

Second Session - Fortieth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

Official Report
(Hansard)

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Daryl Reid
Speaker*

Vol. LXV No. 107A - 10 a.m., Thursday, September 12, 2013

ISSN 0542-5492

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Fortieth Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALLAN, Nancy, Hon.	St. Vital	NDP
ALLUM, James	Fort Garry-Riverview	NDP
ALTEMEYER, Rob	Wolseley	NDP
ASHTON, Steve, Hon.	Thompson	NDP
BJORNSON, Peter, Hon.	Gimli	NDP
BLADY, Sharon	Kirkfield Park	NDP
BRAUN, Erna	Rossmere	NDP
BRIESE, Stuart	Agassiz	PC
CALDWELL, Drew	Brandon East	NDP
CHIEF, Kevin, Hon.	Point Douglas	NDP
CHOMIAK, Dave, Hon.	Kildonan	NDP
CROTHERS, Deanne	St. James	NDP
CULLEN, Cliff	Spruce Woods	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	NDP
DRIEDGER, Myrna	Charleswood	PC
EICHLER, Ralph	Lakeside	PC
EWASKO, Wayne	Lac du Bonnet	PC
FRIESEN, Cameron	Morden-Winkler	PC
GAUDREAU, Dave	St. Norbert	NDP
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Liberal
GOERTZEN, Kelvin	Steinbach	PC
GRAYDON, Cliff	Emerson	PC
HELWER, Reg	Brandon West	PC
HOWARD, Jennifer, Hon.	Fort Rouge	NDP
IRVIN-ROSS, Kerri, Hon.	Fort Richmond	NDP
JHA, Bidhu	Radisson	NDP
KOSTYSHYN, Ron, Hon.	Swan River	NDP
LEMIEUX, Ron, Hon.	Dawson Trail	NDP
MACKINTOSH, Gord, Hon.	St. Johns	NDP
MAGUIRE, Larry	Arthur-Virden	PC
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MARCELINO, Flor, Hon.	Logan	NDP
MARCELINO, Ted	Tyndall Park	NDP
MELNICK, Christine, Hon.	Riel	NDP
MITCHELSON, Bonnie	River East	PC
NEVAKSHONOFF, Tom	Interlake	NDP
OSWALD, Theresa, Hon.	Seine River	NDP
PALLISTER, Brian	Fort Whyte	PC
PEDERSEN, Blaine	Midland	PC
PETTERSEN, Clarence	Flin Flon	NDP
REID, Daryl, Hon.	Transcona	NDP
ROBINSON, Eric, Hon.	Kewatinook	NDP
RONDEAU, Jim, Hon.	Assiniboia	NDP
ROWAT, Leanne	Riding Mountain	PC
SARAN, Mohinder	The Maples	NDP
SCHULER, Ron	St. Paul	PC
SELBY, Erin, Hon.	Southdale	NDP
SELINGER, Greg, Hon.	St. Boniface	NDP
SMOOK, Dennis	La Verendrye	PC
STEFANSON, Heather	Tuxedo	PC
STRUTHERS, Stan, Hon.	Dauphin	NDP
SWAN, Andrew, Hon.	Minto	NDP
WHITEHEAD, Frank	The Pas	NDP
WIEBE, Matt	Concordia	NDP
WIGHT, Melanie	Burrows	NDP
WISHART, Ian	Portage la Prairie	PC
<i>Vacant</i>	Morris	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, September 12, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m.

Mr. 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, 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.

Good morning, everyone. Please be seated.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. Speaker: As previously agreed, we're going to call bills in the following orders—following order: Bill 6, followed by Bill 27, Bill 41, Bill 42, Bill 9, Bill 12, Bill 14, Bill 15, Bill 26, Bill 11, Bill 43, Bill 44, followed by Bill 46.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

Mr. Speaker: So we'll start with Bill 6, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Flexible Short-Term Regulation of Vehicle Weights and Dimensions).

**Bill 6—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act
(Flexible Short-Term Regulation of
Vehicle Weights and Dimensions)**

Mr. Speaker: And the debate was open. Is there any debate on this Bill 6?

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I do want to talk about Highway 6 in regards to the changes, or proposed changes, of legislation. We know very much that this change is—with 'timate'—climate change, of course, is very important. We've seen spring come early; we've spring—seen spring come late. And as a result of that, we need to ensure that road safety be paramount. And far as the infrastructure, we've seen a number of changes that come about in past years, and, of course, with trucks and getting—being able to carry heavier loads and lighter loads and, of course, we need to find that balance. And we know that even in the city of Winnipeg, whereby restrictions are put on—and those rural roads that we need to get our product to and

from. So we're looking forward to moving forward in trying to help preserve some of those roads as a result of this change.

The thing that's most important here on this bill, of course, is we always come back—and I talk about so much in the House—and that's on consultation. So we want to move this bill on to committee and listen to those folks that have concerns about this particular piece of legislation.

We know that the amount of money that it costs to build a road nowadays because of the increased cost of infrastructure, whatever we can do to maintain those roads is so important. We know that through snow clearing and other things, a lot of roads get damaged just through maintenance itself. So we need to do whatever we can.

I know that in my previous careers of—before I become a MLA for the area, I did use the highways an awful lot and found that restrictions—we had to take different routes. Sometimes the roads were ready to assume those bit of heavy loads, but we haven't had that opportunity to do that because the minister never had the opportunity to be able to change those restrictions on a per-road basis. Now they'll certainly be able to do that, and we're certainly looking forward to getting rid of that bit of red tape that's in the way of the minister to be able to make those decisions.

Of course, we also know that, you know, the farther north you go, roads stay frozen a bit longer. So those goods and services being forwarded to the north certainly don't need to be closed the same as they are in the south.

We have also been calling for the government to participate in the New West Partnership. This is significant in regards to weights and 'dimisions'—in dimensions in regards to trucking weights and standards. So we'll continue to bring that back to the government to have that conversation. So we look forward to this bill going to committee and hearing what the public has to say.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, you know, I believe, in general, it is good to have the additional flexibility. But what concerns me is this:

that within that flexibility it gives the minister the power to down grow—downgrade the classification of roads to manage things in a way that may be poor instead of better.

And, certainly, at a time when it is vital that we look after our roads and our infrastructure extremely well, that it—we need to make sure that they are kept up to a high standard and not just downgraded because the minister can't look after the infrastructure properly. We've seen this too often in the past, where roads have been reclassified and downgraded to the detriment of people in our province by this government because they have failed to deliver on the infrastructure improvements that they should have delivered. And I am concerned that this power could be badly abused, particularly by a government which hasn't always consulted and listened to people at the grassroots level and in the local municipalities, as we've seen very much quite recently.

I would give an example that we had just in a presentation the other day from members from the Shellmouth-Boulton municipality when they were presenting. They were talking about the extraordinary level of extra use and maintenance that had to be provided on municipal roads because the provincial road needed repair, I think it was to a bridge. And, you know, it was the municipal government which had to take up the slack because the provincial roads had not been kept up and bridges had not been kept up to the standard that they should have been. And, certainly, while we understand that this government isn't perfect—they've told us that a lot of times recently, recognizing their major faults—but that we'd certainly urge the government to make sure that they are actually consulting and listening to people at the local municipal level as they make decisions and that those decisions are made in the interests of making sure that the road structures are well looked after, the infrastructure is preserved and maintained, and not just to allow people to use roads in a way that is going to cause a lot more damage and cause a lot more problems down the road.

* (10:10)

So, with those comments, I look forward to seeing this bill go to committee and have presentations there.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on Bill 6?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Question's been called.

The question before the House is Bill 6, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Flexible Short-Term Regulation of Vehicle Weights and Dimensions).

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

* * *

Mr. Speaker: We'll now move on with Bill 27, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Charter Bus Service), standing in the name of the honourable member for Steinbach (Mr. Goertzen).

**Bill 27—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act
(Charter Bus Service)**

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave for this matter to remain standing in the name of the honourable member for Steinbach?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: No. I hear a no, so leave has been denied.

Is there further debate on Bill 27?

Is the House ready for the question?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is Bill 27, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Charter Bus Service).

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

* * *

Mr. Speaker: We'll now call Bill 41, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Enhanced Safety Regulation of Heavy Motor Vehicles), standing in the name of the honourable member for Lakeside.

**Bill 41—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act
(Enhanced Safety Regulation of
Heavy Motor Vehicles)**

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): Long time coming, Bill 41. Getting to know this conversation quite well. We've been back and forth with the minister's office on this particular bill, and, of course, this bill is a safety bill, a bill about inspections for trucks. And the minister has said, and we totally agree, that safety is paramount, and whenever the Manitoba Trucking Association brought this recommendation forward

to the minister's office, they were quite concerned that the safety was not—safeties on trucks wasn't standardized across Manitoba.

In fact, in 1987, when the National Safety Code was brought into being, there was exemptions on that, and one of those exemptions was the T-plates. And part of the T-plate is for trucks that stay within a 30-mile radius of their particular trade area, and it was intended that whenever these trucks would deliver goods to those various businesses around their trade area, they would have a bit of a lower rate in order to be able to compete with those other trucks even though it was a standard truck that was used but it wasn't going long distance. And it didn't have the safety requirements of those travelling longer distances.

So as a result of that, the minister did bring forward some changes to whereby those trucks would be inspected on a regular basis, same as those others in the light of safety. The Manitoba Trucking Association applauds the government for that.

This is not a money bill. This is not a bill whereby it's going to give the government the opportunity to increase rates, because these trucks are safer than they were before. Because, really, the only thing that's changed is only the name, so we do have an amendment to this bill that the government has accepted, and we'll be bringing that amendment forward in committee stage, and the minister has assured us that the fees will remain relatively close to the same. And that's very important to those trucks that—and those businesses that have those services.

Because of the distance, they can't charge a lot of money for those so it would put them at an uncompetitive level, which is really important to maintain those local jobs. In total cost, I would dare to speculate on what that would do but it would put them at an unfair advantage and they would not be able to compete. And, of course, that would also drive up the rates for our goods and services that are so important to get them to a final destination.

We do want to hear what the public has to say at committee level on this particular bill. I encourage all members to pay attention to it. It's an important part of our legislation. Any time we talk about safety, I know it's paramount on all of our minds. We want to make sure that we're doing the best job we certainly can to keep Manitoba families and, of course, those drivers of those vehicles safe, as well.

So with that, we look forward to moving on to committee and hear what the public has to say. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, thank you. Yes, this is a bill which I support in terms of standardizing safety requirements and making sure that vehicles and people are safe. At the same time, I think it's very important that we get the details right, the amendment, to make sure that we don't have excessive—and the effort to make sure that we don't have excessive fees is—are important components of this legislation in order for us to get the assurance of good service at the same time as good safety.

So I look forward to presentations at committee stage, when they come, and to moving this legislation forward. Thank you.

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): Yes, I just want to put a couple of words on the record regarding this particular bill, and I want to pay credit to the member for Lakeside who has been very involved in terms of the work on this particular bill and making sure that it does what it's intended to do and it is intended to be about safety, it's not intended to be about a revenue grab for the government or putting excessive fees on those who use licensing of this kind by putting it into a different category. And so we've had numerous discussions, the member for Lakeside and I together with the Manitoba Trucking Association and the minister to ensure that the intention of this bill is actually carried out.

It forms a special part of the sessional order that we agreed to yesterday. It ensures that the amendments that'll come forward at committee are agreed to by the opposition and the government, and I give credit to the member for Lakeside in terms of the amendments that he has drafted, but we wanted to ensure that it wouldn't put at financial harm the industries that rely on these particular licences to carry out their operations and so it took special status within our operating—within our sessional order yesterday and we want to ensure that it is about safety, not about revenue, that it is about ensuring that we have appropriate standards, not about unnecessarily taking more money from people who are already working to build their province, to create employment and to build a tax base.

I want to give credit to the member for Lakeside (Mr. Eichler). I've appreciated working with him on this to ensure that the bill is intended to do what it should do, and we look forward to continuing to

work with him and the minister to ensure that the insurances that we've been given and that the Manitoba Trucking Association has been given are followed through on. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on Bill 41? House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is Bill 41, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Enhanced Safety Regulation of Heavy Motor Vehicles).

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

* * *

Mr. Speaker: We'll now call Bill 42, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Enhancing Passenger Safety), standing in the name of the honourable member for Midland (Mr. Pedersen).

**Bill 42—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act
(Enhancing Passenger Safety)**

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave that this matter remain standing in the name of the honourable member for Midland?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Leave has been denied. Is there any further debate on Bill 42?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: The House is ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is Bill 42, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Enhancing Passenger Safety).

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

* * *

Mr. Speaker: We'll now proceed to call Bill 9, The Teachers' Society Amendment Act, standing in the name of the honourable member for Steinbach, who has unlimited time.

Bill 9—The Teachers' Society Amendment Act

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): I've been looking forward to an opportunity to speak for unlimited time again in this House but probably won't take it this particular time, Mr. Speaker.

On this particular bill, I have put already quite a bit of comments on the record and I just want to emphasize that we certainly support the right of professional organizations to be involved in the standards and discipline—when necessary—of their members. That's common among different organizations like the Law Society or the medical profession, and it shouldn't be different for the teachers' profession as well, Mr. Speaker, although we want to ensure that teachers also have some protection within that and ensure that where there is a necessity for discipline that it's being done for the right reasons. And we might have, you know, some pause. We've heard from a number of teachers over the last couple of months, many who are concerned that there was a presentation at the PST hearing that indicated that all teachers were in favour of the PST hearing, in fact, I—or the PST increase. In fact, I spent the next day responding to a barrage of emails from teachers who said that that didn't actually represent their views and that they didn't support the PST increase. I know many of my colleagues got those emails. There were—many of them were copied to the Manitoba Teachers' Society, as well.

* (10:20)

And so we would want to ensure, obviously, that teachers would not be subject to any sort of punishment for speaking their views on the PST tax increase, for example. We also know—and my colleague from Morden-Winkler saw a presentation where—of Bill 18 where a teacher was essentially told that they shouldn't be making a presentation opposed to the bill, and so somebody had—and I know you seemed surprised by that, and so was I, Mr. Speaker—somebody had to do it by proxy because they were worried about coming to committee, from what they were hearing. Some might call that intimidation. I certainly do know of teachers who felt intimidated, and that's wrong. And everybody should feel free to come to this Legislature and speak—and speak publicly and be able to have their views heard publicly and freely. But that wasn't the case when it comes to teachers, many of them who felt intimidated and some had to do it by proxy.

So we would not want to see those teachers punished if they came and spoke their democratic right, whether it was for or against the bill, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't matter their position to me. What matters is that they have the right to come and speak. So we have some concerns that teachers might be subject to penalties for just exercising a democratic

right that many others, in fact all others in Canadian society, are entitled to. So those are the concerns that we would have with the bill, and they've arisen in the last little while in relation to the PST hearings and the Bill 18 hearings. And we'll consider those as this bill moves to committee.

Thank you very much.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I want to say, to start with, I support the bill which strengthens the internal disciplinary process within the Manitoba Teachers' Society for teachers. However, I think based on experience with a number of other organizations—College of Physicians and Surgeons, College of Registered Nurses and so on—who have disciplinary proceedings, that, in this case, it is the Teachers' Society who is also an advocate as well the disciplinarian. And it's important to recognize that but it's also critically important, based on the experience with other organizations, that the process be extremely fair. Where a process is not fair and is tainted, it will cause a lot of problems both for the organization and for the individual involved.

So it is absolutely critical that the process be—have some level of independence, that people are not on the investigating or the disciplinary committee who would have a particular, you know—a particular point of view which would be diametrically opposed to that of the person who is being disciplined. And I think, without going into details, the problem can happen that people have certain biases from time to time. It is certain—it is really essential that this process be fair.

It is also important that in going through this process that the positive qualities or the positive contributions of teachers are recognized. Sometimes in going through the disciplinary process the whole emphasis is on the negative aspects of what a teacher has done. But I would suggest to the Speaker and to others in this Chamber that many people who have made mistakes have also, at the same time, done some very excellent things, and those excellent things need to be recognized as well as the mistakes need to be recognized, and sometimes this is not done and it doesn't provide the kind of balanced perspective on an individual that should be presented.

And so with those comments, I will look forward to this going to committee and to the presentations that are going to be made there.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on Bill 9?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question's been called, Bill 9, The Teachers' Society Amendment Act.

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

* * *

Mr. Speaker: We'll now proceed to call Bill 12, The Community Schools Act, standing in the name of the honourable member for Steinbach.

Bill 12—The Community Schools Act

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): Mr. Speaker, I've had the opportunity to speak on this bill somewhat. It certainly has, I think, some merit in terms of community schools. All of us want our schools to be places that are connected into the community to some extent, the places where the community can access it for appropriate reasons and where there can be interaction with the community. Often we talk about schools being the hub of a community, and we know that where there is that sort of connectedness that often there are benefits from that. We know, sometimes, whether that is businesses having job fairs or mentors coming into the schools, that there's benefits that arise from those sort of things.

So I expect that we'll have favourable presentations at committee and I look forward to those committees in the weeks ahead. Thank you very much.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to Bill 12, The Community Schools Act. The biggest surprise about this bill is that it has taken 14 years for the NDP to recognize that schools are the hubs of communities and that this role of schools in communities is absolutely essential. It is something that for most communities that this has grown up as a natural evolution that schools are very closely tied to communities. And I suppose, to some extent, it says something about what has happened under the Province in the last 14 years that, to some extent, schools have become disconnected from communities and that we need to have now legislation to come in to reconnect schools to communities. And I certainly support this close connection between schools and community and close working relationships and the recognition, which is common sense and goes back historically to how schools and communities worked together. There are many examples, historically, of how

school places have been used by communities, of how schools and communities have worked very closely together, how schools and supporting communities are, in turn, supported by donations and in many other ways, volunteers, by people in the community.

And so I am all for nurturing this relationship and I, you know, want to congratulate the NDP for recognizing that this is important after 14 years.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on Bill 12?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Question's been called. Bill 12, The Community Schools Act.

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

* * *

Mr. Speaker: We'll now proceed to call Bill 14, The Education Administration Amendment and Public Schools Amendment Act, parenting groups for schools, standing in the name of the honourable member for Steinbach.

**Bill 14—The Education Administration
Amendment and Public Schools Amendment Act
(Parent Groups for Schools)**

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): Mr. Speaker, just briefly, this bill will provide some legislative status for parent groups. We certainly appreciate the fact that parents throughout the province of Manitoba are involved in their kids' education in a number of different ways, obviously, at the parental level. In the home it's important that parents are engaged with their kids as they go through their schools years to be aware of what's happening within the lives of their kids as it relates to school. That's part of reducing bullying, obviously. It's part of ensuring that kids are getting the appropriate instruction and support that they need in school. It is a part of ensuring that parents and guardians are engaged in that process.

* (10:30)

We appreciate the fact that many parents take their responsibility one step further and get involved in parent councils to interact more directly with the school and to set different priorities and to have that interrelation with the school. And this will give them somewhat more legislated status—it's not a significant change or require meetings with the government on a prescribed basis, I'm not sure if that necessarily needs to be in legislation but maybe it was difficult

to get meetings with the government otherwise and so maybe that'd be beneficial.

But I certainly applaud parents who take an active role in the education system, whether that's being involved with the parental councils, whether that's running for a school board, or most critically, whether that's simply being involved with their kids in the home as they're going through their school years.

We look forward to the committee presentations on this bill in the weeks ahead.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to Bill 14, The Education Administration Amendment and Public Schools Amendment Act, which deals with parent councils and parent councils actually being listened to.

Mr. Speaker, parent councils play an extraordinarily important role in ensuring that schools are working well, that problems with kids in the community or issues that are happening in the schools are dealt with and looked after and that the planning for school is done and done well.

What is a big surprise is that you actually have to legislate that a principal must consult with the school's parent advisory council or school committee when preparing the annual plan. You know, this is common sense, one would have expected that this would be happening at every school in the province in a major way, in an important way. And the fact it has not happened as widely as it should and is obviously a reason for this legislation and it says something about the lack of attention of this government to ensuring over the last 14 years that this—parents are actually listened to. And they need to be listened to; they are very vital to the growth and development of their children and to what happens in the school.

And they clearly are hearing lots that can be of great benefit to what's happening in the school and vice versa, the school has a lot to contribute in general to parents and the parent council can be a very important vehicle for communicating with parents and addressing issues.

So, you know, I welcome this legislation, I'm just surprised that it had to be necessary, but when it is necessary under a government like this, then it needs to be done and it must be done and it is being done.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on Bill 14?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Question's been called. Question before the House is Bill 14, The Education Administration Amendment and Public Schools Amendment Act, parenting groups for schools.

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

* * *

Mr. Speaker: Now I'll proceed to call Bill 15, The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Minimum Wage Protection for Employees with Disabilities), standing in the name the honourable member for Riding Mountain.

Bill 15—The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Minimum Wage Protection for Employees with Disabilities)

Mrs. Leanne Rowat (Riding Mountain): Bill 15, The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act, which looks at the minimum wage protection for persons with disabilities is something that we support. This government is proposing to end the exemption in the Employment Standards Code which permitted employers to hire persons with disabilities to work for below the minimum wage so long as the employer obtained a permit.

In 1992, the Progressive Conservative government changed the law to create a formal, legitimate process to permit employers to pay disabled people wages lower than the minimum wage, and this was response to concerns raised by the disabled community. This was something that they were looking for to ensure that there was opportunities to employ individuals with disabilities and to provide them with the experience and an income. At the time this method was widely—was a widely accepted practice and there were, in the 1990s, about 200 permits in existence.

The legislation as it exists allowed a balance between a positive trade of work and employment with the understanding that many employers would not have the resources and employment opportunities available at wage levels which were at or above the wage—minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that it is time that this amendment gets put to rest. We believe that there are only two provinces still utilizing this, and I believe that this is something that has gone to the next level

where we believe that this legislation is not required as persons with disabilities have come a long way in gaining the self-esteem and the confidence. And I believe the employers, as well, have identified and encouraged and supported honest work and aided independent living. So I believe that both employers and employees have come a long way and have recognized that this piece of legislation is obsolete and time to move on.

We believe that under Manitoba law persons with disabilities are the only ones permitted under circumstances to be paid less, and I believe that this legislation will now value members of—all members of society at equal pay. Many people with disabilities work in highly skilled professions, breaking barriers and inspiring all of us to do greater and better things.

While this legislation was symbolic, many stakeholders we spoke to believe it is a step in the right direction. Stakeholders also noted that more advocates in the field helping disabled workers and employers work together would be a great help. They told us at the programs to ensure the initial training of an employee with a disability and support throughout the working relationship will be imperative with this change, recognizing their capabilities and limitations, and finding the right working relationship and environments will be key and will take time and effort. This issue goes beyond permits. Persons with disabilities face bigger barriers to employment than others and the government needs to develop a working relationship with businesses to help employers to understand how a worker with a disability can enrich and contribute in the workplace. We know that there are very few of these permits left as the government has, for a number of years, not issued any new permits, and I believe that the permits that are in place right now are being grandfathered. But that has been done in consultation with the employer and the employee and I believe that once that is complete, then all will be equal on the employment scope.

The government, I believe, needs to develop partnerships and programs with businesses to ensure that business owners understand how they can employ persons with disabilities in meaningful ways. And we need to ensure that meaningful consultations with business as well as with employees are considered and that every opportunity is made available for disabled workers. Clearly, we have ways to go to ensuring that persons with disabilities are included in full—as full members of society, but

I believe the change—or this amendment will be very supportive of that happening.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that people with disabilities are treated equitably in terms of what they earn and the wage that they get and, therefore, that there is some positive things in this legislation.

However, I think that they're, in my experience, dealing with many people with disabilities, quite a number of whom who are looking for work, that there is also a role under a number of specific circumstances for the Province to provide partial wage subsidies that would bring them up to equivalent wage that other workers would be getting. And I think that this is in recognition of the fact that there are people who are absolutely capable of working and being as productive as anybody else, but there are people with certain disabilities who are in situations where they need a little bit of extra help.

* (10:40)

Now, thankfully the technology and various other things are changing so that people with disabilities can be aided and helped in a variety of different ways. And many of the people with disabilities are achieving things which probably would not have been dreamed possible not that long ago. And that's wonderful and, indeed, marvellous to see.

It is, you know, amazing to see a young woman who's got a condition which means that she's in a wheelchair, not a respirator, but holding down a full-time job and making an incredible contribution to the lives of many other people. And this story and stories like that go on and on and on.

But there are others—and it may apply particularly to some people who are older workers, you know, in their 50s or early 60s, who still want to make a contribution. And, of course, they will tend to have a harder time getting work, often partly because of their age and partly because of the disability that they've had for their whole life or have acquired.

And that under the right circumstances and the right approach, we could provide a wage subsidy which would mean that employers would be very eager to hire them. And we can't do this just for a few months, as often as has been done in the past, because at the end of three months or six months,

when the wage subsidy is gone, then the person tends to be out of work.

And even though the goal is to have permanent employment, that, you know, sometimes there has to be a recognition that in order to provide quality for people with disabilities, that sometimes we have to provide a provincial subsidy so that in the marketplace they are, in fact, equal and competitive.

And I think that this is something that really should be looked at as well, and could help really make this transition much more smoothly and much more effective and a better future for all people with disabilities.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on Bill 15?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Question's been called. The question before the House is Bill 15, The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act, minimum wage protection for employees with benefits.

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

Mr. Speaker: We'll now proceed to call Bill 26, The Accessibility for Manitobans Act, standing in the name of the honourable member for Steinbach.

Bill 26—The Accessibility for Manitobans Act

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave for this matter to remain standing in the name of the honourable member for Steinbach?

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): Yes, just a couple of comments, and I look forward to hearing comments from our critic.

I want to say that I was surprised that the government didn't select this as one of their priority bills. I've been surprised throughout the session that this isn't one of the bills that have been called for debate. And we waited eagerly for this bill to be called so we could discuss this, so we could have a debate about a priority issue. And we think it is a priority issue, and yet the government refused to call it.

They continued to call the PST bill day after day after day; all they wanted to talk about was getting more money. Didn't want to talk about this bill.

Didn't want to talk about the importance of accessibility. Day after day after day they called the issue of trying to get more money out of the pockets of Manitobans, including those living with disabilities, I would add, Mr. Speaker, and didn't call this bill for debate.

But I thought there was hope because under the sessional agreement, of course, the government could pick its top 10 priority bills, and I thought for sure this one would make the top 10. How could it not make the top 10, Mr. Speaker? So I was shocked when the government didn't select this as one of their top 10 priority bills. It speaks a lot about the priorities of this government, and I'm sure it'll speak a lot in the community about the priorities of this government.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Leanne Rowat (Riding Mountain): It's a pleasure to put a few words on the record with regard to Bill 26, The Accessibility for Manitobans Act.

I would like to put a things on the record. I appreciate the comments from the member for Steinbach (Mr. Goertzen) because that is what we have been hearing in the community. There was great concern when there was the discussion of ten bills going forward, and this was not one of them, and I understand that the community is disappointed, but they are, you know, watching this very closely and are looking for, you know, some direction from this government and seeing where this will go after session ending tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, the government's record on accessibility hasn't always been one of success. The four main principles of the bill, which are access, equality, universal design and systemic responsibilities are noble, and we see that in other legislations across the country, Ontario, for one.

The NDP have been, you know, very critical of anything that we put on the record with regard to legislation or ideas with regard to social policy, but I find that that is extremely offensive. I believe that we all care for Manitobans, whether they are facing emotional challenges or physical barriers, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that policy positions intended to help persons with disabilities and other vulnerable persons overcome barriers is something that we are very, very interested in and believe that these things should move forward. So we were very, you know, concerned that this bill did not make the government's top 10 of bills being moved forward.

Recently we had said that, if elected, we would raise the EIA shelter allowance to 75 per cent of media markets rates. This is something that has been called for by numerous groups for years, Mr. Speaker. Considering that 60 per cent of people who receive EIA are persons with disabilities, this would greatly help them find quality housing.

We have also proposed raising the basic personal exemption to \$9,651, the national average, which would also put more money back in the pockets of persons with disabilities and others who are living at the poverty levels, Mr. Speaker. This would permit everyone to keep more of their own money in their own pockets, and these measures would serve to help persons with disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, what we have been doing in consideration of Bill 26, The Accessibility for Manitobans Act, is consulting with stakeholders to gather perspectives of Manitobans on issues for persons with disabilities. We've also been taking concrete actions to support people with disabilities and also prevent disabilities from happening in the first place.

One measure we've taken is to take the advice of the Canadian Pediatric Society and push this bill to implement universal—or push this government to implement universal newborn screening, a painless test that seeks to screen newborns for hearing problems. The NDP dragged its feet on this proposal for years, Mr. Speaker, while Ontario and British Columbia and, I believe, Alberta, are now integrating programs that will make it mandatory and no other option. Delays in the diagnosis of hearing loss for children results in significant harm.

Universal screening, on the hand, will result in the earliest possible interventions which improve language and hearing outcomes. And I want to take this opportunity, while speaking about the importance of universal access for persons with disability, to urge the government to implement this legislation as soon as possible.

On the subject of consulting with stakeholders, one of the groups we met with during the course of our consultations with stakeholders was the Independent Living Resource Centre, where we learned of their work on an innovative program called Access Together. Access Together was launched by the Independent Living Resource Centre and Barrier-Free Manitoba. And, Mr. Speaker, Access Together is an award-winning, online guide

that enables people with disabilities, as well as their families and friends, to crowd source accessibility information on shops, restaurants, accommodations, attractions, and most other public settings throughout Manitoba. This is an innovative way for individuals with disabilities can go online and identify whether, you know, there is accessibility issues in attending an event or a restaurant or accommodations. This guide includes information related to mobility, sight and hearing accessibility, as well as sensory and senior-friendly features. This guide can be used either on the computer or on the smartphone, and this is a concrete example of a not-for-profit organization taking a concrete step to encourage accessibility in the province of Manitoba. And I would like to take this opportunity to thank them and applaud the Barrier-Free Manitoba and the Independent Living Resource Centre for launching the Access Together because I believe it is an excellent tool for enhancing the independence for persons with disabilities and seniors.

* (10:50)

Mr. Speaker, the government needs to act in the spirit of groups like Barrier-Free Manitoba and the Independent Living Resource Centre and work on innovative approaches to providing opportunities and promoting access for Manitobans with disabilities. The goal of eliminating barriers to accessibility for Manitobans with disabilities is a worthy one. The problem I see is that there are a number of areas requiring improvement, and I will now take some time to outline them.

As currently drafted, Bill 26 enables but does not actually require the government to take any measures to prevent and remove barriers to accessibility. The only actions required by the bill are the preparation and release of annual plans and reports from the minister, as well as additional reports from public sector bodies and the independent review of the new law. The bill's sole requirement for even more plans and reports will only be useful if clear and progressive standards are developed and then implemented that provide for the timely prevention and removal of barriers.

Another important issue that the minister needs to understand or have better consideration or clarity on is the definition of disability. The definition is that used by article 1 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which is a good definition with one ex-considerable exception. The definition may exclude non-medical conditions

such as disfigurement or amputation, as well as a short-term medical condition that may be intermittent or recurring. I think it's pretty clear that a more comprehensive and inclusive definition would be most helpful.

Mr. Speaker, in going back to the previous point, one of the best things this government can do is to ensure that people with disabilities have access to appropriate housing and accommodation. So, once again, given the 60 per cent of people receive EIA are persons with disabilities, raising the rental portion of EIA to 75 per cent of the medium market rates would greatly help persons with disabilities finding quality home-housing. And we believe that that's—is so important because then they can spend dollars that are not allocated or considered for housing and use it on the things that they are intended to, such as food and other things like that, as would our proposal to raise the basic personal exemption to \$9,651, the national average. This would—this is a move that would allow people with disabilities to keep more of their own money in their own pockets.

Mr. Speaker, I have said this many times, being in government is about priorities. Universal accessibility is a noble priority, however, there are several areas where this bill needs to be improved. Many of those areas I have outlined today.

Thank you for the opportunity to put a few words on the record regarding Bill 26, The Accessibility for Manitobans Act. I think it's a step forward, but, obviously, there's more work to do.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, this bill, Bill 26, The Accessibility for Manitobans Act, you know, is being presented by the NDP government.

I want to, first of all, say that I have for many, many years been a very, very strong supporter of improved access for people with disabilities, whether that's physical or mental disabilities. In many speeches that I've given, in many blog notes that I've posted, in what I have done both as a Member of Parliament, as an MLA, this has been a major and important cause that I have strongly supported.

I have seen over the last 14 years how slowly, in fact, this government has often moved. We had, I think it was about four years ago, a big campaign because this government, for 10 years, was all talk with very little action. And that campaign and the effort by many people in the disability community

finally put enough pressure—plus the pressure that I and others were providing in this Legislature and outside the Legislature to act—have finally given us legislation which may start to move the process forward.

This bill is about the process but, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that there is a major problem with this bill, and that major problem is this: that there is no target, there is no goal. This is a government which has set in place a process but has not set a target. You know, when Kennedy in the 1960s said, we are going to go to the moon in this decade, he said we're going to set a target. We're going to go for the moon. We're not going to set standards for O-rings and hope that we can get to the moon at some point. He said we're going to set a standard. We're going to set a target.

This bill should have included a target that all newly constructed buildings in this province should—would be fully accessible by 2018, 2020, 2025, 2030? It could be any of a number of dates, but we need that target, and we need the time to get to that target, to implement it and make sure that buildings, as a starting place, are fully accessible to all.

We don't have that now. We have not had it in the last 14 years of this government. We still don't have a target. This bill has a major, major deficiency because it doesn't have that target. Now, I'm going to vote for this bill because I think that any step in terms of improving the process and moving in this direction is positive, but I would hope that when this comes to committee stage, there are others there who will take up the call and say, this bill is not good enough. We need a target. We are not, in 2013, going to accept this bill alone without at least a major target of when we're going to have every newly building—new building constructed in this province fully accessible.

We can do that. It requires planning but people with disabilities should no longer be in the position that when they become disabled as they age, they are not able to go into or use their own home. They're not able to go into or use some public buildings. It's time that we set a target and a target for new construction and a target further down the road for the conversion of older construction. But we need to set that standard. We need to set that target. This bill is not good enough. It needs to be amended. It needs to have a target.

I'm going to say a couple more things. One is the importance of recognizing people with mental

disabilities and that they have barriers just as people with physical disabilities do, and I hope we have people coming forward who have mental disabilities who will explain and help people understand what those barriers are and how we can overcome them.

The last point I want to make is that accessibility is not just about legislation. It's about the whole compendium of programs that a government put forward. It's very hard to have faith in a government which talks accessibility and then doesn't provide the shelter rates at a level that people don't have to use the food money from their kids in order to contribute to the rent. It is shameful what is happening in this province by this government in 2013. That we are having shelter rates which are so low that people must take the money for basic nutrition and food from their kids in order to pay for their rent in order to survive. This is no longer tolerable and that is something that this government also needs to change. Thank you.

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): I'll be very brief on my comments on this, but I can tell you how disappointed I am in this government in regards to this particular piece of legislation.

* (11:00)

When they introduced this legislation, they had people in the gallery, the minister said it fell short. If it falls so short, is that because they haven't called it in their top 10? And I'm very disappointed the government hasn't made this their priority.

I have a lot of friends and people that I'm connected to through people with disabilities, and I can tell you they're very, very disappointed in this government. And I know very clearly people like David Steen, a personal friend of mine, a constituent, that's an advocate that does a phenomenal job—phenomenal job—at advocating for people with disabilities, and I can tell you that people like him that have been fighting and striving each and every day to make lives better for people with disabilities, are very disappointed. And I'm not speaking for him, I'm speaking for me.

But I can tell you whenever you have leaders such as that that have been arguing with the government and telling us, as opposition—and working with our critic—it's just another thorn in their side. I'm encouraging the government to look at other ways they can bring this legislation changes forward—some that the critic has brought forward, some that the Leader of the Liberal Party has brought

forward. I can tell you that I know we have to take baby steps. But when we're talking about people with disabilities and those that are disadvantaged, this is one more step that they didn't need to have to try and take. Let's encourage the government to move forward and to look at options that are better for those people with disabilities.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on Bill 26?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The House is ready for the question. The question before the House is Bill 26, The Accessibility for Manitobans Act.

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

* * *

Mr. Speaker: We'll now proceed to call Bill 11, The Proceedings Against the Crown Amendment Act, standing in the name of the honourable member for Emerson.

**Bill 11—The Proceedings Against
the Crown Amendment Act**

Mr. Cliff Graydon (Emerson): It's clear that I've brought my fan club with me this morning, and I appreciate them being here on time. I'm also pleased to see that the government has saw fit to bring this bill—finally bring this bill forward and let the public have an opportunity to see what they've done with their time for the last six, seven months.

And so, in saying that, this is a great opportunity that we can go to committee. The public will have their say on the bill, and thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on Bill 11? Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The Question before the House is Bill 11, The Proceedings Against the Crown Amendment Act.

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

* * *

Mr. Speaker: Now proceed to call Bill 43, The Manitoba Liquor and Lotteries Corporation Act and

Liquor and Gaming Control Act, standing in the name of the honourable member for Spruce Woods.

**Bill 43—The Manitoba Liquor
and Lotteries Corporation Act
and Liquor and Gaming Control Act**

Mr. Cliff Cullen (Spruce Woods): Well, Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to enter into second reading debate on Bill 43 this morning.

This bill is certainly a significant piece of legislation moving forward in Manitoba. And basically what it will do, it will take four pieces of legislation and move them into two areas. Mr. Speaker, it—what it's designed to do is to amalgamate Manitoba liquor and lotteries corporations together, and certainly we're interested to see how that may play out into the future. We're certainly interested to hear what Manitobans have to say in committee and we're certainly looking forward to getting this piece of legislation over to committee so Manitobans will have their say on the proposal by the NDP government.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, if—once brought into force, certainly will bring in into the retail side on one side and the regulatory side on another in terms of the amalgamation of the two corporations, and that probably stands to reason and hopefully this will be a benefit for Manitobans. I know Manitobans—and certainly when you look at the liquor side of things, the Liquor Control Commission is both the retailer and both the regulator, and it certainly makes it confusing when you try to do both of those with that particular corporation. So hopefully this legislation will actually clearly define their respective roles within the retail side and, as well, within the regulatory side.

The other—one component I want to speak to briefly here, Mr. Speaker, I know the corporation and the government is actually saying that there could be some potential cost savings here. Well, certainly we will look forward to the future and what the future holds in terms of cost saving with amalgamations. I know amalgamating these two corporations does present a lot of challenges, there's no doubt about that, but I'm sure the management there are facing those challenges on an on-going basis as they try to move the two corporations together.

Clearly, Manitobans are already seeing the amalgamation in terms of the advertising that's going on around the province so there is a bit of a sense

that that process is certainly well under way, Mr. Speaker.

The—one component of this legislation is that a lot of regulations that allows for a lot of regulatory capacity within the framework of the legislation, Mr. Speaker, and that's always a concern for us certainly on this side when we look at how legislation is proposed and certainly when we see a lot of allowance for regulation under the act it always raises questions.

And certainly not only raises questions with us as opposition but I'm sure many Manitobans around the province will wonder what in fact those regulations will mean to them and it will mean to individual businesses and it will mean to individuals as well. So that's certainly important when we move forward.

It would be nice if we could see regulations in advance of passing the legislation, Mr. Speaker, so that we all know what we're getting ourselves into. But unfortunately that is rarely the case. So a lot of times we pass the framework of legislation and hope that the regulations are in the best intent for Manitobans and certainly Manitoba businesses.

Certainly, there's a recognition that there's time for change, a need for change in terms of dealing with this particular legislation, both on the lotteries and on the liquor side, Mr. Speaker. Clearly there's been a lot of debate and discussion over the history of regulation and legislation as it pertains to liquor sales in Manitoba. It's certainly an interesting past and to read the history of the laws as it's progressed through the years is quite interesting and worth the read, no doubt about it.

So I know many Manitobans are looking forward to enhanced—enhancing of the rules pertaining to liquor sales and hopefully the lottery business as well, Mr. Speaker.

And from a business perspective, we certainly hope that this will allow for the reduction in red tape, Mr. Speaker, that businesses face across our province. I guess only time will tell if that in fact does happen.

We certainly will be staying in close contact with the stakeholders that are involved in the delivery of liquor and on the lotteries side as well. And we will be looking for their input as well as regulations come forward and the legislation moves forward. It's certainly good to have that communication so that we can understand what the—

where the industry is coming from and how the government rules and regulations are playing out in their business. And ultimately it's up to the individuals that will be purchasing those products as well, Mr. Speaker, and how they—the government will be dealing with the regulations pertaining to those.

The one interesting note in this legislation—and I see it in other legislation that the government is proposing—is the opportunity for the government to have a way out. And they have a way out in terms of if they're going to change and amend existing—I would say that probably the term would be contracts—if they're going—the government goes out and they decide they're going to amend a contract that they have with either a corporation or an individual business, what the government has done in this legislation and other ones has allowed themselves a way out.

* (11:10)

So I look to the example of, for instance, the Manitoba Jockey Club, where the government of the day is certainly having a disagreement with the Manitoba Jockey Club. The Manitoba Jockey Club has an existing contract with Manitoba Lotteries in terms of what the revenue sharing component will be to the lotteries there. The government has signalled that they want to change that contract. They want to tear up that contract that was signed not very long ago. They want to tear up that contract and rewrite the terms of that contract. And normally, when a party to a contract would tear up or renege on that contract the other party would have recourse on how to deal with that, the implications around the renegeing on the contract. But, unfortunately, what Bill 43 will do, it will preclude the other party, in this case the Manitoba Jockey Club, for taking action against the government and, certainly, we have concerns about that. Clearly, I would view this as the government being able to bully third parties into signing contracts that they may not will—otherwise willingly want to enter into and then, clearly, the government would have the opportunity to tear up existing contracts and there would be no recourse for those—the other party to the contract. And that really is, certainly, I think, an affront to democracy and it's really not a good way to do business. And I think what it does, it sends a bad signal to the business community, in fact, not just the business community within Manitoba, but certainly the business community that may be looking to do business within Manitoba and it really sends the wrong signal.

We certainly know what the government looks at in terms of the liquor and lottery sales. They certainly look at it as a cash grab. We've certainly seen this spring, with an increase in the beer and liquor prices where the government is looking for—to generate more revenue through the Manitoba liquor commission, and certainly they're looking generate as much income as they possibly can through the lotteries as well. So we know there's certainly a component of a cash grab and this is what they're looking at in terms of their Crown corporations. That's something we'll keep an eye on in conjunction, of course, with their increase in the provincial sales tax.

And with those few short comments, Mr. Speaker, we look forward to this bill getting to committee and hear what Manitobans have to say. Thank you.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to Bill 43, The Manitoba Liquor and Lotteries Corporation Act and Liquor and Gaming Control Act.

I want to say, first of all, and make it very plain, I'm opposed to this legislation. I am, I think, probably the only person in this Chamber who is opposed, but I will lay out the reasons why I'm opposed to this legislation step by step as I speak.

First of all, before talking about the reasons why I'm opposed to the legislation, I want to note one positive aspect of that, and that is that the separation from the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission of some of the inspection and regulatory powers, because I think that it is very important that you have, as we have had with gaming, a gaming control commission which is separate from the lottery corporation and that the regulatory powers are separated from the delivery of liquor. So that aspect is a positive aspect and I want to note and credit the government for that. It probably should have been done quite some time ago, but the fact that it's being done is positive.

Now, I'm against this act for several reasons. I believe that combining liquor and gambling, promotion and delivery of services in both areas is a potentially toxic combination no matter how you cut it. Putting people together who are promoting and delivering both services at the same time will result in the promotion and effective message to people: go out and drink some liquor so that you'll gamble more. Now, the message will probably not be delivered as unsightly as that, but that, in fact, will be

the message here: take a glass of wine and go out and gamble; have a drink of beer and go out and gamble. The two—putting these two together inevitably will give joint promotion in a whole variety of different ways, subtle to not so subtle, and, certainly, as we all know, that, you know, drinking liquor has an impact on an individual's self-control, their so-called executive function, and, inevitably, we are going to have more people who will gamble more, who will lose more money and who will end up in greater and greater distress.

And so this is a problem, Mr. Speaker, in that we are going to have a problem of decreasing social well-being as a result of this act. Now, I want to put on record that this government, after 14 years, has already plummeted Manitoba to the very bottom of social well-being in Canada, and we have that this week from a report from the Broadbent Institute. Now, Broadbent Institute is—one would think, if anything, might have a little bit of bias toward this government but they have been frank and honest about the level of social well-being that this government has provided for Manitobans in the last 14 years. And it is at the very, very bottom of all provinces.

I have here a study by Jennifer Mason done for the Broadbent Institute, Social well-being in Canada: how do the provinces measure up? And this shows very clearly that when we look at the provinces, British Columbia is No. 1, Ontario is No. 2, Prince Edward Island is No. 3. It's not a question of whether you're big or small. It's how well your government does in providing social well-being for the citizens of its province. Québec is No. 4. Nova Scotia is No. 5. Newfoundland and Labrador is No. 6. New Brunswick is No. 7. Alberta is No. 8. Saskatchewan is No. 9; Manitoba, No. 10, last in the whole country.

And that, you know, speaks volumes, and it is one of the reasons why I'm opposed to this legislation, because I think that this legislation is a setup to take us in the same direction that this government has been taking us, down to the bottom, in terms of social well-being. We should be smarter than this legislation. That is for sure.

Now, let's look at some of the elements of this social well-being index. Homicide rate, Manitoba is the worst. Life expectancy at birth, we are not quite the bottom. We're No. 9 instead of No. 10 in terms of life expectancy. Infant mortality rate per thousand live births, Manitoba is, on this particular year, No. 9 instead of No. 10, although, as I pointed out earlier,

if you average several of the recent years, we'd actually be the worst.

So time and time again, we come out on the subindices either the worst or near that, and that ends up to Manitoba having social well-being, a status as a result of the poor management and the poor approach to government by this NDP, as the worst in Canada.

Now, I'm opposed to this legislation because I think it is likely to take us in the wrong direction, and I don't see the necessary constraints on joint advertising and promotion to the extent that they need to be there. And I think that even if you put them in because you've got people working in a variety of different aspects, all this—what will be a joint company, Crown corporation—that you will have these two elements so mixed up that you can't separate the joint promotion of both entirely.

* (11:20)

Now, I am concerned that the claims for cost savings and efficiencies are overblown. We've seen this in many other circumstances.

You know, it's easy for the government to come forward afterwards—and this is part of the reasons they like to amalgamate and talk about how many people that they've fired or laid off and so saved government's money. With the RHA they got rid of a number of senior administrators. With the amalgamations, as we're hearing, they're going to be a very substantial number of chief administrator of officers who will lose their jobs. And although this may look—and with this merger there will people who will be laid off or fired or let go. And the issue here is that it's easy to make it look as if you're saving money by firing people—which this government, of course, is going to make that claim—but, in fact, there are a lot of extra costs. When you come to RHAs, there are huge extra travel costs and administrative costs because of the much larger districts that you're dealing with, and with what you have to grapple with.

When you're coming to the amalgamation of municipalities, as we have heard from so many rural municipalities, that the efficiency and the cost savings is not necessarily in the size. We've seen extraordinary municipalities like Lakeview who are able to run their operations on a lower cost and make sure that their citizens at the same time get better services. We see this time and time again. That amalgamations—although they have many claims, as

this government does, we've lowered the cost because we've laid off or fired people, and so we're saving the province money. But the reality is that when you look at what's happening on the ground, that a lot of those claimed efficiencies are losery, and I expect that it will be, in this case, as well.

The—I share the concern that the MLA for Spruce Woods raised in terms of control related to contracts and so on, and I just wanted to mention that I think it's very important as you bring these two together that you have increased safeguards against corruption and other misdirected practices. That we have seen lots of problems in Québec, we don't want to get a lot of problems here because things are not done well.

Now, one of the areas that—and one of the reasons why I'm opposed to this legislation is the legislation brings in an allocation of 2 per cent of its net revenues to social responsibility. Now, I support an allocation. I'm not sure that that 2 per cent is high enough.

But what is most important is not the—well, it is not that there is an allocation. What is irresponsible is that there is no target, no goal, no outcomes to be measured. This is just money to be, you know, blown away. In my experience, too often when you do this, you allocate money and that money gets wasted or spent very poorly because there is no goal, no measurement of outcomes, no targets.

I have asked time and time again in legislative committee hearings dealing with the Manitoba liquor commission, for example, about, you know, what are their goals for reducing FASD in the province when they're spending this money. Oh, no, they don't have any goals. They're not even measuring the level of FASD in the province to know whether they're doing any good or not doing any good in any campaigns. And my experience is that this kind of money often goes without achieving any really useful purpose except to try and make the government look good because it's spending some money on a good purpose, and so long as it's doing that, it should be okay.

Well, the reality is that this legislation should have set out very clear parameters for the expenditure of that, should have made it spent in a way that would actually gone to achieve those purposes and there should have been outcome measures and measures taken to ensure that that money was actually not only being well spent, but

we're achieving targets like, for example, reducing FASD, reducing problem gambling, et cetera.

I have seen no evidence that this government has actually reduced the level of FASD; the numbers are still the same as when they first came into power. We have no evidence that they've actually reduced the level, the extent of problem gambling, the per cent of people who are involved in problem gambling. And until we have a better bill—and I believe that the corporations should remain separate—you know, I'm not going to support this bill and I won't support this legislation. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on Bill 43?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Speaker: House ready for the question.

Question before the House is Bill 43, The Manitoba Liquor and Lotteries Corporation Act and Liquor and Gaming Control Act.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of adopting the motion, please signify it by saying aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed to the motion, please signify it by saying nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: Opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it.

The motion is accordingly carried.

* * *

Mr. Speaker: We'll now proceed to call Bill 44, The International Education Act, standing in the name of the honourable member for Agassiz.

Bill 44—The International Education Act

Mr. Stuart Briese (Agassiz): I'm pleased to rise and put a few remarks on the record on The International Education Act, Bill 44. In 'kleeping' with the regular process, the government once again has put a piece of legislation in place without consulting the

stakeholders that are involved in it. They produced a piece of legislation, put it forward and then, actually, after that—after going through that process, did actually then meet with the National Association of Career Colleges and the Manitoba Association of Career Colleges. So without any prior consultation they put their vision of this bill in place, and it appears that there are certainly some things missing in this bill and some improvements that could be made to this bill.

The Manitoba Association of Career Colleges is the umbrella organization that represents the 53 career colleges in Manitoba. They are already probably the most heavily regulated post-secondary institutions in Manitoba and in Canada. These—this bill is slated at—supposedly at protection of students from bad actors in recruitment to various post-secondary educational institutes. What it does is say the existing large institutions, such as our universities and community colleges, are essentially exempt from these regulations because they already have their own processes in place. What they are targeting here is the private vocational colleges.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time, none of the private vocational colleges are actively recruiting international students. Robertson College in Winnipeg here has zero international students, and it's perceived that this legislation, if it passes, they—those post-secondary institutes will probably refrain from even actively recruiting. And there's a reason to recruit these international students. It provides a—it adds to the economy of the province. It adds to our diversity. And it would seem counterproductive to put such heavy regulation and controls in place that these post-secondary institutions, these private community—vocational colleges would say, this is too arduous, this is too strenuous, we're going to not even bother looking for international students. It's counterproductive. It's counter to what we as Conservatives believe in in this province. And I think the minister needs to have another good look at her bill and decide to make it a little less strenuous on those colleges so they will actively go out and recruit international students to our province.

* (11:30)

Every other province in Canada at the present time is getting by with internal regulations, not with top-down legislation. I think that is something for the minister to pay attention to and be aware of. At the present time, none of Manitoba's career colleges would qualify for a full designation under this

legislation. And the costs are prohibitive due to the newly designed accreditation process. And our post-our PVI's would be—would at best qualify as provisional under the designations that are called for here.

As written, The International Education Act will prevent Manitoba career colleges from fully participating in Manitoba's effort to become a destination of choice for international students. This hurts not only the career college sector but education of Manitoba as a whole. And I would certainly urge the minister to take into consideration some of those concerns.

I look forward to this bill going to committee. I look forward to presentations at the committee.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to Bill 44. It would appear that this Bill 44, The International Education Act, has been poorly drafted, poorly thought out and done without consultations and without understanding. I certainly hear the problems that have occurred at—with ICM and with Navitas, and that there are concerns with what has happened, but I'm not at all convinced that this bill, as it is currently drafted, is the answer.

Certainly, all of us want, for students coming from elsewhere, from international students, that they be welcomed, that they be supported and encouraged in their participation to get an education here, and that we make, as we have for many years, Winnipeg and Manitoba, international centre for students, for welcoming students. And it is right and appropriate that we look at ways that we can ensure that students who come from elsewhere are getting both a quality of education which is high and are not getting into problems with fraud and other issues. We want to make sure that international students are treated well, that they, in fact, are encouraged to come here, and that we have an ideal environment in Manitoba for international students.

And so, I think that we need to keep that in mind as we look at how this bill is constructed.

And clearly, Mr. Speaker, it's going to be extraordinarily important to be able, with those two goals in mind—having the best opportunities anywhere for international students so we can attract them and having the good, sensible assurances that international students are going to be treated well, that there's not going to be any bad dealings when it comes to institutions and international students.

And so, you know, how we do this—from the comments I've received, this bill is quite problematic, and there are common sense and other ways making sure we achieve these objectives. And I will give you some examples. The institutions—give you an example, like the University of Winnipeg, which has not got embroiled in the problems that the University of Manitoba has, you know, has an enviable track record in attracting and supporting international students, and we don't want to make the task of an organization like the University of Winnipeg, which is prominent as a global college, has global respect, that we want to make sure that we don't make their task more difficult, that we make it easy for—in fact easier, right, for them to bring in international students—and for new players like Robertson College, and not just larger new players like Robertson College, but smaller individual—smaller companies, smaller businesses as well.

I think, for example, there—we're setting up a Canadian Museum for Human Rights; as part of that Canadian Museum for Human Rights, we hope that we are going to have people coming from around the world and, as part of that, we would hope that there would be educational institutions from around the world who are using our Canadian Museum for Human Rights as a place to come to, to teach people about human rights. And so we will have institutions from elsewhere sending teachers and students here to Winnipeg, for the Canadian Museum for Human Rights. And we don't, I think, need the sort of bureaucracy that this bill entails for every global institution who wants to do some teaching and some educating here in Manitoba, high quality for students coming from elsewhere to learn here, because we have the Canadian Museum for Human Rights, one of the best places in the world to learn about human rights.

So we've got to be careful that we don't entrap, right, institutions in a very complex and bureaucratic system which will suppress the ability for people to come here and to teach about education, have professors, have students here on—in our province, in our institutions like the Canadian Museum for Human Rights. They don't need to be caught in precisely this legislation. We need to have measures which are appropriate to their situation.

Second point I would like to make: We're in a point in time when English-language education globally is very, very highly valued. People from Korea, China, indeed, around the world, are coming here to learn English language. And the—one of the

interesting things is, and this is typical, that the institutions, the groups, the companies, right, who are at the leading edge, who are the most innovative, are often the smallest companies, start-ups, teaching English in new ways, working with companies and teaching institutions elsewhere but working in partnership. And I believe that we will have at the committee stage a presentation from an individual who's been involved in one of these companies, and the reality, sadly, is that this bill has already created a level of uncertainty. Because if you're leading edge, if you're doing the innovating, if you're doing things in new ways there may not be some of the typical standards set up. You may not be as big an institution. You don't have the bureaucracy to deal with all the requirements here. We want to make sure that people are getting quality education, that they're getting an experience which works for them, that there's no fraud or issues related to that, that people can be assured that things are financially well run and that people are getting a good education.

* (11:40)

But, in this case, you know, my understanding is that this educational operation has decided that, you know, until this is sorted out—just as we've heard recently from Plum Coulee—that while this government is changing the rules about amalgamation there are people who have stopped developing, people who have stopped investing because of the uncertainty. We need to make sure that we get the uncertainty around this bill, you know, clarify it so that we have sensible procedures, that we allow innovation. My understanding is that the approach being used at this teaching and learning environment was a very forward-thinking, structured submersion approach which, in fact, was enabling people to learn high-quality English much faster than traditional methods, and that people were very excited and happy about the approach.

But the reality is that if we are not careful—we don't want to stifle innovation. We don't want to be a province in a straightjacket; we want to be in a province which enables innovation, forward-thinking improvements in the way that we teach and that we learn, and at the same time we want to have the approach which will be welcoming for students and would enable companies and institutions to be able to deliver here in Manitoba the best in the world.

Let's have that as our goal to start with and then work backwards and make sure that any rules put in this legislation are actually going to achieve those

goals. Even though we are in a province at the moment where we have a government, which after 14 years has plummeted us to the bottom of social well-being, there are those of us in this province, and I include myself among them, who believe that Manitoba can do much better, that instead of being last we should be first. And we should not just be last in Canada; we should not just be an also-ran in the world; we should be among the best in the world. We need to design this legislation with that gold in mind rather than with the end in sight, which this government has too often had, of taking us down to the bottom.

So let's change the vision of what we need to do and where we need to go and let's change this bill so it fits with that vision. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on Bill 44?

Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is Bill 44, The International Education Act.

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

* * *

Mr. Speaker: We'll now call Bill 46, The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2013, standing in the name of the honourable Minister of Justice, who has unlimited time.

Bill 46—The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2013

Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill 46, and I do note that I have unlimited time this morning, and while it's tempting to take advantage, I do believe that discretion is the better part of valour.

Mr. Speaker, lawyers—it should be noted for the record that lawyers used to be paid by the word, and thankfully those days are long behind us.

This bill is said today primarily to correct minor drafting, typographical and numerical errors in the statutes of Manitoba, and I just want to take a few minutes to bring a few matters in the bill to the attention of honourable members.

An amendment is being made to the Victims' Bill of Rights. This amendment will allow for the denial or reduction of victims' compensation benefits

to a person who's convicted of certain offences after the incident that led to the claim for benefits.

Amendments to this act in 2010 enabled benefits to be terminated if a claimant was convicted of serious offences before or after the incident that led to the claim. Benefits can also be reduced or denied if a claimant is convicted of less serious offences before the date of the incident. This amendment ensures there will be a similar consequence for less serious but unlawful activity that occurs after the date of the incident that led to a claim for benefits.

The bill will also repeal four outdated or obsolete acts. The Victoria General Hospital Incorporation Act is being repealed because the Victoria hospital has been transferred to the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority and it was a term, Mr. Speaker, of the transfer agreement that the act would be repealed.

The Seed and Fodder Relief Act and The Coarse Grain Marketing Control Act have not been used in many years. New government programs and changes respecting the marketing of agricultural products mean that these acts no longer serve their intended purpose.

The Charities Endorsement Act requires charitable groups soliciting donations door to door or conducting tag days to obtain an authorization from a municipality. The act offered no real protection and most municipalities were simply no longer issuing authorizations. The regulation of charitable giving is more effectively handled through Canada Revenue Agency's requirements around the issuance of charitable receipts for tax deduction purposes.

Those conclude my remarks on Bill 46. I will, of course, be pleased to discuss the bill further at committee stage. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Reg Helwer (Brandon West): I'm pleased to rise today to Bill 46, The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2013, is indeed an interesting piece of legislation going through and correcting and amending little pieces here and there. I know many of the corrections have to do with French language translation and it does bring up the discussion we had over changing to electronic records and which would indeed be the final record that would be the one that people would look to. So interesting number of amendments there, Mr. Speaker.

I note The Coarse Grain Marketing Control Act, which brings us back to the Canadian Wheat Board discussion that we had in this—several parts of this House, Mr. Speaker, and outside the House and I know that on this side of the House we certainly stand up on the rights of Canadian farmers especially in western Canada for marketing freedom, which they have now gained and are seeing the benefits of, and we see those receipts doing very well in agriculture and it's interesting that the government on the other side of the House was a proponent of a referendum for those individuals but yet they won't stand up for Manitobans and allow Manitobans to vote on the sales-tax-increase referendum. So very disappointing that they will not allow Manitobans a voice in the tax increase that they are proposing.

So, at that, I know there are maybe others that wish to speak to this and we'll make sure that they have that opportunity.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on—the honourable member for River Heights.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I could speak at great length on all these many amendments which are included here, but I won't. I will wait for the people at the committee to come forward with concerns and I will have an opportunity again at third reading. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Debate on Bill 46? The House is ready for the question.

The question before the House is Bill 46, The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2013.

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

House Business

Hon. Andrew Swan (Acting Government House Leader): Could you call for concurrence and three readings—and third readings, three private bills, bills 301, 302 and 300.

Mr. Speaker: So we'll call for debate on bills in this order: 301, 302 and 300.

Is there leave of the House to debate these bills in private members' business on concurrence and third readings of private bills? *[Agreed]*

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS—PRIVATE BILLS

Mr. Speaker: So we'll start first by calling Bill 301, The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba Amendment Act.

Bill 301—The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba Amendment Act

Ms. Sharon Blady (Kirkfield Park): I move, seconded by the member for Tuxedo, that Bill 301, The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Fondation dénommée « The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba », be reported from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, be concurred in and now be read for a third time and passed.

* (11:50)

Motion presented.

Ms. Blady: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to put a few final words on the record about how happy I am to see this finally come to fruition, that we've got it at this stage and that it can move on to help facilitate the work that the Jewish Foundation of Manitoba does not just for the Jewish community, but in larger philanthropic work throughout the province and that—the wonderful sense of community that they have in terms of their co-operation with so many partners throughout the province. And I know that this piece of legislation will, again, help them, and the fact that it will receive royal assent soon means that they can hit the ground running.

And I would really like to thank the members of the Jewish Foundation for the work that they've done because, really, in so many respects, what we do here in the Legislature is supportive work and it is really that sort of carrying—to use a common football metaphor because there's no shortage of them here in our Chamber—we're the ones, really, that carry the ball over the line, but they've been the ones that have taken the ball all the way down the field. And so, again, it's an opportunity for us to all work together. I'm pleased to see that in this Chamber we've had unanimous consent at various stages and I, again, look forward to what this bill will be able to help the foundation to do and was quite happy to let Marsha Cowan know this morning that we were, again, at this final stage. And, again, want to thank members opposite and other members of this Chamber for the work that they have in co-operation so that we can,

again, help this wonderful organization keep doing the work that they do.

Mrs. Heather Stefanson (Tuxedo): I'm pleased to rise today and put a few words on the record in third reading of Bill 301, The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba Amendment Act. I want to thank, first of all, Marsha Cowan and Steve Kroft and all the others who, from the Jewish Foundation, who have been so active and all the volunteers and so on from the Jewish Foundation who have been very instrumental in that community. And I just want to thank them for all the work that they do.

I do also want to extend—it was Rosh Hashanah, recently, Mr. Speaker, last week, and I want to extend a happy new year to my Jewish friends. And I know we are on the eve of Yom Kippur, the Jewish Day of Atonement which will be tomorrow evening, and I—we, of course know that this is the most solemn and holiest day of the Jewish calendar and so we are thinking of our Jewish friends at this time in their holiday.

And I just, again, want to say thank you to the member for Kirkfield Park for bringing this forward and for allowing me the opportunity to second this bill. I think this is going to be very good for the foundation, very good for the Jewish community and we are very much in support of this. Thank you.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say briefly that I wish the Jewish Foundation well, their board and members and the Jewish community well in their endeavours. I'm pleased to see this legislation pass. We heard some incredible stories at the committee stage, and we thank the presenters for coming and helping us understand the historic situation and the contributions that have been made.

So with that and with best wishes at this particular time of year, with Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, to all those in the Jewish community.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on Bill 301?

House is ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Question before the House is Bill 301, The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba Amendment Act.

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

Ms. Blady: Mr. Speaker, I would ask if you would seek leave to—for a motion to seek the refunding of fees for the foundation.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave of the House to allow the honourable member to introduce a motion for refund of the fees? *[Agreed]*

Ms. Blady: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Tuxedo (Mrs. Stefanson),

THAT the fees paid with respect to Bill 301, The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Fondation dénommée « The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba », be refunded, less the cost of printing.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

Hon. Andrew Swan (Acting Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could canvass the House to see if there's agreement for you not to see the clock while we finish the two other private bills before us this morning.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave of the House to not see the clock until we finish the two remaining items we have before us currently? Four items, pardon me, including the motions. Is there leave? *[Agreed]*

So we'll now call Bill 302, Les Franciscaines Missionnaires de Marie Incorporation Amendment Act.

Bill 302—Les Franciscaines Missionnaires de Marie Incorporation Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: Any debate?

Mr. Dave Gaudreau (St. Norbert): I move, seconded by the honourable member for Lakeside, that Bill 302, Les Franciscaines Missionnaires de Marie Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation Les Franciscaines Missionnaires de Marie, be reported from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, be concurred and now read into a record—or read in for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Gaudreau: Yes, I'd just to rise today, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words on the—on this bill and I'd like to thank the member for Lakeside with his support on this and actually of the opposition for their support on this bill.

As we—as I spoke to you at the beginning of this bill, \$20,000 was the original amount that they were allowed to do transactions for back in 1901 and this bill really cleans that up and it allows them to have the active and natural person in pursuing funds and stuff for the organization.

And I also want to thank the sisters that I worked with for all of their words of kindness—and, actually, they've invited me over for supper in the next couple of weeks for moving this bill. So it's very fantastic to work with such nice people and the amount of work that they do in the community to make Manitoba a better place every day.

Thank you much—very much.

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): I do want to congratulate all members of the House in passage of Bill 302. I know that, you know, I was first contacted about this piece of legislation; I was very focused on seeing to it that it got passed and I'm very pleased that we got to this stage. And I know that when we look at modernization of any type of legislation, something dates back as long as it in this particular case, it certainly makes sense to do it.

So we're pleased to see it come to reality and certainly we like to congratulate those involved and wish them well in whatever their new endeavours may be.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Monsieur le Président, je voudrais dire seulement que merci aux membres du—des Franciscaines Missionnaires de Marie pour leurs efforts depuis beaucoup des années. Je voudrais aussi dire aux membres de les Franciscaines Missionnaires de Marie que je veux le meilleur possible pour eux pour l'avenir et pour leurs efforts et pour leurs contributions dans notre société.

Translation

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say thank you to the members of the Franciscaines Missionnaires de Marie for their efforts over these many years. I would also like to say to the members of the Franciscaines Missionnaires de Marie that I wish them all the best in their future efforts and contributions to our society.

English

So, with those few words, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Franciscaines missionaries de Marie for all their contributions and to wish them the best in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on Bill 302?

Question before the House is Bill 302, Les Franciscaines Missionnaires de Marie Incorporation Amendment Act.

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

Now, with the honourable member for St. Norbert.

* (12:00)

Mr. Gaudreau: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to move a motion to refund the fees.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave of the House to allow the honourable member for St. Norbert to move a motion to refund the fees? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Gaudreau: I move, seconded by the honourable member for Lakeside (Mr. Eichler),

THAT the fees be, with respect to Bill 302, Les Franciscaines Missionnaires de Marie incorporation act; loi modifiant la loi constituant en corporation les Franciscaines missionnaires, be refunded, less the cost of printing.

Mr. Speaker: It's been moved by the honourable member for St. Norbert, seconded by the honourable member for Lakeside,

THAT the fees paid with respect to Bill 302, Les Franciscaines Missionnaires de Marie Incorporation Amendment Act, be refunded, less the cost of printing.

Is that agreed? *[Agreed]*

* * *

Mr. Speaker: We'll now proceed to call Bill 300, The Brandon Area Foundation Incorporation Amendment Act.

Bill 300—The Brandon Area Foundation Incorporation Amendment Act

Mr. Drew Caldwell (Brandon East): I move, seconded by the member for Fort Garry-Riverview (Mr. Allum), that Bill 300, The Brandon Area Foundation Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation « The Brandon Area Foundation », reported from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Caldwell: First of all, I would like to thank the Brandon Area Community Foundation for their

decades of philanthropy and good work in western Manitoba. Their work really is an inspiration to me and my community in building a better community and always working for the best interests of the community. And, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Manitoba and the province of Manitoba, I do want to thank the Brandon Area Community Foundation for that work.

I'd also like to thank members opposite for supporting this resolution and look forward to seeing this passed unanimously here today.

Mr. Reg Helwer (Brandon West): I'm very pleased to rise to speak to The Brandon Area Foundation Incorporation Amendment Act.

The Brandon area foundation has long been a leader in foundations in Manitoba. I know many foundations in rural Manitoba and, indeed, Winnipeg look to the Brandon area foundation for how they operate and the opportunities that they have for fundraising and, indeed, the grants system that they have available. So, indeed, pleased to see this act come forward and make sure that they are able to continue their good works and modernize their operations.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): Briefly, Mr. Speaker, as the House leader for the Conservative Party, I want to thank the member for Brandon West and all members of this House, but in particular the member for Brandon West, who has mentioned this bill several times in our caucus and has wanted this bill debated quickly and offered his support many times. He's been a strong voice for all issues, I think, in Brandon but he's always bringing forward different ideas and he suggested we have this debate even sooner and has been a strong advocate for so many issues in Brandon. We appreciate the advice that he's given to us on this bill and many other issues in Brandon. Thank you.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I want to wish the members of the Brandon foundation—Brandon area foundation well, to thank them for their efforts that they have undertaken on behalf of Brandon area over many years and their contributions that they will be making in the years ahead. It is an important foundation, and Brandon is an important community to our province, and I wish people in that area well as we move forward and do try to do some good things for people in Brandon and area.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on Bill 300?

House is ready for the question?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Question before the House is The Brandon Area Foundation Incorporation Amendment Act.

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

Mr. Caldwell: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to seek leave to make a request to the House.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave of the House to allow the honourable member for Brandon East to introduce a motion to refund fees? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Caldwell: I move, seconded by the member for Fort Garry-Riverview (Mr. Allum),

THAT the fees paid with respect to Bill 300, The Brandon Area Foundation Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation

« The Brandon Area Foundation », be refunded, less the cost of printing.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Helwer: I seek leave to make the motion passing the act and the motion here unanimous.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to—since we have already passed the third reading of the bill, I would need to seek the leave of the House to allow the record to reflect that it's unanimous that this House has passed the bill.

Mr. Caldwell: Mr. Speaker, I think this is completely appropriate and am grateful for the member for making that suggestion to the House. It shows we've come a long way here in this session.

Mr. Speaker: So is there leave of the House to let the record reflect that this Bill 300 is passed unanimously? *[Agreed]*

I think that concludes our business here this morning, and the hour being past 12 noon, this House is recessed and stands recessed until 12–1:30 p.m. this afternoon.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, September 12, 2013

CONTENTS

ORDERS OF THE DAY			
GOVERNMENT BUSINESS			
Debate on Second Readings			
Bill 6—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Flexible Short-Term Regulation of Vehicle Weights and Dimensions)		Bill 26—The Accessibility for Manitobans Act	
Eichler	4985	Goertzen	4992
Gerrard	4985	Rowat	4993
		Gerrard	4994
		Eichler	4995
Bill 27—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Charter Bus Service)	4986	Bill 11—The Proceedings Against the Crown Amendment Act	
Bill 41—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Enhanced Safety Regulation of Heavy Motor Vehicles)		Graydon	4996
Eichler	4986	Bill 43—The Manitoba Liquor and Lotteries Corporation Act and Liquor and Gaming Control Act	
Gerrard	4987	Cullen	4996
Goertzen	4987	Gerrard	4998
Bill 42—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Enhancing Passenger Safety)	4988	Bill 44—The International Education Act	
Bill 9—The Teachers' Society Amendment Act		Briese	5000
Goertzen	4988	Gerrard	5001
Gerrard	4989	Bill 46—The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2013	
Bill 12—The Community Schools Act		Swan	5002
Goertzen	4989	Helwer	5003
Gerrard	4989	Gerrard	5003
Bill 14—The Education Administration Amendment and Public Schools Amendment Act (Parent Groups for Schools)		PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS	
Goertzen	4990	Concurrence and Third Readings—Private Bills	
Gerrard	4990	Bill 301—The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba Amendment Act	
Bill 15—The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Minimum Wage Protection for Employees with Disabilities)		Blady	5004
Rowat	4991	Stefanson	5004
Gerrard	4992	Gerrard	5004
		Bill 302—Les Franciscaines Missionnaires de Marie Incorporation Amendment Act	
		Gaudreau	5005
		Eichler	5005
		Gerrard	5005
		Bill 300—The Brandon Area Foundation Incorporation Amendment Act	
		Caldwell	5006
		Helwer	5006
		Gerrard	5006

The Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Debates and Proceedings
are also available on the Internet at the following address:

<http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/index.html>