third Reading – Government Specified Bills (Completion Date)	10 minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minister, Critics and each Independent Member
62(3) 29(2)	Condolence Motion Grievances	- 10 minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaking time limits do not apply • Member may raise only one grievance per session
38(4)	Matters of Urgent Public Importance – Debate of	10 minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If debate proceeds all Members have 10 minutes. • Total debate shall not exceed two hours.
38(2)	Matters of Urgent Public Importance – Explanation of	10 minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member has 10 minutes to explain why debate should proceed. • One Member from each recognized party may respond for 10 minutes.
27(1)	Member's Statements	2 minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to five Members each sitting day
26(3)	Ministerial Statements	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No time limit for Minister • Replies must not exceed Minister's time
Rule	Debate	Speaking Time	Notes
44(1) 44(2) 44(5) 60(1)	Motions or Resolutions – Government	30 minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unlimited speaking time for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Leader of Recognized Parties (may be transferred) ○ Minister moving a motion ○ Member making a "no confidence in the government" motion ○ Minister replying to the "no confidence in the government" motion • Member may divide speaking time equally with another Member of same party • Right of reply for Minister who moved a substantive motion.
30(8)	Opposition Day Motion	10 minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to three sitting days in each session • Only one designated during any week
28(3)	Oral Questions	60 seconds 45 seconds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions & answers for Leader of Recognized Parties • Questions & answers for other Member & Minister • Oral Questions shall not exceed 40 minutes
44(5)	Private Member's Business – Bills, Resolutions, Motions	10 minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be considered during Government Business time • Considered on Tuesdays and Thursdays mornings
23(9)	Private Members' Bills – Question Period	45 seconds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For all questions & answers • Question period shall not exceed 10 minutes • Only one question for each Independent Member • Only applicable at Second Reading
33(6)	Private Members' Resolutions – Question Period	45 seconds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For all questions & answers • Only one question for each Independent Member • Question period shall not exceed 10 minutes and does count as part of the three hours of debate time.

138(9)	Report Stage Amendments	10 minutes	30 minutes for: •Premier •Leader of Recognized Parties
44(1)	Second Reading – Government Bills	30 minutes	•Unlimited speaking time for: ◦ Leader of Recognized Parties (may be transferred) ◦ Minister moving the Second Reading motion
44(2)			•Member may divide speaking time equally with another Member of same party
44(5)			•Right of reply for Minister who moved Second Reading motion
60(1)			
136(5)	Second Reading – Government Bills – Question Period	45 seconds	•For all questions & answers •Question period shall not exceed 15 minutes
2(17)	Second Reading – Government Designated Bills (Completion Date)	10 minutes	•Minister, Critics and each Independent Member •Question period shall not exceed 15 minutes
2(10)	Second Reading – Government Specified Bills (Completion Date)	10 minutes	•Minister, Critics and each Independent Member •Question period shall not exceed 15 minutes

Rule	Debate	Speaking Time	Notes
86(2)	Standing & Special Committees	10 minutes	•Member may speak more than once •Presenters get 10 minutes to make their presentation •Questions from Member shall not exceed 30 seconds
91(2)			
47(4)	Throne Speech Debate	20 minutes	•Unlimited speaking time for: ◦ Leader of Recognized Parties (may be transferred)
47(5)			
50(2)	Time Allocation on Government Bills or Government Motions	10 minutes	Restrictions on who can speak: •Government House Leader •Minister moving the motion •One Member from each Recognized Opposition Party may respond

Agreements

Your Committee reached the following agreements during the meeting on May 31, 2022:

- *THAT these amendments to the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba come into force on September 28, 2022.*
- *THAT the Clerk may renumber the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba and make other minor corrections that in no way alter the intended meaning of these amendments.*
- *THAT the Clerk is authorized to make minor corrections to the French version of the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba to ensure the equivalence of both versions of the Rules, ensuring that they in no way alter the intended meaning of these Amendments.*
- *THAT the Clerk prepare revised rule books incorporating all amendments, additions and deletions.*
- *THAT these amendments to the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba are permanent.*

- *THAT the document entitled: "Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Rule Change Proposals – May 2022" be included at the end of the Hansard transcript of this meeting.*

Mr. Micklefield: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Borderland (Mr. Guenter), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

Madam Speaker: Further committee reports?

Committee of the Whole Report

Mr. Dennis Smook (Deputy Chairperson): The Committee of the Whole has considered and reports the following without amendment: Bill 41, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act; Bill 44, The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Minimum Wage).

The Committee of the Whole has also considered and reports the following with amendments: Bill 234, the drug-related bereavement–death bereavement day act.

I move, seconded by the honourable member for Riding Mountain (Mr. Nesbitt), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

Standing Committee on Public Accounts Fourth Report

Mr. Jim Maloway (Chairperson): Madam Speaker, I wish to present the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Clerk: Your Standing Committee on Public Accounts—

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense.

Your Standing Committee on Public Accounts presents the following as its Fourth Report.

Meetings

Your Committee met on May 31, 2022, at 6:00 p.m. in the Chamber of the Legislative Building.

Matters under Consideration

- *Province of Manitoba Annual Report and Public Accounts – dated March 31, 2020*

- *Auditor General's Report – Public Accounts and Other Financial Statement Audits – dated December 2020*
- *Province of Manitoba Annual Report and Public Accounts – dated March 31, 2021*
- *Auditor General's Report – Public Accounts and Other Financial Statement Audits – dated December 2021*

Committee Membership

- *Mr. LAMONT*
- *MLA LINDSEY*
- *Mr. MALOWAY (Chairperson)*
- *Mr. MARTIN*
- *Mr. MICHALESKI*
- *Ms. NAYLOR*
- *Mr. NESBITT (Vice-Chairperson)*
- *Mr. SMOOK*
- *Mr. TEITSMA*
- *Mr. WASYLIW*
- *Mr. WISHART*

Officials Speaking on Record:

- *Mr. Tyson Shtykalo, Auditor General of Manitoba*
- *Mr. Richard Groen, Deputy Minister of Finance*
- *Ms. Andrea Saj, Provincial Comptroller*

Agreements:

As per the motion passed by the Standing Committee on Public Accounts on October 14, 2020, your Committee agreed to the following:

1. *To ask the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson to request, by joint letter, that the Department of Health complete, within six months of receipt of this letter, a Progress Report with an update on the status of all outstanding recommendations related to the Auditor General's Report titled "Management of MRI Services", dated April 2017.*
2. *To ask the Auditor General and the Steering Committee to review the completed Progress Report, and then for the Steering Committee to report back to the full Committee whether or not there is a will to invite the Department to appear before the Committee to discuss the Progress Report and any outstanding recommendations.*

Reports Considered and Passed

Your Committee considered and passed the following reports as presented:

- *Province of Manitoba Annual Report and Public Accounts – dated March 31, 2020*
- *Auditor General's Report – Public Accounts and Other Financial Statement Audits – dated December 2020*
- *Province of Manitoba Annual Report and Public Accounts – dated March 31, 2021*
- *Auditor General's Report – Public Accounts and Other Financial Statement Audits – dated December 2021*

Mr. Maloway: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Flin Flon (MLA Lindsey), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Scott Fielding (Minister of Natural Resources and Northern Development): It's my pleasure to rise today to the Assembly to table the Five-Year Report on the Status of Forestry, April 2016 to March 2021.

Thank you.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Madam Speaker: The honourable First Minister—and the required 90 minutes notice prior to routine proceedings was provided in accordance with rule 26(2).

Would the honourable Premier please proceed with her statement.

Special Olympics Awareness Week

Hon. Heather Stefanson (Premier): I rise in the House today to recognize Special Olympics Awareness Week in Manitoba. And I want to recognize guests in the gallery today: board chair Duane Brothers; CEO for Special Olympics Manitoba, Jennifer Campbell; athlete Josiah Brothers. Thank—and I want to thank them for being here in the gallery with us today.

Nine years ago, I had the privilege of introducing and passing bill 209, The Special Olympics Awareness Week Act, to proclaim the second week of June each year as Special Olympics Awareness Week in our province. It remains one of my greatest honours

in public life, and I continue to cherish the memory of passing bill 209 unanimously in this House.

This year, Special Olympics Awareness Week begins on June 13th, but it has become customary for members of the Legislative Assembly to celebrate just as the legislative session winds down for the summer.

Madam Speaker, while there was no barbecue outside this year, I was pleased to provide Special O with a virtual greeting on the theme Why I Love Special Olympics Manitoba to mark the occasion.

For 35 years, Special Olympics Manitoba has provided sports programs that enrich the lives of thousands of Manitobans with intellectual disabilities. Over 1,800 Manitobans regularly participate in Special Olympics activities along with over 530 coaches and almost 1,000 volunteers. They have truly become a flagship organization supporting inclusion for Manitobans with intellectual disabilities right across our province.

The dedicated police officers involved in the Law Enforcement Torch Run also continue to carry the flame of hope into the opening ceremony of competitions here in Manitoba and around the world. These Guardians of the Flame are truly a beacon of hope and love for so many.

Madam Speaker, I love Special Olympics Manitoba because it makes our province more inclusive for all those who call our province home. Special Olympics Manitoba makes clear to all Manitobans that we must accept everyone and their unique abilities.

As their theme states, we must: Accept With No Exception. Our government will continue to do exactly that.

* (13:40)

I wish all athletes, coaches, staff and volunteers with Special Olympics Manitoba another successful awareness week and all the best in the upcoming events and competitions.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): Madam Speaker, we're so excited to celebrate Special Olympics Awareness Week, which recognizes the hard work and dedication of athletes with intellectual disabilities in our province. This year's theme is the same as the last: acceptance with no exceptions. We need to ensure that there are no barriers to Special Olympics, and this theme reminds us of the value of these

phenomenal Manitobans and what they provide to sport, both in Manitoba and across the world.

Special Olympics Manitoba supports over 1,800 athletes across 18 sports and seven regions of our beautiful province. We note how tough it has been on athletes over these last—past years, as much of their program has gone virtual, and we're so excited to watch them get back to competing in person.

So, to all of Manitoba's Special Olympians: we honour and congratulate you for all of your accomplishments and wish you all of the best in your games and competitions in the months to come.

We also want to thank all those who support Special Olympics through fundraising, like 79-year-old Bridgwater resident Tom Creighton, who has been walking virtually across the country since the new year in an effort to raise \$100,000 for Special Olympics Manitoba, and has so far walked 900 miles and has raised \$35,000.

To Tom and all those other phenomenal folks who are raising money and donating to this great cause: miigwech on behalf of our NDP caucus.

Finally, Madam Speaker, we encourage Manitobans to participate in a number of events organized by Special Olympics Manitoba this week, like the Kingsmen [*phonetic*] outdoor track-and-field meet on June 4th and 5th and the Wolseley golf tournament on June 14th. For more information on that, please reach out to Special Olympics Manitoba.

And, once again, on behalf of our NDP caucus, congratulations, and we look forward to seeing the events as we go forward.

Miigwech.

Mr. Dougald Lamont (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I seek leave to speak to the ministerial statement.

Madam Speaker: Does the member have leave to respond to the ministerial statement? [*Agreed*]

Mr. Lamont: It's a real pleasure to speak honouring Special Olympics Awareness Week and their theme, Accept With No Exception: Why I Love Special Olympics. I had a great coach many years ago who had a simple philosophy, which I think is summed up in the values of the Special Olympics, and his philosophy was that everybody gets to play.

Special Olympics Manitoba has officially been around for 35 years. Former NHL hockey player Ted Irvine brought the concept of Special Olympics to

Manitoba in the 1970s and it is now recognized as the sport-governing body for individuals with an intellectual disability today, as they provide 18 supports to over 1,800 athletes in all seven regions of the province.

And, in particular, I want to salute their dedication to their values, because Special Olympics Manitoba really walks the talk when it comes to inclusion and inclusive communities: acceptance and promoting diversity by honouring what is unique in each individual; empowerment; respect by working in co-operation, collaboration and dignity; and excellence by elevating standards and performance.

And I think if there's a single idea that bears promoting and repeating, is it's the idea that no person is a burden, that everyone has something to contribute, and, in making room for that contribution, we're all richer for it.

So, thank you to the organizers of the Special Olympics. To the athletes, best of luck.

Thank you. Merci. Miigwech.

Madam Speaker: Further ministerial statements?

The honourable Minister of Families—and I would indicate that the required 90 minutes notice prior to routine proceedings was provided in accordance with rule 26(2).

Would the honourable minister please proceed with her statement.

Deaf-Blind Awareness Month

Hon. Rochelle Squires (Minister responsible for Accessibility): Imagine not being able to see or hear. It is difficult and yet it is a reality for many people right here in Manitoba.

Deaf-blindness is a unique disability that includes the sensory loss of both sight and hearing. Persons who are deaf-blind face complex barriers that can make it challenging to access services and information they need.

As the Minister responsible for Accessibility, I am pleased to proclaim June 2022 as deaf-blind awareness month in Manitoba to raise our understanding and awareness of deaf-blindness and to recognize and celebrate the contributions that many Manitobans who are deaf-blind make in their communities.

The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, The Human Rights Code and The Accessibility for

Manitobans Act all reflect on an abiding commitment to equitable access for all persons with disabilities.

Accessibility is a priority for this government, and, in recent years, we've made significant strides in support of persons with disabilities. We continue to work towards becoming a province that is fully accessible and inclusive, where all abilities are valued, diversity and independence are celebrated, barriers are removed and human rights are protected.

The public is often unaware of the barriers faced by people who are deaf-blind and the measures that can be taken to reduce and remove these barriers. We collectively have the responsibility to do all we can to raise awareness and ensure that all individuals can communicate, access information and make choices so that they can achieve equal opportunities, independence and full economic and social inclusion.

Today, in the gallery, I am happy to welcome staff and volunteers from the Resource Centre for Manitobans who are Deaf-Blind—welcome here today. I would like to acknowledge and thank them for their work in providing and promoting opportunities for independence, dignity and empowerment for Manitobans who are deaf-blind.

The resource centre serves adults who are deaf-blind due to accident, trauma, disease or condition. And since 1996, the resource centre has provided the resources, advocacy and supports such as intervener services, co-ordinating community activities and linking other individuals to other community resources.

To all those who are experiencing deaf-blindness, we recognize the challenges that you face, and our government remains committed to removing those barriers so you may achieve a full destiny.

Thank you for being here today.

MLA Malaya Marcelino (Notre Dame): June 2022 marks deaf and blind awareness month, an opportunity for us all to raise awareness about the distinct experience of Manitobans who are deaf and blind. Deaf-blindness is a unique disability that incorporates the loss of both sight and hearing.

People observe this event in the month of June because it is the birth month of Helen Keller, an extraordinary advocate who lived with deaf-blindness.

Recently, the Manitoba NDP caucus met with folks from Manitoba Possible, Barrier-Free, Abilities Manitoba, Manitoba Supported Employment Network and other folks. They impressed upon us the need for this government to champion the spirit of The

Accessibility for Manitobans Act, which is landmark legislation which was passed unanimously by this House in 2013.

Right now, this government is falling short—no meaningful consultation and very limited implementation of this act. Issues top of mind for disability advocates are ensuring employment opportunities, proper enforcement of the compliance framework and significantly updating 10-year-old building codes.

Manitobans who are deaf-blind can thrive independently with the right supports in place. Manitobans with disabilities are looking for investments in affordable housing, meaningful implementation of the accessibility act, increased employment opportunities through the RFP process and ensuring public spaces are accessible by persons with disabilities.

On behalf of my NDP colleagues and I, we recognize and celebrate the contributions that deaf-blind Manitobans make in their communities, and we will always stand up for all Manitobans with disabilities.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

* (13:50)

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Speaker, I ask leave to speak to the minister's statement.

Madam Speaker: Does the member have leave to respond to the statement? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Gerrard: Madam Speaker, June, this month, deaf-blind awareness month, is an important time for us to pay attention to those who are deaf-blind; individuals with a substantial degree of both hearing and vision loss, the combination of which results in significant difficulties in accessing information, in pursuing educational, vocational, recreational and social goals.

It's estimated that there are about 460,000 deaf-blind individuals in Canada. This is a very substantial number. My father, in the last few years of his life, lost both his sight and his hearing, so I have some personal experience of the impact of losing both sight and hearing.

He was legally blind as a result of acute macular degeneration. His hearing was almost zero without a hearing aid. His hearing loss may have been in part a result of his experiencing a months-long bombardment at Anzio in Italy during the Second World War.

The latter is a reminder of the side effects of war and of what is happening today in Ukraine. His last few years, when he was deaf-blind, were very frustrating ones for him, though he compensated and he persevered in spite of the challenges.

Doing what we can to help those who are deaf-blind, or at risk of becoming deaf-blind, is vital. It is one reason why I've been calling on the government repeatedly to address the long wait-lists for cataract surgery, and why I've been reading so many petitions to ensure those who are older have access to cochlear implants and hearing aids when they need them.

Those who are deaf but do not have access to cochlear implants or hearing aids are at higher risk of becoming isolated and, later on, of having dementia.

For those like Helen Keller who was born deaf-blind, support is critical to enable them to pursue their educational, vocational, recreational and social life goals. We must never stop doing all we can to provide the best support possible for those who are deaf-blind.

Madam Speaker: Further ministerial statements?

The honourable Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Immigration—and I would indicate that the required 90 minutes notice prior to routine proceedings was provided in accordance with rule 26(2).

Would the honourable minister please proceed with his statement.

Ukrainian Refugees in Manitoba—Update

Hon. Jon Reyes (Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Immigration): Madam Speaker, I rise in the House today to update all members on the Ukraine situation.

Our government has taken action since day one, and I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate that Russia's unprovoked attack on Ukraine is tragic and our government condemns the events taking place right now.

We are proud that the first of three charter flights carrying 328 Ukrainian citizens and 39 pets, including a hamster named Chups, landed safely on May 23rd into the Winnipeg international airport. While this was the first round of Ukrainian citizens coming to Winnipeg, we welcome more arrivals in the future.

The work to co-ordinate these arrivals was made possible by the leadership of our Premier (Mrs. Stefanson) and that of the Ukrainian Refugee Task Force and the Deputy Minister Steering Committee. Many community partners, such as the

Ukrainian Canadian Congress, Manitoba, under the steady leadership of Joanne Lewandoski, Nick Krawetz, their staff and volunteers, helped to facilitate the safe arrival at every stage, from the airport, to the welcome reception centre, to integration into the community.

The welcome reception centre, led by staff from the Emergency Measures Organization and the Department of Families, has been second to none. To date, there are nearly 1,500 visits since its opening, and currently over 160 families and individuals are being supported with temporary accommodations, access to a Manitoba Health card and a SIN number and connecting with public health nurses and volunteers from the Ukrainian Canadian Congress.

As well, eligible Ukrainians may also apply to our government's Temporary Assistance Program if they do not have access to other sources of income. Benefits from this program will provide short-term monthly income for basic needs, including transitions to long-term community rental housing and access to health benefits not otherwise covered, such as prescription drugs, dental and optical benefits.

Madam Speaker, we are taking a whole-of-government approach to the Ukraine situation since the war started in February. To date, over \$21 million has been committed, including \$800,000 in direct humanitarian aid; over \$5 million in newcomer support funding; waived the \$500 application fee for Ukrainian nationals; and agreed to cover the costs of medical exams for Ukrainian newcomers to have them update their work permits and get employed in health care, child care and agriculture.

As well, the funding commitment has gone towards mental health supports for Ukrainian citizens, multiple expansions of the refugee reception centre and accommodations, and monies towards the various health-care services.

I also want to thank the many post-secondary institutions who have stepped up during the humanitarian crisis. Not only did they handle the pandemic, but they also pivoted to offer supports for Ukrainian students such as providing domestic tuition parity; offering student scholarships and bursaries; establishing an emergency support fund for tuition, textbooks and meal plans; and offered deferred fee payments for those affected by the war.

On a personal level, for me, to see first-hand the stories of many Ukrainian families arriving to Winnipeg was very heartwarming. On two occasions

at the welcome reception centre, I heard from many individuals say how friendly our province was, how resourceful the staff and volunteers were with any questions they had and the leadership our government did with providing a range of provincial support services once they arrived.

And at a recent tour of an immigrant settlement organization, the Ukrainian individuals and families I met were also in awe of our friendly Manitoba welcome and our nice weather. I did not tell them about our Manitoba winters, but I know they will enjoy our winters very much.

Our caring and compassionate government will continue to welcome as many Ukrainians as possible. We will continue working closely with all government departments, community partners, as well as Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada. And I know that many households and communities across Manitoba will do their part and offer up their homes and hearts to many Ukrainian citizens.

I know that the members opposite like to criticize when they have no plan for the Ukraine situation, but we on this side of the House do have a plan, and over the past four months, all Manitobans have seen our plan in action. We are a government that is taking action for the betterment of Ukrainian citizens wishing to come to Manitoba, the home of hope, Madam Speaker.

Thank you.

Mr. Mark Wasyliv (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, the Russian invasion of Ukraine continues. Putin's illegal war has unleashed untold suffering onto innocent people. Ukrainians persevere against this horrible invasion, determined to protect their homeland and those they love. They are defying all expectations in their successful defence of their country.

And as Ukrainian families flee the country as refugees, Manitobans are stepping up to welcome them into our province. We've seen fundraisers hosted to raise support, families renovating their basements to give new arrivals a place to stay and resettlement experts working hard to help these families adjust to a new place and a new language.

As more Ukrainians arrive in the coming weeks, the Manitoba NDP reiterates our call for measures that can be taken to help support them, like recruiting more refugee resettlement co-ordinators, increasing humanitarian aid to Ukraine and creating an all-party committee to help plan for the long-term resettlement.

As this Legislature breaks, we'll continue to support Ukrainians and their future, both in Eastern Europe and in Manitoba.

Slava Ukraini. [*Glory to Ukraine.*] Heroyam slava. [*Glory to the heroes.*]

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Tyndall Park): Madam Speaker, I ask for leave to respond to the minister's statement.

Madam Speaker: Does the member have leave to respond to the statement? [*Agreed*]

Ms. Lamoureux: I want to begin by thanking the minister for sharing this update with us before we rise for the summer.

Before I get into the update on displaced Ukrainians, I also want to mention the refugees who have come here from Afghanistan. Several of these individuals have joined us today up in the gallery.

Madam Speaker, there are over 180,000 Manitobans with Ukrainian heritage, and that is in part why our Province continues to openly welcome all of those who have been displaced by this unjust war and are resettling here in Canada.

Now, as people begin resettling, there is so much we can be doing to support them. And by supporting these individuals, we are also supporting a free, democratic and independent Ukraine.

So, Madam Speaker, people may be asking, how else can we support?

Well, I am very pleased that this government implemented the request we made on May 18th to have medical exams covered. This contributes to ensuring every displaced individual has continued access to health care.

* (14:00)

In addition to health care, we can help with education, child care, jobs and food security, and all newcomers must also be supported with a sense of security, safety and community. These are all necessities that can help with—that we can help with provincially for a smoother transition.

And just before wrapping up, I want to encourage those who are here in Manitoba to find ways to support individuals as they resettle; and if you are a Ukrainian and are considering coming to Canada, consider exploring Manitoba Operation Blue Skies.

Thank you.

Introduction of Guests

Madam Speaker: Prior to moving into members' statements, we have some guests in the gallery that I would like to introduce to you before they do leave the gallery.

And we have seated in the gallery from École Swan River school 16 grade 7 and 8 students under the direction of Chris Chmelowski, and this group is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Swan River (Mr. Wowchuk).

So, welcome to you, in the Manitoba Legislature.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Daniel Joseph Lalama

Mr. Obby Khan (Fort Whyte): Today gives me great joy to not only highlight a resident in my riding of Fort Whyte, but to highlight someone who is a living example of—with hard work, perseverance, dedication and passion you can reach your dream.

Daniel Joseph Lalama is living proof of this. DJ grew up playing football for the Fort Garry Lions at the young age of seven. He attended St. Paul's High School where he played hockey, football, student council and was on the academic honour roll.

He went on to attend University of Manitoba from 2012 to 2016, where he was a rare gem—and I mean rare gem—where he was an academic and athletic scholar: he was a conference all-star, All-Canadian, Academic All-Canadian and the founder of the Bisons give-back initiative; he has the record for most tackles in a game and a season; he's the CIS defensive player of the year, and much more.

From there DJ went on to battle an uphill—or big-hill battle—making it to the CFL. He was too short, too slow and not strong enough, they said. He was the last pick by the Edmonton Elks in 2016 and everyone had written him off.

But DJ proved all the naysayers wrong, then went on to play another five years in the CFL.

DJ lived his dream by playing for his hometown Blue Bombers in 2019, running onto the field here with his proud mom and dad, Donna and Dave Lalama, in the stands, as they were cheering him on there and they are here today.

DJ has a heart of gold and his desire to give back is always there.

With COVID 2019 disrupting what was the prime of DJ's career, DJ made a tough decision to walk away

from his passion a few weeks ago and move on to the next chapter of his life. For this, I want to recognize DJ for the sacrifice he made to get to where he is in the CFL, but also know when it was time to walk away—the toughest and saddest day in an athlete's career—and DJ did it with humility, grace and for the love of the game.

In the next chapter of his life, DJ was able to fill the rest of his heart with the love of his life, Carley, who he married this off-season.

DJ, you are the living proof of what hard work can do and I'm proud to shine a light on you for all you've accomplished.

Madam Speaker, I would ask that my colleagues stand and recognize DJ for his accomplishment as a former professional athlete but, more importantly, for his role in the community and as a positive role model for thousands of kids to achieve their dreams.

John Morrisseau and Ovide Mercredi

Ms. Amanda Lathlin (The Pas-Kameesak): It is my great honour today to recognize two remarkable individuals and constituents, John Morrisseau and Ovide William Mercredi.

Both were appointed to the Order of Canada by our Governor General Mary Simon on last December, which is one of the country's highest civilian honours to recognize outstanding achievements, dedication to the community and service to the nation. John and Ovide perfectly exemplify the order's Latin motto, which translated means they desire a better country.

John Morrisseau is a residential school survivor and esteemed Métis leader from Grand Rapids, Manitoba. He has done so much in his 82 years that when he learned late last year that he had been appointed to the Order of Canada, he couldn't—and still can't—pinpoint why he was nominated.

Well, John has led a life of service as a Canadian Ranger, member of the Canadian Armed Forces, as a politician and a founding member and president of the Manitoba Métis Federation. John worked as an assistant deputy minister in the Howard Pawley NDP government and later became deputy minister of Northern Affairs. John is now retired but still active as a member of the Indian Residential School Survivor Committee.

Ovide Mercredi is a member and former chief of Misipawistik Cree Nation. He was appointed to the Order of Canada for his leadership and advocacy of Indigenous rights and non-violence. Ovide has a law

degree from the University of Manitoba and was elected regional chief of the Assembly of First Nations for Manitoba in 1989.

Having specialized in constitutional law, Ovide became a Cree—a key strategist for the assembly during the time of Meech Lake Accord constitutional reform discussions and had a strong leadership role in resolving the Oka Crisis.

Later, he was elected as national chief for the Assembly of First Nations and played a major role in the Charlottetown Accord constitutional discussions. In addition to serving as a lawyer and a politician, Ovide is a noted author.

Please join me in congratulating John Morrisseau and Ovide Mercredi, who are exceptional men and leaders in our province, and thank them for their service and tireless dedication in advance—to advance the rights of Indigenous people.

Ekosi.

Jamaican Independence from the UK

Hon. Audrey Gordon (Minister of Health): Madam Speaker, I'm honoured to rise in the Chamber to celebrate the Diamond Jubilee of Jamaica's independence from the United Kingdom.

It was at midnight on August 6, 1962, in the National Stadium in Jamaica, that the Union Jack, the flag of the British Empire that once ruled Jamaica, was lowered for the final time. In its place, the flag of Jamaica, with its bold colours of yellow, black and green, was raised, and so, too, were the hopes and dreams of Jamaicans around the world at the birth of their new independence.

Since then, Jamaica has come a long way. Our presence on the world stage in politics, arts, theatre, sports, music and fashion has been nothing short of magnificent.

Today, Canada and Jamaica benefit from a rich and diverse bilateral relationship, founded on our shared democratic heritage, common values and strong people-to-people ties. We share a large and vibrant Canadian Jamaican community of over 300,000 people, and every one of them has a story.

It is these people, their families and their journey that make this anniversary's theme all that more impactful: Reigniting a Nation for Greatness.

Here in Manitoba, we are the proud home of over 4,000 Jamaicans, and after 60 years, Madam Speaker, Jamaica's national motto Out of Many, One People

stands as true for us all, now more than ever. It is this same tradition of unity in diversity that is so treasured in Canada.

I would like to acknowledge Her Excellency Sharon Miller, Jamaican High Commissioner, who is viewing online. Your steadfast commitment to strengthening our bilateral relationship has been an inspiration to us all.

Madam Speaker, I am also pleased to welcome many members of Manitoba's Jamaican community here in the gallery.

Today we have with us Dr. Lois Stewart-Archer, honorary consul for Jamaica in Winnipeg; Mr. Tony Beach, the president of the Jamaican Association of Manitoba; Mrs. Mavis McLaren, past president; and Donna Taylor, president of the Afro-Caribbean Association of Manitoba.

Every Jamaican living at home and abroad has made a considerable contribution to helping put Jamaica's name on the map.

To everyone in the Jamaican community, as you prepare to celebrate the 60th anniversary of the independence of Jamaica, may you continue to be a symbol of Jamaica's strength, the hope, endurance and successes.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the 60th anniversary of Jamaica's independence. *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

The honourable Minister of Health (Ms. Gordon).

Ms. Gordon: Madam Speaker, I ask for leave to table the full list of guests' names so that they may be included in Hansard.

* (14:10)

Madam Speaker: Is there leave to—*[interjection]* Oh. The member does not need leave. She just needs to give it to Hansard.

Ayodele Abiodun, Mildred Beach, Tony Beach, Carmel Chambers, Diedre Coleman, Diandre Douglas, Azariah Francis, La-Toya Gibbons, Patrice Gilman, Shana Goodridge, Kishaun Haffenden, Neville Hamilton, Dr. Karl B. Koth, Bishop Calvert Layne, Mavis McLaren, Natayla Petrekin, Shereese Porter, Keisha Powell-Ewers, Diana Raynor, Kamta Singh, Dr. Lois Stewart-Archer, Donna Taylor, Kareen Thompson, Nathalie Waite

East Side Eagles Football Club

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): I rise today to congratulate the East Side Eagles Football Club on their 50th anniversary of bringing people together in north-east Winnipeg through sport.

The East Side Eagles were founded in 1972 as a single team playing out of the Chalmers Community club. In 1985, Chalmers burned down and the Eagles moved to Anderson Park as they expanded to include teams of younger ages.

In 1995, they moved again to their current field at Kildonan-East and currently field seven teams, ages seven to 30 years, of all genders. Over time, the field has been significantly upgraded to include artificial turf, which has been widely used by athletes across the province, especially in a wet season like we've had this spring.

Throughout it all, the East Side Eagles Football Club has continued to represent their strong working-class roots by ensuring all youth in northeast Winnipeg feel a sense of belonging in their community through sport.

A big part of their success has been the many volunteers and coaches throughout the years—coaches like Al Leitch, who was recently inducted into the Football Manitoba Hall of Fame. Al began with the East Side Eagles in 1988 as a coach for his kids' team and continued to coach for 10 years. He went on to serve for 17 years as the club rep for the Manitoba Minor Football Association and was instrumental in increasing involvement.

Al has always believed that football should be accessible to everyone, no matter your gender, physical ability, income or background. During the five years he spent as president of the Manitoba Minor Football Association, they saw an increase from 1,200 to 2,100 players.

Through it all, Al has 'remaided' grounded in why he initially got involved. For him, it was—always been about the kids and finding ways to get them on the field to play, no matter the barriers and obstacles in the way.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Manitoba Legislature and in particular, at least a couple of former players here in the Legislature, former Eagles, I want to congratulate and thank Al Leitch and all the coaches and volunteers over the 50 years of East Side Eagles who have made football a point of pride for our community.

We look forward to the next 50 years and beyond.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Sherry Janzen

Hon. Cameron Friesen (Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Sherry Janzen, CEO of Salem Home in Winkler.

Raised in Saskatchewan, Sherry worked as a health-care attendant in a Saskatchewan nursing home. She studied gerontology at Wichita State. And she came to Salem Home in 1991, bringing a vision of a relationship-centred care facility.

Salem has grown over 50 years to be leader in providing long-term home care focused on Christ-centred care, compassion and dignity. Bringing deliberate meaning and purpose to the residents' lives has been Sherry's and her team's mission. Sherry's dedicated her life to residents and the families that she's served. People speak about her using words like mentor, leader, influencer, innovator, cheerleader, teacher and confidante. James Peters, the board chair, says Sherry's biggest priority has been the residents, that they would live in a home-like environment with meaning and purpose.

And under her leadership, Salem has been on the cutting edge of PCH practices. The relationship-centred care model she helped implement with the QUIS-EH-O measurement tool helps residents flourish and received the leading practice designation from Accreditation Canada in 2012.

Salem is—has the only behavioural treatment unit in the province. They were the first to utilize micro-fibre cleaning systems. They're an early adopter of technology. They decentralized dining. They pioneered innovative models like DementiAbility and spiritual-care volunteer program.

Sherry even found a robotic dog on the Internet and is in the process of commissioning it for use by residents. People say it's not safe to give Sherry a magazine because stuff ends up being bought and put in the facility.

Sherry, your commitment, compassion and dedication to the residents of Salem Home these 31 years is to be commended. Throughout the pandemic, you remained strong in the face of uncertainty, adversity and challenging community conditions. I have appreciated our meetings and discussions on policy, PCHs, fundings and care models.

Your retirement is just around the corner, and we wish you well. And also we wish you well in your new role as a member of the group—the advisory group on seniors for the province of Manitoba.

Thank you, Sherry, for a lifetime of service.

Introduction of Guests

Madam Speaker: Prior to oral questions, we have some guests that I would like to introduce to you.

I would like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the public gallery, where we have with us today the 2022-2023 legislative pages who are here to observe proceedings. And we look forward to welcoming you in the fall.

Also in the public gallery, we have with us refugees from Afghanistan and members of the Winnipeg Afghan community, who are the guests of the honourable member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard). And on behalf of all members here we welcome you to our Manitoba Legislature.

* * *

Madam Speaker: It is also now time to say goodbye to our last two pages.

And one of our pages, Abrianna, is serving her last day in the Chamber today, and I wanted to share some of her comments with the House: I am very grateful to have been chosen as a provincial page this past year. It has been an amazing opportunity that I'll never forget. I've got to meet so many incredible people. I now have a greater appreciation for the legislative process here in Manitoba. I admire all the hard work and dedication each and every one of you puts in to make our province a better place every day.

I will be graduating this June from Collège Belivue [*phonetic*], a French immersion high school, and plan to attend the Asper School of Business at the University of Manitoba this upcoming fall. You have inspired me to some day consider a career in politics and to continue all the good work that has been done to improve the lives of Manitobans. I have profound gratitude and respect for each and every one of you, and I thank you again for making my time so memorable.

Introduction of Guests

Madam Speaker: Abrianna is joined today by her parents, Jeri-Lynn and Kevin Graham, brother, Ben, and grandmother, Carol Kreitz.

* * *

Madam Speaker: And we have Chelsea Capellan, who is serving her last day in the Chamber today, and I wanted to share some of her comments with the House.

Chelsea Capellan is a young woman who will be graduating from Springs Christian Academy this year with the intention of pursuing a degree in psychology at the University of Manitoba. In the years to come, she aspires to contribute to her community by being able to provide them with services that will positively impact their mental health, a matter that has been discussed in the Legislative Chamber numerous times.

By being a page, she has developed a new-found understanding of the legislative processes in Manitoba, and she thoroughly enjoyed being able to assist the MLAs, even if it just meant delivering a coffee, tea or retrieving an important document. Her most memorable day was when the member for Burrows (Mr. Brar) acknowledged the sacrifices his parents made when his family first arrived in Manitoba. As an immigrant herself, she appreciated his acknowledgement of the sacrifices immigrant parents make in order to provide their children a life full of opportunities. She is grateful for the opportunity of being able to work in parliament alongside the Speaker, Deputy Speaker, legislative staff and the MLAs, and will use this experience to better serve her community.

So, on behalf of all of us, we wish our two pages all the best as they venture forward into their new path that will take them forward into their new lives.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Surgical Backlog Timeline to Clear

MLA Uzoma Asagwara (Union Station): Madam Speaker, I just want to take a moment to welcome our guests in the Chamber from Afghanistan, and I hope that they're settling into Manitoba—the big Manitoba family—very well, and to congratulate our pages on all their hard work. They're amazing; it's been an absolute joy to have them in the Chamber.

There are tens of thousands of Manitobans waiting for surgeries and tests, and Doctors Manitoba's update is concerning. It shows that there are over 166,000 Manitobans waiting for essential health care. Manitobans are waiting in pain and are demanding accountability. That's why we've called on this government to set a date to clear the surgical backlog.

It's a simple request. It's a choice this government can make to be accountable.

Will the Premier show leadership? Will the Premier set a date to clear the surgical backlog today?

* (14:20)

Hon. Heather Stefanson (Premier): Madam Speaker, as this is the last day of session, I just want to thank you and all the table officers, the Clerk and the pages and everyone who has made this Chamber function and run throughout the session. Thank you all so much, including our Hansard staff, as well; thank you so much for that.

When it comes to the member's question, one thing I'd like to point out is that I think Manitobans want to know that we're moving in the right direction, and I know that Doctors Manitoba has recently indicated that they know that we are tackling the surgical and diagnostic backlogs. They see that we have peaked and that we're moving in the right direction. That is the most important thing, that we ensure that Manitobans are getting the surgeries and the diagnostics when they need them.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Union Station, on a supplementary question.

MLA Asagwara: Madam Speaker, the problem is that over 166,000 Manitobans are not getting the surgeries and tests that they need when they need them. It's disappointing that the Premier has chosen not to set a date to clear the surgical backlog.

We've learned through public reporting there are more Manitobans waiting for surgery than there were just a few months ago, and those Manitobans are waiting longer for hip, knee, cataract surgeries and other important tests. These Manitobans deserve to know when they'll be able to get their surgeries and essential medical services.

So will the Premier show some leadership today and set a date to clear the surgical backlog?

Mrs. Stefanson: Well, Madam Speaker, we have a plan to tackle the surgical and diagnostic backlogs in Manitoba. That include—that is included in our budget that we introduced in the Manitoba—Chamber some weeks ago. It includes \$110 million that will be invested towards decreasing the surgical and diagnostic backlogs.

We know that this has resulted as a result of COVID-19. We know that it's not unique to Manitoba. I had—I was at a Western Premiers' Conference last

week, Madam Speaker. Everyone is having challenges as a result of COVID when it comes to surgical and diagnostic backlogs.

I just want to thank Doctors Manitoba for recognizing that we're making progress.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Union Station, on a final supplementary.

MLA Asagwara: Madam Speaker, the diagnostic tests and surgical backlog—Dr. Matear has actually already made clear those backlogs started before the pandemic. Those lists were growing before COVID ever reached Manitoba's borders.

And the Premier should simply set a date to clear that surgical backlog. That way, tens of thousands of Manitobans waiting for hip, knee and cataract surgeries would know when they could get the procedures that they need. That way, the Premier would be accountable to Manitobans and this House. It's a choice the Premier has to make.

Will the Premier show leadership and set a date to clear the surgical and diagnostic backlog today?

Mrs. Stefanson: Well, Madam Speaker, we are making some headway in the right direction here, and I just want to thank all of those who are working tirelessly on our surgical and diagnostic task force. They are working day in, day out to ensure that we find those innovative solutions to ensure that citizens of Manitoba are able to get those surgeries and diagnostic procedures when they need them.

We have invested \$110 million, Madam Speaker, in surgical and diagnostic backlogs. That was in our recent budget. I'll remind members opposite, what did they do when we are investing record amounts of money in surgical and diagnostic backlogs? They voted against it.

We will take no lessons from members opposite.

Education System Funding Concerns

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): Madam Speaker, after spending \$1.5 million on their failed bill 64 campaign, the PCs have now hired yet another consultant, this time for \$344,000. This time the focus will be on education funding.

Well, we're prepared to save the Premier (Mrs. Stefanson) a few bucks here and just tell her what Manitobans want. They want smaller class sizes and they want no more cuts to education.

Will the Premier start listening to the people of Manitoba, or is just going to be more of the same from this government?

Hon. Wayne Ewasko (Minister of Education and Early Childhood Learning): I appreciate the question from my friend from Concordia who is—must have been a little bit of a opposition shuffle over there, Madam Speaker, and—as he's the new critic for Education.

Just to put some facts on the record, Madam Speaker, we have had record investments in education over the last two years: \$327 million. That's a 17.2 per cent increase over the last two years—17.2 per cent. That's even more than the NDP got in their votes in the Fort Whyte by-election.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Concordia, on a supplementary question.

Mr. Wiebe: Madam Speaker, the reality is is that school funding is nowhere close to keeping up with either inflation or with the higher enrolments. So, while this minister wants to get cheeky, he should know that these cuts have been hurting kids in our classrooms.

Class sizes have grown under this minister's watch; 28 educators in Seven Oaks have been let go; 11 in Brandon. The minister doesn't need to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on an external consultant just to learn that his government is on the wrong track when it comes to education funding.

Will the minister just start to listen to educators, to parents, to students, to people across this province and stop cutting education across Manitoba?

Mr. Ewasko: Madam Speaker, \$327 million over the last two years, 17.2 per cent increase. It's unfortunate that this member from—or, from Concordia—and he might as well join the member from Transcona, because they need to both stand up and apologize today.

They continue to talk about certain things that school divisions are making certain decisions within their school divisions, Madam Speaker. I table the document today that Brandon School Division are open for business. They're hiring. I'm tabling the documents today.

It's the member who needs to apologize today and put on the record that he's going to apologize for the misinformation that he continues to put on the record, Madam Speaker.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Speaker: Order.

The honourable member for Concordia, on a final supplementary.

Mr. Wiebe: Well, the minister doesn't need to take it from me. The Auditor General went ahead and surveyed school leadership. *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Wiebe: The overwhelming majority of them don't believe this government will do what's right and help our kids, especially as they recover from the pandemic.

And at the end of the day, this government has broken trust with families and with educators. They're asking for a new approach. They want to see a government that stands behind them to provide smaller class sizes and resources that keep up with inflation and rising enrolment.

Will the minister listen to the Auditor General, to educators, to school leadership, to parents and students across this province and stop cutting teachers in our schools?

Mr. Ewasko: Madam Speaker, there's so much false information that that member just put on the record, I might have to ask for leave to continue talking for the remainder of question period today.

In fact, the Auditor General said himself that the Department of Education and Early Childhood Learning, Madam Speaker, led an effective kindergarten-to-grade-12 system—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Ewasko:—response to COVID-19. We've got the action plan. We've got Mamāhtawisiwin. We've got the learning for—the framework for learning. We've got so many of our education partners all across—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Ewasko:—this great province of ours commending this government for moving forward and trying to create success for all learners.

I just wish the member for Concordia would stand up and apologize today.

Private Liquor Sales Public Service Revenue

Mr. Adrien Sala (St. James): Madam Speaker, the PCs are privatizing the sale of alcohol in this province.

Information provided by government shows alcohol sold by private providers will take 11 per cent of each product sold from public services. That's millions of dollars less for health and education, and millions more for private corporations. Those are dollars that should go to help pay for our hospitals and our schools.

* (14:30)

Why is the government taking millions from public services?

Hon. Scott Fielding (Minister responsible for the Manitoba Liquor and Lotteries Corporation): Our government is about standing up for consumers, Madam Speaker. We know that Manitobans want convenience, we know that Manitobans want choice and we know that Manitobans also want a modernized system, and that is the difference between our government and the NDP.

We have a plan to make life more easy and accessible for many Manitobans when they're doing their shopping. This means over 70 different locations in Manitoba where people can buy their alcohol just in Winnipeg alone, and over 170 different locations in rural Manitoba. That will make life more convenient for Manitobans.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for St. James, on a supplementary question.

Mr. Sala: Madam Speaker, the PC government's own information shows millions will be lost for health and education because of the government's plans. Retail liquor products have a markup of over 11 per cent, which will now be given to private providers instead of supporting services that Manitobans rely on. That's a tremendous transfer of public wealth. These are funds for our hospitals and for our schools.

Why is the government taking millions from public services?

Mr. Fielding: The member is just wrong.

We know right now that over 70 per cent of the volume of liquor is sold in the private sector right now, Madam Speaker. That's choice that's there. What Manitobans will get with this new legislation is more convenience.

If you're in the city of Winnipeg, over 70 different locations to buy your wine, spirits and other products like this. Same thing in rural Manitoba, Madam Speaker: over 169 different locations where Manitobans can go. What that means is convenience,

it means better choice and it means a more modernized system like other provinces.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for St. James, on a final supplementary.

Mr. Sala: Madam Speaker, the minister is counting every drop of wine and beer sold at restaurants as part of that 70 per cent. We're talking about alcohol sold in our liquor commissions.

This government is trying to mislead Manitobans. Retail liquor products have a markup of over 11 per cent. We're talking about millions of dollars or more. These are funds for public benefit for our schools, our hospitals and our roads. Manitobans deserve to know how much revenue is being lost.

Will the minister table the documents? How much public money will soon go to private benefit?

Mr. Fielding: This is something—legislation that we know Manitobans want. They want a more modernized system, Madam Speaker. They want more choice. They want more convenience when they're buying their alcohol products.

We know that the liquor commissions are—
[interjection]

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Fielding:—Liquor Marts are doing a very good job and Manitobans love the experiences. What we want is to make sure there's a more modernized system and there's even enhanced services and supports for Manitobans when they make their choice of where they buy alcohol.

That's what our plan is. We want to know what the NDP's plan is.

Violence Against MMIWG2S People Request for Action Plan to Address

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): Within the last three weeks, Madam Speaker, we have lost Rebecca Contois, age 24; Doris Trout, age 25; and Tessa Perrier [phonetic]—Perry, age 31, who have all been murdered. On behalf of our NDP caucus, our profound and deepest condolences to each of their families and the communities.

The loss of these women illustrates the continued epidemic levels of violence against Indigenous women, girls and two-spirited. I, alongside the Indigenous collective community here in Manitoba, are increasingly frustrated and disappointed by the

lack of response by this PC caucus and, in particular, by the new Premier (Mrs. Stefanson).

This is a crisis. Will the Premier actually start addressing the crisis of MMIWG2S today?

Hon. Rochelle Squires (Minister responsible for the Status of Women): On behalf of our government, we also do extend our condolences to the families and the loved ones, for these women and their lives who were tragically taken all too soon.

Our government recognizes that gender-based violence and intimate partner violence is a significant threat facing women in this province, and particularly that Indigenous women are disproportionately represented. That's why I was very honoured the other day to host Diane Redsky from the Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata, who came to support a piece of legislation that this government introduced that will put greater tools in the hands of people to protect themselves against violence and greater tools for all of community, including law enforcement, to ensure that we can put an end to these tragic deaths.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for St. Johns, on a supplementary question.

Ms. Fontaine: The murders of Rebecca, Doris and Tessa should be a cause for concern for this PC government, for all communities and, quite frankly, for all Manitobans.

I cannot stress this enough, that this is an ongoing genocide of Indigenous women, girls and two-spirited. We, as Indigenous women, should be able to live safely and wholly in our communities and be able to thrive. There should be some kind of sense of urgency on behalf of the PC caucus to address this issue in a comprehensive and strategic manner, Madam Speaker. And yet, we see nothing.

Will the Premier finally commit to taking urgent action on the issue of missing and murdered Indigenous women and girls and two-spirited today?

Hon. Alan Lagimodiere (Minister of Indigenous Reconciliation and Northern Relations): MMIWG continues to be a pressing and extremely important issue. And part of this is intimate partner violence.

This is why I'm so pleased and proud of my colleagues, the members for Riel and Steinbach, on their work in introducing Clare's Law before the House and for increasing awareness of intimate partner violence for all Manitobans.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for St. Johns, on a final supplementary.

Ms. Fontaine: Last night, the member for Point Douglas (Mrs. Smith) attended a vigil that had hundreds of people there in honour of Tessa Perrier [*phonetic*], including teachers and friends of her children.

This is the third vigil in just a matter of weeks, Madam Speaker. Vigils come downstream from a series of systemic realities that face Indigenous women, girls and two-spirited and put us more at risk. For some, we need social safety—social housing and increased and—resources for women's shelters, who are often forced to turn away Indigenous women and their children, who are still operating at the same levels as 2016.

Will the Premier get up in the House today and commit to a comprehensive housing strategy for Indigenous women?

Ms. Squires: Following up on a Throne Speech commitment that our Premier had made just this past fall, our government invested more than \$5 million in enhanced supports for domestic violence shelters.

A lot of this included operating dollars so that the shelters could increase their capacity so that they could continue to serve the community that greatly needs them. And I'd like to remind a—members opposite that it was—really disappointed that they voted against those dollars that went into these shelters that are on the front lines of intimate partner violence every day of the year.

They voted against that.

Paid Sick Leave Request for Program

MLA Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon): With the cost of living going up every day, it's more important than ever that workers have paid sick leave. Many Manitoba workers are being forced to go to work when they are sick, because they simply can't afford to stay home. Paid sick leave would solve this and keep people safe. The minister can take action today.

Will the minister implement a permanent paid sick leave program for Manitoba workers and Manitoba families today?

Hon. Reg Helwer (Minister of Labour, Consumer Protection and Government Services): Well, Manitoba's current approach to sick days is consistent with most other jurisdictions.

Now, we pay attention to what's happening in other provinces and, in fact, we were the first to—in-jurisdiction to introduce paid sick leave through the COVID supports that we had, with the minister of Finance, Mr. Deputy—Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Flin Flon, on a supplementary question.

MLA Lindsey: This government is far from first in many things when it comes to workers. Minimum wage, for example.

* (14:40)

Too many Manitobans have to choose between staying home when they're sick or going to work. This is true even more so now. Gas prices are going up. Food prices are going up. This government keeps cranking up hydro rates. People can't afford to stay home when they're sick.

This government could address this issue today by implementing a paid sick leave program.

Will they do so?

Mr. Helwer: We—as I said before, we are consistent with what happens in other jurisdictions.

What is not consistent, Madam Speaker, is the affordability that it is—that we have enabled for Manitobans. Manitoba is a much more affordable province in which to live than many other jurisdictions, thanks to the changes that we have made through several budgets.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Flin Flon, on a final supplementary.

MLA Lindsey: Madam Speaker, I don't know what dream world that minister is living in, but clearly it's not the same world that Manitoba workers are forced to live in without paid sick leave. They can't afford to stay home and pay their bills if they get sick.

So, the minister could do the right thing, maybe even lead for a change rather than be dead last all the time in doing the right thing.

Will he introduce paid sick leave today?

Mr. Helwer: Well, on May 7th, 2021, Manitoba introduced the Manitoba Pandemic Sick Leave program, which provides employers with up to \$600 per employee for up to five full days of a COVID-19-related sick leave to fill gaps in coverage provided by the federal government.

This is something that we were the first province in Canada—among the first provinces in Canada to do, Madam Speaker, in addition to all the affordability measures that we have put into place.

Vulnerable Indigenous Women and Girls Addiction Treatment and Housing Supports

Mrs. Bernadette Smith (Point Douglas): Three Indigenous women were murdered in the last three weeks here in Manitoba. Desperate action is needed now more than ever. This is a life-or-death situation. Much more needs to be done to address homelessness and addiction.

The government has an opportunity to support people where they are at to make sure that they can get access to the services that they need.

Will the minister support a real strategy to address homelessness and addiction today?

Hon. Rochelle Squires (Minister responsible for the Status of Women): I would like to thank the nearly 400 Manitobans, including 100 Manitobans with a lived experience in being unsheltered, for their input in our whole-of-government strategy on combatting homelessness. It was a commitment that our Premier (Mrs. Stefanson) had made in the Throne Speech and a commitment that this government is going to live up to in addressing the homelessness situation and ensuring that all Manitobans have a safe, affordable access to a place to call home.

Our government was also very proud to stand with the Clan Mothers and make a significant contribution to their healing village, because we believe that more supports need to be done, and their model of land-based healing, we believe, will get the right supports to the right individuals. And we'd like to thank the Clan Mothers Healing Village for the work that they're doing to improve the lives of Indigenous women in the province of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Point Douglas, on a supplementary question.

Mrs. Smith: The recent string of murders shows that not enough is being done to protect Indigenous women and girls in our province. Urgent action is needed today.

Two Indigenous women at Tessa's vigil last night approached me and shared that they recently left a domestic abusive relationship. They put in for a Manitoba Housing transfer and are living in fear waiting for this transfer. Housing and addiction support

needs to be greatly enhanced and it needs to be enhanced today. We need to keep women safe in this province.

Will the minister support real and immediate supports to housing here in Manitoba so women like this don't have to sit in fear while waiting to get transferred in Manitoba Housing?

Ms. Squires: Our government is committed to creating safe and affordable housing for all Manitobans.

That is why we've created more than 745 housing units, since we formed office, at a price of \$110 million. That is why we signed onto the National Housing Strategy and that is why we're moving forward with many initiatives to get new housing in the community.

And if the members opposite would like to bring the names forward or put me in touch with the constituents that she met with that are experiencing challenges, I'd be more than happy to look into that.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Point Douglas, on a final supplementary.

Mrs. Smith: I thank the minister for that, and I will connect with her after that—after this on that.

Four hundred and seven Manitobans lost their life last year to addictions. Addictions and the lack of housing leave far too many Indigenous women, girls vulnerable to violence. Much more needs to be done to help support folks where they are at and ensure their safety. The government has the power to address this with safe consumption sites and more investments in social housing.

Will the minister support safe consumption sites and greatly increase the investments in social housing here in Manitoba?

Hon. Sarah Guillemard (Minister of Mental Health and Community Wellness): The member is right that there needs to be more done for the—Manitobans who are dealing with addictions issues, which is why our government has invested over \$58.1 million in 40 initiatives since 2019. We've also increased our budget \$17.3 million in this year's budget alone to support people with mental health and addictions issues.

We have fulfilled our promise to build 100 supportive recovering housing beds—that's over two

years, Madam Speaker—which is the equivalent number of beds that the NDP had built in 17 years in government.

There is more to do. We are determined to get it done, and I'd be happy to work with the member opposite on initiatives.

Thank you.

Government's Management of Health Care Prairie Mountain Health Report Findings

Mr. Dougald Lamont (St. Boniface): Prairie Mountain Health in Westman is looking at losing 20 doctors by the end of the summer, and we're hearing Winkler will lose another three.

I table a report, virtually, from Prairie Mountain Health that shows that while one third of physicians across Canada are experiencing burnout, depression and even suicidal ideation, in Prairie Mountain Health, it's half: 49 per cent. Two thirds of those doctors say excessive job demands are the problem, and 20 more doctors leaving is going to make it worse, not better.

We've heard from folks in Westman. They feel this government has abandoned anyone who lives north of the Trans-Canada, and it's up to communities to the—do the recruiting.

If it's up to communities, what is Shared Health doing? What is this Premier (Mrs. Stefanson) doing to stop the bleeding in our health-care system and keep doctors working in rural Manitoba?

Hon. Audrey Gordon (Minister of Health): I thank the member for St. Boniface for the question. And these are challenging times, and it's challenging in terms of the added pressures related to the COVID pandemic, and it is very challenging, of course, in our rural communities to maintain the staffing levels. But our government is committed to ensuring that all areas of the province are provided with the medical professionals and services that they need.

And that's why, Madam Speaker, we have made this record investment of \$7.2 billion. It's also why I have gone across the province and will continue to do that to hear directly from the regions what their challenges are so that we can develop solutions to those challenges.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for St. Boniface, on a supplementary question.

Mr. Lamont: We all know there's a pandemic happening everywhere. Inflation is a problem happening

everywhere. Global warming is a problem that's happening everywhere. But health care is run by this provincial government, and there's only one party that's been running it and ruining it for the last six years.

Lots of other places have shortages, but not every province has doctors and nurses leaving in droves because the government isn't supporting or listening to them. And that's what half the doctors in Prairie Mountain Health say, that ineffective leadership and inflexible workplace policies are making things worse, because when doctors are asked for their opinions—and this is a quote—it often seems like a decision or a plan has already been made. End quote.

One reason they are leaving is because government isn't listening. Is that going to change?

Ms. Gordon: The member for St. Boniface is wrong.

We are listening, Madam Speaker. That is why our government invested \$812 million to build, expand and fix health-care facilities in all regions through the clinical preventative services plan. That's why we're looking at development of a northern hub so that individuals can get care closer to home. That is why I was so pleased to join my colleague in the Interlake-Eastern Regional Health Authority last year to welcome internationally educated medical graduates to the region.

* (14:50)

Madam Speaker, we're going to continue to work with the University of Manitoba Rady faculty to ensure we have physicians and clinicians throughout the province.

Regulation of Therapy Services Request to Establish

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Tyndall Park): Madam Speaker, over the last year I have continued to push for therapy to be regulated here in Manitoba. The need for mental health resources continues to rise, and we need to ensure that therapy is accessible and affordable, that there is a standard of care from trained professionals, and that mechanisms are in place to protect the public and hold therapists accountable.

Madam Speaker, regulating therapy would alleviate stress and save money in many departments, including health care, Education and Justice. There is currently no regulation for therapy, and Manitoba needs immediate oversight as a first step to addressing the long-standing issue.

What is the minister doing to ensure we don't keep falling behind on this important issue?

Hon. Audrey Gordon (Minister of Health): I'm pleased to provide the member for Tyndall Park with an update.

After receiving the proposal from the counsellors and therapists across the province, it was referred to the regulated health professionals association. That is before them, Madam Speaker. There's a process we have to go through to identify what type of regulation is required, and that process is under way.

Pleased to update the member after the process has concluded.

Voluntary Intoxication and Violent Crime Supreme Court of Canada Ruling

Mr. James Teitsma (Radisson): Recently, the Supreme Court made a decision that allowed the defence of extreme intoxication for violent crimes. This quickly became a significant concern for Manitobans and for all Canadians. The victims of these violent attacks are often women and children.

I immediately began to work with the Minister of Justice to call on the federal government to address this issue. I brought forward yesterday a resolution to do just that. Unfortunately, the NDP sided with violent criminals and refused to pass this resolution.

Can the minister explain concrete steps our government is taking, despite the NDP blocking this important resolution?

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I want to thank the MLA for Radisson, who is a strong advocate for children, seniors and others who might be vulnerable to violent offences, particularly sexual offences.

He did bring forward a resolution yesterday because Canadians were rightfully very concerned when the Supreme Court of Canada made a decision that said voluntary extreme intoxication could be used as a defence against violent offences—fencers, often sexual offenders, Madam Speaker.

We have written, as a government, to the federal Minister of Justice, asked them to fill this gap, to change this legislation, Madam Speaker. We've talked to and written to other Attorneys General. I'll continue to work with my colleagues across Canada.

I appreciate the member for Radisson for bringing this forward.

We'll stand with victims even when the NDP won't, Madam Speaker.

Provincial Parks Safety Concerns

Ms. Lisa Naylor (Wolseley): You know, it's actually hard to stand and ask this question with this degree of misogyny going on in the House.

We know how important Manitoba's provincial parks are to Manitobans and, unfortunately, recent weather events have caused a lot of damage to our parks. Flooding has washed out access roads and has damaged campsites. Many reservations had to be cancelled for safety reasons.

The government needs to make appropriate investments in a timely manner to repair and clean up our parks.

Will the minister make this commitment today?

Hon. Jeff Wharton (Minister of Environment, Climate and Parks): Certainly, pleased to get up to answer a question regarding our parks, Madam Speaker. We know that parks were not a priority for the former government, under the NDP. We know that cuts were made over several years while they were in government.

We are committed, as a government, to ensure that the right investment at the right time for our parks is taking place. It's exactly what we're going to endeavour to do over the coming weeks, months and years.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Wolseley, on a supplementary question.

Ms. Naylor: I know the minister's new to this portfolio, but he might want to look back in the budget at the subsequent cuts that were made over the first few years his government was in power.

Provincial parks are where Manitobans go to vacation and spend time with their families. It's important that our parks are safe for everyone.

Safety issues at Grand Beach have been raised by advocates, yet they were told that addressing these concerns would be too expensive. They want more staff on site, a designated boat on standby for emergencies to help prevent drownings.

The minister could address these safety concerns by implementing their recommendations: Will he do so today?

Mr. Wharton: Again, we'll take no lessons from the NDP on—when it comes to investments in parks, Madam Speaker. We know that the NDP cut parks' budget by—tunes of millions of dollars—we know they did it. And I can tell you, they held the program—they froze the program from 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, '12, '13, '14 and, yes, before Manitobans threw them out, they even closed the budget in 2016.

We will ensure that parks have the investment and Manitobans have the ability to go to our parks and enjoy all the services that Manitobans deserve.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Wolseley, on a final supplementary.

Ms. Naylor: Madam Speaker, safety issues in Manitoba's provincial parks need to be addressed today, in 2022.

Grand Beach community advocates are frustrated that this government hasn't taken their safety concerns seriously. We know two children drowned at Grand Beach several years ago, and there was a near drowning last summer of multiple people in one event.

Advocates want investments to be made to prevent drowning and more staff on site, a rescue boat nearby, but this government has told them it would be too expensive to invest to prevent drownings. We're not satisfied with that answer.

Will the minister commit to implementing additional safety measures today?

Hon. Rochelle Squires (Minister responsible for the Status of Women): Madam Speaker, in response to the member for Wolseley's preamble, I would like to put on the record that, when our Justice Minister stands up for survivors of sexual violence, that is not misogyny; that is compassionate.

Catalytic Converter Theft Initiatives to Prevent

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): My question is to the Premier. The government needs more than Bill 9 to prevent catalytic converter theft. Between 2020 and 2021, MPI reports a 450 per cent increase in catalytic converter theft; 2022 promises to even be worse.

A few weeks ago, a seniors block in my riding had their parking lot targeted.

Our bill, 234, requires car dealers to add vehicle identification numbers on the catalytic converter on every vehicle sold by the dealership, new and used cars. This government should also direct MPI to

provide insurance discounts to drivers who get their VIN engraved on the part.

Will the minister support these initiatives?

And I have a recent CanStar news article that I would like to table dealing with the thefts from the block in my riding.

Hon. Heather Stefanson (Premier): Well, Madam Speaker, today is the last day of session, and all I can say for members opposite is each and every day they stood in this House and they put false information on the record. They are negative nabobs of negativity—nattering nabobs of negativity, nothing but negativity. They have no plan, no vision for the future of our province.

* (15:00)

Well, we have a plan and we have a vision; a plan to strengthen health care, a plan to rebuild our economy—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Stefanson: —Madam Speaker, a plan to protect our environment, to invest in our communities. There is going to be a better, brighter future for our province here in Manitoba because of our plan.

Thank you to all Manitobans out there. And I say to everyone in the Chamber: Have a wonderful summer.

Madam Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

* (15:00)

Speaker's Ruling

Madam Speaker: I have a ruling for the House.

Prior to routine proceedings on Thursday, May 26, 2022, the honourable Official Opposition House Leader (Ms. Fontaine) raised a matter of privilege contending that on the previous day, the honourable Minister of Natural Resources and Northern Development (Mr. Fielding) had made numerous comments to the media in relation to Bill 42, even though the bill had yet to be introduced or distributed in the Assembly.

At the conclusion of her remarks, the honourable Official Opposition House Leader moved, and I quote: that the introduction of Bill 42 be immediately stopped and treated as being out of order until such a time as this matter can be ruled on by the Speaker. End quote.

The honourable Government House Leader (Mr. Goertzen) also offered contributions to the Chair, and noted that it is a common occurrence for governments to signal that legislation is coming. He also stated that the text of legislation was not shared with shareholders.

The honourable member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard) opined that a government may mention a bill is coming; however, it is inappropriate to share details.

I took the matter under advisement in order to consult the procedural authorities.

There are two conditions that must be satisfied in order for a matter raised to be ruled in order as a prima facie case of privilege: was the issue raised at the earliest opportunity, and was sufficient evidence provided to support the member's claim that their privileges or the privileges of the House were breached.

On the first issue of whether the issue was raised at the earliest opportunity, the honourable member indicated she was raising the issue at the earliest opportunity, and I accept the word of the honourable member.

On the second issue whether sufficient evidence was provided, there are a number of considerations to explore.

I will note that the underlying principle here is the primacy and authority of the Assembly. As elected representatives it is our duty to carefully consider the business before us so that we may make informed decisions. Any matter destined for consideration by this body—including legislation—should be introduced and explained here first before it is shared with the public or the media. This has been the practice of this place for many years.

The honourable Official Opposition House Leader (Ms. Fontaine) noted that in 2001, House of Commons Speaker Peter Milliken had ruled that the provision of information concerning legislation to the media without effective measures to secure the rights of the House constituted a prima facie case of contempt, which is indeed what he ruled on that occasion.

However, on May 13, 2003, Speaker Milliken also ruled that a burden of proof existed in order to achieve a finding of a prima facie breach of privilege in order to a claim of disclosure of a bill to the media before distribution to members of Parliament. He stated, and I quote: Unless there is some considerable evidence that the minister has made available copies

of the bill to someone else, it is hard for the Chair to find any breach of privileges of the House. End quote.

He went on to say, quote: Of course, the honourable member I am sure will monitor the situation closely and watch and see if copies are being bandied about in advance, which I admit might be a breach of the privileges if that sort of thing were going on. We do not have evidence of that at the moment, so there is no question of privilege here. End quote.

In turning to the case associated with this matter of privilege, the claim for a valid prima facie case of privilege is hampered by the fact that the honourable Official Opposition Leader did not provide any proof that the minister gave the media copies of the bill or substantive details about the legislation.

In looking at an online article from the Free Press on May 25th, 2022, it notes that the minister answered questions from the media at a scrum, but the event was not described as a briefing, nor was it reported that copies of the legislation were provided to the media. The same article has the minister indicating that a new bill is coming to provide a more modern alcohol delivery system and that he consulted with stakeholders. However, the minister is also quoted as saying he could not share specifics of the bill before its introduction in the Chamber.

In recent years, it has become more commonplace for members on both sides of the House to discuss, in general or conceptual terms, potential legislation outside of the House in advance of introduction. These discussions have occurred in the form of consultations with stakeholders and also through interactions with the media. I would give the caution to all members that such discussions must not reveal or relate any detailed provisions of upcoming legislation to ensure that the primacy and authority of the Assembly is not infringed on. To aid in this matter, members might consider having press conferences or media briefings after legislation has been introduced.

In the current circumstance, no specific evidence was provided that the media received copies of the legislation or detailed information about specifics of the bill. This is a crucial point, because in the absence of such proof, it is difficult for a presiding officer to rule that any privileges were breached.

Accordingly, after careful consideration of the matter, I am ruling that a prima facie case of privilege has not been established.

I would further like to note that the motion moved by the honourable Official Opposition Leader contained a procedural irregularity in that it called for first reading of the bill to be prevented. In consideration of this, such an action would not be taken until the Speaker has returned to the House with a ruling finding a prima facie case of privilege and the House also adopting the motion containing the remedy sought by the Official Opposition House Leader. Had the first reading been prevented from happening when the matter was first raised, and had the matter of privilege not been found prima facie, then a member would have been unfairly prevented from introducing a bill.

As I explained to the House when ruling on a related point of order raised on May 26th, I have concerns about the potential use of parliamentary privilege to prevent a member from introducing a bill, as it could be unduly punitive, and it could also develop into a routine tactic to prevent members from one side of the House or the other from introducing a bill.

Members can assist with this potential concern by ensuring they are not providing copies of a bill or details of a bill to the media and stakeholders, and they can save themselves a world of grief by holding press conferences after the bill has been introduced.

And clarification for the House: I would just like to indicate that in one of the sentences, it should have said, I would further like to note that the motion moved by the honourable Official Opposition House Leader (Ms. Fontaine) contained a procedural irregularity. And I would like to ensure that this is corrected in Hansard.

Speaker's Statement

Madam Speaker: I also have a statement for the House.

As the House is adjourning for the summer today, I would encourage all honourable members to remove the contents of their desks now. I would further encourage members to recycle as much of the material as possible. The blue bins here in the Chamber are designated for recycling of Hansards only. Any other material you would like to recycle may be placed in the larger recycling bins in the message rooms located just outside the Chamber.

PETITIONS

Hearing Aids

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to this petition is as follows:

A hearing aid is a battery-powered electronic device designed to improve an individual's ability to perceive sound. Worn in or behind a person's ear, they make some sounds louder, helping people hear better when it's quiet and when it's noisy.

* (15:10)

People who suffer hearing loss, whether due to aging, illness, employment or accident, not only lose the ability to communicate effectively with friends, family or colleagues, they also can experience unemployment, social isolation and struggles with mental health.

Hearing loss can also impact the safety of an individual with hearing loss, as it affects the ability of—[interjection]

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Gerrard: —to hear cars coming, safety alarms, call 911, et cetera.

A global commission on the state of the research for dementia care and prevention released an updated consensus report in July 2020, identifying 12 key risk factors for dementia and cognitive decline. The strongest 'riks' factor was—that was indicated was hearing loss. It was calculated that up to 8 per cent of the total number of dementia cases could potentially be avoided with management of hearing loss.

Hearing aids are therefore essential to the mental health and well-being of Manitobans, especially to those at significant risk of dementia, Alzheimer's, a disorder of the brain affecting cognition in the ever-growing senior population.

Audiologists are health-care professionals who help patients decide which kind of hearing aid will work best for them, based on the type of hearing loss, patient's age and ability to manage small devices, lifestyle and ability to afford.

The cost of hearing aids can be prohibitive to many Manitobans, depending on their income and circumstances. Hearing aids cost on average \$995 to \$4,000 per ear, and many professionals say the hearing aids only work at their best for five years.

Manitoba residents under the age of 18 who require a hearing aid, as prescribed by an otolaryngologist or audiologist, will receive either an 80 per cent reimbursement from Manitoba Health of a fixed amount for an analog device, up to a maximum of \$500 per ear, or 80 per cent of a fixed amount of a

digital or analog programmable device, up to a maximum of \$1,800. However, this reimbursement is not available to Manitobans who need the device who are over the age of 18, which will result in financial hardship for many young people entering the workforce, students and families. In addition, seniors representing 14.3 per cent of Manitoba's population are not eligible for reimbursement, despite being the group most likely in need of a hearing aid.

Most insurance companies only provide a minimal partial cost of a hearing aid, and many Manitobans, especially retired persons, old-age pensioners and other low-income earners do not have access to health insurance plans.

The Province of Quebec's hearing devices program covers all costs related to hearing aids and assistive listening devices, including the purchase, repair and replacement.

Alberta offers subsidies to all seniors 65 and over and low-income adults 18 to 64 once every five years.

New Brunswick provides coverage for the purchase and maintenance not covered by other agencies or private health insurance plans, as well as assistance for those for whom the purchase would cause financial hardship.

Manitobans over age 18 are only eligible for support for hearing aids if they're receiving Employment and Income Assistance, and the reimbursement only provides a maximum of \$500 an ear.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to consider hearing loss as a medical treatment under Manitoba Health.

To urge the provincial government to provide income-based coverage for hearing aids to all who need them, as hearing has been proven to be essential to Manitobans' cognitive, mental and social health and well-being.

Signed by Sharon Neufeld, Darren *[phonetic]*, Bruce Gehlert and many other Manitobans.

Madam Speaker: In accordance with our rule 132(6), when petitions are read they are deemed to be received by the House.

Catalytic Converter Engraving Credit

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background of this petition is as follows:

(1) The spike in catalytic converter thefts occurring across North America has hit Winnipeg. The price of precious metals in catalytic converters like rhodium, palladium and platinum are worth thousands of dollars an ounce. Scrap metal dealers have catalytic converters priced to the vehicle, with some catalytic converters worth \$800.

(2) Organized groups of criminals are climbing under vehicles and cutting catalytic converters, and selling them to scrap metal recyclers for cash without any record of these transactions.

(3) Catalytic converter thefts cost consumers about \$2,000 for each replacement. Manitoba Public Insurance charges a betterment fee for new replacements, so insurance doesn't cover the full cost.

(4) Catalytic converters do not have any part number or vehicle identification number, VIN, and the inability to tie a catalytic converter to a specific vehicle is a major enforcement issue.

(5) Engraving of a vehicle's VIN on its catalytic converter would be a major deterrent to theft by tying the vehicle to the part and making enforcement possible.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to bring in consumer protection legislation directing Manitoba Public Insurance to initiate credits to Manitobans for engraving vehicle identification numbers on their catalytic converters.

This petition signed by many, many Manitobans.

Madam Speaker: Are there any further petitions?

If not, grievances.

GRIEVANCES

MLA Uzoma Asagwara (Union Station): Madam Speaker, I rise on a grievance.

The 2022 Winnipeg Pride started on May 27th, just last week, and today marks the first day of Pride across the country.

Also, Winnipeg is hosting the Fierté Canada Pride national human rights conference. It's a conference that has people from across the country attending, including folks participating from Manitoba.

But you wouldn't know any of that, Madam Speaker, from this government, because neither the Premier (Mrs. Stefanson), the Minister for Sport, Culture and Heritage, nor a single PC MLA has bothered to even acknowledge any of it.

These are the first in-person Pride celebrations in years, when many in the 2SLGBTQIA+ community have been disproportionately affected by COVID. Thousands of Manitobans are celebrating themselves, their friends, their loved ones, their community members and communities as a whole.

People are also speaking up to advocate for further advancements of human rights. This is in the spirit of Pride. It is a riot. It is a protest, a reminder that there's still a lot of work to do to accomplish equity and equality in our province, across the country and globally.

That's why my colleague, the MLA for Wolseley, and I, along with our caucus, have been dismayed this week, quite frankly, wondering how it's possible that this government chooses to be silent and minimize the significance of not only Pride but the Manitobans who make Pride truly what it is.

Madam Speaker, it's inexcusable. And it's clearly intentional, and it's harmful. It's harm that this government is knowingly inflicting and that's wrong.

A government is meant to lead. Each member of this Assembly is a leader that citizens look to to help guide their way and set the example for how we want our province to be and our society, more broadly, to be. Manitobans are paying attention. What we say and what we do and what we don't say and what we don't do matters.

We finally have had the privilege of having students in the gallery. I know that we all appreciate this so much. And so, what does the government's silence on this particular issue and area tell those students and their families? And actually, Madam Speaker, I would ask, what does the Government House Leader (Mr. Goertzen) not paying any attention right now and members opposite not paying attention say? What message does that send?

Because this particular issue is important. Members of the 2SLGBTQIA+ community are important. What does this say? What does their silence

say to students who are seeking support as they navigate their queerness, or the students who are supporting their friends who might be a part of the community? They look to us as leaders to help protect them, affirm them and support them, learning in their environments so that they can thrive without any shame or any fear of being—not being accepted. But they don't see that leadership that they sorely need from this government.

So, when this government, Madam Speaker, claims to care about Manitobans but chooses to be silent on Transgender Day of Remembrance, chooses to be silent on International Day Against Homophobia, Transphobia & Biphobia and Pride? Manitobans hear a clear message. And it's a message that, in any day and age, never mind in 2022, that this government should be completely ashamed of.

* (15:20)

The message that Manitobans hear from the Premier (Mrs. Stefanson) and the PCs is that they don't actually care about equality. They don't actually care about equity, and certainly not when it comes to 2SLGBTQIA+ peoples, Manitobans. Because, if they did, Madam Speaker, they would simply say it. They would simply say it and acknowledge it in this House.

And so I'm saying that this government needs to do better. I'm saying that anything less than speaking up and acknowledging these important moments and days and festivals in our communities, especially during these times, Madam Speaker, especially when people are looking to leaders now more than ever, it's not acceptable. It's not acceptable that they don't speak up.

They have a role to play in advancing equity. They have a role to play in advancing human rights. And they have a critical role in making sure that the voices of all Manitobans are reflected and heard in this Legislature.

And I wish I could say that I have the confidence that they would do that. I wish I had that hope, because that is the hope that Manitobans need right now. That is the hope that Manitobans, coming through this pandemic in communities that have been so affected, so disproportionately harmed and ignored by this government during the pandemic, they need to believe this government will stand up and do the right thing. They needed to believe a new Premier would do that—change the narrative and start a new path—and she and her caucus, her government, has failed to do so.

So, what I say to the Manitobans who are struggling right now with feelings of being accepted or being accepted in your communities, to those people who are looking for leaders to show them what acceptance and affirmation and compassion and love looks like, I can tell you with full confidence that our NDP team is here for you. We see you. We lift you up—and not just during Pride—we do this every single day of the year. You can count on that.

Thank you.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

House Business

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Government House Leader): Madam Speaker, I have a number of leave requests related to House business this afternoon.

Could you please canvass the House and members for leave: (1) to allow the Government House Leader to call concurrence and third readings today on all remaining specified bills in an order other than what is listed on the Order Paper; (2) to allow the Government House Leader to call, without notice, a motion to extend the Sessional Order governing virtual sittings; (3) to allow the Government House Leader to call, without notice, a motion to concur in the first report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House; and (4) to allow the Standing Committee on Public Accounts to consider the Auditor General's report titled Department of Infrastructure: Oversight of Commercial Vehicle Safety, dated December 2019, despite it having been passed by the committee on June 10th of 2020.

Madam Speaker: Is there leave: (1) to allow the Government House Leader to call concurrence and third readings today on all remaining specified bills in an order other than what is listed on the Order Paper; (2) to allow the Government House Leader to call, without notice, a motion to extend the Sessional Order governing virtual sittings; (3) to allow the Government House Leader to call, without notice, a motion to concur in the first report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House; and (4) to allow the Standing Committee on Public Accounts to consider the Auditor General's report titled Department of Infrastructure: Oversight of Commercial Vehicle Safety, dated December 2019, despite it having been passed by the committee on June 10th of 2020?

Is there leave? *[Agreed]*

GOVERNMENT MOTION

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Government House Leader): So I'll first deal with the issue of the—extending the Sessional Order.

So, I move, seconded by the member for St. Johns (Ms. Fontaine), that the Sessional Order passed by this House on October 7th, 2020, and subsequently amended, by further amended—oh, sorry—be further amended so that in the first paragraph, June 10, 2022, is replaced by: December 1st, 2022.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the honourable member for St. Johns, that the Sessional Order passed by this House on October 7th, 2020, and subsequently amended, be further debated—pardon me—be further amended so that in the first paragraph, June 10th, 2022, is replaced by: December 1st, 2022.

Madam Speaker: The honourable Minister of Justice—*[interjection]* Oh.

Are there any members wishing to debate?

If not, is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is extending the Sessional Order request put forward by the Minister of Justice.

Shall the item pass? *[Agreed]*

The motion is accordingly carried.

CONCURRENCE MOTION

Standing Committee on Rules of the House First Report

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the member for St. Johns, that the first report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House, received on June 1st, 2022, be concurred in.

Motion presented.

Mr. Goertzen: Just to speak briefly to this quickly, Madam Speaker. So, first of all, I want to thank the member for St. Johns, the MLA for River Heights for their discussion and co-operation on a number of things. The first has already been dealt with and that being the issue of extending the sessional agreement and those things that deal with virtual participation.

I've said before and I'll just reiterate that it's been remarkable how this Legislature has been able to continue on through various stages of the pandemic. We, of course, now hope that we're largely on the other side of it, but regardless of where we are, there's been many times where we've needed to rely on the technology to have infrastructure here to continue on to represent people, either virtually or in person, and that is a credit, of course, to you, Madam Speaker, to the Clerk's office, to all those who are involved in the technology.

And I appreciate working with the member for St. Johns (Ms. Fontaine) and the member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard) to ensure that we can continue on with what we've agreed upon.

On the issue of the rules, which is the motion that we're now discussing, I, again—I'm not sure that this is the favourite part of legislators' work when dealing with the rules of the House, but it is a very important part of the work. I know it's some folks' favourite part.

I have had the opportunity, because I've been House leader, you know, probably 14 or 15 years combined, at various stages of my time in opposition and government, to be involved in the rules a lot of time. And I've grown to appreciate the importance of it because it is very internal and it is very specific to the work we do as MLAs, but it's incredibly important, and when you get it right, it certainly, I think, pays dividends. And when you get it wrong, you have to correct it. And coming back and having a continuous effort to redo the rules and look for things that can be improved upon is really important.

And there's portions of these rules where the leader—or MLA for St. Johns, the MLA for River Heights and I came to agreements on how to deal with things like on specified bill dates, for example, and—that are now incorporated in the rules. And I think that that's a great way to do things. We essentially test drove certain things, and now we're incorporating them permanently in the rules because they worked, and they—that won't mean they work for the opposition or work for government or work for the independent members, they work for everybody. And I think that that, sometimes, is lost; that politics sometimes feels like a zero-sum game, that if somebody gains something, somebody else has to lose something. That's not the case when it comes to the legislative rules.

There are lots of things we do that benefit all of us as legislators and allow us to do our job properly. So I'm grateful for working with the two opposition House leaders, and then I'm particularly grateful for

being able to work with our Clerk, Patricia Chaychuk, and our Deputy Clerk, Rick Yarish, and of course, you, Madam Speaker, and others in the Clerk's office, because we ultimately set a broad framework and agree to a structure, but we don't write the legalese and so our job is much easier than theirs. They have to actually put it into a written form and reduce it to writing and then ensure that it all works. And so I thank them for the work that they've done.

* (15:30)

I hope that, whether I am the House leader in the future or not or whomever is the House leader on all sides, that we'll continue that process of looking at the rules. And I would always encourage future legislators to do that and to go under the hood, as it were, Madam Speaker, and to make sure that the engine's running well of this Assembly because it does benefit all of us, and it doesn't have to come at the cost of any of us.

So thank you, again, for all those who were involved in the work, and I look forward to this passing.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (Official Opposition House Leader): I'm going to keep my comments super tight because we are operating on a very tight timeline.

I concur with the Government House Leader (Mr. Goertzen). I say miigwech to him and to the member for River Heights for the good work that was done.

But, more importantly, again—and I will always put this on the official record—we would be lost if it was not for the clerks that guide us through this, take us through really sometimes complicated discussions. We would be lost without both of you—both of them, Madam Speaker. And I just want to say miigwech on behalf of our NDP caucus. I'm sure everybody in the House, we lift you up and honour you for the work that you do.

Miigwech.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Speaker, having gone through this process now of changing the rules a number of times, I want to thank the MLA—the House leader for the government and the House leader for the official opposition, the MLA for St. Johns, and to say thank you for working co-operatively on a task which can be challenging. And we started out with a daunting list of potential rule changes and whittled it down to something which is more manageable. We will have more work to do, obviously, in the days ahead.

But I also want to say a particular thank you to Clerk Patricia Chaychuk and her Deputy Clerk, Rick Yarish, and their supporting staff, because this is a big effort, and, at times, things had to be done very quickly. And we appreciate that you were able to do that and to do it well.

So I look forward to the Chamber working under the new rules when we come back in the fall and thank everybody for participating.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is the first report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House, received on June 1st, 2022—is it the pleasure of the House to adopt—*[interjection]*—be concurred in.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? *[Agreed]*

* * *

Mr. Goertzen: So, we need to deal with four non-specified bills prior to 4 o'clock, before we get into the call of the specified bills. So I'm going to ask for leave of the House to not see the clock at 4 o'clock until we are done with the four specified bills, 37—or non-specified bills, the non-specified bills: 37, 41, 44 and 234.

So, could we not see the clock until those bills are complete?

Madam Speaker: Is there leave of the House to not see the clock at 4 o'clock until the bills the minister indicated have been passed? *[interjection]* I should indicate, then, the bills are 37, 41, 44 and 234.

Agreed? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Goertzen: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I thank the House.

So could you please call for third reading and concurrence the bills 37, 41, 44 and 234.

Madam Speaker: So it has been announced that the House will now consider concurrence and third readings of Bill 37, Bill 41, 44 and 234.

CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS

Bill 37—The International Child Support and Family Maintenance (Hague Convention) Act

Madam Speaker: I will now call, then, concurrence and third reading, Bill 37, The International Child Support and Family Maintenance (Hague Convention) Act.

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I won't speak long on this particular bill. I—*[interjection]* Oh. I'm a rookie, Madam Speaker. Yes, I'm new. Lost in the paper; 19 more years and I'll have this process figured out.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Education, that Bill 37, The International Child Support and Family Maintenance (Hague Convention) Act, now reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Goertzen: I'll try again. As I indicated before, I don't intend to speak long, and then I took five minutes trying to get to the point of me trying to speak.

But this particular bill is important. It follows British Columbia's lead and I believe that other provinces will follow as well. The 2007 Hague Convention on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance allows Manitoba to ultimately be able to get child support for individuals who are residents in Manitoba and may have an order from another jurisdiction which Manitoba doesn't have a bilateral agreement with.

And there are some countries, by virtue of their laws, that they cannot enter into a bilateral agreement with the Province of Manitoba directly. They have to do it with another country; for example, several in the EU, I understand. And so this requires provincial legislation that allows the federal government to ratify the convention at the national level, with—then allows for that agreement to happen between Canada and those countries, but then Manitoba is a participant in it.

Mr. Andrew Micklefield, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

So, as I mentioned in the question-and-answer period of this bill, we don't expect, though, to be hundreds of applicants, but there will be certainly some who come forward from these countries and who need—and there could be reciprocity, of course, if they're in—living in one of those countries and have a Manitoba order. But there will be some who will come forward and say, we have an order in another country, can you please enforce that order using the enforcement mechanisms that we have here in Manitoba.

And for those individual families, as few as they may be, it'll be critical and very, very important and I know that all members of this House—and it's already

been expressed—see this as important to ensure that we have the ability to enforce those orders.

So, with those few words, I thank the members opposite for their committed support on this bill. I thank department officials for bringing it forward. And we look forward to the federal government doing what they need to do on the ratification process in Parliament to allow this to be enacted in Manitoba.

Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): I will keep my comments short.

We are in support of Bill 37. As I've said previously in this House and at committee, it's important for legislators to bring forward pieces of legislation that modernize our court systems and, in particular, modernize those provisions that impact on the lives of children.

And certainly, I don't think anybody in this House would stand up and vote against a bill that would allow folks—again, predominately women—to get the dollars that they're owed no matter where they are in the world and from those countries that are signatory to the Hague Convention on—for 2007.

So, again, we support Bill 37, and I look forward to its implementation in helping Manitoba families get the dollars that they're owed.

Miigwech.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Ensuring that maintenance payments are made is important. It is also important that a spouse who owes maintenance payments is not able to escape to another jurisdiction and avoid paying those payments. And this legislation will enable Manitoba and Canada to have a farther reach—not to every country in the world, because not all will sign on to this agreement, but to many more countries than before.

* (15:40)

It is an improvement in the legislation that we currently have. It is a good example of co-operation between provincial and federal governments. It is a significant step forward in terms of recognizing that we live on one planet and that we have to work together with other countries in the best interest of children and families to get the best results. We certainly support this bill and look forward to it passing and becoming law.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there any more speakers?

Seeing none, is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question for—before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 37, The International Child Support and Family Maintenance (Hague Convention) Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? *[Agreed]*

Bill 41—The Child and Family Services Amendment Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We'll now move to Bill 41, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act.

The honourable Minister of—*[interjection]*—Families. Forgive me. Thank you, yes.

Hon. Rochelle Squires (Minister of Families): I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Goertzen), that Bill 41, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille, be—reported from the Committee of the Whole, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Ms. Squires: I am pleased to speak today for the third reading of Bill 41, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act.

Bill 41 will amend The Child and Family Services Act as a key step to support the realization of Indigenous jurisdiction over Child and Family Services. These amendments will provide Indigenous governing bodies and their service providers with access to information about children and families receiving Child and Family Services.

The amendments will also authorize the transfer of service responsibility, enable the use of the provincial CFS electronic information system and the Child Abuse Registry and protect certain information shared under this act.

Additionally, this bill clarifies—has clarifications regarding the information sharing required to best support children receiving services and clarify the use of the Child Abuse Registry by provincially mandated agencies.

These changes will ensure the seamless transition of services from a provincial CFS agency to service providers operating under Indigenous law, ongoing

province-wide service co-ordination and the continued safety of children. Through these changes, our government is signalling the expectation that information should be shared to support Indigenous jurisdiction for Child and Family Services.

I would like to congratulate Peguis First Nation, again, as they were the first in the province to bring their own law into force at the end of January. They are setting a precedent in the country because they are exercising jurisdiction for their children that are on and off reserve, and I look forward to working with all Indigenous partners throughout the province as they bring about their own laws to exercise jurisdiction over the—and oversee the repatriation of their children.

Manitoba is currently engaged with several Indigenous governing bodies that are all at various stages of exercising jurisdiction and more is expected to come forward in the days and weeks ahead.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we recognize that this is only a first step towards the longer journey, and we expect to make more changes as we hear and learn more about what is required to effectively support the realization of Indigenous jurisdiction of Child and Family Services in Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I look forward to seeing Bill 41 become law. I believe that this is a historic moment for Manitoba, and I congratulate all the First Nations partners who helped us bring this legislation to this House and bring it through here for third reading, and I look forward to its passage in the House today.

Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Ms. Amanda Lathlin (The Pas-Kameesak): It's always an honour to stand here to represent my community, my constituency of The Pas-Kameesak, and also, too, to speak to this very important bill as the critic for Families, particularly CFS, and, most importantly, as an Indigenous mother, foster parent as well.

I want to put on record that we, on this side of the House, we support this legislation and believe it is important to move forward quickly with this.

I'm very proud of one of my communities. It's the largest First Nation in Manitoba, Peguis First Nation, and it was an honour to gain that community within The Pas constituency. We went from 11 communities to 17. So, Peguis, I've always had a long admiration for them. They're very progressive thinking, just like Opaskwayak Cree Nation, where I come from.

So this change is welcome, but procedural matters need to be addressed to ensure proper record keeping across the systems, as well for arrangements for transfer of children across the system. We realize the transition of services is very important, but we also believe that the CFIS [*phonetic*] system needs to be updated, because that system contains very, very, very delicate information about families in Manitoba, including me.

So, I also want to point out that I'm willing to work with the minister or future minister of Families, to work with children and to ensure that their voices are involved whenever changes are made. You know, it's just ironic, you know—child welfare services, and there's no children's voices. So I think that needs to be implemented, you know; that's progressive thinking to me.

When OCN was on its way to implementing a program like this under bill C-92, they held an audience for children to speak—former and current children in care—about their experiences, and guess what, it sounded like residential school. It sounded like the social workers were nuns and RCMP, coming into their home, telling them they had 10 minutes to gather their belongings and their parents are bad.

So, with that culture—yes, this is all about technology—CFIS [*phonetic*], transition of services—but I also want to work with the minister and future minister of Families that this culture has to end in regarding families and children to be treated with respect. And as critic for Families, as a foster mother, as an Indigenous mother, I'm going to make sure that this is going to happen.

Ekosi.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there any other members who wish to speak?

Is the House ready for the question?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 41, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? [*Agreed*]

Bill 44—The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Minimum Wage)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We now move to Bill 44, The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Minimum Wage).

Hon. Reg Helwer (Minister of Labour, Consumer Protection and Government Services): I move, seconded by the Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure (Mr. Piwniuk), that Bill 44, The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act, reported from the Committee of the Whole, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Labour, seconded by the honourable Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure, that Bill 44, The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Minimum Wage), reported from the Committee of the Whole, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Mr. Helwer: I'm very happy to see this important piece of legislation move quickly through the approval process. This enabling legislation will allow Manitoba to ensure that our minimum wage is more in line with other Canadian jurisdictions as we navigate these challenging economic times.

I look forward to consultations and feedback from the Labour Management Review Committee on potential increases to the minimum wage, and I would like to thank members of this House for their support in passing this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

* (15:50)

MLA Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon): I'm not going to say too much more. At second reading, while we were ramming this bill through the other day, I put the meat of the matter of what's missing with this bill into the record. We still don't know how much the government might, someday, eventually, perhaps, raise the minimum wage. Working people in this province demand better from this government.

We're going to let this go simply because whatever it lands up being has got to be better than what they have right now. We don't know if they're only going to raise it to \$13.05 an hour so that they can say they're ahead of Saskatchewan.

We would hope that they will actually listen to what working people need and raise this minimum wage immediately to \$15 as they then agree to work towards making minimum wage an actual living wage so that working people in this province can afford to be participants in society, they can afford to have their kids in sports, they can afford to put food on the table,

they can afford to stay home when they're sick because this minister also won't introduce paid sick leave.

So we hope they'll do the right thing. I'd be shocked and aghast if they do, but I guess time will tell.

So, with those few words, let's move on.

Mr. Dougald Lamont (St. Boniface): We have very—we have aspirations—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If I may interrupt the member for St. Boniface, your mic was not on at the beginning and so I'm asking if you could perhaps put your headset on as requested by the tech people and start again. I'll give you just a moment to get that wired up.

But for the sake of Hansard, the honourable member for St. Boniface does have the floor.

Madam Speaker in the Chair

Mr. Lamont: Yes, I'll just put some brief comments on the record. As—I think I quoted H.L. Mencken once before saying that when it comes to—whenever he found a newspaper, that he never failed to pick it up without a sense of hope or put it down without a sense of disappointment.

We certainly hope that we can see some improvements, and as the member for Flin Flon noted, that we have aspirations to see that this government will actually do the right thing. It doesn't happen terribly often, but we're certainly open to working with the government and with all members, in fact, to make sure that the legislation passes when it's appropriate.

Thank you so much.

Madam Speaker: Are there any other speakers?

If not, is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 44, The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Minimum Wage).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? [*Agreed*]

**CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS—
PUBLIC BILLS**

**Bill 234—The Drug-Related
Death Bereavement Day Act**

Madam Speaker: We'll now call concurrence and third reading of Bill 234, The Drug-Related Death Bereavement Day Act.

Mrs. Bernadette Smith (Point Douglas): I move, seconded by the member from St. Johns, that Bill 234, The Drug-Related Death Bereavement Day Act, as amended and reported from the Committee of the Whole, be concurred in and now be read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mrs. Smith: This bill proclaims the first Sunday in May of every year as drug-related bereavement day, a day to reflect on the impacts of drugs in Manitoba and to grieve those lost to drugs. This bill also seeks to normalize the experience of grief and establish a community which mourns with those who have lost a loved one to drugs.

Across the province, many Manitobans continue to struggle with addictions and the pandemic has only made the already deadly and ongoing public crisis of opioid overdose deaths worse. Too many Manitobans have been lost to addictions and are still struggling and many are still watching their family members suffer: 372 Manitobans died from an overdose in 2020, 87 per cent higher than in 2019.

The situation last year, 2021, was even worse, with 470–407 Manitobans losing their lives. Over 1,200 Manitobans lost their lives in the last four years here in Manitoba. That's 1,200 families who are grieving and even more friends who are grievants.

I am happy that we have unanimous support for this bill and that we're going to stand and be leaders and support those who are grieving their loved ones, but also sending a message to our community that, you know, the stigma around drug use; we have to speak about this. We have to let folks know that they are supported, that there are places and people that would support them. So this bill will also help educate the community.

And I just want to say thank you to the minister across the way for, you know, supporting the bill, members opposite. This is an important step in the right direction. We do have more work to do, but this is a good start.

And, of course, I want to dedicate this to all those families that—and friends who are grieving the loss of someone and those families that are struggling to support someone who is struggling with addictions.

Miigwech.

Madam Speaker: The honourable Minister for Mental Health and Community Wellness.

Was the minister wishing to make any comments on Bill 234?

Hon. Sarah Guillemard (Minister of Mental Health and Community Wellness): I just want to reiterate some of the words I've already put on record: that we appreciate the member for Point Douglas (Mrs. Smith) bringing this bill forward.

I know that she has met with numerous families who are in the midst of a very traumatic grief who have expressed gratefulness at her efforts and the efforts of all members of the Chamber to pass this bill in a timely fashion so that the community can come together, grieve together and my hope is that they, too, would work towards healing.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Speaker, I rise to support this bill. It is a significant bill and I think help us not only to help those who have lost loved ones with a day that is set aside specifically to remember those who are gone. But it is also, I think, important in that it will provide a day that will bring more attention to the need for better action to end the tragedies of Manitobans who are dying from overdoses.

It has been terrible, what has happened in the last few years, the increases, and hopefully someday we will reach a time when we will eliminate these terrible tragedies and be able to much better prevent overdose deaths. I look forward to being part of a movement which will bring in changes, which will drastically reduce and hopefully completely end these tragedies which result in so much loss of life and so much loss of potential and so much grief for so many loved ones.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Is there any further debate on this bill?

Is the House ready for the question?

An Honourable Member: Question.

* (16:00)

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 234, The Drug-Related Death Bereavement Day Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? [*Agreed*]

I declare the motion carried.

* * *

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Government House Leader): Just to announce the order of which the specified bills up for third reading and concurrence can be called. Can you please call them in this order: Bill 33, 34, 15, 21, 7, 8, 9, 17, 18, 19, 23, 26, 27, 30, 32, 16, 2 and 29, followed by royal assent.

CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS

(*Continued*)

Madam Speaker: I will now put the question on the remaining concurrence and third reading motions on the specified bills, without further debate or amendment except for the debate provisions allowed under rule 2(14). The House will not adjourn until all applicable questions are put and royal assent has been granted. In accordance with our rules, all matters of privilege and points of order are deferred until after these actions have been concluded.

The bills will be called in the order as announced by the Government House Leader. These remaining specified bills are: 33, 34, 15, 21, 7, 8, 9, 17, 18, 19, 23, 26, 27, 30, 32, 16, 2 and 29. For each bill, the minister will move the motion and will be able to speak for up to 10 minutes, followed by the official opposition critic and the independent Liberals, who can speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Bill 33—The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Municipal Board Amendment Act

Madam Speaker: I will now call upon the honourable Minister for Municipal Relations to move concurrence and third reading for Bill 33.

Hon. Eileen Clarke (Minister of Municipal Relations): Can you hear me?

Madam Speaker: We can.

Ms. Clarke: I move, seconded by the Minister for Justice, that Bill 33, The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Municipal Board—

Madam Speaker: Order. [*interjection*] Order. I would just ask the minister to hang on for a sec.

Oh. The minister—the member—the minister will have to choose a—another person to second her motion. Families, perhaps.

Ms. Clarke: I move, seconded by the Minister for Families, that Bill 33, The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Municipal Board Amendment Act, as reported on the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and now be read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Ms. Clarke: I'm pleased to once again rise for the third reading on Bill 33. I'm very happy to see Bill 33 continue through the legislative process, and I want to thank everyone who contributed to the development of the bill, particularly our stakeholders who provided input and feedback during the committee stage.

Bill 33 modernizes how Manitobans can access their property assessment notices, allows municipalities to improve access to assessment roll information and supports the Municipal Board in managing planning appeals.

Currently, in Manitoba, all property owners receive their notice of assessment via mail, with no option to receive it electronically. The Province, on behalf of municipalities, prints and mails assessment notices for property owners outside of the city of Winnipeg.

Bill 33 will enable the Province to send electronic assessment notices to property owners outside the city of Winnipeg if Manitobans choose to switch to electronic notices. It will also enable the City of Winnipeg to do the same, should they choose to in the future. Property owners will be able to access and save an electronic version of their notice in a place convenient for them.

Bill 33 will also enable municipalities to pass a bylaw to provide online access to their assessment rolls so citizens can view them at a place and a time that is convenient to them. Certain identifying information property owners will be removed from the assessment roll before it is shared online.

Bill 33 also amends The Municipal Board Act by giving clear authority to the Municipal Board to work with parties to use effective and mutually beneficial alternatives to more costly and time-consuming public hearings.

To streamline the planning appeals process further, Bill 33 introduces statutory requirements for grounds and dismissal of appeals. Appellants will be

required to state grounds for appeal in their initial filing with the board. This will improve transparency and accountability while helping to narrow the limit, the scope and extent of future appeals to the board.

We're very proud to move forward with this legislation which responds directly to feedback from Manitobans.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): Well, thank you very much, Mr.–Madam Speaker. Beginning of a long night here; I should get that, right, at least in the beginning. I do appreciate the opportunity one more time to put some words on the record with regards to Bill 33.

And, you know, I'm going to be careful in how I put this to the House because I know there are specific rules about commenting on absence or the location, maybe you could say. I'm not sure. I know that we are allowed to virtually participate in this Legislature. I do think that it does speak to a level of, you know, importance that, I guess I would see the minister placing on such an important—what she calls an important piece of legislation that is Bill 33, that really is trying to clean up the mess that this government has made with regards to The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Municipal Board Amendment Act.

These are—this is legislation that is brought forward as a direct result of the mistakes made by this minister's predecessor, by the Pallister government, by the Stefanson government, in their relationship building and listening to municipalities across this province.

Now, again, I'm going to give the minister—we've got kind of this back and forth here where, you know, I make sure that I point out that I recognize it's not her that's, you know, created this negative relationship with municipalities. But I do want to continue to hold her accountable for the fact that she's continuing to do this, you know, this tour of amending these terrible pieces of legislation and trying to backtrack what her predecessors did.

So, again, while she has a good relationship, I know, with the AMM, with municipalities across this province, ultimately, she's just trying to make a bad piece of legislation just a little bit more palatable.

And what we heard from the president of the AMM, from Kam Blight here at committee, was unequivocal, that they still believe that bill 37 is a bad piece of legislation and should be repealed by this minister.

And so no matter what she does now to go back-track and try to fix and change and amend some of the bad policies that were brought forward as part of bill 37, ultimately, what they're asking for is a return to respect for local autonomy and for the local democratic process which we are about to enter into a period of across the province. We're about to enter into a period of electioneering by our municipal friends, and they want to go out and speak to their ratepayers and say, this is where I stand; this is what I think when it comes to development and, you know, ways forward in our communities. They want to be able to put to their ratepayers their vision for their municipality. And for many of them, whatever they say may be negated by bill 37 and by the actions of this government.

So they may say, I believe that this is the way forward in terms of development in our community, but, ultimately, they won't have the power to do that because it'll be taking out—taken out of their hands by the minister and this Premier (Mrs. Stefanson).

So while Bill 33 makes amendments to The Municipal Assessment Act and The Municipal Board Act, ultimately, this bill enables a municipality to post assessment information online and allows permits, documents to be sent electronically. It does give the Municipal Board the power to dismiss a matter without hearing. We had a good opportunity to talk to the minister about circumstances where that may be applicable. I understand the intent of the legislation. I think it is important and a step forward.

* (16:10)

But, ultimately, what we don't like is this legislation continues to put more power in the hands of the Municipal Board rather than in the—power in the hands of those municipalities who are going to be impacted by developments coming forward.

We know that the minister is trying to portray a different relationship or to try to set a new tone. You know, she's doing her work to do that. But ultimately, if she's carrying water for this Premier and for, you know, decisions that were made under the last premier, I don't think she's going to have much success because, ultimately, municipalities are saying this is bad legislation that will be difficult for them to deal with.

So, Madam Speaker, I think—as I said—I mean, this is important legislation coming forward in front of the Legislature. I think it would be appropriate for all of us to be here, present and participating in this debate.

And I think it's unfortunate that the minister, you know—it doesn't have the same—doesn't feel the same—doesn't feel it necessary to have that kind of input; that direct input when it comes to how this legislation goes forward.

You know, third reading, second reading, committee hearing; it doesn't matter. What does matter is that we're listening to municipalities across this province and that's what we're going to continue to do. Every single member of our caucus has spent time going out, speaking to municipalities, reaching out to those folks who are dealing with this on the ground, and not only hearing from them at committee but going out and listening to them in person. We're going to continue to do that throughout the summer. And we hope that the minister is listening, as well.

Ultimately, at the end of the day, what she could do is that she could repeal bill 37, start from scratch, go back to the drawing board and get back to listening to Manitobans and what's really important to them.

So, as we see this bill go forward, we urge the minister to make a statement with regards to bill 37 and we look forward to hearing more from our municipal friends as they get ready for a very busy season for them.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: I just want to caution members that even though somebody is participating virtually, they are present in this House, and that is something we have to get used to. While they may not be here in the House, they are participating virtually and that still means they are present in our debate.

So just a caution to members that we are not to be referring to whether members are absent or present from this House. So be very careful, please.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Speaker, a few words on Bill 33, The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Municipal Board Amendment Act.

This bill, as has already been stated, corrects some major problems with bill 37. It doesn't fully address some of the issues that have arisen but it is a bill that we will nevertheless support.

We are concerned about the government having powers through the Municipal Board or in other ways to overturn decisions made locally, which are made with good due diligence and with solid reasons based on local input. We are concerned that with the changing rules, that if we're not careful, there may be

not enough people knowing about the changes which could result in fewer people participating in important local decisions.

It is a positive to be able to use electronic delivery of information into a greater extent but it is really important that there is a significant effort made to ensure that people across the province are aware of changes and how best to participate in local issues when they come up, because I think that local democracy and local input and local decision-making are really, really important.

With those few words, we will support this bill moving forward.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 33, The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Municipal Board Amendment Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

An Honourable Member: No.

Madam Speaker: Did I hear a no? [*interjection*] I hear a no.

Voice Vote

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

An Honourable Member: Nay. [*interjection*] Moo. The cows have it.

Madam Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it. I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Wiebe: On division.

Madam Speaker: The motion has been carried, on division.

We have to thank the member for Concordia (Mr. Wiebe) for that. We needed a little laugh.

Bill 34—The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Planning Amendment Act

Madam Speaker: Moving now to concurrence and third reading of Bill 34, The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Planning Amendment Act.

Hon. Eileen Clarke (Minister of Municipal Relations): Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I hope you have an enjoyable rest of the day.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Families (Ms. Squires), that Bill 34, The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Planning Amendment Act, as reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and now be read for the third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Ms. Clarke: I'm pleased to once again rise for the third reading on Bill 34. This bill amends the City of Winnipeg Charter and The Planning Act to streamline land-use planning, reduce red tape and modernize building inspection processes.

I'm very happy to see this legislation move through the 'apparval' process. This bill is a 'prioridoy' for the government of Manitoba and supports key recommendations of the 2019 Treasury Board review of planning, zoning and permitting in Manitoba and it builds on previous legislative changes under The Planning Amendment and City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment Act that passed on May 20th, 2021, 'previously' bill-known as bill 37.

We have been listening to stakeholders. The input we received from the Association of Manitoba Municipalities, the public and other stakeholders such as professional planners and the development industry, has helped to shape this legislation.

Ensuring municipal governments make timely decisions on planning application provides greater certainty needed for development and investment. Now more than ever, this is critical to support recovery efforts from the challenges created by the pandemic.

Bill 34 complements and clarifies existing timelines in The City of Winnipeg Charter and The Planning Act, including requiring planning authorities to determine whether a planning application is complete or not within 20 days and reducing the timeline to file and appeal to the Municipal Board on subdivisions, aggregate quarries and large-scale livestock operations from 30 days to 14 days under The Planning Act to align with the other appeal timelines.

In response to stake back-feed-stakeholder feedback, the bills also allows statutory timelines on planning applications to be extended within the agreement of the applicant. The bill also gives planning authorities an additional 30 days on the longest applicable

timelines when holding combined hearings on two or more planning applications.

Mr. Andrew Micklefield, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

Another important feature of Bill 34 is that it creates greater clarity and 'transparenty'-'cy' around secondary plan processes in the city of Winnipeg. The City can only require an applicant to prepare a secondary plan if it has adopted a bylaw that sets consistent rules on when a secondary plan is required and what the requirements are.

Bill 34 ensures timely decision making on secondary plans by 'instabishing' timelines and giving applicants the right to appeal missed timelines and council decisions on applicant-prepared secondary plans to the Municipal Board.

* (16:20)

Bill 34 also alleviates unnecessary administrative burdens on the City of Winnipeg, property owners and the court system, which align with key government mandates to reduce red tape.

Amendments will remove an outdated and duplicative need to annually audit Winnipeg's sinking funds trustees related to the previous sale of Winnipeg Hydro. They will also reduce red tape around property removal and demolition on land in tax arrears by removing the requirement for a—one step of a duplicative approval process. Amendments will also remove red tape around substitutional service provision for compliance demolition orders. These changes align with the work of the City of Winnipeg, government of Manitoba collaboration-table subcommittee, on the City of Winnipeg Charter.

Bill 34 also amends The City of Winnipeg Charter Act to create a new definition of designated official to enable the City of Winnipeg to choose either a designated employee or a designated official to conduct building and fire inspections. This means the City of Winnipeg will have the same alternative service delivery mechanism as provided for in other municipalities in Manitoba. This change delivers on Manitoba's commitments to modernize processes by establishing a co-ordinated approach to conducting building and fire inspections.

To close, the Province of Manitoba is taking responsibility to ensure that the regulatory processes in our province operate in an efficient, transparent and consistent manner and achieve the desired outcomes.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): I, once again, appreciate the opportunity to put a few words on the record with regards to Bill 34.

As the minister pointed out and as I commented on in my previous discussion of Bill 33, this is part of a suite of legislation that has been brought forward as a continuation of bill 37, which has been roundly decried by all municipalities—or, many municipalities across this province.

And, you know, I thought maybe—I realize that I didn't get to this in my previous remarks, so I thought maybe I could just take folks back on a bit of a history lesson before we get to the contents of Bill 34, because it is important to remember that this legislation actually has its genesis in bill 48 which was brought forward by the member for Riel (Ms. Squires), who brought forward this legislation when she was minister and brought it forward as a piece of legislation that took away power from local municipalities, took control away from elected officials around our province, and really tried—at the direction of Brian Pallister, who was premier at the time—tried very hard to take shots at the City of Winnipeg, tried to take power away from the City of Winnipeg and tried to impact their ability to manage the development within their—within the city of Winnipeg and surrounding areas.

We knew this was bad legislation. We heard it time and time again from municipalities around this province, and so as an NDP caucus, we stood—we held this bill back. We stood up against this government. And normally, you know, governments—majority governments—particularly in the province of Manitoba, have really unlimited power in terms of passing legislation. It may not be exactly on the timeline that they wanted, but they certainly have that right to move legislation through the process. And had we not done that, had we not stood up to that legislation—there was a number of other bills that were particularly bad—we stood up against bill 48 and we actually managed to stop that bill in its tracks.

And what that allowed the government then to do is to go back and say to municipalities we're sorry; you know, we realize that we're overstepping our bounds. Let us try this again and go back and actually, you know, listen to municipalities.

Did they take that opportunity to do that? Did they actually avail themselves of that opportunity? No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they did not. In fact, they went back to municipalities, they got, you know, yelled at across the province, every corner of the province, every AMM meeting that they attended, every chance

that they had to listen to municipal officials. They heard over and over again that bill 48 was bad and not to go down this path again.

But, again, they didn't listen. They went back. They redrew the—redrew up the legislation. They took out some of the most egregious parts but essentially brought it back wholesale in the form of bill 37—again, probably at the direction of Brian Pallister.

This Cabinet and this caucus stood behind this minister who brought forward bill 37, which was bad legislation then and it's bad legislation now. And it's not just me saying that. And it's not just the current president of the AMM, Kam Blight, saying it. It's not just municipalities across this province that are saying it. It's the minister herself who is saying that they got it wrong with bill 37. And they got it wrong when it comes to how they treat Manitoba municipalities.

So they bring in Bill 33. They bring in Bill 34. They're trying to tie up loose ends. But, ultimately, it's lipstick on a pig, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because they're not making things any better at the fundamental level.

Now, this bill, in particular, is one that—you know, we heard the minister in her previous opening comments say, we listened to folks at committee. Well, we—this is a situation where we actually had experts in the field. We actually had those folks at the City of Winnipeg who deal with these changes that are being proposed under Bill 34 on a daily basis. And not just that—not are they—not only are they civil servants who do this work, but they're actually civil servants who have engaged the Province at, you know, at the ministerial level to sit down at a working group table to actually try to, you know, amend the legislation, make it better, work with the Province to see how things could be improved.

They came to committee to basically say, you know, all that work that we did, all the times that we sat down with the minister, with the Deputy Minister, with staff across the department, you know, none of this was laid out the way that it eventually came forward as a bill.

And the changes that are being made are not the changes that will make things move smoother. In fact, there's more red tape in what's being proposed here. And they gave us some suggestions. We brought those suggestions forward in the form of amendments to this bill. And, you know, surprisingly, even though, again, the words of the minister saying, now we're going to listen, now we're going to consult, now we'll listen to

Manitobans—once again, when the experts came forward at our committee process, they came forward, they were ignored in the form of these amendments to the legislation.

It's disrespectful to those folks that are doing the work, but it also shows a larger problem with how this government treats municipalities—not just the City of Winnipeg, although I think there's a lot to be said for the relationship and how it's been soured over the years because of the actions of Brian Pallister and now the actions of the Premier (Mrs. Stefanson) with regards to how they work with the City of Winnipeg—but it's, really, it's beyond that. It permeates around the province.

And so it was municipalities who came forward to us and said, look, this impacts the municipal region. This impacts the metro region. But we're concerned because this could be applicable elsewhere—bill 37, that is. And now, what we see is actually changes that are being made within the City of Winnipeg that actually take it out of compliance or out of step with some of the other measures that are implemented elsewhere in the province and within the metro region.

So there's a lot of concern. And, you know, we brought this forward as a, you know—well, it's not really a friendly amendment. I know that has a specific connotation in terms of Robert's Rules and the rules of this Legislature.

But what I'm saying is, is that this was a amendment that was brought forward in a non-partisan way and it was offered to the minister. We can make these changes that doesn't impact the spirit of the legislation you're trying to bring forward, simply makes it better, and it simply removes some of that red tape you keep talking about. So why not go ahead and follow through on that? They didn't do that.

And so there is major concerns about this legislation, how it will impact the City of Winnipeg, but, ultimately, to back—you know, back it out a little bit, again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how municipalities around the province are going to deal with the implications of bill 37.

Now, I mentioned briefly in my previous comments, you know, just the impact that municipals—municipalities are going to be feeling as they enter the election season. They go to their ratepayers and they say, look, here I am; I want to be your councillor; I want to be your mayor; I want to be your reeve. And they have a vision. They're bringing forward a vision for their communities to the voters in those regions.

* (16:30)

And if bill 37 continues to be in place in Manitoba, what we're telling the people of Manitoba is who you elect may not matter. Your representation at the table does not matter because, ultimately, it'll be up to the Province to—and the municipal board—to make the decisions about what goes forward and what doesn't.

I identified to the minister in committee, in the brief amount of Estimates time that we had, you know, just one case that I've heard. There are going to be many more and there is a precedent that's being set that I think should be very worrisome to all people in Manitoba, but hopefully the minister is paying attention to this as well.

So, ultimately, Mr. Deputy Speaker, while the minister continues to try to, you know, say I'm sorry and try to make good, you know, on some of the mistakes made by the member for Riel (Ms. Squires), the member—other members who have been ministers here of Municipal Relations, I think there is fundamentally a problem if they don't repeal bill 37. And if we continue down this road, no matter how many changes are made, it's ultimately only going to make things worse for the people of Manitoba.

We've heard that before. We continue, as we go out, throughout this summer to listen to people throughout Manitoba. I'm sure we'll be hearing it again, and, you know, we are very concerned, once again, that this bill, you know, without the amendments that we've asked to bring forward, simply just does not work, makes things more complicated, and will be more heavy-handed from this government.

Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Bill 34, which amends the City of Winnipeg Charter and the planning amendment act, has some good points, but it has some real concerning points.

The bill clearly builds on—or tries to correct—in some instances, some of the problems with legislation bill 48 and 37, which were brought forward previously; 37, of course, was passed, while bill 48 was not.

It is of concern that, at the committee stage, there were presentations by Marc Pittet from the City and James Platt, who's experienced in terms of planning within the city, and there were concerns that were raised and they were not adequately addressed by the minister and the government.

So we express those concerns now and, clearly, if this passes, there is still some work to do. The presenters clearly indicated that this bill was rushed and that some of the details should have been sorted out with the City of Winnipeg before proceeding. Some of the timelines may be problematic.

So, we'll look with concern and with caution about this legislation and see what happens when the government does, in fact, push this through, because I expect that there will be need to be further changes from whatever government is elected next year in the next provincial election.

Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 34, The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Planning Amendment Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Mr. Wiebe: On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On division. The motion is carried, on division.

Bill 15—The Drivers and Vehicles Amendment and Highway Traffic Amendment Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We now move to Bill 15, The Drivers and Vehicles Amendment and Highway Traffic Amendment Act.

Hon. Doyle Pivniuk (Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure): I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Johnson), that Bill 15, the drivers and vehicles amendment and

highway traffic act, reported on the Standing Committee of Justice and—be concurred in and now read for a third time and passed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure, seconded by the honourable Minister of Agriculture, that Bill 15, The Drivers and Vehicles Amendment and Highway Traffic act—Amendment Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Justice, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Mr. Pivniuk: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm pleased to provide some comments on Bill 15, which will improve an appeal of services assessed by the public and create administration efficiency.

The first of the bill removes medical specialties for the Medical Review Committee from legislation and instead allows qualifications of members to be set in policy based on the medical needs of cases. This will reduce delays in hearing appeals as other areas of expertise can be included. For example, a registered or psychiatric nurse or a geriatric specialist—there is no desire to remove existing medical specialties from the committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the bill also allows online reporting of police by the public when a driver is involved with a certain type of motor vehicle accident or a hit and run. This change has—requested by the Winnipeg Police Service and will lessen the administration burden on the public and police.

Finally, the bill allows this Licence Suspension Appeal Board to hear appeals from commercial vehicle operators when their safety fitness certification—or certificate has been suspended or cancelled. Currently, appeals come from the Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure. The board has the necessary expertise and capacity to take on this function.

With those comments, I look forward to seeing this bill complete a third reading, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): Nice to have the minister giving his opening comments here in the House, especially because I do know that he is, you know, of all ministers in the House, I think it's him that might be the busiest. And some days, I wonder how, you know, with all the knowledge of the impacts of flooding around our province, you know, quite frankly, how do you sleep at night because so many people have been impacted.

So while I didn't get an opportunity to put some words on the record today in the form of a ministerial statement, which, you know, is disappointing, I do want to just take a few moments to just recognize, once again, all those throughout the province who are dealing with flooding, who are actively working to help their neighbours, their friends, their communities.

It has been an incredible, unbelievable flooding season in this province, one that we probably won't ever see again exactly in this form. And for many around the province, I know it's been absolutely heart-breaking as they've lost property.

So, as I said, I'll just take this quick opportunity to thank all those who are doing the work through—in the department, in municipalities across our province, volunteers, individual citizens and the minister for doing the work that he's doing. And, hopefully, he does get some sleep at night. He looks well rested, but I'm sure he's always concerned about all the impacts that we're seeing across the province.

Very briefly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, very pleased to put some words on the record with regard to Bill 15. Bill 15, as we—as the minister pointed out, gives the minister the authority to determine the composition of the Medical Review Committee and to appoint members. When appointing members, the minister must ensure there's sufficient range of medical expertise and experience for the committee to carry out its responsibilities.

* (16:40)

The minister will know, we've now had the opportunity to put on the record a few times concerns about the composition and the qualifications of those members of that committee. I know, well, once again, the minister has, you know, said, trust us, we'll make sure that we have the right people.

We recognize that there are evolving and changing dynamics with regard to who would be appropriate with regard to a medical review committee. That being said, it is, you know—it's important that the minister take this very seriously and ensure that the proper qualifications are there because the work that the Medical Review Committee does is so important. The minister has that authority now, so it just—it is going to be very important that those, you know, qualifications remain robust in terms of making sure they can deal with all of the cases that could come before them.

Likewise, we support the changes with regard to police reporting to The Highway Traffic Act, which, you know, we understand this legislation is making permanent a change that was implemented under COVID and which allows a person to make a report under the—sorry—under The Highway Traffic Act electronically rather than only in person.

You know, this is part of, I think, a number of changes that have been made not just in this legislative session but even going back to when we first were dealing with the impacts of COVID. I remember coming back for an emergency session here of the Legislature where we, you know, we were just sort of just trying to tie up some loose ends and try to, you know, for—at the very beginnings of this pandemic, try to grasp how we can start making these changes.

You know, not that I would say now that—well, I mean, you know, if we're looking for something positive, I guess you could put it that way, that comes of—out of the pandemic, these are the kinds of changes that you could say, you know, maybe have helped streamline the process.

And we understand that there has been consultation with law enforcement; I think that's important to make sure that they're on board. And, you know, I mean, ultimately, folks expect this kind of service now, and it's only been heightened throughout the pandemic. So if we're able to make these changes as a Legislature, I think that's a good way to go.

We do have some concerns with regard to the safety fitness certificate appeals. Commercial operators of regulated vehicles require a safety fitness certificate issued under The Highway Traffic Act. Currently, an operator can appeal the decision—the director's decision—about their safety fitness certificate to the minister, and these appeals will now be heard by the Licence Suspension Appeal Board.

And, you know, I heard—again, I heard in the minister's comments, don't worry, the Licence Suspension Appeal Board will be able to handle these—this additional work and that any appeals that come in will be able to be absorbed and dealt with in a timely manner by the board. That being said, there are, as far as we understand, no additional resources that are being offered. And this impacts commercial drivers.

So this is an important element, you know, in terms of how we talk about recovering from the pandemic and how our economy can grow if any kind of hiccups happen at this level. This can be a real concern

for those commercial operators. So, you know, not to say I don't believe the minister, but I think it is an area that we'll be paying close attention to, and I hope that he does as well, because I think there are some concerns there.

Very briefly, again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, one issue that we do have with regard to, you know, how folks are expected to stay connected in this kind of new digital landscape that they find themselves in. There is a real value to the technology and how we can implement these kinds of changes, as I said.

That being said, we also always need to be very, very cognizant that, for some people, access to online services are not as easy as it is for many others. So we, you know, continually remind the minister that for those with visual or physical disabilities, we need to ensure that there's always that ability to access these services outside of the online realm and give them the opportunity to continue to come in person and deal with a person who can facilitate them and accommodate any kinds of challenges that they might have.

So, you know, there are some concerns with this bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but ultimately, I think there are some changes that, you know, will make things a little bit more streamlined. You know, to be sure, we're going to be paying very close attention to that Medical Review Committee and making sure that there are some qualified folks with the right kind of qualifications who are sitting on that board. We want to see that be one of the focuses of this government to ensure that we're building, we're not going backwards.

So with those few words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we're happy to see Bill 15 go forward and we look forward to more information as this goes forward and is implemented, as to how this government will manage these changes in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): I will address this bill but I will first, as the MLA for Concordia has done, provide a few comments on the flood, which is clearly a major, major event for us this spring. And it looks like some of the impacts are going to last into the summer and maybe later.

Clearly, a big thank-you is in order for the minister, the staff and many others who have worked long hours to try and do their best to address the flooding issues to help people who are in difficulty and communities which are in difficulty.

We have seen examples of what the rain and the excess moisture can do, with flooded underpasses in Winnipeg; with a lot of damage and evacuations at Peguis; with people calling in and telling us yesterday that they were very, very concerned about Lake Manitoba because it's now 11 years after the 2011 flood—major flood—and we still don't have the outlet done to Lake St. Martin and Lake Winnipeg.

I think it is a time, not only for thanks, but a time now for doing some planning moving forward. That planning needs to include providing the long-term flood protection for Peguis, as has been done for many communities in southern Manitoba. And whether that diversion or diking or holding water back or some combination of all these, it needs to be done. It has been delayed far too long.

When it comes to the situation in Lake Manitoba, we've had over 11 years—many, many excuses to why it's not done, but it is really the job of politicians not to make excuses but to figure out how to get the job done. And that—[interjection]—more excuses I'm hearing—that job takes, you know, politicians with skill, with knowledge, with the ability to work with other levels of government, but fundamentally to serve Manitobans in a way that is not a pathway or flood lined with excuses.

That being said, Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a lot of excess moisture in farm fields, and we hope that we have some clear, dry weather in the next few weeks that will allow much more seeding to be done. We're pleased that the government has extended—at least for some areas, I understand—the crop insurance deadline and hope that there is every effort made, not only by farmers to get the crops in but also, where needed, by government to make sure that farmers don't bear an undue share of that risk.

Those comments being said, I want to specifically focus on Bill 15, which deals with amendments to The Drivers and Vehicles Amendment and Highway Traffic Amendment Act.

* (16:50)

I have already raised some concerns about the Medical Review Committee, which can have a quorum of three, which means you can have decisions being made on the basis of the views of two people. I have already talked about what I see as a need to include individuals who are lay individuals who had live—lived experience with disabilities, seniors and people who are driving instructors.

I have, as a physician, served on many committees where there was both medical experts and there was lay people with their ability and their knowledge, often with lived experience, and in my view it is—would be a significant improvement to have such experience on this Medical Review Committee. And I think it is something that will need to be done in the future and made more clear.

That being said, there are some positive aspects of this bill, and so we look forward to watching closely the results from its passage and the impact that it has on the lives of Manitobans.

Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Question before the House is the concurrence and third reading of Bill 15, The Drivers and Vehicles Amendment and Highway Traffic Amendment Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? [*Agreed*]

I declare the motion carried.

Bill 21—The Highway Traffic Amendment and Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Amendment Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We now move to Bill 21, The Highway Traffic Amendment and Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Amendment Act.

Hon. Doyle Piwniuk (Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health (Ms. Gordon), that Bill 21, The Highway Traffic Amendment and Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Amendment Act, reported from the Standing Committee of—on Justice, be concurred in and now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Piwniuk: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to provide some comments on Bill 21 which is—introduces in response to the number of requests from Manitoba municipalities, businesses and other organizations.

The bill enables pilot testing for micro-mobility devices including personal transportation vehicles and 'electric' scooters and low-speed vehicles on roads.

Future regulations will set out on conditions of pilot projects, such as the type of device or vehicle being tested, 'maximum' speed limit, age limits, insurance requirements and so on. The bill also addresses a—

'suspicious' insurance requirements for public pilot projects.

The amendments also create a concept of shared streets and enables municipalities to make bylaws to designate shared streets for pedestrians, cyclists, motorists and people using recreational equipment will have equal access, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The speed limit is—on shared streets will be the 'maximum' of 20 kilometres per hour and regulated signage will be required to ensure that all road users are aware of the shared streets.

Bill 21 provides a means of explore—expanding activities and 'alternative' forms of transportation. This will increase access to these modes of transportation for the public, while continuing to ensure road safety for all users, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

With these comments, I look forward of seeing Bill 21 complete third reading, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Thank you.

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): I appreciate the opportunity to once again rise on Bill 21 and, you know—well, we've had a chance to debate this bill a few times now, as this is third reading here of this bill. But it is important that we do spend some time talking about this particular bill because, as I've said, you know, a few times, how—as we've heard from the community over and over again, this is really a representation of a missed opportunity by this government to—well, again, find something positive from the pandemic and from the impacts of COVID.

Going back to spring of 2020 and into 2021, what we saw was that folks' regular routines were impacted in a way that we had never seen before; once in a lifetime, probably—I would hope, anyway, Mr. Deputy Speaker; but again, in some respects, in a positive way.

We saw people get out to our provincial parks in a way that we've never seen. We saw them using our civic resources, in terms of our parks and our infrastructure like our paths, our active transportation systems, in a way that we have never seen before. Because they couldn't go out and see a movie, maybe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, or they couldn't go out to a restaurant, they found themselves using this opportunity to get more active and to get out in their communities.

And what we heard from the City was that, you know, they wanted to move forward and they, again, wanted to find something positive from this, so they

brought forward an open streets program that was well received across the board.

You know, I know that within specific neighbourhoods and communities, many of these streets were streets that were already sort of de facto active transportation routes or used by many pedestrians and cyclists and those using many different modes of transport. This was an opportunity to designate those streets in a way that we hadn't done before. And there are parts of our city that see this on a regular basis, but many hadn't.

And so, it was an opportunity to show every community what we can do when we open our streets and when we make them more pedestrian friendly, and we ask the community to come out and enjoy these places free from the concerns about vehicular traffic. And we had, as I said, broad consensus across the board. Everyone was saying, this is a great idea; let's move forward with this; doesn't this make our city a better place.

And yet, this government, given that opportunity, given that chance to stand with Winnipeggers and with municipalities across the province to say yes, we want to see more of this kind of active transportation, this kind of physical activity and getting outdoors, enjoying our cities and enjoying our communities—they dropped the ball, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

So it's frustrating. It was—I know it was frustrating to our mayor and to councillors who came to this minister and said, let's make this change immediately. Let's get this done. This isn't a big change or a significant—a consequential change to our legislation, but it does need to be done. It needs to be done at the provincial level. So why won't you step up, and why won't you get this done?

We, as an opposition, called for this. We asked for this to be done expeditiously. The government didn't act. So here we are now. You know, I guess maybe the government could consider itself lucky that it's been a bit of a wetter spring in terms of less, maybe—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Wiebe: —demand for the—I appreciate the feedback. And I—you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know you're doing your job, but the more feedback we can get about supporting our local streets, open streets program, is a good thing.

But it could have been done last spring. It could have been done in the fall when we knew that this

spring would be another chance for people to get out. And let us capitalize on the fact that people want to get out and be a part of a community and be active in that community.

We, as I said, as an opposition, asked the government to move on this. And here we are now, almost in June—no, I correct myself, we're in June—and people want to be out utilizing our streets in this way. But, unfortunately, they couldn't do that, and, in fact, they can't do that until we pass this legislation.

So, it's very frustrating. I know it's been frustrating for our municipal friends who have been navigating these changes, been pushing this government, asking for these changes to happen. And I know that they're looking forward to this moving forward.

The other change that this makes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I think it's one that, I think, many Manitobans might be a bit curious about how this is going to roll out. This is with regard to personal mobility devices, scooters, e-scooters, this sort of thing, and what we understand is there's a number of pilot projects that are proposed in different parts of the province that we want to see move forward.

* (17:00)

As I mentioned at second reading, I had an opportunity to be in Calgary during spring break with my family and we saw, you know, scooters everywhere. Well, maybe too many scooters in too many places, but I think that that really comes down to how municipalities manage these kind of projects as they roll out.

But here is an opportunity for the minister and his department to get down into the, sort of, you know, the details with regard to how these personal mobility devices can be rolled out throughout the province.

I think most Manitobans would be surprised, first, that this is—needs to be done at all and this change needs to be done at the provincial level, but secondly, and more importantly, perhaps, there are—they're probably wondering why this is being done as a pilot project and wondering why we're so far behind other jurisdictions.

We don't need to necessarily pilot this because we know what has been implementing—implemented in other places and, ultimately, again, giving municipalities the opportunity to do what's right for their citizens would probably be the right path to go.

This minister has chosen to go this route. We'll be watching very closely how this is implemented and how this impacts folks.

We'll also be watching very closely how this may impact those in the disability community, because we know that this isn't just a question about recreational devices, although there are a number of new technologies that have been rolled out that we look forward to hearing more about how the minister is going to regulate and put some restrictions on those. But this will potentially impact those folks in the disability community.

And so we hope that the minister is paying very close attention to that community as they look for feedback from the minister about how changes that are made to The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Amendment Act could impact folks there. And not just the folks in the disability community but, ultimately, for many seniors throughout our province, this could be something that, you know, impacts them and makes a big difference.

So while we don't oppose this legislation, there is, I think, a lot of work that will need to be done to monitor it, to—as an opposition—try to improve it or try to make changes as we go forward. We do hope that information will be coming—forthcoming very shortly, in terms of exactly what this minister intends to do with regard to these pilot projects, that he brings that information forward to the Legislature so that we know exactly what is going to be rolled out.

I know I've heard informally from several members in the Chamber about projects that they're looking forward to, but as we enter a season of elections, municipal elections across our province, I think it will be very interesting to see the different interactions between that municipal level of government and the member for—and the Minister for Infrastructure, because this is one of those changes that will ultimately impact how they're able to deliver services and opportunities to folks in their municipalities and they want the freedom to be able to go to their rate-payers and say, this is my vision, this is what I want to do, and put that to the test at the ballot.

So thank you very much for the time here once again, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I think it's an important piece of legislation and, as I said, we're committed as an opposition to continuing to monitor this as this goes forward and watch to see how it's rolled out in different parts of the province.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Dougald Lamont (St. Boniface): I'll just put some brief comments on the record. This is a decent bill. It's not a great bill. It seeks to do what it achieves

and in a very modest way. The reality is that many of our sidewalks are impassable. Many of our roadways are currently undriveable and that there's no charging for electric vehicle stations—or, totally inadequate charging for electric vehicles. All of these are things that need to be improved.

It would be great to see that this is something beyond just Assiniboine Park, but let's get on with it and vote for it.

Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading on Bill 21, The Highway Traffic Amendment and Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Amendment Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? [*Agreed*]

**Bill 7—The Police Services Amendment Act
(Enhancing Independent Investigation
Unit Operations)**

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We now move to Bill 7, The Police Services Amendment Act (Enhancing Independent Investigation Unit Operations).

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I move, seconded by the Minister of Families (Ms. Squires), that Bill 7, The Police Services Amendment Act (Enhancing Independent Investigation Unit Operations), reported from the Standing Committee on Justice, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Goertzen: We know that the vast majority of the women and men in law enforcement, whether that's in the Winnipeg Police Service, the RCMP, the Brandon Police Service, the various municipal services around the province—[*interjection*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Goertzen: —each and every day are working hard to ensure that Manitobans in the various jurisdictions that they're responsible for are safe.

But we also know that, like in any organization, there are challenges and there are problems. But when those problems happen in a policing organization, they can be particularly significant and impactful, because police, by virtue of the authority that we give them, give them all as legislators, have very unique and powerful responsibilities in a society like ours, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And so, you need to have, in a

society like ours, an ability to investigate when things happen with the police.

Now, the IIU, which was created under the NDP government—I believe it was Mr. Chomiak who was minister of Justice at the time—is there to investigate things that are largely criminal in nature, that involve the RCMP, and when there should be civilian and independent oversight.

And at the creation of the IIU, and I remember in this Chamber having discussions with Mr. Chomiak about whether it was wise to have officers, existing officers, be involved in that. I mean, one of the things he said at the time was that there are very few individuals who have investigative authority or power skills other than RCMP or other police officers. And—but we all recognized that that had both the perception of potential conflict and, at worst, maybe a reality.

And so, today, we're moving away from that and moving to those who are not active in the service. There's a movement away from that, and that isn't a criticism of Mr. Chomiak or the NDP when they brought this in. I think everybody brought it in with the best intentions that they had, recognizing it was new.

But there are other important changes here, and the most significant—I won't go through all of them—but certainly, I think the creation of a full-time director of Indigenous community relations is one that's very important—very important—for the Indigenous community. There were significant consultations with leaders in the Indigenous community and saw this as an important step. It's not a cure-all for all the challenges that might exist in the IIU or in the relationship with the Indigenous community, but it's a very important step.

And I think that we should always remember in legislation that when we're trying to improve things, it might not always be to the perfect. And I know the role of the opposition is to point out things that they feel could make things better, but I don't think that that should ever be a block for improvement.

And this is a bill that improves the IIU, and I'm sure that in the future, there'll be other ministers of Justice, and hopefully, within our government, that'll continue to improve it, but in the history of time and in the future, I'm sure that there'll be other governments that struggle with this as well.

But I think this is an improvement, and I recommend it to the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): Sorry. Well, I'm pleased to put a couple of words on the record in respect to Bill 7, Deputy Speaker, the police services amendment act, enhancing the Independent Investigation Unit operations.

The—my colleague, the Minister for Justice, spoke about—that the IIU was established under the NDP government. And, in fact, as I've shared many times, when I was the director of justice for the Southern Chiefs Organization—I was the director of justice, I think, from, like, 2002 until 2010. And very early on in that role, one of my primary responsibilities was helping my people navigate some of the public complaints process that we have in respect of Indigenous police relations or—so, interactions with policing institutions: RCMP, Brandon, Winnipeg Police, DOPS and such.

* (17:10)

And one of the things that became very, very clear early on doing this work was that the complaints system—the complaints body system within Manitoba at the time was inadequate because, you know, most people will know that Manitoba has the Law Enforcement Review Agency and that the complaints—or the concerns and criticisms that we had back then, from 2002 until 2010, still exist right now.

We have the Professional Standards Unit, which is an internal investigative body within the WPS. And, you know, obviously—quite obviously, there's a lot of concerns with the PSU as well because it is internal to the WPS. And so, you have WPS members investigating themselves in respect of a complaint that's come forward between interactions in the police. And then, of course, we have the Public Complaints Commission with the RCMP, which has its own set of rules and criteria.

And so, you know, very, very early on, part of my role was to lobby and advocate for what at the time we were calling a special, independent investigations unit, and we were kind of modelling it over—after the Ontario model, which was a pretty good model at the time.

And I even brought in their former—I can't remember what his title is, and for the life of me—it was so many years ago—I can't even remember his name, but I hosted a community gathering with him, and people were able to ask questions. I remember we had so many folks come out to that. I hosted it at the Mount Carmel Clinic and then actually met with him

when I was in Ottawa. We ended up doing more work together and he explained everything.

And so, from very early on, I've been one of the folks in Manitoba that have been advocating for a independent investigations unit. When the NDP announced that they were going to start this process of establishing an IIU, I was part of the committee that would work with Glen Lewis at the time, who was in charge of policing. And so, there was MKO, SCO, AMC and MMF, and we all sat on this committee with Glen Lewis and talked about what we wanted to see in this IIU—this—the establishment of an IIU alongside other changes that we wanted to see in The Police Services Act.

So, at the time—and I agree with my colleague, right, like, I think that we all understood that we had to get—establish an IIU. We had to, you know, unequivocally get one established. And that—I think there was the understanding that there would be changes to it as we went along.

And so, you know, I support some of the changes that we see in here: one, that current officers are no longer eligible to serve as an investigator with the IIU. I think that's appropriate. I think that's proper. I think it's essential, in respect of having community confidence in the IIU, to—as much as possible—separate current active members of policing institutions and having them as investigators. So, I support that.

And, you know, there was a lot of discussion going back and forth about the role of, you know, the role that the Indigenous community could play in the IIU. And I know that for myself, I argued that we had to have civilian members that were also investigators within IIU.

And again, I know that my colleague talked about, you know—Dave Chomiak was talking about, you know, the level of training to be able to do these investigations, but I argued back then, as I argue now, that you can train civilians to undertake investigations in respect of policing interactions. And they can be as easily trained as police officers.

Now, of course, there'd be—you know, when you have ex-police officers that are investigators, of course they have years and years of more experience. I get that, but I still think that there's a role in the IIU to have civilians trained up to be able to equitably participate in investigations involving police officers.

Now, in Bill 7, we have the newly created—the position of director of Indigenous and community relations. I think that's fine; that's good, it's a good

start. The problem is that if you look in the legislation is that even though this director of Indigenous and community relations position is established, it's not specifically earmarked for an Indigenous person, an Indigenous Manitoban, to be able to have that role.

And so, as I've said in second reading and standing committee, I take great exception if the IIU were to hire a non-Indigenous person to fill the role of the director of Indigenous and community relations. That is the antithesis to what we should be doing, and I would argue and I would suggest that that would go—that would not look very favourably by the Indigenous community.

And so I was trying to work on an amendment to present on the—on Bill 7 to ensure that only an Indigenous person would be hired as the director of Indigenous relations and—or Indigenous and community relations, but I wasn't able to do that. Apparently, we can't be specific that it can only be an Indigenous person. It violates human rights.

So, all of that to say, in these notes that these folks that go back in Hansard, my hope is that folks will do what's right and hire an Indigenous person to fill that role. Now, that could be a former Indigenous police officer. We—there are phenomenal Indigenous police officers who are retired. Sam Anderson is one of them. I know that we have one sitting in this Chamber right now with us. There are a lot of really good Indigenous police officers that are—if that's the way that IIU wanted to go, that they wanted to hire a former police officer.

And I don't think that it has to be—just to be clear—it doesn't have to be a former police officer. It can be a civilian that can do this work, that can be—do that liaison work between the community and the IIU and policing institutions. In fact, I would argue and suggest that a civilian member, an Indigenous civilian member would be best fitted for this position.

So, you know, I hope—and again, I still think that there's a lot more work that can be done with the IIU to strengthen it, to build the confidence of the public. And one thing I know that—you know, I've spoken with my colleague across the way and I know that it has been part of the discussions is, you know, how do you compel a police officer who's involved in an incident to get interviewed. And so that's a huge issue that I think that we have to tackle.

And I'm hoping to do that sooner than later, to ensure that, you know, officers that are involved in particular criminal, or potentially criminal activities should be interviewed. They should be interviewed

and, you know, held to account rather than just everybody else. And so I know that that's a huge thing that has to be undertaken, but I think it's a necessary and an important step to strengthen the IIU so that Manitobans can have confidence in what is supposed to be an independent investigative body.

Miigwech, Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Dougald Lamont (St. Boniface): We do have existing concerns about this bill. I know I've often said myself that we can't let perfection be the enemy of the good, but this bill makes important steps, but it does not go far enough.

* (17:20)

We have had a huge problem with, quite frankly, with police accountability in this province for decades. I remember the inquiry that followed J.J. Sharper [*phonetic*] being hot-shot and murdered. It was absolutely shocking. He died in 1988, March of 1988, and when the media arrived the next day, they—this crime scene—and it was a crime scene—had been washed clean. It ended up sparking an inquiry that involved cover-ups and accusations against—and attempts to—against people involved in the inquiry. It was terrible. But we still don't have the mechanisms in place to have adequate civilian oversight over police, and this bill still doesn't do that.

I talked with Robert Taman. He ended up resigning from more than one position, including the IIU, because there was an inherent conflict of interest. And the conflict of interest does not even have to be—all it has to be is perceived, but you cannot have police investigating police. I know we don't have that anymore, but we still had the possibility you could have members of the military police, for example. Military police have experience in investigations, in prosecutions, in law. They would be well suited and independent and separate from police, from drawing people from the ranks of former police and investigating each other. You can't let people mark their own homework. We need watchdogs with bark and bite, and we have never had that adequately in this province. We don't now, and we will not adequately after this bill passes.

Even with the IIU, we've had more than a dozen cases where the IIU made recommendations to prosecute and the Crown said no. And you still get what people call—you know, there's—it's essentially a form of toxic solidarity, but we know it's in place, where police are staying silent about the misbehaviour of

their—and it happens in other organizations as well—silent about the misbehaviour of their colleagues.

Now, they cannot be compelled to testify because that would be a violation of fundamental constitutional rights, the right not to incriminate yourself. That being said, they have an obligation as public servants to disclose not if they are—not if they're incriminating themselves, but they need to do their jobs. And it is a very, very serious issue because it—if we cannot ensure that we're properly enforcing the law, it puts at risk trust in authorities.

For police to work, we need to be able to trust them, and there is a huge amount of well-earned distrust. And we've seen it from BIPOC communities, from the terrible treatment of Indigenous communities and what is essentially a two-tier justice system in this province. And where people who do not have power and who do not have a reputation can be convicted and sent to jail because they don't have a reputation to protect, whereas people with a reputation can get a slap on the wrist because the public shame of it apparently is supposed to be enough. And we've seen this over and over again.

This is—this cuts straight to one of the fundamental questions of justice, which is the ability of police to be independent and the ability of police to police themselves, which they've never been able to do ever in history.

So we have to have adequate oversight, and we have to have people who are willing to stand up and be independent and have the IIU be truly independent. And that would include people who are—who have different kinds of investigative skills, including from outside of the police agencies that are involved because we have a long way to go to rebuild trust. So, we will not be sorting—supporting this bill.

Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 7, The Police Services Amendment Act (Enhancing Independent Investigation Unit Operations).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? [*Agreed*]

I declare the motion carried.

Bill 8—The Court of Appeal Amendment and Provincial Court Amendment Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We now move to Bill 8, The Court of Appeal Amendment and Provincial Court Amendment Act.

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour, that Bill 8, The Court of Appeal Amendment and Provincial Court Amendment Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Justice, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Goertzen: This bill has two important provisions.

One is something that I believe that all members of the Assembly support, and that is to ensure that there is judicial education in sexual assault law and social context. Of course, this is a matter that was debated in Ottawa for some time, brought forward by the former leader of the Conservative Party, Rona Ambrose, as a bill to ensure that federal justices receive this sort of training.

It became a matter of some controversy because, you know, understandably, judges will exert their independence, and independence over the education that they take when they're on the bench, as well. And I have respect, of course, for those who are in the 'judiciary' and the independence—and why they have independence, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's an important part of our model of government, where you have the executive branch of government separate from the 'judiciary'.

And so, lots of discussion about how we could try to get the imperative of this important type of training done, both in Ottawa with the judges federally, and then provincially, and settled on—upon this model whereby, prior to becoming a judge or accepting a provincial judge appointment, this is a requirement or a provision. So, in that way, preserving the independence of the 'judiciary' while still meeting an important social and societal goal, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I know that there'll be other discussions, I'm sure, with the 'judiciary' in Manitoba. I believe in Ottawa, they've signed an MOU with the Court of Queen's Bench and other federally appointed judges, and perhaps that discussion can happen here in Manitoba, as well.

And then, of course, there's also the issue of how judges themselves are appointed to the bench, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And this is often a matter of some debate. I want to say off the top, though, that I know that my friend from St. Johns may take the opportunity to try to import American systems into this

debate. And without expending the next seven minutes on going through the differences of the confirmation process of judges in the American system compared to the Canadian system—you know, 'sufficient' to say that the differences are significant and they'll remain significant.

This model is essentially aligned to the federal model in terms of how judges are appointed. It is endorsed, I imagine, then, by the NDP-Liberal coalition that governs in Ottawa these days, and existed under a previous government, as well, in Ottawa.

And it doesn't mean that the system is perfect, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and it doesn't mean that there won't be things revisited, as they are—always are. And then there've been changes across the country in how judges are appointed.

But I think it is important to know there are specific criteria in terms of how long an individual has to have served or been called to the bar before they can be appointed as a judge, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Then, of course, there's an application process that'll get vetted by a committee of individuals that include, of course, judges and others from the legal profession, and then those who are appointed from the community at large.

In—and, you know, I've heard my friend from St. Johns talk about, you know, the important role of having the judges steer all of this. And I have a great deal of respect for those who are in the 'judiciary', I truly do. But one of the beautiful things about our legal system is that we do find opportunities and space for members of the public at large to play a role.

A judicial justice themselves, Mr. Deputy Speaker, can be a member of the public at large. That's specifically laid out. That needs to be called justices of the peace, I believe. But a judicial justice can become—be a member who's not a member of the bar, not a lawyer, not trained in the law but is a member of the public who applies and shows that they have skills that align to a judicial justice appointment. And they can be—and can be appointed, then, in that way.

That shows that there is an interplay. I mean, in—just on the previous bill, the member opposite was talking about civilian oversight when it comes to law enforcement—having the ability to have the public have some impact when it comes to appointing judges or in the method that I talked about before, as a judicial justice: those are important things, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

* (17:30)

So, with that, while I know I'll hear some of the arguments from my friend across the way, I'm sure, again about this portion of the bill. It aligns well with Ottawa. It, you know, ensures that, you know, qualified individuals are vetted and give the Attorney General of the day, the Minister of Justice, the ability to choose from a well-qualified, substantive list of individuals to serve well on the 'judiciary' in Manitoba.

So, thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I look forward to seeing this bill pass.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): Well, I'm pleased to get up and put, I guess, my final words on the record in respect of Bill 8.

Again, similar to what I said the last couple of times and in committee—which in committee was backed up by presenters—no one asked for these changes. Absolutely no one asked for these changes to the judiciary appointment committee.

And again, I don't know why—how the idea, you know—again, because this came under—this bill came forward under the former Justice minister. Again, the former failed Health minister and now, again, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Friesen)—[*interjection*] Which one, yes, yes—[*interjection*] The former form—no, the former. The former former, yes. I think that should—[*interjection*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Ms. Fontaine: —clarify it.

So, I just don't understand how the discussion to change, you know, something that has worked for 30 years—30 or 35 years, that's worked without any complaints on both sides of the House within the 'judiciary', no complaints, running smoothly, everything's hunky-dory, we have good folks who are appointed to our courts, to sit on our courts.

And all of a sudden, when it gets to the former Justice minister, the former Justice minister is sitting in his office or I don't know where, and decides, you know what? Let's change what's working; let's change it because I don't like it. I don't like the way it's working, even though nobody's complaining about it. It works good. Let's change it because that's what I can do when I am the minister of Justice. I can do what I want despite nobody asking for those changes.

So, I know that I've said this before; I want to say a couple of things about some of the presenters to standing committee. At the standing committee, concerns were brought forward by Lisa LaBossiere, the executive representing the Criminal Defence Lawyers

Association of Manitoba, as well as Ian Scarth, president of Manitoba Bar Association, and Susan Dawyers [*phonetic*—I apologize if I am not saying that correctly—the legal counsel for the Provincial Judges Association of Manitoba.

So first, let me point out, Deputy Speaker, that none of them had been consulted with. Nobody. Again, the former Justice minister just said, ah, I'm going to do this because I don't like the way it's working, but I'm not going to consult with anybody, but I'll try to appear like I'm consulting with people, but not really. I'm not going to consult with the people that actually really matter here, the folks that represent a wide spectrum of stakeholders within the judiciary. So, didn't consult with them.

They raised concerns about how Bill 8 opens the door for the politicalization within our judicial system, removing the majority of non-political appointees on the committee. Because again, Deputy Speaker, as is well-established in this Chamber, what has happened with this bill is they've removed the chief judge as the chairperson and they've added another appointee from the government. So you have a non-judge—another non-judge person that sits, now, on this committee, and it's not chaired by the chief judge.

And so, this really does stack the judicial appointment committee and could stack it in favour of whatever government's political ideologies may be. And I know that the Minister for Justice just said, and he said it a couple of times, about how I've raised concerns about what we saw in the US under the administration or the presidency of Donald Trump. And I know he's saying they're two different things. Obviously—quite obviously—I know they're two entirely different justice systems. That's not the point that I'm trying to make.

The point that I'm trying to make is that when you have an individual that wants to get their way and has an agenda, a political agenda—like Donald Trump—and what he did was he stacked the courts with his preferred judges that benched towards his political ideology. And what you see with that—and including the highest court in the land, the Supreme Court of the US—the US Supreme Court—and what you see is that his political appointees have slanted the court.

And so now, again, the end game to that was to get rid of citizens rights to access abortion, and that was a very co-ordinated effect across the US, but at all levels. And so there's an inherent danger. Right now, like I've said before, folks in the US are waiting for, you know, the Supreme Court's decision—probably

sometime at the end of June—that will strip individuals' ability to access abortion because that's what they were meant to do. Donald Trump put them in those positions to do exactly that, and then, lo and behold, they're doing exactly that.

So, there's concern when the PC government under the former Justice minister—and now this Justice Minister—this Justice Minister could've said, hey, former Justice minister; hey, colleague, you know what? I don't think we should go ahead with Bill 8. I'm the new Justice Minister. I think we're not going to move forward with Bill 8 because it's not needed.

Deputy Speaker, he could have had that conversation with his colleague. He could have said, you know what? You know, I know you wanted to change something that was working well for 30 years, 35 years. I don't know why you wanted to change it, but we're not going to change it. I'm going to do what's right and I'm going to—we're not going to go—proceed with Bill 8.

But, unfortunately, both of these Justice ministers have moved forward with Bill 8 and now we will have a new Judicial Appointments Committee. Why, who knows? I would have loved to have been a fly on the wall to hear that conversation and how that conversation came up to change something that was working, that everybody was happy with. But, alas, here we are. In a couple of hours, Bill 8 is going to become—is going to receive royal assent and receive law.

And we're going to have—

An Honourable Member: How many hours?

Ms. Fontaine: Couple of hours. Well, around midnight, Deputy Speaker; midnight, 1:00, you never know—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Ms. Fontaine: —you never know. But in whatever, how many hours, this is going to become law.

And it will forever be known, Deputy Speaker, that the former Justice minister and this Justice Minister, both failed Health ministers, right—so kind of married together here—changed the way that we appoint judges in Manitoba, despite nobody asking them to do so. And I think that that's really not good. It's tragic, actually, quite honestly.

Because now we are—you are creating a system whereby there is an inherent distrust, because who are the members going to appoint to sit on this Judicial Appointments Committee? You know, I'm pretty

sure—I'm going to put it on the record here—I'm pretty sure that there's, you know, no NDPers that are going to be appointed to that—*[interjection]* I know the Minister of Justice (Mr. Goertzen) likes lots of NDPers, that's great. But I think that the move to change the judiciary was not to appoint any left-leaning folks on that committee. *[interjection]*

So, again, here we are. We're all talking about who we like and all of that, but at the end of the day I really do—all jokes aside, Deputy Premier—this really does—*[interjection]* What did I say? *[interjection]* Oh.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You said Deputy Premier. I'm honoured, but I'm the Deputy Speaker.

Ms. Fontaine: Deputy Speaker, sorry, it's been a long day. Sorry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes, I know.

Ms. Fontaine: Thank you to Madam Clerk for pointing that out.

* (17:40)

At the end of the day, Deputy Speaker, I do think this really does erode the confidence of Manitobans in our judicial appointment process, and we heard that at committee. I'm sure that we're going to hear that a little bit more as we go on. And it's unfortunate that these two gentlemen will be forever attached to law—to a law that changed the way it was working and that was working very good.

Thank you, Deputy Speaker.

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Tyndall Park): I'm happy to be able to rise and share a few words during third reading, here, of Bill 8.

And I think there's actually two components of this legislation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the first component I actually really, really appreciate. And it talks about the need for judges to have training in sensitivity so that when they are dealing with people in their courtrooms, they have been properly trained—whether that be in language and discretion and insensitivity—and that, I think, all members of this House is in complete favour of.

And I say that because it was actually the national—Conservative member of the national government at the time, Rona Ambrose—sorry, she wasn't in government at the time. But it was Rona Ambrose, Conservative MP, who brought forward similar legislation ensuring that people—judges—would have to take sensitivity training when working in—on their cases.

So then, here, provincially, we followed suit. And I know I introduced legislation calling for this. I know a member of the NDP also introduced legislation calling for this—and the government had the opportunity to support either of our pieces of legislation, and they chose not to.

Instead, they chose to take the idea—which is fine, it happens. They put it in their legislation. But in the same piece of legislation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they added in this whole section taking away control from the judiciary council. And, you know, this is something that I have been learning a lot about—especially back when I was the critic for Justice—and just through many conversations that I've had with the former Justice minister, the member from Morden-Winkler, actually. We had many conversations about that, the importance of independence in our judiciary. And that's why I'm actually quite surprised that this was brought into legislation here.

I remember at committee, reading through committee Hansard, and one of the speakers from—a member of the Provincial Judges Association of Manitoba explained it really well, where for the last 30 years political hands have been out of the pot and there have been no concerns brought forward. There have been no—no one has actually approached this government to ask them to make these changes. But what they've done in this legislation—if it passes—is it allows the Minister of Justice to review the list of judges before actually putting that judge into their official seat.

And I don't think that's any business of the minister, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I think that's where it's really important that our judiciary remains independent and they have the final say at the end of the day because they're the ones who know best. And what has been happening has been working for the last 30 years.

So, no one called for this. We're confused as to why it's coming forward. And that's why it's so unfortunate that they combined both these things into one piece of legislation because we do—we a hundred per cent support the need for training for judges with the—as far as sensitivity training goes, but we can't in good faith support the second part because we haven't heard from anyone in our judiciary that this is favourable.

With those few words, I'll cede my seat.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question before the House—*[interjection]*

Order, please. *[interjection]* Order, please. *[interjection]* Order. Thank you.

The question before the House is Bill 8, The Court of Appeal Amendment and Provincial Court Amendment Act.

Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hear a no.

Let me check my script, here. Hang on a second.

Voice Vote

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Ms. Lamoureux: On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried, on division.

Bill 9—The Scrap Metal Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will now move to Bill 9, The Scrap Metal Act.

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I move, seconded by the Minister of Sport, Culture, Heritage, that Bill 9, The Scrap Metal Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Goertzen: I know that this bill and this issue matters to all Manitobans, maybe no member more so than the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), who I know has brought forward this issue many times. And I commend him for that. It is a good thing when members of the House pick up an issue and decide to make it their own and drive it. And whether that is the catalytic converter theft issue, or building bridges or whatever else, the member opposite has a couple of things that he gets very focused on and very driven towards. And that's good.

It's an important thing because these are important issues to Manitobans. And the issue of catalytic converter theft, which is the impetus behind this bill,

is significant across North America. It's a significant issue in every jurisdiction in North America. Members can go online and quickly google the term, and they'll find in every state in the United States this is a problem; in every province in Canada this has become a problem.

This is one measure to help make it more difficult for the theft of catalytic converters to happen, because it makes it more difficult for the conversion into money, into funds, to happen, by requiring that scrap metal dealers have an identity of the individual who's selling it and keep a record of that transaction. And we do know that these crimes are often crimes of convenience, and the easier you make it for an individual to not only steal but then convert that into cash, the more likely it is to happen.

But we also know it's not the only thing that probably has to happen, and I've had discussions with MPI about what other measures could take place. I know that, in the United States, there's a lawmaker, either in Congress or in the Senate, who is bringing forward, through their process, a bill that would require manufacturers to put the VIN number on a catalytic converter. That's something that might make sense because it's happening at the manufacturer's level and it wouldn't be a significant challenge.

I understand that I might be wrong on this. I hope I'm not putting any wrong information on the record, but I understand that Toyota has now—I think there's the cages that they have on catalytic converters, that Toyota is doing it on some of their vehicles as a standard sort of thing. So maybe not unlike what we saw with auto theft; and where immobilizers became a standard part of vehicles, we might see this again as it goes along.

And, you know, I know the member opposite has talked about VIN numbers and he's talked about maybe cages on catalytic converters, is that something that MPI could be involved with. And certainly, I continue to have discussions with MPI about what other measures other than the ones we're taking here in the Legislature could happen.

So, all that to say, again, this is not a silver bullet to a problem that no jurisdiction in North America has found a silver bullet for, but it is an important step. And we'll continue to look at other measures and then also work, of course, with industry, because, ultimately, I think that the solution is going to be at the manufacturer's level where they're looking at consumer protection, and—either through VIN numbers or other sort of insulations at the manufacturer's level

similar to auto theft, where the measures will be taken there. And that's what's ultimately going to be, I think, the solution to this issue.

But that doesn't mean that we won't continue to look at action to be taken, taking action today. Thank the member for Elmwood for his advocacy on this bill and his continued advocacy on this issue.

Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm very pleased to follow the minister on—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

* (17:50)

Mr. Maloway: —speaking to this bill. And I can tell you that he has a—you know, I think a pretty solid understanding of what has to be done here.

The reality is that Alberta and British Columbia had a three-year head start on us in terms of a scrap metal bill, but you have to remember that the catalytic converter issue has kind of snuck up on us. And the bills that were brought in, in those other two provinces, were dealing more with scrap metal, which would be a lot of copper and construction site thefts of materials. And when commodity prices really went up high, like copper and other metals the people were stealing, you know, from construction sites, from hydro sites. And from hydro sites is particularly dangerous because a lot of people would end up getting electrocuted when they did things like that.

So the genesis of this bill was to deal with scrap metal and knowing that scrap metals were being brought to scrap metal dealers, and that was the natural flow of this—of these products. And so, the idea was to make it a requirement that the dealers had to keep track and keep records of the scrap metals that were being brought in.

Now, what happened is that the government has introduced a bill, Bill 9, which is essentially a knock-off of the Alberta bill, which is now three years old and has sort of been overtaken by, just, history. Because the number of catalytic converters—the value of catalytic converters being stolen, I believe, in the last year is, like, \$4 million. In other words, the problem's gotten worse.

So, you know, who would introduce a bill—what government would introduce a bill knowing that three years from now the—what you're trying to solve is actually going to be way worse than it is right now. So,

clearly—*[interjection]*—yes, what we concluded was that there had to be a multi-pronged approach to this.

And the minister's right. When we look back to the 1990s, we had auto theft in Manitoba at record-high levels. And you know what, the car manufacturers could have solved the auto theft problem, I believe, by putting an immobilizer in the vehicle from the factory, and the cost was going to be, I believe, \$130—that was it. But they were too cheap to do that, because it would raise the price of the car by \$130, so they leave this problem for the end consumers. And auto theft was at record-high levels.

The Liberals here were pushing bait cars. Kevin Lamoureux was here at the time, and he wanted to have this bait car program that was successful in some parts of the United States where you lured—you put a car on the street and you lured the thief to the car, and then the thief jumped in the car and the car locked and you caught your person.

Well, Manitoba didn't follow that, thank goodness, and actually got a very, very good—*[interjection]*—well, yes, the minister said we did some of it; we did a bit. But we—but it took us a while. It didn't happen overnight. But it took us two or three years, the minister will know, to get this right.

We started out with Autopac giving minor discounts, you know, like a hundred—\$50, that kind of thing. Well, the public didn't respond. So the government decided in the next year, well, we got to get more serious, and they started raising the discounts.

And that's what I'm saying, is that if we were to offer MPI discounts on auto insurance for people who engraved the VIN numbers or serial number on the catalytic converter, if we were to do that now and you were to offer \$50, the minister's going to lose a year, because people are not going to respond.

Madam Speaker in the Chair

All I'm suggesting is, learn from what we learned with the auto theft program in the 1990s and get serious from day one and get MPI to get out there and offer a substantial discount—offer \$100, \$200. You know, use the experts in the field to decide how big the discount would be, but hit it hard and hit it fast, and don't lose another year or two in the process.

We introduced another bill to require car dealers selling new and used cars to require them to put a VIN number on the catalytic converter. Well, you know that's going to take a while because you have to come up with your regulation and pass a bill, first of all, then

come up with regulations and then get them to do it. This is going to take, you know, five years before we get something moving here, right? So—but that's an idea that the government should be looking at—and there may be some other ideas too.

The whole idea of having the manufacturers deal with the issue, Mr. Minister, evidently you could look at Ontario where they tried to get the parts dealers—the parts manufacturers of Canada—to deal with the issue and I'm told that—I think the Ford government tried it—and the federal government didn't want to be involved. You know, they didn't want to—they got negative response from the parts manufacturers so they don't want to do it.

But let me tell you that the parts manufacturers, Mr. Minister, can do this for a fraction of the cost. We're going to turn over thousands of people to after-market operators who want to make money. You know, whether it's putting serial numbers or VIN numbers on catalytic converters, you know, that—the cat's—the cow's out of the barn. You have to—you should be going back to the manufacturer.

And this is where the Premier (Mrs. Stefanson) should be involved. The Premier should take up this issue and deal with the Prime Minister and get these auto parts manufacturers to the table and get working on it. But that doesn't mean the minister shouldn't sit around and wait for this to happen because it doesn't look like it is happening. So he, at least, is moving today in passing Bill 9, and I don't think it's strong enough. It's only keeping records for two years; that's not enough. And my bill said it should be five years. I thought that the—I thought the penalty should be increased as well, from where he's at right now because he's starting behind already if he's adopting the requirements of the Alberta bill.

So all we're saying is that he expects to pass this bill today, promulgate all the regulations and go out there and try to convince these scrap metal dealers to comply with these things, we're going to be sitting here a year from now and he's not going to be that much further ahead than he is right now. And he knows that, and he knows that that's the case.

So I'm just encouraging him to move on more fronts than one. Don't expect that somehow passing this bill is going to get you the results you want when Alberta says it's not going to happen and BC says it's not going to happen either.

So we've offered some suggestions. By all means, we're not—we don't have the total answer here, as he

indicated himself. Nobody has the total answer, but you should be passing the—our bill to require the car salespeople—the car dealers—require them to sell vehicles with a serial number, with a VIN number on that part. That would be helpful. And then get MPIC—MPI into the game, as well, to offer substantial discounts.

And on that basis, he will have consumers of Manitoba looking at him as actually being an activist and doing something about the problem as opposed to simply taking one little piece of the puzzle and saying, oh, well, we've achieved success here.

Well, you haven't achieved success and you're not going to, either, just by passing this bill tonight and thinking you're going to get big results out of it. And you've even indicated yourself that that's not going to work out the way you want it to at this point.

So all I'm suggesting is, like, don't give up. You do it—you're on the right track with this bill, but you've got to move a lot more quickly on other aspects of this issue as well.

And with that—

An Honourable Member: Yours was better.

Mr. Maloway: —I'm prepared to—I think our bill is better, yes.

* (18:00)

Mr. Dougald Lamont (St. Boniface): It's a pleasure to put some facts on the record, and take the opportunity to correct—I know that the other members speaking on this have made a couple of mistakes that I'm eager to correct, one of which is that this bill was not originally just proposed for catalytic convertors.

It was, in fact, based on a bill that I presented in 2020, which was brought forward, or the ideas behind it were brought forward by constituents of St. Boniface who are frustrated with the fact they'd seen property crime go up by 300 per cent and that people were stealing stuff from their yards, chopping up their bikes and barbecues and more.

In fact, after I introduced that bill, it was voted on—it was voted against by both the PCs and the NDP. I had a very positive meeting with the former minister of Justice, the current Minister of Finance (Mr. Friesen), who said that they would use our bill as a model, which is reflected in an online article with the—this largely replicates the private member's bill that we brought forward in the first place. This is something that, had we voted on it and passed it two

years ago, we would not have to be dealing with the level of catalytic convertor theft we've had—seen up to this point.

I will grant that the member from Elmwood is right in saying that it should have a longer list in terms of five years, in terms of five years of records, but this is a very serious issue. The—it was—basically, all it does is create scrap metal dealers the way we should be treating, and we have treated the regulation of pawn shops because there's no question that people, and including organized criminals, are stealing huge amounts of scrap metal.

It's damaging to cars, it's bad for MPI, it's bad for constituents and residents, and it has even led to the massive, large-scale theft from places like Vale in Thompson, where multiple million dollars' worth of nickel was stolen from the—from Vale and recycled—recycled, quote, unquote—criminally through a scrap metal dealer.

So, finally, as far as the member for Elmwood's (Mr. Maloway) comments on what was done about car thefts, car thefts were at a record high, and one of the things the NDP did was not—was to appeal to the federal government to have much, much tougher tough-on-crime legislation. They encouraged them to strip away rights and to have more aggressive prosecution of young offenders, which means—which partly led to vast numbers of Indigenous people, especially Indigenous children, being put behind bars.

So, with that being said, I am looking forward to this bill being passed.

Madam Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 9, The Scrap Metal Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? *[Agreed]*

I declare the motion carried.

Bill 17—The Family Law Act, The Family Support Enforcement Act and The Inter-jurisdictional Support Orders Amendment Act

Madam Speaker: Moving now to concurrence and third reading of Bill 17, The Family Law Act, The Family Support Enforcement Act and The Inter-jurisdictional Support Orders Amendment Act

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I move, seconded by the Minister for Seniors, that Bill 17, The Family Law Act, The Family Support Enforcement Act and The Inter-jurisdictional Support Orders Amendment Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Justice, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Goertzen: It's a pleasure to speak about this bill this afternoon—or this evening. When it comes to family law, there are many who've had some sort of experience with it. And it's not always considered a positive experience because, you know, often when you're going to a family law situation, it's because something has broken down. Either a marriage has broken down or there's some relationships been broken down, and often it involves children in that breakdown.

So one of the things that our government has been focused on over the last six years is to try to, as much as government can, recognizing that laws and government can only do so and so much on issues that are really matters of the heart, when it comes to marital breakdown or other sorts of things. But as much as government can, how can you mitigate the amount of discord and animosity and conflict that happens often when you're dealing in family relationships?

And so, a great deal of attention has been paid to the modernization of family law by our government, by past ministers of Justice, with the goal of trying to keep many of these issues out of court, modernizing the way things are done, trying to provide other alternatives other than just simply court resolutions and always keeping in mind the best interests of children, when children are involved in the matter that's being discussed.

So this bill continues on along that path, Madam Speaker. It aligns largely with the Divorce Act—the federal Divorce Act. Again, you know, there are differences of authority that are sometimes confusing to follow, and the same way with marriage. For example, the definition of marriage is a federal responsibility, but the solemnization of marriage, the actual performing of the act of marriage, is a provincial responsibility; a provincial licence is granted. In the same way, there are some aspects of family law which are purely within the realm of the provincial government, yet the Divorce Act is a federal act.

But if an individual or a couple, as an example, is not going through divorce per se, but they're getting separated, many of the same principles apply, many of the same protections apply. And so it's important that the acts that govern that, on the one side, which are provincial legislations, mirror that which govern the federal legislation under the Divorce Act, so you don't have individuals having to make choices based on different acts that they might not otherwise make. It's important that they are essentially the same, so that an artificial choice isn't being made simply on which act seems to be better for them at that particular time.

So, this act aligns, in terms of terminology, with the Divorce Act. It takes away a lot of the language that is more conflictual about custody; it's more about shared parenting time and, to the best that one can, ensuring, again, that the focus is on children.

It also deals with issues around interjurisdictional support orders, trying to ensure, again, that there are—some of the barriers for enforcing an interjurisdictional support order are broken down, which is very important. It provides things for ensuring that where one parent is deciding to relocate to another jurisdiction, that proper notice provisions are provided to the other parent. That's important because, of course, relocation can have a dramatic effect, both on the relationship between two individuals, but, of course, the spouse or the parent that doesn't have primary care and control of a child. So, it aligns that.

When it comes to other issues, it allows a child to, in fact, themselves ask for child support if, for whatever reason—and these would be rare cases, but there might be some cases where the parent wouldn't ask for or refuses to ask for support, a child can actually ask for support, and that clarifies the existing language. And then when it comes to other issues, it allows—like many things these days, as we learn more about electronic transfer of information and the security around that, it allows for the transmission of documents to be done across jurisdictions outside of Canada, and that, again, allows for support orders to be enforced.

So, the bill is not, on its own, something that overturns family law on its head. But it continues on with our government's changes to make family law more modern, less conflict-orientated, the ability to try to move things through court more quickly into a resolution that is in the best interests of the children, ultimately the 'best'—best interests of the family.

Now, just as a closing comment, of course, again, we all have experience, either personal or through

family or through friends, of individuals who, through the breakdown of a marriage or breakdown of a relationship, it's been difficult. And it's challenging when you're trying to try to come to some sort of a resolution that doesn't involve a lot of conflict.

Government will likely never be able to resolve all of those issues. Government is not a good vessel for, necessarily, trying to put back together personal relationships. But to the best that we can, we need to have structures that mitigate and minimize that conflict as much as possible. This is part of the government's commitment to do that and we'll continue in further acts in the future.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

* (18:10)

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): Sorry, I was waiting for the applause for the minister, so I was—*[interjection]* No, I meant for you. I was waiting for the applause for you. *[interjection]* Okay, okay.

Okay, well, I'm pleased to put some words on the record in respect of Bill 17, The Family Law Act, The Family Support Enforcement Act and The Inter-jurisdictional Support Orders Amendment Act.

Similar to bill—the Hague Convention bill, it's important for governments to modernize legislation and make sure that they're in line with federal legislation. So we do support the changes in Bill 17. It's vital that provincial and federal laws align and keep up with modern times. Like everything else, Madam Speaker, society has changed and family structures have changed as well and our legislation must accurately reflect Manitoba families.

This bill replaces concepts of custody and accessing respecting children—access respecting children with the concept of parenting arrangements, parenting time and decision-making responsibilities. These new provisions allow step-parents and other family members, like grandparents, who stand in the place of a parent to seek parenting time or decision-making responsibility for a child rather than having to apply for guardianship.

I think that this is a positive and a necessary step to reflect, you know, all of the different individuals that are in a child's life. You know, we often say, well, it takes a village to raise a child. But often the court system can make it difficult for those folks that want to have access to that child, to help raise them, to love them, to give them opportunities. Sometimes the court system can be a hindrance to that. So I do think that

that's a really good movement to change that to allow that other folks can apply to access time or parenting time.

This bill also expands access to child and spousal support by making it possible for children to apply for child support, and clarifies under what circumstances a foreign support should be enforced. Again, you know, I don't typically use the word progressive when talking about members opposite, but I will say that this legislation is progressive in respect of allowing children to apply for child support. And I think that that's important.

You know, there are children that, you know, like myself. I moved out when I was 15. I've been on my own since I was 15 years old, and we know that there are children that are out there that are on—15, 16—but that should have access to extra, additional supports if they can. And so this allows—if they are able—allows children to be able to apply for that child support from their parents. I think that that's a good move. That's progressive and that's an important move. And it's a modern move, as we make our way down this new kind of journey.

This bill places an explicit duty on families to try and resolve divorce matters through a family dispute resolution process. I've spoken in the House here, in respect of going to family case conferencing, which I found it to be—when my youngest son was only two, I found it to be not an enjoyable experience, Madam Speaker, but, certainly, it was less intimidating and it allowed for a safe space to be able to have those conversations in respect of, you know, custody arrangements and child maintenance. And I wasn't traumatized by it, and I think that that's important, right?

At the end of the day when you—because again, life happens. You think you're going to be with somebody for the rest of your life and then life happens and you're not. And then—and that—it is what it is. It happens to many of us. But often, you know, the court system can make it just so adversarial. And yet, you have a child together. And at some point you still have to parent together. Not always, but, you know, you should, if you're able to, be able to have a cordial relationship. And so I know for myself, my family, case conferencing was a good experience and it worked well for myself and my young son. And so I'm glad to see that as well.

While the rights of the child are not mentioned in this bill, it does place an emphasis on the best interests of the child. Parents having clear legal rights and responsibilities is critical to a child's life, and

last year's amendments to the Manitoba Family Maintenance Act clarified the legal definition of a parentage for a child who was conceived through assisted reproduction with or without surrogacy. Legal parentage impacts a number of areas in the child's life, including citizenship, health-care decisions, custody in the event of a separation or inheritance rights.

I will say, Madam Speaker, it's concerning that the government took so long to safeguard the rights and interests of children through a legal recognition of parents. Though they did ultimately bring this legislation forward and pass it, they missed the deadline. I think it's important to bring that out.

I would like to thank Lawrence Pinsky [*phonetic*], who spoke to Bill 17 at the standing committee on behalf of family arbitration and mediation legal institute. He spoke of other areas where family law could be modernized and updated, and I would urge my colleague, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Goertzen), to take those into account and ensure that Manitoba's family law is adapting to the times, and again, that we are continually modernizing to make the system more responsive and safe for Manitoba families—in particular, Manitoba children.

Again, Madam Speaker, I think I'll leave my comments for there. I think we've had a lot of discussion on Bill 17. It's important that we look ahead to the future and that we acknowledge the way that Manitoba families are currently experienced. And we have a variety of different ways in which families raise their children and love their children and work together to raise their children. And then, sometimes, you know, you have the opposite of that.

And so, you know, creating a system that puts the best interests of the child first I think is important; it's necessary, and it's certainly proper in 2022.

Miigwech.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Speaker, Bill 17 makes some major changes in family law which, overall, we certainly support. The concept is to have a system which is less confrontational and dependent more on mediation for settling difficulties.

I thought the comments of Lawrence Pinsky in the committee meeting were noteworthy, and so I'm just going to quote from that. He says: The social science is very clear that early intervention by a professional, by a decider who's trained in the area, is absolutely critical in making sure that families don't—that is, families who are separated—don't continue

down a path that is less than what would be expected or wanted for children overall, for their best interests or of the families themselves.

On a separation, it's a highly emotive time, and permitting people to continue down paths that are less than what one'd hope without that sort of input, obviously, isn't in their interests or the best interests of the children.

So, there have been many instances in the past, under the current system, where a confrontation between parents or other family members sometimes has occurred, and it has become very emotional and led to deep rifts between parents which are difficult to resolve and which hurt the raising of the child, with often one blaming the other.

This moves to a system which should be more based on what Lawrence Pinsky refers to as the social science showing that professional mediators can be very useful in helping parents come to a decision about how the stewardship of the child will be shared and how costs will be shared and so on.

* (18:20)

So, I think this is a very good bill overall, and we're certainly ready to support it.

I have one comment, and it's similar to one that I've raised in other bills. And that is this, that the family member definition doesn't adequately recognize extended family members. For example, in traditional families, it's not all that infrequently that a grandparent has been raising a child as if it were their own. And this can occur for a whole variety of reasons, and it recognizes the importance of grandparents. But this bill, I don't believe, adequately recognizes the importance and the role that grandparents have and can have, sometimes much more than others, in the upbringing of children.

So with that, which I hope at some point in the future can be recognized and corrected, we're certainly ready to support this bill moving forward and to becoming law.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Merci. Miigwech.

Madam Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 17, The Family Law Act, The Family Support Enforcement Act and

the Inter-jurisdictional Support Orders Amendment Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? [*Agreed*]

Bill 18—The Legislative Security Amendment Act

Madam Speaker: I will now call concurrence and third reading of Bill 18, The Legislative Security Amendment Act.

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Friesen), that Bill 18, The Legislative Security Amendment Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Justice, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Goertzen: I have spoken about the specifics of this bill both at second reading and at—a little bit in committee in answering some of the questions that came out of the Q and A. So I wanted to speak more—little bit more in generalities, if I could, on third readings, about this.

So, all of us have an interest in how this building operates. Earlier today, we passed revisions to the rules, and that's very specific about how the Assembly operates and how it interacts with members and how members interact with each other. But we also have a broader responsibility in this place, in this Assembly, this more-than-100-year-old building. And that is because—and it's often referred to as the people's House, and it is the people's House, and I'm glad that, although it's not a hot ticket right now, but there are, you know—there is the ability for people to come to the gallery and to watch our proceedings. And I'm glad that that's happening again.

But with that comes its own responsibility, because the building itself and those who are in it can sometimes be a target by what it represents, or what the people who work here represent. That's a—true in every Legislature in Canada. It's certainly true in Parliament, and we've seen the tragic results that have happened in Parliament at times.

And yet, some will say, well, this bill must be about MLAs and about protecting MLAs by increasing security or changing the security provisions. The reality is that MLAs aren't actually the people here who are here most often.

Now, it may be that the building, you know, becomes a target or those who become a target for certain activities because of us, because we are politicians, and we all understand that, and we understand the realities of the world. But this building is occupied by many others other than the 57 of us who are elected. It's occupied by staff of the building, staff of the Assembly, deputy ministers, senior civil servants. It's occupied by the public who come to the gallery at different times and watch our proceedings. It's occupied by tourists who come and, thankfully, they're back as well, to tour this beautiful building, the most beautiful Legislature in all of Canada, in my opinion.

And we also owe them a responsibility that those who are coming to this building for other reasons than elected officials also need to feel safe and secure. We have dignitaries that visit; consul general for Ukraine was here not long ago. Many people come to the Legislature for a lot of different reasons, and they have an expectation, or they should have an expectation, that this place has a certain level of security.

Now, all of us want this to continue to be an accessible building, and I think even with these changes, it'll still be the most accessible legislature in Canada. And I think that that's important, but there has to be a base level of security for those who visit here, for those who work here, for those who come here for other reasons.

It's also true for those who come and protest here. Because those who come and protest in front of the building or in other ways, they also need to feel safe to come and protest, and they should feel safe to come and protest—often said. This bill isn't about stopping peaceful protests. This is the right place for people to come and bring their concerns about government, and they should feel safe as well. And we've seen 'confrontations' sometimes, between different protest groups who were on opposite sides of a protest, and there's a need to ensure that there's a base level of security for them as well.

I also know that this bill will continue to involve very heavily the Speaker, others of the Assembly, because there's shared responsibility. This is a unique building when it comes to shared responsibility, when it comes to safety. And I give credit to you, Madam Speaker, for the advancements that you've made in your time as Speaker, when it comes to ensuring security in this building.

I won't speak about what happens on LAMC, because I'm not allowed to, of course, but I was there for many years, and we'd often talk in generalities about

securities. And all of us understood that things had to be done, but it was very difficult to move some of the most basic things.

And the comment I got most often from people who would come to visit the Legislature at times was, well, I can't believe I didn't have to check in with anybody or I didn't have to—nobody checked my bag or nobody checked my ID or—and they were remarking on it not always as a positive thing, but as surprised that, if you walked across to the law courts, there's more security. If you go to the Jets game, there's more security. You know, frankly, if you go to a movie theatre, sometimes there's more security than has been the case in this place, in this building.

Now, I've had members opposite—I'm not going to name anybody—I'm—I've had members opposite, at different times—and members who aren't even members of the Assembly anymore—but have come and said, we need to do something about security. And this is, I think, a modest but an important step, this particular bill, of moving us along that way.

And I understand the members opposite will probably speak against the bill and—because maybe they don't want to have ownership for some of the—for some security measures. And if they want to do that, that's fine. But there have to be some individuals in this House who stand up and say, we will take responsibility for the safety and security of people who work here, people who visit here, people who protest here. And if the members opposite don't want to take that responsibility, this government is absolutely willing to take that responsibility, because this is the people's House, and the people deserve to be protected here as well.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): Well, for the third time, getting up on Bill 18.

You know, I know that—if you listen to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Goertzen), he would have us believe—or have the public believe—that we are all at great risk in this building.

Now, I'm not disabusing that things have changed. I agree with the minister that things have changed. You know, and I think that, you know, when we look at what's going on in the States, particularly, we know—and across Canada—you know, I know that—and I probably would imagine—I would hope, anyways, that everybody in the Chamber has seen, you know, the last couple of weeks, videos of Jagmeet

Singh, and getting accosted and harassed by individuals. It really—it broke my heart, like, just grotesque, savage behaviours from Canadians attacking a politician who was simply doing his job. And I think it is, you know, disgusting that public servants have to go through that.

You know, often people will say, oh, you have to have a thick skin if you want to be a politician. Yes, I—yes, you do, to an extent, but often that's used as a justification for the way that public servants are treated in the public. If somebody comes up to you and they yell at you, like, I don't know—I don't like what you did, you're this and that. And, believe me, as I've shared in this House, I've had my fair share of that in emails, DMs—I don't think anybody's ever said it to me personally. I've had one individual that tried to get to me, but my staff were there. But—so, that narrative of public servants having to have thick skin is used as a justification to allow the public to really have disrespectful behaviour.

* (18:30)

But you know who else are public servants? And they'll say, well, you're a public servant. Well, teachers are public servants. Police officers are public servants. You'd never go up to a police officer and—like what we've seen in the last couple of weeks, the behaviours that we've seen towards Jagmeet Singh. You would never see people do that to a police officer, and if they did, there'd be swift consequences.

So I'm not saying that there—that things aren't heightened right now in Canada. The pandemic has made things exponentially worse. I agree with the Minister of Justice. My fear, though, Madam Speaker, is the level to which we lean into that fear and then we make a little, mini-militarized zone of the public's building. This building doesn't belong to us. This is Manitoba's building and for, you know, many, many generations, people have worked in this building safely.

For many generations, people have protested outside, a couple of times inside. And nothing extraordinarily violent or tragic has occurred. Now, again, I'm not saying that it can't. It could very well. But I think that when we lean into that fear, it makes decisions that I don't think are necessarily conducive to the notion that this is the public's building.

And so what I have problems with Bill 18 is that it is up to the—this new provincial Cabinet to establish a list of prohibited activities in the area.

Now, Madam Speaker, I'm sure nobody's surprised in this House when I would say, well, I don't trust individuals opposite to make a list of prohibited activities. What they might interpret as peaceful protest and what I might interpret as peaceful protest, I would actually suggest could be very different. And so I have great concern with any one of the individuals sitting opposite sitting there and being part of a Cabinet that's going to determine what's allowed to take place on these grounds.

And I think that all Manitobans should be concerned with that. Why, Madam Speaker? Because in—when was that? In January and February, we had white nationalists organize themselves across the country and, you know, participate in these convoys; take over whole cities, including Ottawa, in our—you know, where the seat of democracy of Canada—weeks on end, torturing citizens with noise—torturing them; you know, taking food from homeless shelters; accosting women as they, you know, walk home.

We had, you know, a white nationalist trucker convoy here, parked in front on Broadway. And instead of any significant, you know, condemnation from the Premier (Mrs. Stefanson) or the Justice Minister or anything like that, we had, kind of, the capitulation to these folks. These folks were kind of allowed to sit there.

So here's these folks that are torturing downtown Winnipeg citizens—and I do want to point out that councillor Sherri Rollins and Leah Gazan, the MP for Winnipeg Centre, and the member for Union Station (MLA Asagwara) wrote an open letter, like, asking people to go home, asking for support to get these folks to go home, for the police to move them so that they could stop torturing Winnipeggers with all their noise.

We didn't see any action, any concern from members opposite. They kind of just, like—in fact, we had the member for Borderland (Mr. Guenter) who we went and visited and had tea and crumpets with white nationalists at the Emerson border, and then publicly talked about how he was in support of having tea and crumpets with these individuals that were blocking the border to get goods in and out of Manitoba.

So, you know, these are the same individuals that will then determine what prohibited activities are going to be allowed when Bill 18 passes. Keep in mind, Madam Speaker, as well, you know, Bill 18 is kind of like the offspring, the lovechild of bill 58 or 57—was it 57 or 58—[interjection]—right, of when the former premier, Brian Pallister, wanted to kind of

invoke, you know, everything and you wouldn't be allowed to protest anywhere at the drop of his discretion here. And so, luckily, we were able to kill that bill.

But again, this is just kind of like a little bit of a 'reminence' that members opposite can determine what's going to happen on these grounds or around these grounds. And if they're okay with white nationalists, then they can stay, but if they're not okay with Indigenous land protectors, then those Indigenous land protectors are going to have to leave or they'll be fined \$5,000. So, that is a great concern.

This bill has kind of gone under the radar. I'm not sure why, you know, most folks haven't kind of seen or offered criticism or anything about this bill, it's kind of 'flawn'—gone under the radar. It's going to become law tonight at some point, at two or three in the morning, and then, Madam Speaker, it will be left to the individuals on this side of the House to determine what's allowed and I think that is very, very scary.

So, Madam Speaker, with those little bit of words, I will—let me just finalize with this: we on this side of the House understand the importance of protest and even protests that people may not like. You know, everybody—you know, when people will say, well, peaceful protests and protest is this and you shouldn't do it like that, like—policing how individuals try to effect transformative change.

Protest has been used throughout history. In fact, there are plays—Les Misérables is about the French Revolution and people pay hundreds of dollars to go on Broadway to watch that play, and yet we celebrate that protest. Or the—you know, the American Revolution or whatever. We celebrate those protests, and yet we look down on or criticize Indigenous protests or land defender protests or environmental protests or animal welfare protection protests.

That's why I'm concerned. The same folks that would celebrate what we saw in January and February are going to look down and try and oppress and squash those other meaningful, transformative means at protest.

Miigwech, Madam Speaker.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Yes, Madam Speaker, Bill 18, The Legislative Security Amendment Act, provides for a chief legislative security officer who'd be responsible for leading, co-ordinating, organizing the security operations at the legislative precinct. The legislative security officer or officers are also able to provide security services

outside the Legislature to members of the Legislative Assembly and government officials.

I listened with interest to the comments of the opposite Minister of Justice (Mr. Goertzen). He talks as if he's got a chip on his shoulder for some reason. This is actually a pretty good law. *[interjection]* There is a pretty good law. I'm not sure why he's so sort of nervous or anxious about it.

I think that it will be positive for us to co-ordinate security operations, to have a chief legislative security officer and it will certainly be positive for MLAs where there are concerns for them to have some additional security, whether it be at their constituency office or, if needed, at their home, or where they're living if they're from out of town, when they go to the Legislature. I think this is also a very positive development.

Now, just as I'm—was surprised about the Minister of Justice talking as if he had a chip on his shoulder, I was also surprised about the opposition party's critic for Justice going after negative things about crowd control, when this bill may actually provide a better way of handling a protest so that protests—which we need, right? Which are part of democracy—can happen here and can happen here safely, both for people who work here and for the protesters themselves. We have seen over the years, I have seen over more than 20 years, many such protests, which have been peaceful and which have been organized and sometimes which have had many, many hundreds of people come out to the Legislature. I think it's a tribute to the people of Manitoba that we're able to do this.

* (18:40)

But we are living in a slightly different time. We have to be a little bit more cautious, and hopefully this—these changes will allow us to seek that and to achieve the balance that we need in allowing peaceful protests but at the same time being able to handle and deal with protests which cause chaos and cause major problems, and that clearly is part of what we need to be doing in today's world.

So as a—behalf of the Liberal Party, we support this legislation. It is a good bill, and I believe that there are a number of MLAs who I have met and talked to, who will be very appreciative of the fact that the first time in the history of Manitoba, there will be the potential to have security services provided outside the Legislature where it is needed.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 18, The Legislative Security Amendment Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? *[Agreed]*

I declare the motion carried.

Bill 19—The Beneficiary Designation (Retirement, Savings and Other Plans) Amendment Act

Madam Speaker: Moving now to concurrence and third reading of Bill 19, The Beneficiary Designation (Retirement, Savings and Other Plans) Amendment Act.

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I move, seconded by the Minister of Health (Ms. Gordon), that Bill 19, The Beneficiary Designation (Retirement, Savings and Other Plans) Amendment Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Justice, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Goertzen: This is an important but relatively narrow application of change of the law.

Currently, where an individual becomes incapacitated and needs to have a substitute decision maker make decisions for them, that substitute decision maker, if they want to change one of the investment instruments, like a tax-free savings account or retirement savings account or an RRIF, if they renew or replace or convert that particular instrument, the beneficiary can't be changed. And so the original intention of the individual who's become incapacitated becomes frustrated, which results in the substitute decision maker either not making any of the conversion changes which might not be, you know, a good financial move to do and because often these things had to change or they're required to change it as an individual gets older or they lose that beneficiary.

So a variety of individuals have come forward, including those in the financial industry, to say, we don't want to see an individual who designates a beneficiary on a financial instrument not have the fulfillment of that gift or that beneficiary assignment fulfilled if they become incapacitated simply because a

substitute decision maker isn't allowed to do it because that's seen as a new instrument. So it's a relatively small change, but it's an important one in fulfilling a person's wishes.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): I am pleased to put some words on the record in respect of Bill 19, The Beneficiary Designation (Retirement, Savings and Other Plans) Amendment Act.

Madam Speaker, this bill amends The Beneficiary Designation Act. Recognizing that many Manitobans live with a condition that may leave them unable to change plans which affect their beneficiaries, it's important to give legal representatives the ability to make the best choices on behalf of the person that they are representing.

Madam Speaker, this bill proposes that a legal representative of a person be able to make a beneficiary designation on behalf of a participant if the participant cannot make the designation themselves. This is certainly a step in—is safeguarded by the fact that legal representatives can only designate a beneficiary if the beneficiary was already listed as a beneficiary of an older plan which is being renewed or replaced.

Currently, Madam Speaker, legal representatives can only make decisions regarding beneficiaries on behalf of other people with a plan and—while ongoing. So, however, if changes to the plan need to be made—for example, if the type of a bank account needs to be changed—the representative is not able to make these changes without the expressed consent of the person they are representing, who may no longer be able to make such a decision due to a disability or a health condition.

This bill will add additional safeguards to ensure that a plan administrator is expressly required to verify the identity of a person making a designation, and the identity and the authority of a representative, before accepting a designation.

Certainly, Madam Speaker, Bill 19 is one small step for Manitobans living with a 'dehabilitating' health 'contition' or a disability, and for those that support them.

Let me just say this, Madam Speaker—I'll keep my comments very, very short on Bill 19—we do expect this government to do more to support vulnerable Manitobans, and we know that this government is very loath to spend extra dollars and to support vulnerable Manitobans.

But certainly, for the very same folks that we're talking about in this bill, it's important that the government step up and ensure that these individuals, these vulnerable individuals, have all of the different needs that they are—require to ensure that they are safe and protected.

Miigwech, Madam Speaker.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Speaker, Bill 19, which deals with beneficiary designation and retirement savings and other plans—I have read this legislation, carefully reviewed it, received advice and so on. I believe that this is sound legislation, that it is meant for a good purpose; that is, that the will of the—and I mean that the desires, not necessarily what's stated in the will, but the desire of the person who is disabled—it can be brought to fruition, basically; that the person whose concept of what should happen can happen, and can happen in a reasonable way by the—as a result of the legislation.

And to the extent that this will allow the wishes of the individual who is disabled to be, you know, made manifest, to come into effect, this is certainly a very good bill. I mean—and it's worthwhile, it makes a contribution.

One has to wonder and have a little bit of concern—and this is the only real concern I have, is that the idea here, which is an eminently good and worthwhile concept, that the legislation could, under some circumstances, perhaps be redirected, not in the direction that the individual with the disability desires, but in another direction.

I believe that this legislation will have to be watched closely to make sure that there are not flaws which emerge over time. But certainly, we're ready to support it today and hope that the intent of this legislation is carried through as—after the law comes into effect.

* (18:50)

Madam Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 19, The Beneficiary Designation (Retirement, Savings and Other Plans) Amendment Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? [*Agreed*]

I declare the motion carried.

Bill 23—The Reducing Red Tape and Improving Services Act, 2022

Madam Speaker: I will now call concurrence and third reading of Bill 23, The Reducing Red Tape and Improving Services Act, 2022.

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I move, seconded by the Minister of Health (Ms. Gordon), that Bill 23, The Reducing Red Tape and Improving Services Act, 2022, reported from the Standing Committee on Justice, be concurred in and now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Goertzen: This bill makes relatively minor, although I think important, changes. It's an annual bill brought forward by the government to reduce red tape, to make the operation of things easier.

A couple of examples I might add, Madam Speaker, in here is the ability to have electronic documents procured when it comes to The Employment Standards Code. This, we're seeing, of course, in a number of different places in government. Some of it's a learning of the pandemic and some of it is probably things that were happening before, but the ability to transmit documents electronically, or sometimes that's been the case in other pieces of legislation to have meetings that are electronic.

Some of it's renaming of Cabinet committees to more accurately reflect what their operations are. For example, the Regulatory Accountability Committee of Cabinet better reflects the changing of the name to the Statutes and Regulations Review Board—better reflects the actual work of that committee. I currently chair the committee and it's not just regulations; it's statutes and regulations that are reviewed. And so it's just simply a housekeeping matter to make sure that we are properly describing things that are happening within government.

Other matters that are not inconsequential but that I would note: This bill allows for a stipend to be paid similar to a legislative assistant for the military envoy. I think this is important because the military envoy, which is, you know, relatively new, I suppose, in Manitoba; I guess it's been around for maybe 15 years or 20 years or so. But I think that that role is—has really grown to be significant in the province, in connecting government together with the women and men in military who are stationed here in Manitoba and looking after some of their needs. And there's been really, really good work done by military envoys in our government and I would say in other governments as well.

So this is a recognition of just a small stipend for the work that they do.

I know the former NDP government, at one point, paid their military envoy, oh, I don't know, 80 or \$90,000. It was a lot of money. This is nothing like that. This is, I think, you know, well less than 10. So it's a representation that it's important work, but obviously, probably undervalues the work that they do. But those who serve in our government and in other governments who connect with the military, it is important work and worthy of some recognition.

So I recommend the bill to the House.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): So, Bill 23 makes some changes; some minutia changes, but one of the changes that it does do is it amends The Residential Tenancies Act to allow an appeal panel to participate by Zoom.

Certainly, I think that if the COVID or the pandemic has taught us anything, it's actually the value of Zoom and the efficiency of Zoom and the ability of Zoom, not always, obviously, but to give more accessibility to folks. So I do certainly think that's a good thing.

But it's disappointing that we haven't seen from this government a real commitment to housing overall. And I know that, you know, we asked questions in QP today in respect of housing, particularly when we're looking at sustainable, safe, social housing for Indigenous women, or for shelters. In fact, I just was checking my DMs, and a nurse who works with women who are sexually assaulted was reaching out to me to say how bad it is in the shelters, that often, she's working with women who have just been sexually assaulted, who can't go home for obvious reasons, and when she tries to get them into shelters, she can't get them into shelters because there's just no space available, or they're forced to kind of go outside the province.

And, you know, we're in a really critical time right now in respect of shelters, and I know that some members opposite have put on the record about, you know, dollars, but what we're seeing is that those dollars aren't either getting there—or, I don't know what's going on, but we do know that—and I've been told multiple times by a variety of different executive directors—that as soon as a bed is open, within 10 minutes, 15 minutes, that bed is gone.

And so, you know, I think that this government has a responsibility—or, I know this government has a responsibility to do more in respect of social housing.

And when we look at The Residential Tenancies Act, you know, we've established on this side of the House that the government has allowed about 310 above-guideline rate increases applications in the 2019-2020 year. And we had met and brought forward a woman who was talking about the rent increase to her apartment, and it was an additional \$300, which was substantial—it was 30 per cent increase—and was substantial for her to be able to all of a sudden now be able to come up with an additional \$300 when—particularly when, like her, she's living on a fixed income. And we have so many Manitobans that are on fixed incomes, and so any increase to their overall budget can be detrimental.

When we look at the rising food costs and, you know, Manitoba Hydro costs—we know that they keep raising Manitoba Hydro and are so gleefully looking forward to being able to raise it again. You know, the government, you know, instead of just, you know, tinkering with some of The Residential Tenancies Act, they really should be looking at a complete overhaul to make sure that Manitobans that are renters are protected and safeguarded from, you know, increases that are just simply too much and unwarranted.

And so, Madam Speaker, I will leave it there for this bill. I would encourage members opposite to really look at what's going on in respect of housing in Manitoba. We're in a critical shortage of social housing. We have landlords that are increasing rents. We know that they decreased, you know, money that they can get back at taxes. And it's making it very, very difficult for renters, and they should be willing and wanting to do more, particularly as Manitobans are coming out of this pandemic.

And I would encourage them, over the summer, to look at what they're doing in respect to social housing and protections for renters.

Miigwech, Madam Speaker.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Speaker, this bill amends a number of acts, and the changes are such that we find them generally acceptable.

I want to comment on one of the changes, and that is that the minister no longer has the power to determine which program under—offered under The Workers Compensation Act is to be reviewed by an independent auditor.

While it is our view that the board is best positioned to determine which programs should be reviewed, we also see that there may be times when the

board may feel that it has made a mistake and that there are members of board who will want to cover up that mistake and not have certain parts of the activities of the Workers Compensation Board audited.

And so, it seems to us that there needs to be an alternative way for—whether it is public input or other, to ensure that the areas of the Workers Compensation Board which need auditing are audited.

* (19:00)

And so, while we respect and agree that the board of directors should have the primary responsibility for determining which program is reviewed, we believe that there also should be alternatives at—alternatives in which there can be—whether it's public input or other mechanisms—decisions made to audit sections of the activities of the Workers Compensation Board if there are public issues or public questions.

So, with those comments, Madam Speaker, I look forward to this moving forward and becoming law.

Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 23, The Reducing Red Tape and Improving Services Act, 2022.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? [*Agreed*]

Bill 26—The Officers of the Assembly Act (Various Acts Amended)

Madam Speaker: I will now call concurrence and third reading of Bill 26, The Officers of the Assembly Act (Various Acts Amended).

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I move, seconded by the Minister of Advanced Education, that Bill 26, The Officers of the Assembly Act (Various Acts Amended), reported from the Standing Committee on Justice, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Goertzen: I won't get into all the details of this bill, but just to highlight one in particular.

So, the officers of the Legislative Assembly fulfill a very significant role for all of us as MLAs. And at various times, I think, if you've served in this Assembly for any length of time, you've had some interaction with the officers of the Legislative

Assembly. We often refer to them as independent officers. I understand they prefer to be referred to as officers of the Legislative Assembly. But I think the term independent is often used because we see them as serving all of us as MLAs.

Mr. Andrew Micklefield, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

They don't serve the government, although they might, you know, do some reports that relate to government. But they don't serve the government specifically. They serve all of us as MLAs, and by extension, they then, of course, serve Manitobans. Whether that's the child advocate or the chief electoral officer or the Ombudsman, I mean, they are there to serve Manitobans as a whole. But of course, they essentially then report to the Legislature.

The way that officers of the Legislative Assembly have been hired for as long as I can recall—so, you know, 19 or 20 years that I've served here—is there is a committee of the Legislative Assembly, the Legislative Affairs committee, which it's called. And then a subcommittee is struck that has members of the political parties, and I think the independent member usually—an independent member usually sits on the committee, as well. There's a hiring process, there's advertisements that go out for the—that particular officer. It's involved staff of the Assembly. There's a vetting, there's sometimes interviews, and then a recommendation comes from that subcommittee back to the main committee. And then it's provided to government, and then Executive Council Cabinet, ultimately, ends up signing an order in council that hires the officer of the Legislative Assembly.

And yet, it really is not government that should be doing that hiring. It should be the Assembly because they, ultimately, not only make the recommendation on a consensus basis, but then, of course, they are officers of the Legislative Assembly.

So the change, or one of the changes that'll happen here—it also deals with things like unifying term limits, as an example—but one of the more significant changes is that the motion to hire that individual officer will come to the Assembly, and the Assembly will ratify it, which is more appropriate since it is an 'individual' who reports to the Assembly and, ultimately, the Assembly or MLAs, through the subcommittee, are making the recommendation.

And then, some matters—pay matters and other human resource matters will be referred to LAMC, which is a committee that is made up of all members of the Assembly and that deals with a lot of internal

Assembly issues in a non-partisan and consensus basis.

So this is really about ensuring that the officers of the Legislative Assembly—that not only their function but their hiring, and then some of that backstage work in terms of human resources and pay and that sort of thing—are more governed by members generally, and not by the government specifically.

And I hope members will see it for the intention that it has brought forward, and that is to ensure that it's more reflective and more empowering of all members, and not the government.

Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): Going to put just a couple of words on the record in respect to Bill 26—sorry, I just lost my earring. Okay.

This bill, Deputy Speaker, amends various acts with respect to the appointment of the following officers of the Assembly: the Advocate for Children and Youth; the Auditor General; the Chief Electoral Officer; the Clerk of the Assembly; the conflict interest commissioner, which will be replaced by the ethics commissioner; the Information and Privacy Adjudicator; the Ombudsman; the registrar, appointed under The Lobbyists Registration Act.

Currently, Deputy Speaker, these officers are appointed by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council, on the recommendation of a committee of the Assembly. Their remuneration is also determined by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council.

As a result of these amendments, the officers—as a result of the amendments, the officers, other than the Clerk of the Assembly, are appointed by the Assembly on the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Legislative Affairs; the Clerk's appointment on the recommendation of the Legislative Assembly Management Commission. The officers' remuneration is to be determined by the Legislative Assembly Management Commission.

The officers may appoint their duties with prior approval of LAMC. The current officers of the Assembly and their duties continue in office on the coming-in coming into force of the act. Amendments are made to The Legislative Assembly Management Commission Act and five other acts.

Certainly, Deputy Speaker, we support the independent officers of the Legislature—or the officers of the Legislative Assembly and their important role in our democracy. Obviously, each and every one of

these individuals do really important work on behalf of all of Manitoba—Manitobans, and, certainly, as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Goertzen) said, do serve all of us, and serve us in the best way possible. We support efforts to put measures in place to ensure the independence and activities of these offices.

Just briefly, Deputy Speaker, in—you know, in advance of our 3 a.m. royal assent votes—or 3 a.m. royal assent, now, yes.

So, the Advocate for Children and Youth, I think, you know, deserves—and I can't remember what bill it is now, but a little while ago, I had mentioned the office of the advocate of children and youth. And as we all know, because it happened under, I guess, just a couple of years ago, their mandate got extended. They do really, really important work, Deputy Speaker, and I'm sure that every member in the House would agree with the important work that they do to ensure that Manitoba children are—and the gaps in which services are applied for children—that those are reviewed and strengthened, so that Manitoba children are protected in every sphere.

And so, I do just want to give a little bit of a shout-out to each and every one of the individuals that work at the Manitoba advocate for youth and children. It's an important office. It's an important office for accountability, as well; for accountability in justice, in health, in CFS, in education, it's important that we have an infrastructure that supports Manitoba children, the next generation of Manitobans who some of may be sitting in this Chamber at one point. And so, you know, I think any piece of legislation that can strengthen the officers of the Manitoba Advocate for Children and Youth is very important.

* (19:10)

Let me just say this, that, you know, while we're looking at, kind of, like, streamlining all of the hiring and all of that, those mechanisms, I think it is important that—to put on the record that this PC government has to do more to protect youth. And, you know, I know that the Manitoba Advocate for Children and Youth have submitted many reports, in respect of safeguarding youth.

And, you know, I can think of one: the use of segregation. And, you know, we still haven't seen any action from the Justice Minister on banning the use of segregation for youth. And I know that what the report called for was that children could not be segregated more than 24 hours.

We know that in some instances, Deputy Speaker, that sometimes youth have to be, you know, maybe segregated to stabilize or for their own protection, but what the report is saying that anything more than 24 hours is unacceptable, particularly in 2022 when we know the impacts of segregation within correctional facilities. And yet, those are still being used.

And so I haven't heard anybody on that side of the House, nor have I heard any of the Justice ministers talk about a plan to deal with the report from the Manitoba Advocate for Children and Youth to phase out, to get rid of segregation for youth.

And so I think that that's something that they can do over the summer months, and look at bringing forward a bill. I know that I have a bill in the works right now to end segregation for youth. We have to do better for youth. We have to do better for youth, Deputy Speaker.

And then, you know, in its annual compliance report released in December, acting child advocate Ainsley Krone had said that four out of 51 recommendations made from 2018 and 2020 have been fully implemented. That's really pitiful. That's pitiful that only four of 51 recommendations in the last many years have been fully implemented.

You know, earlier, I've been—we've both—the Justice Minister and myself keep getting up to speak to bills, to Justice bills, and a couple of them were about modernizing family law. A couple of bills were about, you know, the language in the bills was about the best interests of children. And I believe that. And I believe, I hope that, you know, that's what those bills are meant to do.

At the same time, we have the advocate, the Manitoba advocate for children and families saying that they've released reports, they've got 51 recommendations, and only four have been implemented. That just doesn't jive with one another.

You can't say that you're doing legislation or you're looking what's in the best interests of children, and yet at the same time, you're still not implementing recommendations that come from, I would suggest, you know, some of the most prolific experts on what are the gaps for Manitoba children and how to create a system of welfare and so that children are protected.

So, you know, again, I mean, I think I've been elected like what, six years now? We've been elected over six years. And, you know, every time we get up and, you know, we ask the government to do, you know, A to Z, and at some point, you know, you kind

of just give up on members opposite, hoping that they're going to do some of these things.

However, I would suggest, and I'm hoping that members opposite will take the summer to at least begin to look at, and reflect, but look at the segregation. That's an easy one to begin with. I know that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Goertzen) is keen—I hope—to make some changes to implement, you know, the 51 recommendations, and one of the recommendations that the advocate has asked for is an end to segregation for children.

You know, are we going to come back in 20, 30 years from now and say, look at—that we weren't—*[interjection]*—well, you know, yes, exactly, the people that come after us 20 to 30 years from now, are they going to say, like, why didn't any single one of these members here, why didn't we end segregation for children?

So, you know, my final comments on this is I'm asking the Justice Minister to seriously look at and consider the end of segregation for youth—who, I will point out, Deputy Speaker, are predominantly Indigenous children. It is Indigenous children that are being segregated to no fault of their own—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Member's time has expired.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): This bill makes positive changes—that is, instead of the government being the one appointing the officers of the Assembly, it will now be the Legislative Assembly itself through the Standing Committee on Legislative Affairs, or through the Legislative Assembly Management Commission in the case of a clerk. The Legislative Assembly Management Commission will also determine the remunerations of the officers of the Assembly.

This is a positive direction to move away from the government controlling the operations of the Assembly to the Assembly having greater jurisdiction over matters which are under the purview of the Assembly and over the appointment, in particular, of the officers of the Assembly. So I congratulate the government on moving this forward.

Now, I have to comment, however, on some of the words that the MLA for St. Johns has. We are not always on the same page, but we happen to agree that the government has been absolutely deplorable when it comes to looking after children and youth. The tiny number of recommendations which are fully implemented is just not—doesn't cut it. And, you know, the—we hope that the government will go back over the

summer and decide that children and youth should be at the top of the agenda instead of at the bottom of their agenda, as it has been.

So, we're looking for some changes. We're not necessarily optimistic, but we would urge the government to consider the welfare of children and youth, including ending segregation of youth as a priority for the next session of the Legislature.

So, with those words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we look forward to this moving forward and becoming law.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 26, The Officers of the Assembly Act (Various Acts Amended).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? *[Agreed]*

I declare the motion carried.

Bill 27—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Alternative Measures for Driving Offences)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will now move to Bill 27, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Alternative Measures for Driving Offences).

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Education, that Bill 27, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Alternative Measures for Driving Offences), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Justice, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Goertzen: So, several years ago, on consultation with MADD and others who are concerned about drinking and driving, the government brought forward a new possibility called immediate roadside prohibition, following other jurisdictions like, I believe, British Columbia, and I believe now, majority of jurisdictions in Canada.

* (19:20)

And what this allows for, if an individual is a—and there's certain provisions: you have to be a first-time offender, so first time drinking and driving, can't be involving in a death or serious bodily harm or other aggravating factors. But if it's a first-time offender, not those aggravating factors. If they are shown to be drinking and driving through a roadside device, a

screening device, then they are eligible for what's called an IRP.

All the same punishments that one would get if they went through a criminal conviction are applied under the IRP, but it doesn't go through the criminal process. And the reason I think why MADD and other advocates against drinking and driving support this is it does provide a punishment much more quickly to the commission of the crime, and there is much evidence that shows that how quickly a punishment can come from a crime is also itself a deterrent effect, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

However, there was a—I hesitate to use the word glitch—but perhaps it's a glitch in the system in that this requires an individual to be shown to be drinking and driving through a roadside device, a screening device, but often, or sometimes, particularly in the times of COVID, but often more generally maybe in more rural northern communities, these screening devices were not always available. And if they weren't available, then the individual would get criminally charged and there wasn't an ability, even though they might otherwise have met all the other criteria, to go through the IRP program.

And so this allows if, for whatever reason, a screening device isn't available—it doesn't happen, you know, sort of immediately with commission of the drinking and driving for some offender, no aggravating factors—if that screening doesn't happen, but later, through another device, the individual is proven to have been drinking and driving but is already charged, so post-charge it allows the prosecution department to say that person would have otherwise, but for the fact there wasn't a device available, would have otherwise been eligible for the IRP program, and they can go into the IRP program even though they weren't charged.

Now, of course, if they don't complete that program, which involves a lot of different things—if they don't complete the program, then they then get criminally charged and they go through that process. But it's been seen as something that's helpful for deterring drinking and driving, something every member of this House is opposed to, and this just ensures that that glitch is fixed.

Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): I will keep my comments ever so brief on Bill 27, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Alternative Measures for Driving Offences).

First off, let me just say I think that everybody in the House, certainly on this side of the Chamber, really applauds the work that MADD does, quite extraordinary work that they do, and all of the individuals are just so dedicated and committed to having safe roads, right, and to protecting loved ones and families so that people don't have to go through such heartache and trauma and all of that.

So I do, on behalf of our NDP caucus, want to just take this opportunity just to acknowledge the important work that MADD does and all of the Manitobans specifically that work at MADD or does the work, the vision, the spirit of what MADD attempts to do. So, we lift them up; we thank them for their work.

At committee, you know, one of the other things that this bill was going to do but—and I want to take this opportunity to just say miigwech to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Goertzen) for allowing some more time to think about the part of the bill that was going to suspend or take away the part where, if an individual didn't participate in alternative measures for sexual procurement offences, they were going to take that away. So I do want to thank the minister for allowing more time and space to consider that. That was important to do and I appreciate the minister doing that.

We did hear from, you know, individuals at committee, you know, Diane Redsky, and folks that work at the John School—which I can't stand that name—but saying how important it is to be able to have that at their disposal to ensure that individuals who are charged with procurement participate in alternative measures.

Let me just put on the record that—I don't know if that's the best program. I appreciate the work that's done there by Manitobans who participate in that willingly. Sometimes I don't know if it's exploitive. It feels exploitive when you have individuals—have to come and share their experience with, you know—predominantly, I think it's like 99 per cent men who are looking to procure sex—go to different areas of the city but get caught and then have to go into this, like—again, I loathe this name—like, John School. But it does feel exploitive, and whether or not individuals that participate in sharing their stories, feel that it's exploitive. I respect that. I honour that. But I just feel that, you know, we maybe should consider some different ways of dealing with this.

So, you know, I know that Diane Redsky made presentations to the committee and said how impor-

tant this ability to do this is in protecting predominantly Indigenous women and girls, who are often exploited on our streets.

And so I—like I said, I appreciate the minister doing this. I think it's important. But it does beg the question, as well, is, you know—what is the government doing in respect of the sexual exploitation of Indigenous women and girls on our streets? Which I would suggest has—since COVID, has also grown exponentially worse. We don't see any substantial strategy or even—you know, even an analysis on Tracia's Trust. Like, have they renewed Tracia's Trust? Has the government looked at Tracia's Trust? Has there been any new dollars put into Tracia's Trust, or StreetReach or any of that?

And so we haven't seen any of that evidence that the government has been seriously looking at and considering the sexual exploitation of, again, predominantly Indigenous women and girls.

And so, again, more homework for the Justice Minister over the summer. I hope that the minister will—you know, alongside every other thing that I've asked or, you know, suggested that the minister do—that the minister, you know, starts to really look at how to protect the most vulnerable Indigenous women and girls who are sexually exploited on our streets. And I'm not going to—I've given many, many speeches in this Chamber about how bad it can be on Winnipeg streets and the consequences for little Indigenous girls who come into contact with the wrong men, with predatory men. And the consequences, Deputy Speaker, are deadly in many cases.

And I know that the member for Point Douglas (Mrs. Smith) and myself have brought it up in the last, you know, certainly today and in the last week, but we've, you know, we've had three Indigenous women who have been murdered in the span of three weeks. We have to do more. We have to do more to protect vulnerable Indigenous women and girls, which includes those Indigenous women and girls who are sexually exploited which, luckily, the minister did make the amendment and those changes are still—those provisions are still in the act as it exists.

Miigwech.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Deputy Speaker, some comments on this Bill 27, the highway traffic amendment act, which deals with, among other things, Alternative Measures for Driving Offences.

* (19:30)

In the committee meeting, we had an excellent presentation by Diane Redsky, who argued that one of the major sections of this bill was wrong. And she argued—compellingly presented the case that the requirement—repealing the requirement that the driver's licence be suspended for a person who fails to complete alternative measures for sexual procurement offences—so that I think that the description and the argument that was made by Diane Redsky, and she made it very clearly.

I'll just quote, so I'm here to speak, she said, against the changes being proposed to the highway and traffic act in regards to repealing the requirement to suspend the driver's licence of those not participating in alternative measures. End.

She indicated that the fact that this had not been used very much was actually a good thing, because it meant the threat of it being used was actually being remarkably effective in pushing people to complete the alternative measures.

And I think that case was made compellingly. And I am pleased that, in the process of bringing forward report stage amendments, that the minister brought forward a report stage amendment which would have changed this fundamental part of the bill so that it would not, in fact, occur.

That is, that the minister had listened to Diane Redskay's [*phonetic*] presentation and I think that was welcome, and so that the act, as it is now revised with that report stage amendment, is an act which is much more reasonable and acceptable and which we would be ready to support.

So, with just those few words and a shout out to the—to MADD for good work that they do and to Diane Redsky and others at Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata for the good work that they do, I look forward to the shortened version of this bill being—becoming law.

Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? [*Agreed*]

Bill 30—The Police Services Amendment and Law Enforcement Review Amendment Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We now move to Bill 30, The Police Services Amendment and Law Enforcement Review Amendment Act.

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I move, seconded by the Minister of Mental Health and Community Wellness (Mrs. Guillemard), that Bill 30, The Police Services

Amendment and Law Enforcement Review Amendment Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Justice, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Goertzen: So this bill continues the work of changes and reform to The Police Services Act, which is probably a never-ending process and, I think, by statute is actually is in—it is required to be reviewed on a periodic basis.

So this, you know, there was consultations done and there'll be several pieces of legislation that come in to deal with the recommendations. A previous piece we already discussed earlier this evening, the IIU changes. It's already passed third reading.

This particular legislation deals with, among other things, I think, three things I want to highlight. One, it brings into statutory effect the Manitoba Criminal Intelligence Centre, which is very important in terms of police agencies in Manitoba sharing information between each other. Means there's municipal forces like Winnipeg and Brandon, some other smaller municipal forces, there's the provincial policing agency of the RCMP—and they don't—they work together, but they don't always share information together, not because they're necessarily opposed to sharing information together, but there has to be the right structure to share information because it is police information, and so you need to have the right statutory ability, you'd need to have the right individuals in place who can collect that information, because sometimes people have to be law enforcement to collect information, and then to share that criminal intelligence between the different forces.

We've seen how this is important more recently with Project Divergent, where \$70 million of street-value drugs were taken off the street. And that was really co-operation, I believe, between the municipal police force of Winkler, I believe it was—it was Winkler or Morden—together with the RCMP that the rural police force was able to get some information, share it with the RCMP and led to the largest single drug seizure in Manitoba history.

So, some of that information, of course, is already being shared, but the Manitoba Criminal Intelligence Centre will make sharing that information even more robust, I would say, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Secondly, I would say that an important part of this bill is the establishment of policing standards. And when I say policing standards, of course there are

many standards that exist already within the various police forces, standards on high-speed chases or how to deal with individuals who are informants, but they're not all well known and they're not all consistent between the various police forces.

If you were to go, Mr. Deputy Speaker—after we're done tonight at 4:00 in the morning, if you were to go online and you were to look at the British Columbia—if you googled British Columbia police standards, you would find—I think it would pop up very quickly—a list of all the different policing standards on things like, you know, the use of a fire-arm or those sort of things. And you could click on there and see those sort of uniform standards. So, that is what we're heading towards in Manitoba: transparency and consistency when it comes to policing standards.

That's not the same as codes of conduct, and that's the third and final thing I quickly want to highlight on this particular bill. Codes of conduct are how police are expected to interact with individuals and whether or not they're—they fulfill that code of conduct. And if they don't fulfill that code of conduct, of course, there needs to be repercussions, and those repercussions happen within the various structures that allow for repercussions to happen.

Now, members opposite will quickly, I'm sure, stand up and say—and I look forward to hearing from my friend from St. Johns, as I always do—about LERA and that LERA isn't working the way that she might like. Maybe it hasn't always worked well under the former government. There's often been challenges with LERA, but it isn't always about the structure of LERA, it is that when there are issues that are criminal in nature that result—or, that reflect upon police or interrelate to police, that goes to the IIU. But those are very rare—thankfully, very rare circumstances. Everything else below that can be captured or falls to LERA. But often, I would say that a good portion of those complaints probably should be dealt with with codes of conduct, that can be dealt with much more quickly, much more efficiently and with some significant follow-up that doesn't always have to go to something like LERA.

So, while there are changes to LERA here—the member opposite will probably refer to them as minor; I don't think they're insignificant, but they're maybe not as fulsome as she might have hoped. But I do believe that the codes of conduct will in itself make it easier for some of the complaints that otherwise are

now going to LERA to be dealt with in a uniform code of conduct, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Manitoba Police Commission will ensure that the standards are being met across the province, and I think this is an important step forward and brings us more in line with policing and the transparency and consistency and expertise that is seen in some other provinces, recognizing that the men and women of our police force, by and large, I knew are doing a difficult job but work hard each and every day to keep Manitobans safe, and we do appreciate the work that they do.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): I'm pleased to put some brief words on the record in respect of Bill 30, The Police Services Amendment and Law Enforcement Review Amendment Act.

* (19:40)

You know, the government spent a lot of money on a police act review, so much money for folks to do a review on The Police Services Act. And, certainly, one of the things that came out of that review was a more comprehensive look at LERA, the Law Enforcement Review Agency, which isn't anything new, because we've been talking about changes to LERA for many years—long before I was in this Chamber, when I was the director of justice for Southern Chiefs Organization—because LERA is not working.

And I know that, you know—I think that people, in many respects, kind of want to, you know, dance around the issue. LERA's not working. It's not working for Manitobans who come into contact with police members and have interactions that are not necessarily great interactions, in which some individuals get harmed in very real ways.

And so, you know, the minister had an opportunity to make some substantial changes in Bill 30, but he chose not to. In fact, Bill 30, which will receive royal assent at 4 a.m. tomorrow—you know, they had an opportunity to do more. And so we're going to be stuck here until 4 a.m. in the morning with nothing to really show for it.

Because I know that the minister is talking about policing standards and codes of conducts for police—great, wonderful—wonderful if there were actually consequences. And I know that the minister talked about, you know, whether or not there were consequences, and I would suggest and I would argue and submit to the House that, you know, if officers are in contravention of codes of conduct—and he said it

when—in his remarks, that's—you know, any consequences are kind of internal. We don't know if there's any consequences. And I would suggest that there's probably very, very minimal consequences, if any consequences, of breaking codes of conducts when coming into contact with Manitobans.

And so, you know, we have—the only changes that we have for LERA is to change the time frame in which a Manitoban can file a complaint. So very, very minimal changes to LERA, when the minister had at his disposal the whole research that they paid good money for and made substantial recommendations on how to strengthen LERA. The only thing the minister chose to do was extend the timeline for applications.

So, Manitobans already don't have confidence in any of our public complaints mechanisms, which I already spoke to, Deputy Premier—or, Deputy Speaker—I already spoke about this earlier, that there are—you know, there's LERA, there's PSU, there's the RCMP's police commission. The public—and then IJU, of course—and the public doesn't have much confidence in those public complaints.

And so, I don't know why the minister didn't take the opportunity, after having spent all that money doing a Police Services Act review, why the minister didn't take more concrete steps to either strengthen LERA, so that the public will have confidence in actually going through the motions of making a complaint to LERA, which we know often take months and months and months to get back. We know, I think, what is it, like, 99 per cent of the complaints that go in are found to be justifiable.

And so, you know, 99 per cent of the, you know, thousands and thousands of Manitobans who have filed complaints at LERA are left feeling—with nothing. They're not given any sense of justice. They're not given any sense of closure. They're not given any sense of accountability. And they're not given any sense of reconciliation or resolution on how to move forward from this interaction with the police.

So, all that money was wasted—and wasted opportunity in Bill 30 to do anything with LERA. And then, you know, the minister is touting that, well, you know, we're going to have policing standards and we'll have codes of conduct, but, again, there's nothing substantial coming out of those. That's my problem with—and we discussed this at the standing committee—there's nothing substantial that would come out of that in respect of consequences.

And so, Deputy Speaker, this was another lost opportunity, a lost opportunity, you know, at the final year, year and a half of the government being in power. They could've made some substantial changes that the public could've had some confidence in some of the mechanisms that we have. But alas, here we are, with nothing really to show for it.

I will say, Deputy Speaker, that I think the sharing of information among police is incredibly important. I've spoken in this House previously about ViCLAS, which is a system that's used in Ontario and other policing institutions across the country, that you can, you know, put in information into this database. I think that that is incredibly important so that policing institutions across the country have the same information, right? We know that people migrate or—and, you know, go interprovincially, and I think that where you have a system where you can share your information among policing institutions across the country is very, very important.

And I've said it before, one of the things that came out of the Paul Bernardo inquest was that you had two policing institutions literally side by side that were not communicating at all. And what Paul Bernardo would do is—before he became a murderer, he was a serial rapist. And he would go into different jurisdictions and he would rape women. And—but the police weren't sharing the information. And the commissioner of that Paul Bernardo inquest said it—you know, these policing institutions might as well have been on opposite ends of the world, the globe, because they weren't sharing information.

And similarly, when you look at Wally Oppal's inquiry in missing women in BC, he also spoke about that, because you would have families that would go and file reports on their missing loved one to, let's say, the Vancouver Police, and the Vancouver Police would say, well, no, you have to go file a report with the Surrey RCMP. So they'd go there. Meanwhile, what was established in the Wally Oppal inquiry on missing Indigenous women was that the Vancouver Police and the RCMP, none of them were investigating that missing Indigenous woman because, again, there was no communication.

And so—and that's been—that was well documented in the Wally Oppal inquiry. And that's tragic, that here's families thinking that they did everything right by filing a missing person's with either the Vancouver Police services or the Surrey RCMP, thinking they did what was right, trying to find their loved one, worried and sick with worry where their

loved one was. And yet, here's these policing institutions that didn't, not once, spoke with one another.

Deputy Speaker, that actually went on for years. They—they're—in the Wally Oppal inquiry there's a well-documented case of one Indigenous woman who went missing, and for years the Vancouver Police weren't investigating and the Surrey RCMP weren't investigating.

So, certainly, in respect of sharing information that's in Bill 30, I appreciate that. I think that that's important. It's proper. We have the technology now, Deputy Speaker, where we can create a system whereby policing institutions, different policing bodies, can share that information and hopefully, you know, bring justice to families or to, you know, whatever comes before policing institutions, by sharing that information. So, I think that's important. We have the technology to be able to do so, so certainly, I do support some of those changes in Bill 30.

But, again, adding to the minister's homework, I would ask the minister to go back and read The Police Services Act review that he paid lots of money for, and look at the recommendations that were in the report in respect of LERA and come back in the fall with a more comprehensive bill to revamp, to make LERA more accountable and transparent and accountable to Manitobans—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Dougald Lamont (St. Boniface): Yes, I'll just put a few, hopefully brief, remarks on the record.

* (19:50)

In 2016, the media looked into how LERA was doing, and of 4,300 complaints that had been put in since 1995, when it was founded, only 3 per cent were ever even progressed to a public hearing in front of a judge. Of those, a handful—literally a handful—ever got processed.

The commissioner at the time said, over 14 years at the agency he could count on two hands the number of times a complainant came out on top following a hearing, and that was based on thousands and thousands of complaints. Mr. Deputy Speaker, 40 per cent of the investigations were closed because people just gave up; they could be stonewalled or could be dragged out or they wouldn't bother.

And we need to be clear: no one—no one—has a problem with good cops. No one does. No one has a problem with good cops. But we do have a problem in

Manitoba with the confidence we have in policing. That was very clear from the Black Lives Matter protest in—at the Legislature two years ago. It was one of the biggest, most-people protests we've ever seen in—with Black Lives Matter protests in Canada.

And—but tens of thousands of people signed a petition asking and expecting the Winnipeg police to change their—the way they do business, right, because it's been a long-standing problem. And if you've got no trust, it's not good for anybody; it's not good for justice, as a whole. We—you know, we need for justice to be done. People need to be able to trust their institutions right through police, courts, politicians, government. And when that falls apart, there's justice for no one.

And so, the problem is a culture that can happen—what people call noble cause corruption. It's when the end justifies the means, even if the means puts—means putting public trust and policing at risk. And you've seen it with police officers who we'll see—you know, they're doing what they can and sometimes going too far to get what they call bad guys off the streets; where officers will do bad things because they believe that the outcomes will be good, that the ends will justify the means, like planting or fabricating evidence, lying on reporters who are—to reports or in court, generally abusing police authority to make a charge stick.

That ends up breaking down the way our actual justice system is supposed to work. We can't be cutting corners. And part of that means we have to be able to have effective civilian oversight, including rules around investigation, police cameras, body cameras and use of force.

So, there are some steps in the right direction here, but I still think this is a—there is a lot to bite—a lot more to bite off and a lot more to—that has to be dealt with for us to actually have an effective system that Manitobans are going to be able to trust.

And the police need to be able to trust it, as well. But ultimately, it's the police who are—who have to be held to account because we have given them extraordinary powers. They are given licence—and I mean that—licence. They are free to use violence in our society and that requires absolutely awesome oversight and awesome checks and balances that currently do not exist.

This is a small step in the right direction, but it's not enough.

Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 30, The Police Services Amendment and Law Enforcement Review Amendment Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? [*Agreed*]

Bill 32—The Victims' Bill of Rights Amendment Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We now move to Bill 32, The Victims' Bill of Rights Amendment Act.

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I move, seconded by the Minister of Indigenous Reconciliation and Northern Relations (Mr. Lagimodiere), that Bill 32, The Victims' Bill of Rights Amendment Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and now read for a third time and passed.

I hope. At 3:00 in the morning.

Motion presented.

Mr. Goertzen: It's a pleasure to stand in this House with only seven hours remaining of debate.

But I do want to say on this particular bill, while I have the opportunity, that it is something that was changed, I believe, by the former NDP government. And I think it was maybe a mistake to do it, and I want to just explain why it was made; not because it was nefarious or that anybody was trying to do anything wrong but that there was an ultimate consequence to it.

So, under Victim Services right now, if an individual has a criminal past, it not only bars them—which might make sense—from getting victim services, but it often bars their families from getting victim services if the individual themselves becomes a victim of crime.

And let me give an example where this might be a real situation. An individual might, at a young age of 20—feels young to me—gets involved in some sort of activity. They get charged. They are convicted, ultimately. They go about, then, cleaning up their lives. Eight years later they're now married, they have a family, they've moved on with their lives and cleaned themselves up, so to speak, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And then they become a victim of crime. Now, let's say they're killed as a random act of violence, as an example. Their family would not be able to get any victim services because the individual who was the victim had a criminal past.

That's an extreme circumstance. There'd be other circumstances, as well, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But this gives the opportunity and the flexibility for Victim Services to say, you know, here is a group of individuals who are suffering, and for no fault of their own they have a loved one who's become a victim of crime and but for the fact that that individual, you know, themselves, had something in their past that had nothing to do with the family, no cause and effect to the family, the family is now suffering. And they almost become re-victimized because they're not able to get services.

So, I don't think that that was the intention that the former government had, but in talking to community leaders and talking to victims' advocates, including Candace House, in talking to Indigenous leaders—and I know in the Calls to Action from the M-M-I-G report that there was one of the Calls to Action is to expand victim services and to not have barriers, artificial barriers, to victim services.

So, I think that this fulfills all of that. My guess is this will be a fairly small class of individuals who, ultimately, are impacted. But for them it will be a big impact.

And so it's simply filling in a gap. I think it aligns with the MMIWG calls to justice. It aligns with what Victim Services and victims' advocates like Candace House have spoken to us about—and MOVA, as another example, we've spoke to MOVA, as well. And I hope that it at least serves a purpose of helping some families who otherwise would have been not able to get victim services to no fault of their own.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): I am pleased to put a couple of words on the record in respect to Bill 30, too.

I do appreciate the minister, you know, explaining what these changes might look like. And, of course, it's potentially, like, an extreme example of potentially what could happen and I would imagine probably very few—but still, it is a barrier.

And, certainly, we do support extending support services for victims of crime, including their families. I've spoken many times—and so has the member for Point Douglas (Mrs. Smith)—spoken about changes to Victim Services in respect of MMIWG2S families.

So, in particular, families that have a missing one who—or a loved one who was missing. And under the former NDP government, we made those changes, as well, because prior to that, if you had a loved one who was missing, you didn't qualify for victim services, as

well. And so those changes came under the NDP, as well.

And I think—I would hope, you know, that everyone of us in this Chamber would agree that we have a responsibility to take care of and protect victims of crime and their families. And, you know, Victim Services does really good work. I think that those services can certainly be extended and a little bit more robust, but I know that there are really good people that work in Victim Services.

* (20:00)

And we know that the need is great. Like, there is, unfortunately, you know, a lot of victims, a lot of victims out there that need those supports and need to—and need help to kind of navigate that system, on how to access those resources and those supports. So, certainly, we support that change that's in Bill 32 here.

I won't speak for long because I've been speaking for a long time and already, you know, this—we're going to be here until 4:00 in the morning for royal assent.

But I do want to just reflect on the Justice of—minister talking about the national inquiries, the MMIWG2S national inquiries calls for justice. And, again, today the member for Point Douglas and myself got up in QP and asked questions in respect of MMIWG2S; and, you know, one of the things that I said in my question was that you can't just express air—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Members are welcome to have conversations in appropriate areas. If you wish to step into the hallway, you can talk freely. But while someone is debating, I would ask for a calmer, quieter volume level, please.

Ms. Fontaine: Again, so the minister did bring up the calls to justice, and the member for Point Douglas and myself asked questions today in respect of, you know, MMIWG2S, particularly in respect of Rebecca Contois, Doris Trout and Tessa Perry. And, in fact, I know that the member for Point Douglas right now is doing something in honour of Tessa Perry.

And so, as I have said repeatedly, and today, Deputy Speaker, in question period, you know it's—here's the calls to justice, the national inquiry's calls for justice, in this little book. And it's not enough just to, you know, say that you support MMIWG2S or, you know, my thoughts and prayers are with the families of MMIWG2S. That's just expressed breath; that's not doing anything. It's not doing anything, just

saying that, when members opposite actually have all the power and the resources to actually implement the calls for justice.

And so, I know that the minister was saying that this is in line with the calls of justice. Certainly, I would agree that it is one small component to what is being asked for in the calls to justice by MMIWG family members and by allies and by folks that are on the front lines of social services that are demanding more—more protection and more resources for Indigenous women, girls and two-spirited.

And I said it yesterday, I've said it all week, I'll say it again today, I'll say it tonight: you know, in the last three weeks, we've had three Indigenous women murdered. As we speak, we have an Indigenous woman—I believe she's 37—Morgan Harris, I believe, who's been missing now, I think, for 32 days. And I'm in constant contact with the family. I keep posting her missing photo, hoping that somebody will recognize her and know where she is, but she's been missing for 32 days now.

And you know, in the context of having, in the last three weeks, three Indigenous women murdered—and, again, like, if you look even just over the last two years how many Indigenous women have lost their lives. Like, it's not like we've just lost three Indigenous women just now in the last three weeks, you know, over the span of 20 years. That's not accurate, right? It's every year. Month after month, we have Indigenous women who are going missing or murdered.

Right now we have Morgan, who has been missing for 32 days. I'm terrified for her family. I'm terrified—you know, I talk with her family every day, and I'm terrified that—I'm terrified that she's no longer with us. I hope to God that that's not the case, and I hope that somebody recognizes her and I hope that the family will find her.

But this is a crisis. This is an ongoing genocide of Indigenous women, girls and two-spirited. And, you know, you would think that people would see this as an urgent issue. You would think that members opposite would see this as the crisis and respond with the level of urgency that it deserves. But we don't see anything.

And, you know, I asked my staff, Ben, my social—or, my constituency assistant this morning when I was driving to the Leg.—I asked him to go through, in particular, all of the Cabinet's Twitter accounts. And I said, I want you to go through their Twitter accounts and

see if any of them have posted anything in respect of Rebecca, Doris and Tessa. None of them. Not one single Cabinet minister has tweeted anything, no condolences, no I'm sorry, no we'll find justice, we'll do any—you know, we'll support the families in any way we can. Not one single Cabinet minister has posted anything.

And so, you know, to—and I will say this until my dying day: It is not enough to just say that you support or you stand in solidarity. That means nothing to us, as we're being slaughtered on our streets. That means nothing. If a government with all the power and money and resources and civil servants that can do work, if a government doesn't do anything, like, who the heck is going to do anything? If the government doesn't see it as a—as an urgent crisis, who is going to see it? I mean, besides us as Indigenous women. Besides us, our Indigenous organizations that are on the front lines. Like, if those folks with the power and the privilege to do something won't do something, who the heck is going to do something? It's so depressing, Deputy Speaker. It really is. It's so frigging depressing.

I'm probably getting tired because we've been up here for hours. I'm probably just getting tired.

Anyways, all of this to say, Deputy Speaker, I hope to God that the members opposite realize what's going on and actually start to, like, care about our women and actually do something.

Miigwech.

I'm so tired.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Bill 32, The Victims' Bill of Rights Amendment Act, makes some quite positive changes in providing support, not just to victims themselves, but extending that to family members. And that would be particularly important in terms of the children, and as I spoke at second reading that I believe it's particularly important that in—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Gerrard: —consultation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I'm having some difficulty hearing the member and would ask all members who are not speaking, which is almost everybody, to quiet down please so that I can hear the honourable member for River Heights.

Mr. Gerrard: I think it's particularly important in terms of compensation for children where a parent, for

example, has been murdered or incapacitated or can't work, that the children be compensated to the extent that they are able to continue their school and finish not just high school, but continue and complete a degree in post-secondary education.

Clearly, education is the great leveller, and in many cases, we are looking at families where the victims are disadvantaged in one way or another. And we need to make sure that victims are compensated in a way that can be very helpful to the family.

* (20:10)

I think it's also important that the victims and family members be compensated even under circumstances where there is no perpetrator found and under circumstances where restorative justice is used because without comparable compensation under situations where restorative justice is used, there will be, as it were, an economic incentive to go to court and to try it in court when there is a possibility that there could be a resolution using restorative justice and that—where restorative justice should be no less—victims and family members should be no less able to get compensation.

The result of victims' compensation needs to be practically useful. And I say that we are not necessarily just talking about money, we are talking about what is needed to most help the family and the victims in order to—whether it is recover; to be compensated for the victimization or what have you.

I want to, before I step down, to comment briefly on the frustration that I hear in the words of the MLA for St. Johns. That we are at a time where there have been recently three women who have been murdered and—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Gerrard: —and there is clearly—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: : Order, please. I can't hear the member talk. I'm asking people to either take your conversations outside the Chamber or do your work or be quiet, but I have to be able to hear the member talk, so let's try this again.

Mr. Gerrard: It is not enough to talk. We need action. We need much more effective action. We need to make sure that the recommendations of the Advocate for Children and Youth are fulfilled. We need to make sure that the recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the recommendations from the report on missing and murdered

Indigenous women and girls are implemented as quickly as possible.

So, there is much to do. We should not just sit back on passing this bill and other bills and say it is good enough because there is much more to do and we need action. And we need action quickly because the situation has and is dire in Manitoba. It is not acceptable and we are expecting much more from the government than we have had so far.

So, with those few words, I will sit down and look forward to this bill becoming law, hopefully, later today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 32, The Victims' Bill of Rights Amendment Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? *[Agreed]*

Bill 16—The Financial Administration Amendment Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We now will proceed to Bill 16, The Financial Administration Amendment Act.

Hon. Cameron Friesen (Minister of Finance): I move, seconded by the Minister responsible for Labour, Consumer Protection and Government Services, that Bill 16, The Financial Administration Amendment Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Friesen: It's a pleasure to have a few minutes to just put a few words on the record in respect of Bill 16.

The Legislature now has had fulsome debate on this bill and the rationale to bring it forward at this time. We know that this bill essentially identifies the challenge between voting annual authority for borrowing and what constitutes total borrowing authority.

Madam Speaker in the Chair

We know that, in the Province of Manitoba, we have an annual bill, whereby we vote authority for borrowing. The problem is we don't consolidate that. I remember being a critic of finance and trying to figure out what the total borrowing authority for the Province of Manitoba was. I didn't realize at the time that the reason this was so confusing is that other provinces had already proceeded to a different basis.

We are essentially departing from best practice in this province. This bill brings us in line with best practice, whereby we don't simply vote new authority for borrowing every year. We set a limit for borrowing. We understand what the Province's requirements are to do all the things we must do in respect of building schools and hospitals and health-care infrastructure and roads and highways.

We know that our government is spending—the Minister of Health (Ms. Gordon) indicated today that we have cornerstone projects for healthcare that are spending \$812 million in key rural projects as part of our Manitoba clinical and preventative services plan. I always have problems with this acronym: the PCPSP.

But we also know we have voted authority for highways and infrastructure that is needed now more than ever. Our government is committed to \$1.5 billion of road infrastructure over the next three years. We have endeavoured to be able to make sure that any underspent amount goes forward into the next year. We are planning on a three-year cycle for the first time ever in the province.

We know, beyond this, that the Minister of Education said today that we are in the middle of building a number of new schools. The number of new schools that our government has indicated that it will build is 22. Twenty-two new schools. And so, Madam Speaker, these are the commitments that we have made.

This bill indicates that it's important to understand what are the requirements of the Province. How much borrowing do we need to have? So I would—I would assert to you, Madam Speaker, that this bill works in favour of the opposition, as much as it works in favour of the government and the public because it creates transparency in an area that never had transparency.

So, we will state in this bill the total requirement for borrowing for the Province of Manitoba. We will state in this bill the total requirement for borrowing for Manitoba Hydro. Why Manitoba Hydro? Because the requirements are very, very large after the completion of Keeyask, Bipole III, the Manitoba-Minnesota tie-in line, certain improvements we've made to the Dorsey station and other stations to be able to convey that power—projects, of course, that we know were billions of dollars over budget by the NDP, but we still need to state what those requirements are.

I want to expunge any view that somehow these limits will put us in a false sense of urgency or invite

conversations around fiscal cliffs, like you see in American politics. That is not the purpose of this bill. The purpose of this bill is to establish adequate levels of borrowing.

What if something unusual happens? What if there are exigent circumstances? This bill contains provisions by which, if things happen, we have that ability to maneuver, we have that ability to respond. The issue is not to invite some kind of false sense of urgency to call the House back in session. That's not the case.

* (20:20)

So I think there are many bills in this House that we debate that are somewhat political. There are bills that we bring that we know that will invite a sharp debate. Honestly, Madam Speaker, this is not one of them. We move into a best practice, a practice adopted by other jurisdictions in this regard. We feel strongly that this is the way to go. We feel strongly that this bill should have the support of all measures.

I do want to say one thing. There was a question posed earlier this week by a member of the opposition who said that somehow the information provided now in the information that we used to call the Supplementary Information for Legislative Review—I think we used to call it the SLIR—was inadequate.

And we have a new acronym we use now. It's called the SEE, the S-E-E. And that supplementary information for the consideration of the Estimates is more robust. This bill brings about what the opposition has been asking for, and that is that additional information to compare prior year appropriations, staffing levels, sub-appropriations. It's all in here.

Now, to be clear, we've been doing it for two years. What this bill does is it solidifies that approach. They asked for more information. Here is more information.

So I think—I commend this bill to the House. I believe it is the way to go. It gives transparency for Manitobans. It gives transparency to the opposition on the loan requirements of the Province. The opposition can hold us accountable for what we spend and what we lapse, and the Public Accounts, of course, always reports how the government did on delivering its budgetary plan.

Madam Speaker, I welcome the debate. I look forward this evening, should it have the support of the House, for the passage of Bill 16.

Mr. Mark Wasyliv (Fort Garry): I just want to say to the minister, who's been my counterpart for the last few months, that I certainly have enjoyed working with him. And I thought, despite our, you know, our passionate differing views, we work well together. But one of my observations of the minister is that he certainly loves the political theatre. He certainly likes the dramatic. And I want to set the stage, to use maybe a term that he understands, about this bill.

So it comes back to the winter and, of course, what was happening was a by-election in Fort Whyte. And, of course, the blackout election rules prevented the government from advertising. So along comes Bill 16. And it's unlike any other bill that we—that I've seen with the Finance Ministry since I've been elected. There was a technical briefing. That's a big deal. And the government made a big deal, and they called all the media in and there—this was a game changer.

This was a piece of legislation that was going to change things in Manitoba, and there was all the bells and whistles. And then, of course, we had a press conference after it and, of course, that was the time for the minister to shine. That was his moment. And he had a—his performance was inspired, but sadly, unconvincing.

So the reviews came in, and here's the review from the Winnipeg Free Press. Quote: piece of political theatre absent of any real relevance or impact for government or its citizens. Close quote. So, sadly, it wasn't convincing anyone.

And, of course, the minister at that press conference made a big deal, saying that this government bill was committed to staying within their means and focused on balancing the books. Well, of course, that was the, you know, meaningless political theatre, virtue-signalling part of this bill. And this bill—and I think the Winnipeg Free Press got it right—really has no real force or effect.

And, in fact, I think a day or two later, when I had the bill briefing with the minister, he changed his tune immediately: no, no, this isn't a debt ceiling. We don't have caps. It's not going to cause any mischief. It's not like the US—but the day before, that's exactly what he was trying to sell to the Manitoban people. And, of course, they didn't believe it.

So there are numerous loopholes in this bill, and there's no real constraints on government, and it seems to be the only real purpose was for virtue signalling during a by-election and getting around election blackout financing rules. And again, sadly, the story

doesn't have a happy ending because it just seems to be yet another skirting of the rules and tightropeing the ethical lines in this building from this government.

But here's the concerning part: you have a minister saying one thing in public and another thing to this House. And we cannot, as legislators, mislead Manitobans because not only does, you know, it affects the integrity of that member, it infects the integrity of all members. And Manitobans are losing trust in politicians and we obviously have to be mindful of that.

But this bill, really, it was a public relations exercise. It's cynical, it is unnecessary and it is meant to sort of mislead the political base for the PC government.

So, I will end with another review on this issue: The new bill is pointless, ineffectual and unnecessary. Winnipeg Free Press. [*interjection*] All right, well, you know, I think the minister is asking for an encore, and I will provide.

So, the one thing that really is sort of troubling of this bill is that there's a continuous trend in this government to concentrate power. I mean, this is not your father's PC Party. I mean, at one time, Conservative political movements believed that political decisions should be closest to the people who are affected by it. This modern PC Party is the exact opposite. They want to take away power.

So, this bill takes away the power and discretion for our operating agencies like universities over their own budget decisions on capital builds. They now have to go to this Cabinet and get permission to work on their own infrastructure in their own institutions. And, of course, we've seen what this government has done with public school education and the infrastructure deficit that's been ballooning. We see the infrastructure deficit ballooning with municipalities. And of course, that will happen, as well, for universities.

So, just like bill 64, this gets rid of those pesky, democratically elected university boards and their discretion and their ability to decide what's best for their own students and their staff and their institutions and it replaces it with yet more authoritarian, top-down, Cabinet control, red tape-inducing, you know, response from this government. And we're all going to be poorer for that.

So, with that, Madam Speaker, we're obviously not supportive of this bill. I don't think any serious government could be. And I think this is the chance

for the big twist ending for the minister to vote against this disastrous bill and show that this government can be responsible when it wants to be.

Sadly, I think we shouldn't hold our breath. That won't be the ending tonight.

Thank you.

Mr. Dougald Lamont (St. Boniface): I'll just put a few brief comments on the record about this bill.

Look, this is not a bill about transparency or about communications. It's fundamentally about control. It's about this government taking away control from people and gathering it to themselves, in fact, taking a lot of it away from the Legislature and democratically elected MLAs where it belongs.

Just to be clear: look, over the last 10 years, of the \$10 billion in new Hydro debt, \$4 billion of that went to the Manitoba government: \$2 billion of it went to the NDP government, \$2 billion to the PCs.

In the last two years, we've seen \$600 million in new debt added just for the property tax rebates: \$350 million in new debt this year, \$250 million in new debt last year.

And the fact is, tons and tons of the debt that this government has racked up, with multiple credit downgrades, has been to—because we are borrowing to pay people for tax cuts when we don't have the money for it. It's completely fiscally irresponsible. There's nothing conservative about it.

And this creates an artificial limit on debt that is totally unnecessary. The idea that just because everyone else is doing it, we should do it too doesn't make any sense. A debt ceiling is used in the US by politicians to hold governments hostage, to shut down democratically elected governments and stop them from—and cause disruption and chaos. It's a completely negative, unnecessary measure that is not going to—it's not going to significantly end the transparency and it is going to take away control from people who actually know what they're doing.

* (20:30)

The fact is that it's, you know, as—actually, the member for Fort Garry (Mr. Wasyliv) said—it's not just a question. Yes, government needs to be delivered, part by the people who are closer to it. But the other is that we have boards of organizations, boards of universities and colleges and people who are actually experts in health care, education and other—and hydro—and we don't let them do their jobs because

people in Treasury Board think they're—think they know what they're doing better.

The fact is that there's a reason why we have all these divisions of power. It's to avoid corruption. It's to encourage accountability and make sure things are getting done. And this bill is not going to deliver any of those things. So we're going to vote against it.

Madam Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 16, The Financial Administration Amendment Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Madam Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Madam Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): Recorded vote, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: A recorded vote having been called, call in the members.

Order, please.

The one hour provided for the ringing of the division bells has expired. I am therefore directing that the division bells be turned off and the House proceed to the vote.

The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 16, The Financial Administration Amendment Act.

Division

A RECORDED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas

Cox, Cullen, Eichler, Ewasko, Fielding, Friesen, Goertzen, Gordon, Guenter, Guillemard, Helwer, Johnson, Johnston, Khan, Lagassé, Lagimodiere, Martin, Michaleski, Micklefield, Morley-Lecomte, Nesbitt, Pedersen, Reyes, Schuler, Smith (Lagimodière), Smook, Squires, Stefanson, Teitsma, Wharton, Wishart, Wowchuk.

Nays

Altomare, Asagwara, Brar, Bushie, Fontaine, Gerrard, Kinew, Lamont, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino, Moses, Naylor, Sala, Sandhu, Smith (Point Douglas), Wasyliw, Wiebe.

Clerk (Ms. Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 32, Nays 20.

Madam Speaker: The motion is accordingly passed.

Bill 2—The Public Services Sustainability Repeal Act

Madam Speaker: We will now move to concurrence and third reading of Bill 2, The Public Service Sustainability Repeal Act.

Hon. Reg Helwer (Minister of Labour, Consumer Protection and Government Services): I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Friesen), that Bill 2, The Public Services Sustainability Repeal Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Justice, be concurred in and now read for a third time and passed. *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

We still have a couple of bills to go through, so I'm going to ask for your co-operation, please.

Motion presented.

Mr. Helwer: The Public Services Sustainability Repeal Act was a product of a different time and different circumstances. We are looking forwards, not backwards, and it's time to move on, so it's time to repeal this legislation.

MLA Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon): It seems a shame that we're still talking about the hated public sector sustainability act that froze so many working people's wages for so long and did such a disservice to Manitoba working people and Manitoba working families.

The only reason that it was repealed is because they knew it wouldn't stand the test at the Supreme Court. They knew that this same kind of legislation had been struck down in other jurisdictions. They knew that it was a loser right from the day they first introduced it, and yet they went ahead and did it.

They forced workplaces to negotiate in bad faith because of this government's actions. Every one of them was sitting at that table and said, yes, let's go ahead, let's bring in this bill that's going to attack public servants except—except—for the member from Fort Whyte. He's got his own sins to carry, Madam Speaker.

So it's kind of a shame that here we are, past the 11th hour, voting to bring in an act to repeal a piece of legislation that had no business being introduced in the first place.

The question remains: will the government allow this to go to the Supreme Court so that we can once and for all know that it is a bad piece of legislation that's not constitutional? Or will they just withdraw it and sit quietly and hope that maybe someday they'll get re-elected to government and reintroduce the same bad legislation to attack the public servants of this province yet again?

Rest assured, everyone on that side, that public servants in this province won't soon forget the actions of your government to attack them, attack them and attack them every step of the way.

Let's make sure that as we go forward—the minister says we don't want to look backwards, and you're absolutely right, but we need to keep an eye on the rear-view mirror to make sure that they don't pull the same stunt again going forward. We need to make sure that this province actually moves forward, that the people who work for the civil service in this province get the respect that they deserve, that they never once got from this government.

* (21:40)

Madam Speaker, we need to make sure that this government is held to account, particularly for this piece of legislation, but also 'selmony'—so many others, like bill 64 that they had to withdraw because it was bad legislation meant to attack Manitobans.

We need to make sure that Manitobans remember the attacks by this government, on the very fibre of this province. Manitoba will not forget, Madam Speaker.

Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Order.

I know everybody's tired and getting a bit ram-bunctious here, but we do have some more people to hear from and I am going to ask for everybody's co-operation please. We are going to be hearing from a member virtually, and it makes it very difficult for me to hear what is being said.

So, I'm going to ask—we only have a few more minutes left in here, if people can just rein it in a little bit so that we can properly get through the evening, very respectfully with each other.

Mr. Dougald Lamont (St. Boniface): I'll try to keep this brief.

You'd think that a bill that had never been proclaimed that is being repealed would be sort of a draw, and that nothing has been—nothing ventured, and nothing has been gained. But, quite frankly, this was a very damaging bill, nevertheless.

It was—despite the fact it was never proclaimed, it was used by school divisions and others to hold down wages. This is really a wage-theft bill that hurt a lot of people. And, you know, the idea that at one point it was necessary, and at another point, it wasn't—it was never necessary because the entire myth of—that Manitoba's public services were at risk and had to be slashed and people had to be fired, lose their jobs and live with lower wages for years to keep the public service sustainable while this government was borrowing billions of dollars and cutting billions of dollars in taxes, doesn't make sense. It doesn't hold water.

It was, nevertheless—it's incredible that a bill that was never proclaimed that—could be this damaging. But it was also—we've also seen this government introduce bills, pull back bills and then reintroduce them again. One example would be the carbon tax, and another example would be what we're seeing with the privatization of liquor sales.

So the idea that we're just going to put the genie back in the bottle is questionable. It seems to me that this was advanced with the hope, perhaps, of taking it to the Supreme Court and 'permanently' stripping—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lamont:—permanently stripping people of their—permanently people—stripping—set—they're trying to set a precedent in Manitoba and in Canada for stripping Manitobans and Canadians of one their most basic and important fundamental rights, which is the right to negotiate and bargain the value of your own

labour and benefits, which is one of the most important decisions you can make in your life.

So, we're happy to see this bill go, and we hope we never see it again.

Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question for before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 2, The Public Services Sustainability Repeal Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? *[Agreed]*

I declare the motion carried—oh.

Recorded Vote

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Government House Leader): A recorded vote, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: A recorded vote having been called, call in the members.

* (21:50)

The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 2, The Public Services Sustainability Repeal Act.

Division

A RECORDED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas

Altomare, Asagwara, Brar, Bushie, Cox, Cullen, Eichler, Ewasko, Fielding, Fontaine, Friesen, Gerrard, Goertzen, Gordon, Guenter, Guillemard, Helwer, Johnson, Johnston, Khan, Kinew, Lagassé, Lagimodiere, Lamont, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino, Martin, Michaleski, Mickelfield, Morley-Lecomte, Moses, Naylor, Nesbitt, Pedersen, Reyes, Sala, Sandhu, Schuler, Smith (Lagimodière), Smith (Point Douglas), Smook, Squires, Stefanson, Teitsma, Wasyliv, Wharton, Wiebe, Wishart, Wowchuk.

Nays

Clerk (Ms. Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 52, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: The motion is accordingly passed.

Mr. Helwer: Is it the will of the House to call it unanimous?

Madam Speaker: Is it the will of the House to call it unanimous? [*Agreed*]

The motion is passed unanimously.

**Bill 29—The Mennonite College Federation
Amendment Act**

Madam Speaker: We will now move to concurrence and third reading of Bill 29, The Mennonite College Federation Amendment Act.

The honourable Minister of Advanced Education. [*interjection*] Order.

Hon. Jon Reyes (Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Immigration): I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Goertzen), that Bill 29, The Mennonite College Federation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Fédération des collèges mennonites, reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred and now be read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Reyes: I will be brief, as I spoke to the bill at first and second readings and then at committee.

I am pleased to put a few words on Bill 29, The Mennonite College Federation Amendment Act, which includes proposed amendments to The Mennonite College Federation Act, and a repeal of The Menno Simons College Incorporation Act.

With the completion and third passing and passing of this bill, outdated references to the institution's former member colleges, Concord College, Canadian Mennonite Bible College and Menno Simons College, will be removed from the act. The rules of the Canadian Mennonite University, CMU, council and board of governors will be outlined in the act, which will also be retitled to reflect the name Canadian Mennonite University.

A second act, The Menno Simons College Incorporation Act, and its requirements are no longer required given Canadian Mennonite University—CMU's—current operational and governance structure. A repeal of this act will streamline administrative processes and reflect the current institutional reality.

As you've heard from CMU President Cheryl Pauls, who spoke in favour at committee stage, this bill will modernize the legislative framework out of the Canadian Mennonite University and support its effective governance.

And I want to conclude that our government continues to be committed in ensuring high-quality post-secondary for all Manitobans and is pleased to support Canadian Mennonite University in these necessary updates to the institution's legislative framework.

I commend this bill for consideration at the third reading and I look forward to its passage and receiving royal assent, tonight.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Jamie Moses (St. Vital): I want to say that, in regards to this bill, you know, it's—it's glad to see that the government is aligning with the practice of CMU. They've been operating under this model for a while. It's been more efficient for them to consolidate their administrative practices, and it's taken a while—a number of years for the government to catch up to the actual practices of what they're doing at CMU.

So I commend the on—the hard-working staff at CMU for their advocacy in pushing the government to align with this legislation to the actual practices and the best practices at their organization. So thank you to all the folks at CMU for the work that you've done, not only to educate the student population in Manitoba, but also in your advocacy, as well.

And while we're speaking about advanced education, Madam Speaker, it's—it is incumbent on us to really outline the past year in the world of advanced education.

Now, let's start with the most notable thing: the strike. We had a strike at Manitoba's largest university. That's a complete failure by this government. And numbers—numerous failures by this government in terms of advanced education this year. A strike that was caused by this PC government, that was extended—

Madam Speaker: Order. Order, please.

I am going to have to indicate that the member's going to have to be relevant in terms of the comments put on the record. This is about The Mennonite College Federation Amendment Act, and I'm going to ask the member to stay relevant with his comments.

Mr. Moses: I appreciate your words of keeping me relevant to the bill. And I think that it's in—you know, notable that the people who also attend CMU also often transfer between there and U of M, where I'm speaking of, where we had the longest and largest strike in advanced—in post-secondary history in our province. I think it's very relevant.

Just like the students at CMU, all students across the province have had—have faced higher tuition. And I think that's extremely relevant. That's unavoidable. It's 'unavailable' for us in this Chamber. It's 'unavailable' for every university student and college student in the province. And this government, again, failed to provide affordable tuition for students; affordable access to post-secondary education, like at CMU.

And I think that's incumbent on us, including the students who require student aid at CMU and the students who require student aid at all of our institutions. The government failed by providing inadequate services. The system was down for weeks, Madam Speaker.

And, in fact, the minister just said in Estimates last week that up to 238 students still do not have proper student aid. Some of those students might attend CMU, Madam Speaker, and it's extremely irrelevant for this discussion and debate today.

And lastly, Madam Speaker, I just want to put on the record that, on this side of the House, along with all the other things that we fight for, and in—to, you know, contrast from all the failures we've seen from the government, not just in post-secondary, but in all areas over this past year, this government will fight for students, will fight for affordable tuition, will fight for accessible access to education, will fight for autonomy to our universities and will fight to make Manitoba a better place, not just for students, but for every Manitoban.

* (22:10)

That's what we do on this side of the House, and that's what we'll continue to do on this side of the House.

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Tyndall Park): There's a time and place for everything, but this legislation is very straightforward.

Changes reflect the evolution of the Mennonite College Federation into the Canadian Mennonite University. This includes a small change in title, replacing three college boards with a council and adjustments to the composition of the board. Ultimately, this legislation better reflects the Canadian Mennonite University act, and we're very happy to support it.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 29, The Mennonite College Federation Amendment Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? [*Agreed*]

I declare the motion carried.

* * *

Madam Speaker: We will now prepare for royal assent, and I would ask and remind members that if you have not already done so, to please remove the contents of your desks.

ROYAL ASSENT

Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms (Mr. Cam Steel): Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor.

Her Honour Janice C. Filmon, Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the throne, Madam Speaker addressed Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor in the following words:

Madam Speaker: Your Honour:

At this sitting, the Legislative Assembly has passed certain bills that I ask Your Honour to give assent to:

Clerk Assistant (Ms. Vanessa Gregg):

Bill 2 – The Public Services Sustainability Repeal Act; Loi abrogeant la Loi sur la viabilité des services publics

Bill 7 – The Police Services Amendment Act (Enhancing Independent Investigation Unit Operations); Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services de police (amélioration du fonctionnement de l'unité d'enquête indépendante)

Bill 8 – The Court of Appeal Amendment and Provincial Court Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour d'appel et la Loi sur la Cour provinciale

Bill 9 – The Scrap Metal Act; Loi sur la ferraille

Bill 15 – The Drivers and Vehicles Amendment and Highway Traffic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les conducteurs et les véhicules et le Code de la route

Bill 16 – The Financial Administration Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la gestion des finances publiques

Bill 17 – The Family Law Act, The Family Support Enforcement Act and The Inter-jurisdictional Support Orders Amendment Act; Loi édictant la Loi sur le droit de la famille et la Loi sur l'exécution des obligations alimentaires et modifiant la Loi sur l'établissement et l'exécution réciproque des ordonnances alimentaires

Bill 18 – The Legislative Security Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la sécurité de la Cité législative

Bill 19 – The Beneficiary Designation (Retirement, Savings and Other Plans) Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la désignation de bénéficiaires (régimes de retraite, d'épargne et autres)

Bill 21 – the highway traffic amendment and the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation amendment act; Loi modifiant le Code de la route et la Loi sur la Société d'assurance publique du Manitoba

Bill 23 – The Reducing Red Tape and Improving Services Act, 2022; Loi de 2022 visant la réduction du fardeau administratif et l'amélioration des services

Bill 26 – The Officers of the Assembly Act (Various Acts Amended); Loi sur les hauts fonctionnaires de l'Assemblée (modification de diverses lois)

Bill 27 – The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Alternative Measures for Driving Offences); Loi modifiant le Code de la route (mesures de rechange en cas d'infractions de conduite)

Bill 29 – The Mennonite College Federation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Fédération des collèges mennonites

Bill 30 – The Police Services Amendment and Law Enforcement Review Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services de police et la Loi sur les enquêtes relatives à l'application de la loi

Bill 31 – The Minor Amendments and Corrections Act, 2022; Loi corrective de 2022

Bill 32 – The Victims' Bill of Rights Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Déclaration des droits des victimes

Bill 33 – The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Municipal Board Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'évaluation municipale et la Loi sur la Commission municipale

Bill 34 – The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Planning Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Charte de la ville de Winnipeg et la Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire

Bill 35 – The Commemoration of Days, Weeks and Months and Related Repeals and Amendments Act; Loi sur les journées, les semaines et les mois commémoratifs et abrogations et modifications connexes

Bill 37 – The International Child Support and Family Maintenance (Hague Convention) Act; Loi sur le recouvrement international des aliments destinés aux enfants et à d'autres membres de la famille (Convention de La Haye)

Bill 41 – The Child and Family Services Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille

Bill 44 – The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Minimum Wage); Loi modifiant le Code des normes d'emploi (salaire minimum)

* (22:20)

Bill 205 – The Filipino Heritage Month Act; Loi sur le Mois du patrimoine philippin

Bill 223 – The Ukrainian Heritage Month Act; Loi sur le Mois du patrimoine ukrainien

Bill 227 – The Turban Day Act; Loi sur la Journée du turban

Bill 228 – The Eating Disorders Awareness Week Act; Loi sur la Semaine de sensibilisation aux troubles de l'alimentation

Bill 234 – The Drug-Related Death Bereavement Day Act; Loi sur le Jour de deuil des personnes dont le décès est lié aux drogues

Clerk (Ms. Patricia Chaychuk): In Her Majesty's name, Her Honour assents to these bills.

Her Honour was then pleased to retire.

God Save the Queen was sung.

O Canada was sung.

* * *

Madam Speaker: I have a—just a couple of comments before we adjourn the House.

I just want to wish everybody a wonderful summer. All of us have been through a lot of challenges over the last couple years. It hasn't always been easy

being an MLA, or staff, in such an—a challenging environment.

So, I do wish everybody a wonderful and safe summer. All the best in reconnecting with your families and friends, and your constituents.

I would also like to say to our staff here in the Legislature—we have an amazing team. You don't get to see all of them very often, but there is a whole team that makes this place work and makes it work as well as it does. And we have had many challenges. We have risen to the challenge, all of the staff have risen to the challenge, and I just want to say, on behalf of all of us to the staff, thank you for your service over the—this year and the past couple years, in rising to these amazing challenges that have been before us—very unprecedented challenges.

And a special thanks to our Clerk and Deputy Clerk for leading the charge in all of this. They make it look easy, and it's not easy. There's a lot of wheels turning behind the scenes.

And I would also just like to say thank you for the collegial efforts of the House leaders in helping to move the agenda forward here in this Legislature. Over this past year, there's been, you know, many topics we've had to deal with. And I have to say, as the Speaker, and I'm sure the—they—all the staff here appreciate, too, the collegial effort that has been put forward by our House leaders.

And with that, the House is adjourned until the call of the Speaker. No. *[interjection]* The House is adjourned until the next sitting period or the call of the Speaker.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, June 1, 2022

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
Committee Reports		Education System	
Standing Committee on Rules of the House		Wiebe	2645
First Report		Ewasko	2645
Micklefield	2627	Private Liquor Sales	
Committee of the Whole		Sala	2646
Report		Fielding	2646
Smook	2634	Violence Against MMIWG2S People	
Standing Committee on Public Accounts		Fontaine	2647
Fourth Report		Squires	2647
Maloway	2634	Lagimodiere	2647
Tabling of Reports		Paid Sick Leave	
Fielding	2635	Lindsey	2648
Ministerial Statements		Helwer	2648
Special Olympics Awareness Week		Vulnerable Indigenous Women and Girls	
Stefanson	2635	B. Smith	2649
Fontaine	2636	Squires	2649
Lamont	2636	Guillemard	2649
Deaf-Blind Awareness Month		Government's Management of Health Care	
Squires	2637	Lamont	2650
Marcelino	2637	Gordon	2650
Gerrard	2638	Regulation of Therapy Services	
Ukrainian Refugees in Manitoba—Update		Lamoureux	2650
Reyes	2638	Gordon	2651
Wasyliw	2639	Voluntary Intoxication and Violent Crime	
Lamoureux	2640	Teitsma	2651
Members' Statements		Goertzen	2651
Daniel Joseph Lalama		Provincial Parks	
Khan	2640	Naylor	2651
John Morrisseau and Ovide Mercredi		Wharton	2651
Lathlin	2641	Squires	2652
Jamaican Independence from the UK		Catalytic Converter Theft	
Gordon	2641	Maloway	2652
East Side Eagles Football Club		Stefanson	2652
Wiebe	2642	Speaker's Ruling	
Sherry Janzen		Driedger	2652
Friesen	2643	Speaker's Statement	
Oral Questions		Driedger	2654
Surgical Backlog		Petitions	
Asagwara	2644	Hearing Aids	
Stefanson	2644	Gerrard	2654
		Catalytic Converter Engraving Credit	
		Maloway	2655
		Grievances	
		Asagwara	2655

ORDERS OF THE DAY
GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Government Motion

Goertzen 2657

Concurrence Motion

Standing Committee on Rules of the House

First Report

Goertzen 2657

Fontaine 2658

Gerrard 2658

Concurrence and Third Readings

Bill 37—The International Child Support and Family Maintenance (Hague Convention) Act

Goertzen 2659

Fontaine 2660

Gerrard 2660

Bill 41—The Child and Family Services Amendment Act

Squires 2660

Lathlin 2661

Bill 44—The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Minimum Wage)

Helwer 2662

Lindsey 2662

Lamont 2662

Concurrence and Third Readings—Public Bills

Bill 234—The Drug-Related Death Bereavement Day Act

B. Smith 2663

Guillemard 2663

Gerrard 2663

Concurrence and Third Readings

(Continued)

Bill 33—The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Municipal Board Amendment Act

Clarke 2664

Wiebe 2665

Gerrard 2666

Bill 34—The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Planning Amendment Act

Clarke 2667

Wiebe 2668

Gerrard 2669

Bill 15—The Drivers and Vehicles Amendment and Highway Traffic Amendment Act

Piwniuk 2670

Wiebe 2670

Gerrard 2672

Bill 21—The Highway Traffic Amendment and Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Amendment Act

Piwniuk 2673

Wiebe 2673

Lamont 2675

Bill 7—The Police Services Amendment Act (Enhancing Independent Investigation Unit Operations)

Goertzen 2675

Fontaine 2676

Lamont 2678

Bill 8—The Court of Appeal Amendment and Provincial Court Amendment Act

Goertzen 2679

Fontaine 2680

Lamoureux 2681

Bill 9—The Scrap Metal Act

Goertzen 2682

Maloway 2683

Lamont 2685

Bill 17—The Family Law Act, The Family Support Enforcement Act and The Inter-jurisdictional Support Orders Amendment Act

Goertzen 2686

Fontaine 2687

Gerrard 2688

Bill 18—The Legislative Security Amendment Act

Goertzen 2689

Fontaine 2690

Gerrard 2691

Bill 19—The Beneficiary Designation (Retirement, Savings and Other Plans) Amendment Act

Goertzen 2692

Fontaine 2693

Gerrard 2693

Bill 23—The Reducing Red Tape and Improving Services Act, 2022

Goertzen 2694

Fontaine 2694

Gerrard 2695

Bill 26—The Officers of the Assembly Act (Various Acts Amended)

Goertzen 2695

Fontaine 2696

Gerrard 2698

Bill 27–The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Alternative Measures for Driving Offences)		Bill 18 – The Legislative Security Amendment Act	2715
Goertzen	2698	Bill 19 – The Beneficiary Designation (Retirement, Savings and Other Plans) Amendment Act	2715
Fontaine	2699		
Gerrard	2700	Bill 21 – The Highway Traffic Amendment and Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Amendment Act	2715
Bill 30–The Police Services Amendment and Law Enforcement Review Amendment Act		Bill 23 – The Reducing Red Tape and Improving Services Act, 2022	2715
Goertzen	2700	Bill 26 – The Officers of the Assembly Act (Various Acts Amended)	2715
Fontaine	2702	Bill 27 – The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Alternative Measures for Driving Offences)	2715
Lamont	2703	Bill 29 – The Mennonite College Federation Amendment Act	2715
Bill 32–The Victims' Bill of Rights Amendment Act		Bill 30 – The Police Services Amendment and Law Enforcement Review Amendment Act	2715
Goertzen	2704	Bill 31 – The Minor Amendments and Corrections Act, 2022	2715
Fontaine	2705	Bill 32 – The Victims' Bill of Rights Amendment Act	2715
Gerrard	2706	Bill 33 – The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Municipal Board Amendment Act	2715
Bill 16–The Financial Administration Amendment Act		Bill 34 – The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Planning Amendment Act	2715
Friesen	2707	Bill 35 – The Commemoration of Days, Weeks and Months and Related Repeals and Amendments Act	2715
Wasyliw	2709	Bill 37 – The International Child Support and Family Maintenance (Hague Convention) Act	2715
Lamont	2710	Bill 41 – The Child and Family Services Amendment Act	2715
Bill 2–The Public Services Sustainability Repeal Act		Bill 44 – The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Minimum Wage)	2715
Helwer	2711	Bill 205 – The Filipino Heritage Month Act	2715
Lindsey	2711	Bill 223 – The Ukrainian Heritage Month Act	2715
Lamont	2712	Bill 227 – The Turban Day Act	2715
Bill 29–The Mennonite College Federation Amendment Act		Bill 228 – The Eating Disorders Awareness Week Act	2715
Reyes	2713	Bill 234 – The Drug-Related Death Bereavement Day Act	2715
Moses	2713		
Lamoureux	2714		
Royal Assent			
Bill 2 – The Public Services Sustainability Repeal Act	2714		
Bill 7 – The Police Services Amendment Act (Enhancing Independent Investigation Unit Operations)	2714		
Bill 8 – The Court of Appeal Amendment and Provincial Court Amendment Act	2714		
Bill 9 – The Scrap Metal Act	2714		
Bill 15 – The Drivers and Vehicles Amendment and Highway Traffic Amendment Act	2714		
Bill 16 – The Financial Administration Amendment Act	2714		
Bill 17 – The Family Law Act, The Family Support Enforcement Act and The Inter- jurisdictional Support Orders Amendment Act	2715		

The Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Debates and Proceedings
are also available on the Internet at the following address:

<http://www.manitoba.ca/legislature/hansard/hansard.html>