

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*

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 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Good afternoon, everyone. Please be seated.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member for Morden-Winkler, on a matter of privilege.

Mr. Cameron Friesen (Morden-Winkler): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. A matter of privilege is a serious thing and, under our rule, section 34 of the rule book, should not be taken—or should be taken into consideration immediately. Of course, the two conditions that must be satisfied in order for a matter of privilege to be raised—to be ruled as a prima facie case of privilege are (1) according to Beauchesne's, section 115, a question of privilege must be brought to the attention of the House at the first possible opportunity. A second test is whether there is sufficient evidence provided to establish a prima facie case of privilege.

Mr. Speaker, first, I want to say that the Minister of Health (Ms. Oswald) stated yesterday that I put inaccurate information on the record in this Chamber. She stated that I claimed that the Selkirk QuickCare Clinic was closed. Now, I have gone back, I have examined Hansard, I have looked at the dates in question for August the 19th and the 20th, and I tell you today that the official record of this House will show that I said no such thing. Having checked that out, I would submit to you that this is the first opportunity I have to raise the matter in this House.

Mr. Speaker, on the second matter—and I thank you for the opportunity to demonstrate that there is sufficient evidence here to establish a prima facie case of privilege—three weeks ago, as I said, I raised the issue that the Selkirk QuickCare Clinic was open and operating at times without a nurse practitioner in the facility. At that time, I conveyed to the Minister of Health clearly that the sign on the door of the QuickCare Clinic indicated that there would be no nurse practitioner that day, the next day or the following day. I tabled a photograph of the sign that indicated that the clinic was open and operating without nurse practitioners. The following day, in question period, I again asked for the minister's response and repeated the concern that the

QuickCare clinic was open and operating without a nurse practitioner in the facility, therefore misleading the public who had been led to believe by an expensive advertising campaign which conveyed to Manitobans that they could seek appropriate care from a nurse practitioner at a QuickCare clinic.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health stated in this Chamber yesterday that I claimed in the Chamber that the QuickCare centre was closed. And yesterday the minister stated, and I quote: August the 19th, the member said that the Selkirk QuickCare Clinic was closed. In this Chamber he said that. Unquote.

Mr. Speaker, that is simply not true. I have read and reread Hansard for the 19th and 20th of August, and while the minister may not appreciate the tough questions that I pose to her about the extent to which nurse practitioners were or were not available at the Selkirk QuickCare Clinic, it does not give her the right to put inaccurate information on the record or attribute to me statements which I did not make. At no time on the dates in question did I state in the Chamber that the Selkirk QuickCare Clinic was closed. Moreover, what Hansard does reveal is that it was, in fact, this minister, on October the 19th, who made the claim that the clinic was closed. I never made that assertion. The minister put that information on the record.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this matter meets the fundamental test that it makes it impossible for me to carry out my parliamentary duties. I take very seriously the responsibilities that have been entrusted to me as a member in this Assembly. I know my colleagues take equally seriously their responsibilities. And as a member of this Assembly, it is my responsibility to bring forward concerns on behalf of my constituents and on behalf of all Manitobans. When the minister puts erroneous information on the record, as she did yesterday, about the concerns that I am raising on behalf of my constituents and on behalf of all Manitobans, it makes it impossible for me as a member of this Assembly to perform my duties.

How can my constituents and Manitobans have confidence as I bring forward information on their behalf if this minister employs strategies to discredit by putting false information on the record? It makes it all the less likely for Manitobans to bring forward

information the next time because they feel disenfranchised and discouraged. They may begin to believe that their concerns won't have a fair hearing, that their information may be altered, questioned, misused, distorted or diminished.

Accuracy matters. This minister has tried to play fast and loose with the facts. This minister, as always, is welcome to her own opinion; she is not welcome to her own facts. And I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to rise today and set this record straight.

Therefore, I move, seconded by the member for Steinbach (Mr. Goertzen), that this issue of the member—the minister's inaccurate information placed on the record with respect to the QuickCare clinic in Selkirk be referred to a committee of this House.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Government House Leader, on the same matter of privilege.

Hon. Jennifer Howard (Government House Leader): Well, the longer we sit, the thinner the skin gets over there on the other side.

I would say, in response to the member's matter of privilege, I don't believe it is a matter of privilege. You will rule on that. I don't believe that it is anything that anybody on this side has done that impairs his ability to do his job but perhaps his own lack of diligence that is impairing that ability.

He said accuracy matters and he's right. And I'm not going to quote from what the Minister of Health (Ms. Oswald) said; I'm going to quote from what some members of the media have said about some of the claims that he's made.

Apparently, a Selkirk journalist investigated this accusation that the Selkirk 'quickclare'—QuickCare Clinic was closed, and this is what they found, and this is what—quoting from the Selkirk Record on August 22nd: The Manitoba PCs attacked the NDP government Tuesday for what they called locked doors at Selkirk's QuickCare clinic, but a trip to the Manitoba Avenue clinic Tuesday revealed it was definitely open for business.

And, apparently, the questions about this member's accuracy extends to other members of the media; the CBC was equally concerned about some of this accuracy. In a interview with Marilyn Mackie on August 20th, 2013, the interviewer said to the critic: I need to ask you, shouldn't you know this if you're the Health critic? Like, shouldn't you know if

the RNs can do this or not before you start raising those issues? Good question.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, in reaction to this matter of privilege, clearly, what the Minister of Health was doing is reflecting what appears to be a widespread view that not everything the member says is necessarily accurate, and accuracy does matter.

Mr. Speaker: On the matter of privilege raised by the honourable member for Morden-Winkler (Mr. Friesen), I thank all honourable members for their advice on this matter. I've said many times in this House that points of order and matters of privilege are very serious matters, and I take them seriously when matters bring them before the House.

I listened very carefully to the comments that were made by the honourable member for Morden-Winkler with respect to his statements reflecting or indicating comments—or relating to comments made by the Minister of Health, and it is a—seems to me to be a very clear case here that this seems to be a dispute over the facts. One member is indicating one issue and another member of the House is indicating another set of facts, and I, as Speaker, I have to accept that the—what the members bring to this House is, indeed, accurate. I accept that all members bring their information here and that it is accurate, and I have no way of determining otherwise.

And I know that—and I'd like to inform the House that past Speakers have ruled on several occasions that a dispute between two members as to allegations of fact does not constitute a breach of privilege for a member. O'Brien and Bosc, on page 145, indicates if a question of privilege involves a disagreement between two or more members as to facts, the Speaker typically rules that such a dispute does not prevent members from fulfilling their parliamentary obligations nor does such a disagreement breach the collective privileges of the House. That's in the second edition of House of Commons Procedure and Practice, 2009. As well, the members—does not prevent the member from fulfilling their parliamentary functions nor does it—disagreement to breach the collective privileges of the House.

* (13:40)

Beauchesne's citation also goes on to indicate—in section 131(1), it advises that a dispute arising between two members as to allegations of facts does

not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege. Joseph Maingot, on page 223 of the second edition of *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada*, states: A dispute between two members about questions of fact said in debate does not constitute a valid question of privilege because it is a matter of debate. End of quote.

I would, therefore, respectfully rule that the matter of privilege raised by the honourable member for Morden-Winkler (Mr. Friesen) is—does not constitute a matter of privilege, and I respectfully indicate that to the member.

* * *

Mr. Speaker: Now—

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no bills—

PETITIONS

East Selkirk Sewage Lagoon Site— Environmental Licence

Mr. Blaine Pedersen (Midland): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to this petition is as follows:

On August 12th, 2013, Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship granted a licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon on the former CIL explosives plant site in East Selkirk.

This site is located 1,100 feet from the banks of the Red River.

Local residents are concerned that hydraulic pressure from the lagoon and instances of heavy rainfall could cause contaminants left over from the manufacturing of explosives at the site to flow into the Red River.

Upon the review of a soil study conducted on the site, the Water Science and Management Branch of the Department of Conservation and Water Stewardship noted that effluent from the site could negatively affect aquatic life in the Red River and may result in increased risks of cancer in fish.

The chemical 'dinitrorene' is present in the soil at the former CIL's explosives plant site and is a known carcinogen to fish and other aquatic species.

Soil testing done prior to the environmental licence being issued should be done at a level consistent with the standards used by the Environmental Protection Agency in the United

States, where they have more experience with testing for contaminants at former explosives sites.

The Province of Manitoba has no available guidelines for the assessment of energetic compounds in soil.

There are many other viable, non-contaminated sites in the area that would be better suited for the construction of a sewage lagoon.

We petition the legislative of Manitoba as follows:

To request that the Minister of Conservation and Water Stewardship reconsider his decision to grant an environmental licence for the construction of a lagoon site at this site—for a lagoon at this site.

And this petition is signed by D. Chwartacki, D. Swanson, F. DeRosa and many more fine Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker: In keeping with our rule 132(6), when petitions are read they are deemed to have been received by the House.

Mrs. Heather Stefanson (Tuxedo): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) On August 12th, 2013, Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship granted a licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon on the former CIL explosives plant site in East Selkirk.

(2) This site is located 1,100 feet from the banks of the Red River.

(3) Local residents are concerned that hydraulic pressure from the lagoon in instances of heavy rainfall could cause contaminants left over from the manufacturing of explosives at the site to flow into the Red River.

(4) Upon the review of a soil study conducted on the site, the Water Science and Management Branch of the Department of Conservation and Water Stewardship noted that effluent from the site could negatively affect aquatic life in the Red River and may result in increased risks of cancer in fish.

(5) The chemical dinitrotoluene is present in the soil at the former CIL explosives plant site and is a known carcinogen to fish and other aquatic species.

(6) Soil testing done prior to the environmental licence being issued should have been done at a level

consistent with the standards used by the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States, where they have more experience with testing for contaminants at former explosives sites.

(7) The Province of Manitoba has no available guidelines for the assessment of energetic compounds in soil.

(8) There are many other viable, non-contaminated sites in the area which would be better suited for the construction of a sewage lagoon.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request that the Minister of Conservation and Water Stewardship reconsider his decision to grant an environmental licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon at this site.

And, Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by W.O. Griffith, L.A. Griffith, J. Serares and many, many other fine Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member for Emerson. *[interjection]* The honourable member for Emerson has been recognized already.

Mr. Cliff Graydon (Emerson): Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

And the background for this petition is as follows:

On August 12th, 2013, Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship granted a licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon on the former CIL explosives plant site in East Selkirk.

(2) This site is located 1,100 feet from the banks of the Red River.

(3) Local residents are concerned that hydraulic pressure from the lagoon and the instance of heavy rainfall could cause contaminants left over from the manufacturing of explosives at the site to flow into the Red River.

(4) On review of the soil study conducted on the site, the Water Science and Management Branch of the Department of Conservation and Water Stewardship noted that the effluent from the site could negatively affect aquatic life in the Red River and may result in an increased risk of cancer in fish.

The chemical dinitrotoluene is present in the soil at the former CFI—or CIL explosives plant site and is

known—is a known carcinogen to fish and other aquatic species.

(6) Soil testing done prior to the environmental licence being issued should have been done at a level consistent with the standards used by the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States, where they have been—more experience with testing for contaminants at former explosives sites.

(7) The Province of Manitoba has no available guidelines for the assessment of energetic compounds in the soil.

(8) There are many other viable, non-contaminated sites in the area which would be better suited for the construction of a sewage lagoon.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request that the Minister of Conservation and Water Stewardship reconsider his decision to grant an environmental licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon at this site.

And this petition has been signed by B. Main, D. Olafson, D. Craigie and many, many more fine Manitobans.

Provincial Sales Tax Increase—Referendum

Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

And these are the reasons for this petition:

(1) The provincial government promised not to raise the PST—not to raise taxes in the last election.

(2) Through Bill 20, the provincial government wants to increase the retail sales tax, known as the PST, by one point without the legally required referendum.

And (3) an increase to the PST is excessive taxation which will harm Manitoba families.

(4) Bill 20 strips Manitobans of their democratic right to determine when major tax increases are necessary.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to not raise the PST without holding a provincial referendum.

And, Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by C. Laughlin, L. McFadyen, G.W. Beyak and many, many others.

**East Selkirk Sewage Lagoon Site—
Environmental Licence**

Mr. Stuart Briese (Agassiz): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

And these are the reasons for this petition:

On August the 12th, 2013, Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship granted the licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon on the former CIL explosives plant site in East Selkirk.

The site is located 1,100 feet from the banks of the Red River.

Local residents are concerned that hydraulic pressure from the lagoon in instances of heavy rainfall could cause contaminants left over from the manufacturing of explosives at the site to flow into the Red River.

Upon the review of a soil study conducted on the site, the Water Science and Management Branch of the Department of Conservation and Water Stewardship noted that effluent from the site could negatively affect aquatic life in the Red River and may result in increased risks of cancer in fish.

The chemical dinitrotoluene is present in the soil at the former CIL explosives plant site and is a known carcinogen to fish and other aquatic species.

* (13:50)

Soil testing done prior to the environmental licence being issued should have been done at a level consistent with the standards used by the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States, where they have more experience with testing for contaminants at former explosives sites.

The Province of Manitoba has no available guidelines for the assessment of energetic compounds in the soil.

There are many other viable, non-contaminated sites in the area which would be better suited for the construction of a sewage lagoon.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request the Minister of Conservation and Water Stewardship reconsider his decision to grant

an environmental licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon at this site.

This petition is signed by J. Fewchuk, R. Fewchuk, M. Scott and many, many other fine Manitobans.

Mr. Cliff Cullen (Spruce Woods): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to this petition is as follows:

On August 12th, 2013, Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship granted a licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon on the former CIL explosives plant site in East Selkirk.

This site is located 1,100 feet from the banks of the Red River.

Local residents are concerned that hydraulic pressure from the lagoon and instances of heavy rainfall could cause contaminants left over from the manufacturing of explosives at the site to flow into the Red River.

Upon the review of a soil study conducted on the site, the Water Science and Management Branch of the Department of Conservation and Water Stewardship noted that effluent from the site could negatively affect aquatic life in the Red River and may result in increased risks of cancer in fish.

The chemical dinitrotoluene is present in the soil at the former CIL explosives plant site and is a known carcinogen to fish and other aquatic species.

Soil testing done prior to the environmental licence being issued should have been done at a level consistent with the standards used by the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States, where they have more experience with testing for contaminants at former explosives sites.

The Province of Manitoba has no available guidelines for the assessment of energetic compounds in soil.

There are many other viable, non-contaminated sites in the area which could be better suited for the construction of a sewage lagoon.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request that the Minister of Conservation and Water Stewardship reconsider this decision to grant an environmental licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon at this site.

This petition is signed by K. Haas, B. Wechnenko, M. Swirsky and many other fine Manitobans.

Mr. Cameron Friesen (Morden-Winkler): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

And the background to this petition is as follows:

(1) On August 12th, 2013, Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship granted a licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon on the former CIL explosives plant site in East Selkirk.

(2) This site is located 1,100 feet from the banks of the Red River.

(3) Local residents are concerned that hydraulic pressure from the lagoon and instances of heavy rainfall could cause contaminants left over from the manufacturing of explosives at the site to flow into the Red River.

(4) Upon the review of a soil study conducted on the site, the Water Science and Management Branch of the Department of Conservation and Water Stewardship noted that effluent from the site could negatively affect aquatic life in the Red River and may result in increased risks of cancer in fish.

(5) The chemical dinitrotoluene is present in the soil at the former CIL explosives plant site and is known carcinogen to fish and other aquatic species.

(6) Soil testing done prior to the environmental licence being issued should have been done at a level consistent with the standards used by the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States, where they have more experience with testing for contaminants at former explosives sites.

(7) The Province of Manitoba has no available guidelines for the assessment of energetic compounds in soils.

(8) There are many other viable, non-contaminated sites in the area which would be better suited for the construction of a sewage lagoon.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request that the Minister of Conservation and Water Stewardship reconsider his decision to grant an environmental licence for the construction of a sewer lagoon at this site.

And this petition is signed by K. Plant, R. Cajino and C. Tymchuk and many, many more.

Mr. Reg Helwer (Brandon West): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) On August 12th, 2013, Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship granted a licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon on the former CIL explosives plant site in East Selkirk.

(2) This site is located 1,100 feet from the banks of the Red River.

(3) Local residents are concerned that hydraulic pressure from the lagoon and instances of heavy rainfall could cause contaminants left over from the manufacturing of explosives at the site to flow into the Red River.

(4) Upon review of a soil study conducted on the site, the Water Science and Management Branch of the Department of Conservation and Water Stewardship noted that effluent from the site could negatively affect aquatic life in the Red River and may result in increased risks of cancer in fish.

(5) The chemical dinitrotoluene is present in the soil at the former CIL explosives plant site and is a known carcinogen to fish and other aquatic species.

(6) Soil testing done prior to the environmental licence being issued should have been done at a level consistent with the standards used by the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States, where they have more experience with testing for contaminants at former explosives sites.

(7) The Province of Manitoba has no available guidelines for the assessment of energetic compounds in soil.

(8) There are many other viable, non-contaminated sites in the area which would be better suited for the construction of a sewage lagoon.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request that the Minister of Conservation and Water Stewardship reconsider his decision to grant an environmental licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon at this site.

Signed by C. Myskiw, K. Fox, S. Erickson and many other fine Manitobans.

Mr. Dennis Smook (La Verendrye): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) On August 12th, 2013, Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship granted a licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon on the former CIL explosives plant in East Selkirk.

(2) This site is located 1,100 feet from the banks of the Red River.

(3) Local residents are concerned that hydraulic pressure from the lagoon and instances of heavy rainfall could cause contaminants left over from the manufacturing of explosives at the site to flow into the Red River.

(4) Upon the review of a soil study conducted on site, the Water Science and Management Branch of the Department of Conservation and Water Stewardship noted that effluent from the site could negatively affect aquatic life in the Red River and may result in increased risks of cancer in fish.

(4) The chemical dinitrotoluene is present in the soil at the former CIL explosives plant site and is known-carcinogenic to fish and other aquatic species.

Soil testing done prior to the environmental licence being issued should have been done at a level consistent with the standards used by the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States, where they have more experience with testing for contaminants at former explosives sites.

(7) The Province of Manitoba has no available guidelines for the assessment of energetic compounds in soil.

(8) There are many other viable, non-contaminated sites in the area which would be better suited for the construction of a sewage lagoon.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

*(14:00)

To request that the Minister of Conservation and Water Stewardship reconsider his decision to grant an environmental licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon at this site.

This petition is signed by B. Scarff, J. Fernel, C. Reeve and many more fine Manitobans.

Mr. Ian Wishart (Portage la Prairie): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

And the background for this petition is as follows:

On August 12th, 2013, Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship granted a licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon on the former CIL explosives plant site in East Selkirk.

This site is located 1,100 feet from the banks of the Red River.

Local residents are concerned that hydraulic pressure from the lagoon in instances of heavy rainfall could cause contaminants left over from the manufacturing of explosives at the site to flow into the Red River.

Upon the review of the soil study conducted on the site, the Water Science and Management Branch of the Department of Conservation and Water Stewardship noted that effluent from the site could negatively affect aquatic life in the Red River and may result in increased risks of cancer in fish.

The chemical dinitrotoluene is present in the soil at the former CIL explosives plant site and is a known carcinogen in fish and other aquatic species.

Soil testing done prior to the environmental licence being issued should have been done at a level consistent with the standards used by the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States, where they have more experience with testing for contaminants at former explosives sites.

The Province of Manitoba has no available guidelines for the assessment of energetic compounds in the soil.

There are many other viable, non-contaminated sites in the area which had-which would have been better suited for the construction of the sewage lagoon.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request that the Minister for Conservation and Water Stewardship reconsider his decision to grant an environmental licence for the construction of the sewage lagoon at this site.

This petition is signed by A. Marks, R. Fontaine, D. Alinsob and many, many more fine Manitobans.

Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Lac du Bonnet): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) On August 12th, 2013, Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship granted a licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon on the former CIL explosives plant site in East Selkirk.

(2) This site is located 1,100 feet from the banks of the Red River.

(3) Local residents are concerned that hydraulic pressure from the lagoon in instances of heavy rainfall could cause contaminants left over from the manufacturing of explosives at the site to flow into the Red River.

(4) Upon the review of a soil study conducted on the site, the Water Science and Management Branch of the Department of Conservation and Water Stewardship noted that effluent from the site could negatively affect aquatic life in the Red River and may result in increased risks of cancer in fish.

(5) The chemical dinitrotoluene is present in the soil at the former CIL explosives plant site and is a known carcinogen to fish and other aquatic species.

(6) Soil testing done prior to the environmental licence being issued should have been done at a level consistent with the standards used by the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States, where they have more experience with testing for contaminants at former explosives sites.

(7) The Province of Manitoba has no available guidelines for the assessment of energetic compounds in soil.

(8) There are many other viable, non-contaminated sites in the area which would be better suited for the construction of a sewage lagoon.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request that the Minister of Conservation and Water Stewardship reconsider his decision to grant an environmental licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon at this site.

This petition is signed by B. Chorney, H. Chorney, S. Chorney and many, many more fine Manitobans.

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) On August 12th, 2013, Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship granted a licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon on the former CIL explosives plant site in East Selkirk.

(2) This site is located 1,100 feet from the banks of the Red River.

(3) Local residents are concerned that hydraulic pressure from the lagoon in instances of heavy rainfall could cause contaminants left over from the manufacturing of explosives at the site to flow into the Red River.

(4) Upon the review of a soil study conducted on the site, the Water Science and Management Branch of the Department of Conservation and Water Stewardship noted effluent from the site could negatively affect aquatic life in the Red River and may result in increased risks of cancer in fish.

The chemical dinitrotoluene is present in the soil at the former CIL explosives plant site and is a known carcinogen to fish and other aquatic species.

(6) Soil testing done prior to the environmental licence being issued should have been done at a level consistent with the standards used by the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States, where they have more experience with testing for contaminants at former explosives sites.

(7) The Province of Manitoba has no available guidelines for the assessment of energetic compounds in soil.

(8) There are many other viable, non-contaminated sites in the area which would be better suited for the construction of a sewage lagoon.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request that the Minister of Conservation and Water Stewardship consider–reconsider his decision to grant an environmental licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon at this site.

And, Mr. Speaker, this is signed by K. Zacharkiw, K. Zacharkiw, K. Zacharkiw and many other Manitobans.

Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to this petition is as follows:

On August 12th, 2013, Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship granted a licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon on the former CIL explosives plant site in East Selkirk.

This site is located 1,100 feet from the banks of the Red River.

Local residents are concerned that hydraulic pressure from the lagoon and instances of heavy rainfall could cause contaminants left over from the manufacturing of explosives at the site to flow into the Red River.

Upon the review of a soil study conducted on the site, the Water Science and Management Branch of the Department of Conservation and Water Stewardship noted that effluent from the site could negatively affect aquatic life in the Red River and may result in increased risks of cancer in fish.

The chemical dinitrotoluene is present in the soil at the former CIL explosives plant site and is a known carcinogen to fish and other aquatic species.

Soil testing done prior to the environmental licence being issued should have been done at a level consistent with the standards used by the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States, where they have more experience with testing for contaminants at former explosives sites.

The Province of Manitoba has no available guidelines for the assessment of energetic compounds in soil.

There are many other viable, non-contaminated sites in the area which would be better suited for the construction of a sewage lagoon.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request that the Minister of Conservation and Water Stewardship reconsider his decision to grant an environmental licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon at this site.

And this is signed by V. Otkalyuk, J. Berry, J. Shannon and many others.

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) August—on August the 12th, 2013, Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship granted a licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon at the former CIL explosives plant in East Selkirk.

(2) This site is located 1,100 feet from the banks of the Red River.

(3) Local residents are concerned about the hydraulic pressure from the lagoon in instances of heavy rainfall that could cause contaminants left over from the manufacturing of explosives at the site to flow into the Red River.

* (14:10)

(4) Upon review of a soil study conducted on the site, the Water Science and Management Branch of the Department of Conservation and Water Stewardship noted that effluent from the site could negatively affect aquatic life in the Red River and result in risk of cancer in fish.

(5) Cancer chemical dinitrotoluene is present in the soil at the former CIL explosives plant site and is known as carcinogen to the fish and other aquatic species.

(6) Soil testing done prior to the environmental licence being issued should have been done at the level consistent with standards used by Environmental Protection Agency in the United States, where they have more experience with testing for contaminants at former explosives sites.

(7) The Province of Manitoba has no available guidelines for the assessments of energetic compounds in soil.

(8) There are many other viable, non-contaminated sites in the area which would be better suited for the construction of a sewage lagoon.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request the Minister of Conservation and Water Stewardship consider his decision to grant an environmental licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon at this site.

This petition is submitted on behalf of P. Gimmell, K. Beek, N. Vielfure and many other fine, hard-working Manitobans.

Mrs. Bonnie Mitchelson (River East): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) On August the 12th, 2013, Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship granted a licence to the construction of a sewage lagoon on the former CIL explosives plant site in East Selkirk.

(2) This site is located 1,100 feet from the banks of the Red River.

(3) Local residents are concerned that hydraulic pressure from the lagoon and instances of heavy rainfall could cause contaminants left over from the manufacturing of explosives at the site to flow into the Red River.

(4) Upon the review of a soil study conducted on the site, the Water Science and Management Branch of the Department of Conservation and Water Stewardship noted that effluent from the site could negatively affect aquatic life in the Red River and may result in increased risks of cancer in fish.

(5) The chemical 'dinitrotolene' is present—I think I was close, Mr. Speaker—is present in the soil at the former CIL explosives plant site and is a known carcinogen in fish and other aquatic species.

(6) Soil testing done prior to the environmental licence being issued should have been done at a level consistent with the standards used by the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States, where they have more experience with testing for contaminants at former explosives sites.

(7) The Province of Manitoba has no available guidelines for the assessment of energetic compounds in soil.

(8) There are many other viable, non-contaminated sites in the area which would be better suited for the construction of a sewage lagoon.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request that the Minister of Conservation and Water Stewardship reconsider his decision to grant an environmental licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon at this site.

And, Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by G. Duncan, J. McKenzie, S. Gallant and many, many other fine Manitobans.

Mr. Ron Schuler (St. Paul): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) On August 12th, 2013, Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship granted a licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon on the former CIL explosives plant site in East Selkirk.

(2) This site is located 1,100 feet from the banks of the Red River.

(3) Local residents are concerned that hydraulic pressure from the lagoon and instances of heavy rainfall could cause contaminants left over from the manufacturing of explosives at the site to flow into the Red River.

(4) Upon the review of a soil study conducted on the site, the Water Science and Management Branch of the Department of Conservation and Water Stewardship noted that effluent from the site could negatively affect aquatic life in the Red River and may result in increased risks of cancer in fish.

(5) The 'chemil' dinitrotoluene is present in the soil at the former CIL explosives plant site and is known—is a known carcinogen to fish and other aquatic species.

(6) Soil testing done prior to the environmental licence being issued should have been done at a level consistent with the standards used by the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States, where they have more experience with testing for contaminants at former explosives sites.

(7) The Province of Manitoba has no available guidelines for the assessment of energetic compounds in soil.

(8) There are many other viable, non-contaminated sites in the area which would be better suited for the construction of a sewage lagoon.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request that the Minister of Conservation and Water Stewardship reconsider his decision to grant an environmental licence for the construction of a sewage lagoon at this site.

This is signed by R. Davies, R. Draho, T. Babuin and many, many other Manitobans.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Standing Committee on Human Resources Second Report

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Chairperson): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Human Resources.

Clerk (Ms. Patricia Chaychuk): Your standing committee on Human Resources presents—

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense? Dispense.

Your Standing Committee on Human Resources presents the following as its Second Report.

Meetings

Your Committee met on the following occasions in Room 255 of the Legislative Building:

- September 3, 2013
- September 4, 2013
- September 5, 2013
- September 6, 2013
- September 7, 2013
- September 9, 2013
- September 10, 2013
- September 11, 2013

Matters under Consideration

- **Bill (No. 18) – The Public Schools Amendment Act (Safe and Inclusive Schools)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les écoles publiques (milieux scolaires favorisant la sécurité et l'inclusivité)**

Committee Membership

Committee Membership for the September 3, 2013 meeting:

- Hon. Ms. ALLAN
- Mr. ALLUM
- Hon. Mr. CHIEF
- Mr. GOERTZEN
- Mr. MARCELINO (Tyndall Park)
- Mrs. MITCHELSON
- Hon. Ms. OSWALD
- Mr. SCHULER
- Mr. SMOOK
- Hon. Mr. SWAN

- Mr. WIEBE

Your Committee elected Mr. WIEBE as the Chairperson at the September 3, 2013 meeting.

Your Committee elected Mr. MARCELINO (Tyndall Park) as the Vice-Chairperson at the September 3, 2013 meeting.

Committee Membership for the September 4, 2013 meeting:

- Hon. Ms. ALLAN
- Hon. Mr. CHIEF
- Ms. CROTHERS
- Mr. CULLEN
- Mr. GOERTZEN
- Mr. HELWER
- Hon. Mr. KOSTYSHYN
- Mr. NEVAKSHONOFF
- Mr. PETERSEN
- Mr. PEDERSEN
- Mr. WIEBE (Chairperson)

Your Committee elected Mr. PETERSEN as the Vice-Chairperson at the September 4, 2013 meeting.

Committee Membership for the September 5, 2013 meeting:

- Hon. Ms. ALLAN
- Hon. Mr. BJORNSON
- Ms. BRAUN
- Mr. BRIESE
- Ms. CROTHERS
- Mr. FRIESEN
- Mrs. ROWAT
- Hon. Mr. SWAN
- Mr. WIEBE (Chairperson)
- Ms. WIGHT
- Mr. WISHART

Your Committee elected Ms. WIGHT as the Vice-Chairperson at the September 5, 2013 meeting.

Substitutions received during committee proceedings at the September 5, 2013 meeting:

- Mr. SMOOK for Mrs. ROWAT
- Mr. HELWER for Mr. SMOOK

Committee Membership for the September 6, 2013 meeting:

- *Hon. Ms. ALLAN*
- *Mr. ALTEMEYER*
- *Hon. Mr. CHOMIAK*
- *Mr. EICHLER*
- *Mr. EWASKO*
- *Mr. GOERTZEN*
- *Mr. GRAYDON*
- *Mr. MALOWAY*
- *Hon. Ms. MARCELINO (Logan)*
- *Mr. SARAN*
- *Ms. WIGHT*

Your Committee elected Ms. WIGHT as the Chairperson at the September 6, 2013 meeting.

Your Committee elected Mr. SARAN as the Vice-Chairperson at the September 6, 2013 meeting.

Committee Membership for the September 7, 2013 meeting:

- *Hon. Ms. ALLAN*
- *Hon. Mr. CHOMIAK*
- *Mr. CULLEN*
- *Mr. DEWAR*
- *Mr. MALOWAY*
- *Mr. MARCELINO (Tyndall Park)*
- *Mr. PEDERSEN*
- *Mr. SCHULER*
- *Mrs. STEFANSON*
- *Mr. WHITEHEAD*
- *Ms. WIGHT (Chairperson)*

Your Committee elected Mr. MARCELINO (Tyndall Park) as the Vice-Chairperson at the September 7, 2013 meeting.

Your Committee elected Ms. BLADY as the Vice-Chairperson at the September 7, 2013 meeting.

Substitutions received during committee proceedings at the September 7, 2013 meeting:

- *Hon. Mr. SWAN for Hon. Mr. CHOMIAK*
- *Mr. SMOOK for Mr. CULLEN*
- *Hon. Mr. RONDEAU for Mr. WHITEHEAD*
- *Ms. BRAUN for Mr. MALOWAY*

- *Ms. BLADY for Mr. MARCELINO (Tyndall Park)*
- *Hon. Mr. ROBINSON for Mr. DEWAR*
- *Mr. GOERTZEN for Mr. SCHULER*
- *Mrs. DRIEDGER for Mrs. STEFANSON*
- *Mr. FRIESEN for Mr. PEDERSEN*

Committee Membership for the September 9, 2013 meeting:

- *Hon. Ms. ALLAN*
- *Mr. ALLUM*
- *Mr. FRIESEN*
- *Mr. HELWER*
- *Hon. Ms. IRVIN-ROSS*
- *Mrs. MITCHELSON*
- *Hon. Mr. RONDEAU*
- *Mrs. ROWAT*
- *Hon. Ms. SELBY*
- *Hon. Mr. SWAN*
- *Mr. WIEBE*

Your Committee elected Mr. WIEBE as the Chairperson at the September 9, 2013 meeting.

Your Committee elected Mr. ALLUM as the Vice-Chairperson at the September 9, 2013 meeting.

Substitution received during committee proceedings at the September 9, 2013 meeting:

- *Mr. SMOOK for Mrs. ROWAT*

Committee Membership for the September 10, 2013 meeting:

- *Hon. Ms. ALLAN*
- *Ms. BLADY*
- *Ms. CROTHERS*
- *Mrs. DRIEDGER*
- *Mr. GOERTZEN*
- *Mr. HELWER*
- *Hon. Ms. IRVIN-ROSS*
- *Hon. Ms. MELNICK*
- *Mr. SCHULER*
- *Mr. SARAN*
- *Mr. WIEBE (Chairperson)*

Your Committee elected Ms. BLADY as the Vice-Chairperson at the September 10, 2013 meeting.

Committee Membership for the September 11, 2013 meeting:

- *Hon. Ms. ALLAN*
- *Hon. Mr. CHOMIAK*
- *Mr. CULLEN*
- *Mr. GOERTZEN*
- *Hon. Ms. OSWALD*
- *Mr. SARAN*
- *Mrs. STEFANSON*
- *Hon. Mr. STRUTHERS*
- *Mr. WHITEHEAD*
- *Mr. WIEBE (Chairperson)*
- *Mr. WISHART*

Your Committee elected Mr. SARAN as the Vice-Chairperson at the September 11, 2013 meeting.

Substitution received during committee proceedings at the September 11, 2013 meeting:

- *Ms. WIGHT for Hon. Mr. CHOMIAK*

Public Presentations

*Your Committee heard the following two hundred and thirty-eight presentations on **Bill (No. 18)** – The Public Schools Amendment Act (Safe and Inclusive Schools)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les écoles publiques (milieux scolaires favorisant la sécurité et l'inclusivité):*

September 3, 2013 meeting

1. *Sandra Trinkies, Private Citizen*
2. *Jaryn Trinkies, Private Citizen*
3. *Gary Trinkies, Private Citizen*
4. *Robert Rivard, Manitoba School Boards Association*
5. *Peter Wohlgemut, Private Citizen*
6. *Robert Hiebert, Private Citizen*
7. *Brendan Hiebert, Private Citizen*
8. *Kevin Rebeck, President, Manitoba Federation of Labour*
9. *Andrew Micklefield, The King's School*
10. *Kristine Barr, Private Citizen*
11. *Naomi Negrych, Private Citizen*
12. *David M. Sanders, Private Citizen*
13. *Ken Mandzuik, Manitoba Bar Association*
14. *Harrison Oakes, Private Citizen*

15. *Shannon McCarthy, United Church of Canada Conference of Manitoba & Northwestern Ontario*
16. *Bilan Arte, Canadian Federation of Students of Manitoba*
17. *Michael Tutthill, Private Citizen*
18. *Ken DeLisle, Private Citizen*
19. *Albert McLeod, Two-Spirited People of Manitoba Inc.*
20. *Rita Hildahl, Winnipeg School Division, Board Chair*
21. *Gareth Neufeld, UNESCO Associated Schools Network*
22. *Sandra Somerville, Private Citizen*
23. *Chris Rigaux, Private Citizen*
24. *Paul Olson, Manitoba Teachers' Society*
25. *Kathleen Venema, Augustine United Church*
26. *Chris Dsovza, Private Citizen*
27. *Eva Campbell, Private Citizen*
28. *Ken Guilford, Private Citizen*

September 4, 2013 meeting

29. *Lance Warkentin, Private Citizen*
30. *Keith Neufeld, Private Citizen*
31. *Jen Haslam, Private Citizen*
32. *Gordon Penner, Private Citizen*
33. *Ken Haslam, Private Citizen*
34. *David Driedger, Steinbach Christian High School*
35. *Al Hiebert, Private Citizen*
36. *Wayne Patram, Private Citizen*
37. *Tara Didychuk, Private Citizen*
38. *Sue Doerksen, Private Citizen*
39. *LeAnne Froese, Private Citizen*
40. *Marlowe Brandt, Private Citizen*
41. *Ian MacIntyre, Private Citizen*
42. *Helena Harder, Private Citizen*
43. *Tim Nielsen, City Church*
44. *Kim Rempel, Private Citizen*
45. *Henry Hiebert, Private Citizen*
46. *Robert Praznik, Director of Education, Archdiocese of Winnipeg Catholic Schools*
47. *Ewald Kasdorf, Private Citizen*

September 5, 2013 meeting

48. *Adam McAllister, Private Citizen*
49. *Reg Klassen, Manitoba Association of School*

Superintendents

50. *Tamar Thiessen, Private Citizen*
51. *Edward Penner, Private Citizen*
52. *Rebecca Sawatzky, Private Citizen*
53. *Alison Johnston, Debra Arpin and Mark Sefton (by leave), The Brandon Teachers' Association, CUPE Local 737 and Brandon School Division*
54. *Bryan Schroeder, Christian Heritage School*
55. *Tim McAllister, Private Citizen*
56. *Sarah Dyck, Private Citizen*
57. *June Derksen, Private Citizen*
58. *Darrel Guenther, Crestview Fellowship Church*
59. *Jasmine Harder, Private Citizen*
60. *Michelle Gawronsky, Manitoba Government and General Employee's Union*
61. *Michael Sitko, Private Citizen*
62. *Nicholas Semenowich, Private Citizen*
63. *Amanda Friesen, Private Citizen*
64. *Rodolf Friesen, Private Citizen*
65. *Glenn Loewen, Private Citizen*
66. *Gord Utz, Private Citizen*
67. *Jason Monkman, Private Citizen*
68. *Dave Sauer, Winnipeg Labour Council*
69. *Francie Humby, Private Citizen*
70. *Bruce Martin, Calvary Temple*
71. *Margaret Jablonski, Private Citizen*
72. *Bill Rempel, Private Citizen*
73. *Darcey Bayne, Springs Christian Academy*
74. *Myla Krauskops, Austin Christian Academy*
75. *Bradley Warkentin, Trinity Baptist Church*
76. *Ron Koleba, Winnipeg Evangelical Free Church*
77. *Phil Najda, Private Citizen*

September 6, 2013 meeting

78. *Gilbert Fehr, Private Citizen*
79. *Ken McAllister, Private Citizen*
80. *Art Koop, Private Citizen*
81. *Susan Penner, Private Citizen*
82. *Menoukia Pearson, Private Citizen*
83. *Russ Reimer, Private Citizen*
84. *Heather Grant-Jury, Training Centre, United Food and Commercial Workers Union, Local 832*
85. *Travis Neufeld, Private Citizen*
86. *Chantal Reimer, Private Citizen*

87. *Carmen Allard, Private Citizen*
88. *Roger Dueck, Private Citizen*
89. *Kaitlyn Fenton, Private Citizen*
90. *Randy Wolgemuth, Private Citizen*
91. *Patrick Peters, Private Citizen*
92. *Kristopher Braun, Private Citizen*
93. *Catherine Pearse, Private Citizen*
94. *Cameron Funk, Private Citizen*
95. *Char Kenemy, Private Citizen*
96. *Corinna Klassen, Private Citizen*
97. *Ernie Plett, Private Citizen*
98. *Charis Penner, Private Citizen*
99. *Brock Peters, Private Citizen*
100. *Stuart Penner, Private Citizen*
101. *Dr. Seantel Anais, Private Citizen*
102. *Bernie Bilecki, Private Citizen*
103. *Phillis Penner, Private Citizen*
104. *Sonya Braun, Private Citizen*
105. *Kimber Munford, Private Citizen*
106. *Tony Falk, Private Citizen*

September 7, 2013 meeting

107. *Ed Hume, Private Citizen*
108. *George Edenhoffer, Private Citizen*
109. *Susan Eberhard, Manitoba Federation of Independent Schools*
110. *Chad Smith, The Rainbow Resource Centre*
111. *Dr. Donn Short, Private Citizen*
112. *Kelly Moist, CUPE Manitoba*
113. *Debra Schnitzer, Private Citizen*
114. *Michael Nelson, Brandon Pride Committee*
115. *Patrick Woodbeck, Rainbow Ministry*
116. *Robert Charach, Linden Christian School*
117. *Celesta Thiessen, Private Citizen*
118. *Leo Thiessen, Private Citizen*
119. *Sydney Davies, Maples Collegiate Gay Straight Alliance*
120. *Roger Armbruster, Private Citizen*
121. *Elfrieda Penner, Private Citizen*
122. *Naomi Kruse, Manitoba Association of Parent Councils*
123. *Tim Koop, Private Citizen*
124. *Cheryl Froese, Private Citizen*
125. *Ryan Appel, Private Citizen*

126. *John Hoogerdijk, The Canadian Reformed School Society of Winnipeg, Inc. Operating Immanuel Christian School*
127. *Arie Veenendaal, Dufferin Christian School*
128. *Sandra Saint-Cyr, Private Citizen*
129. *Luke McAllister, Private Citizen*
130. *Crystal Klassen, Private Citizen*
131. *Joey Reimer, Private Citizen*
132. *Keziah Thiessen, Private Citizen*
133. *Joel Nedohin, Private Citizen*
134. *Brad Unger, Private Citizen*
135. *Lawrence Hamm, Private Citizen*
136. *Melanie Froese, Private Citizen*
137. *Brad Klassen, Private Citizen*
138. *Roger Giesbrecht, Private Citizen*
139. *Kris Kenemy, Private Citizen*
140. *John Fehr, Private Citizen*
141. *Shahina Siddiqui, Private Citizen*
142. *Kathy Plett, Private Citizen*
143. *Kelvin Plett, Private Citizen*
144. *Darlene Duce, Private Citizen*
145. *Lindsay Brown, Private Citizen*
146. *Silas Giesbrecht, Private Citizen*
147. *Jess Reimer, Private Citizen*
148. *Mark Reimer, Private Citizen*
149. *Bob Loewen, Private Citizen*
150. *Bonnie Loewen, Private Citizen*
151. *Scott Wells, Private Citizen*
152. *Carla Schmidt, Private Citizen*
153. *Brian Schmidt, Private Citizen*
154. *Kristy Penner, Private Citizen*

September 9, 2013 meeting

155. *Corey Shefman, Manitoba Association for Rights & Liberties (MARRL)*
156. *Karen Friesen, Private Citizen*
157. *Rick Peters, Private Citizen*
158. *Carolyn Peters, Private Citizen*
159. *Adam Crookes, Private Citizen*
160. *Karella Crookes, Private Citizen*
161. *Chantelle Friesen, Private Citizen*
162. *Jolene Funk, Private Citizen*
163. *Kelly Friesen, Private Citizen*
164. *Dale Funk, Private Citizen*
165. *Ryan Zacharias, Private Citizen*
166. *David Halstead, Private Citizen*

167. *Suzanne Toews, Private Citizen*
168. *Jennifer Thompson, Private Citizen*
169. *Shirley Schroeder, Private Citizen*
170. *Brian Schroeder, Private Citizen*
171. *Samuel Harder, Private Citizen*
172. *Rebecca Hein, Private Citizen*
173. *Devin King, Private Citizen*
174. *John Hiebert, Private Citizen*
175. *Ken Peters, Gateway Church*
176. *Evan Wiens, Private Citizen*
177. *Markus Reimer, Private Citizen*
178. *Reece Malone, Private Citizen*
179. *Bill Bage, Private Citizen*
180. *Sara Peters, Private Citizen*
181. *Ron Lambert, Private Citizen*
182. *Melissa Penner, Private Citizen*
183. *Stephen Kennedy, Private Citizen*

September 10, 2013 meeting

184. *Lisa Shaw, Private Citizen*
185. *Manon Monchamp, Private Citizen*
186. *Doraine Wachniak, Private Citizen*
187. *Carla Coroy, Private Citizen*
188. *Natalie Deuck, Private Citizen*
189. *Sarah Leanne Tonn, Private Citizen*
190. *Vanessa Wollmann, Private Citizen*
191. *Linda Fehr, Private Citizen*
192. *Taija Jarvis, Private Citizen*
193. *Carmelle Friesen, Private Citizen*
194. *Desiree Loepky, Private Citizen*
195. *David Grienke, Private Citizen*
196. *Heidi Grienke, Private Citizen*
197. *Joseph Luke Wiebe, Private Citizen*
198. *Tina Blatz, Private Citizen*
199. *Carlos Sosa, Private Citizen*
200. *Heidi Friesen, Private Citizen*
201. *Travis Friesen, Private Citizen*
202. *Dale Loewen, Private Citizen*
203. *Bradley Tyler-West, Sexuality Education Resource Centre of Manitoba*
204. *Jenni Doerksen, Private Citizen*
205. *Beverly Braun, Private Citizen*
206. *Charles Kehler, Private Citizen*
207. *Denise Taylor, Private Citizen*
208. *Alfred Unrau and Josephine Unrau (by leave), Private Citizen*

- 209. *Trevor LeClair, Private Citizen*
- 210. *Marianne Curtis, Private Citizen*
- 211. *Chris Elias, Private Citizen*
- 212. *Dirk Baker, Private Citizen*
- 213. *Carlin Thiessen, Private Citizen*

September 11, 2013 meeting

- 214. *Sara Fournier, President, Conseil Jeunesse Provincial)*
- 215. *Patrick Fortier, Private Citizen*
- 216. *Sonia Blanchette, Private Citizen)*
- 217. *Francine Lee, The Catholic Civil Rights League*
- 218. *Miranda Ward, Private Citizen*
- 219. *Clement Chaput, Private Citizen*
- 220. *Jorie Sawatzky, Private Citizen*
- 221. *Dylan Barkman, Private Citizen*
- 222. *Kristy Marsch, Private Citizen*
- 223. *Darrell Dyck, Private Citizen*
- 224. *John Loewen, Private Citizen*
- 225. *Francois Grenier, Private Citizen*
- 226. *Fiona Smith, Private Citizen*
- 227. *Philip Watts, Private Citizen*
- 228. *Andrew Fast, Private Citizen*
- 229. *Luke Esau, Private Citizen*
- 230. *Malinda Martin, Private Citizen*
- 231. *Barbara Douglas, Private Citizen*
- 232. *Michael Ringham, Private Citizen*
- 233. *Dawn Fastabend, Private Citizen*
- 234. *Jason Doerksen, Private Citizen*
- 235. *Paul Neustaedter, Private Citizen*
- 236. *Catherine Taylor, Private Citizen*
- 237. *Tasha Deschambault, Private Citizen*
- 238. *Al Deschambault, Private Citizen*

Written Submissions

Your Committee received the following fifty-two written submissions on **Bill (No. 18) – The Public Schools Amendment Act (Safe and Inclusive Schools)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les écoles publiques (milieux scolaires favorisant la sécurité et l'inclusivité)**:

- 1. *Kim Dyck, Private Citizen*
- 2. *Jennifer R. Kramer, Private Citizen*
- 3. *Jurgen Penner, Vital Bible Church*
- 4. *Rev. Mark Wilcoxson and Dr. Neil Craton, Bethesda Church*

- 5. *Rev. Terry Kaufman, Emmanuel Evangelical Free Church*
- 6. *Roger Kiska, Alliance Defending Freedom*
- 7. *Gerald and Deborah Groening, Private Citizens*
- 8. *Audrey and Jim Friesen, Private Citizens*
- 9. *Raquel Peters, Private Citizen*
- 10. *Earl Moravek, Private Citizen*
- 11. *Sannette and Stephan Engelbrecht, Private Citizens*
- 12. *Natasha Bowlby, Private Citizen*
- 13. *Nancy and Terry Browett, Private Citizens*
- 14. *Cheris and Duane Bakee, Private Citizens*
- 15. *Glen Buhler, Private Citizen*
- 16. *Kevin and Christine Neudoff, Private Citizens*
- 17. *Lori vanderHan, Private Citizen*
- 18. *Bonnie Mitchell, Private Citizen*
- 19. *Bryan Schroeder, Private Citizen*
- 20. *John and Rebecca Roozendaal, Private Citizens*
- 21. *N. Semler, Private Citizen*
- 22. *Kathy Brown, Private Citizen*
- 23. *Ken and Jacquie Waldner, Private Citizens*
- 24. *Dawn Dolloff, Private Citizen*
- 25. *Mark Clark, Private Citizen*
- 26. *Y. Yazew, Private Citizen*
- 27. *Dr. P.D. Janse van Rensburg, Private Citizen*
- 28. *Michael Rosumowitsch, Private Citizen*
- 29. *Gregory and Marie Stitt, Private Citizens*
- 30. *Annillee Garcia, Private Citizen*
- 31. *Beatrix Levin, Private Citizen*
- 32. *Nancy Rempel, Private Citizen*
- 33. *Joseph C Giesbrecht, Private Citizen*
- 34. *Richard Sheppard, Private Citizen*
- 35. *Justin Mendel, Private Citizen*
- 36. *Hendrik van der Breggen, Private Citizen*
- 37. *Eric and Angela Klippenstein, Private Citizens*
- 38. *Pedro Wolf, Private Citizen*
- 39. *Karen Price, Private Citizen*
- 40. *Mary-Jane Kehler, Private Citizen*
- 41. *Cindy Wiebe, Private Citizen*
- 42. *Anna Reimer, Private Citizen*
- 43. *Joy Kulachok, Private Citizen*
- 44. *Trevor and Kristie Brandt, Private Citizen*
- 45. *Kameika Funk, Private Citizen*
- 46. *Christine Toews, Private Citizen*
- 47. *Russell Klassen, Private Citizen*
- 48. *Mary Sawatsky, Private Citizen*

49. *Sherise Reimer, Private Citizen*

50. *Agatha Lepp, Private Citizen*

51. *Jenni Funk, Private Citizen*

52. *Brad Kehler, Private Citizen*

Bills Considered and Reported

- **Bill (No. 18) – The Public Schools Amendment Act (Safe and Inclusive Schools)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les écoles publiques (milieux scolaires favorisant la sécurité et l'inclusivité)**

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment on a recorded vote of yeas, 6 nays 4.

Mr. Wiebe: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Burrows (Ms. Wight), that the report of the committee be received.

Mr. Speaker: It's been moved by the honourable member for Concordia, seconded by the honourable member for Burrows, that the report of the committee be received. Is that agreed?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of receiving the report will please signify it by saying aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed to receiving the report will please signify it by saying nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Official Opposition House Leader): On division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

The report will be received.

* * *

Mr. Speaker: Any further committee reports?

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to oral questions, I'd like to introduce for our guests who are with us here—for members of the Assembly guests who are with us here this afternoon and seated in the public gallery.

We have Mr. George Peterson, Brian Mayes and Bob Holliday, who are the guests of the honourable member for Riel (Ms. Melnick).

And also, in the loge to my right, we have Mr. Peter Stoffer, a Member of Parliament for Sackville-Eastern Shore constituency in Nova Scotia.

On behalf of honourable members, we welcome you here.

And it is my—also my pleasant duty to indicate that we have two new pages for the 2013-14 year with us here today. Eric Schillberg is a grade 11 student at West Kildonan Collegiate, and Mathieu Jubinville is a grade 11 student at Centre scolaire Léo-Rémillard.

And also, in the Speaker's Gallery are the grandparents of Mathieu, Rene and Florence Bourgouin.

And on behalf of honourable members, we welcome you here and welcome our pages.

And in keeping with the practice that we have had here in honouring our youth that have continued to serve with the Assembly, I'm sad to say that one of our pages will be leaving us—this is her last day here—Julia Minarik, who is currently enrolled in grade 12 at Gimli High School. And she may be looking for some clientele in the future; after high school, Julia hopes to pursue a career as a taxation lawyer.

So, on behalf of all honourable members, Julia, we welcome you well on your future education opportunities and your future career choices. Thank you for serving the Assembly.

ORAL QUESTIONS

PST Increase

Impact on Charitable Institutions

Mr. Brian Pallister (Leader of the Official Opposition): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Julia.

*(14:20)

Manitobans are known worldwide for our reputation as people who give. Manitobans are leaders when it comes to charitable donations; we're proud to step up and help when we're needed. According to Statistics Canada, Manitoba averaged, in the most recent tax year, \$1,675 in charitable donations. That exceeds even the level of the generous people of Cape Breton, and the reality is

that that was before the record tax increases and fee increases this government introduced.

Now, the Premier (Mr. Selinger) has admitted that he's done no studies on how the PST increase will impact on Manitobans, but the PST hike and the record tax and fee increases imposed by this government will take \$1,600 out of the hands of Manitoba families. So this side is concerned about the impact that may have on Manitoba's charitable donation intentions.

I'd like to ask the Premier today if he would explain to this House how he believes the impact of his tax hikes will be felt on charitable institutions in our province.

Hon. Stan Struthers (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the—if—the honourable Leader of the Official Opposition will get no argument from anyone in this House about the generosity of Manitobans. When it comes to generosity, we top the charts every year.

When it comes to fighting for services that Manitoba families count on, Manitobans take a second place to no one, which is why I'm baffled why the Leader of the Official Opposition would say that what we should do is cut by \$550 million indiscriminately across the board, affecting areas such as health care and education, affecting infrastructure such as roads and bridges.

Charitable, generous Manitobans don't need that kind of stress.

Mr. Pallister: This is a government that indiscriminately cuts the incomes of hard-working Manitobans.

It would be tremendously sad to lose our No. 1 ranking because of NDP insensitivity to the real needs of charitable organizations in our province.

The reality is that Manitobans are also known not just for donating hard-earned dollars to worthy causes, we also volunteer our time. And the number of hours volunteered to help worthy causes, we also are No. 1, and it's well known that people who do volunteer work are more likely to donate more of their incomes, according to StatsCan.

Now, this government doesn't seem to realize or doesn't seem to understand the sensitivity, that by raising the PST and by forcing Manitoba families to work harder just to make ends meet, they're taking away from the very charities that need our help.

Now, how does the Premier expect Manitobans will be able to continue to volunteer for worthy causes when they're working extra hours to pay higher taxes and fees? And I'd appreciate the Premier getting up and answering this question today.

Mr. Struthers: Well, Mr. Speaker, again, the official opposition leader won't get an argument from anybody in this House as to the volunteer spirit of the population in Manitoba; that is without question.

Some of those same volunteers work for the Canadian Diabetes Association, where this government supports them in terms of insulin pumps. Some of those very volunteers work for the Cancer Society here in Manitoba, in which this government works along with to provide free cancer-care drugs.

Mr. Speaker, what those volunteers do not need is the members opposite, led by their—the member for Fort Whyte, in terms of cuts to things like health care, cuts to things like education, cuts to roads, cuts to bridges—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister's time has expired.

Mr. Pallister: Well, if there's anything that's clear from this session, it's that this is a government that takes Manitobans for granted every day. And they need to heed the words of the great Canadian composer Joni Mitchell, who said, you don't know what you got 'til it's gone. And the reality is we should not take our status as the top-ranking province in this country for donating and supporting worthy causes—we should not take that for granted.

Thanks to these unnecessary and illegal tax hikes, charities are going to find out what it's like. And not only has this Premier eroded Manitoba's ability to donate their money and their time to worthy causes, this Premier and his government plan to take a million dollars from Manitobans so they can give it to their own party. Now, that is shameful. And this is a negative impact. It's negatively impacting on organizations' ability to raise money and attract volunteers. Manitobans are the most caring volunteers and donors to worthy causes—worthy causes, not unworthy ones.

Why would the NDP feel it's their right to take money away from worthy causes and give it to an unworthy one, the New Democratic Party of Manitoba?

Hon. Jennifer Howard (Minister of Family Services and Labour): Mr. Speaker, part of my—in

my portfolio, many of the organizations that we work with are charities. They depend on the donations of Manitobans and the volunteer time of Manitobans to do their work. They also depend on government funding to do their work.

And I have to tell the member opposite that had we taken his advice, had we put his plan into effect to cut half a billion dollars from the funding that we provide to those hard-working charities, they would need even more charitable donations. They wouldn't be able to do the work that they have to do. We won't be taking that advice.

We'll continue to invest and work with not-for-profit organizations to deliver the services that Manitoba families count on. That is what we believe in. That's the work we'll continue to do.

QuickCare Clinic (Selkirk) Nurse Practitioner Vacancy

Mr. Cameron Friesen (Morden-Winkler): Mr. Speaker, three weeks ago, I raised the issue that the Selkirk QuickCare Clinic was open and operating at times without a nurse practitioner. The sign on the door said the same.

Now, on August the 19th, the minister responded and said, and I quote, indeed, there were some personal circumstances that were not permitting a nurse practitioner to be available at that QuickCare clinic.

Mr. Speaker, a FIPPA response now shows that there were two positions actually vacant at the QuickCare centre in Selkirk. That means that there were not personal issues; there were personnel issues.

What's obvious is that the minister put inaccurate information on the record. My question for the minister: Will she admit it?

Hon. Theresa Oswald (Minister of Health): I thank the member for the question.

Certainly, we know that 43,000 Manitobans have been the great beneficiaries of the tremendous care that nurses and nurse practitioners have provided since they opened, first of their kind in Manitoba. This is a very good thing.

Certainly, we do know that we continue to educate nurse practitioners, just recently saying that we're going to invest in free tuition for those that will serve in underserved communities.

The member is partially correct today—I will say that—in that two additional nurse practitioners are going to be hired into rural Manitoba.

But, again, I have to say that the Selkirk Journal reported the Manitoba PCs attacked the NDP government Tuesday—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister's time has expired.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, the minister said, and I quote, "indeed, there are some personal circumstances that are not permitting a nurse practitioner to be available at that QuickCare clinic." End quote.

According to a FIPPA response, there were actually two permanent nurse practitioner vacancies at that clinic. The first is a full-time position vacancy; the second is a 0.5 EFT position vacancy.

Why would the minister say in this Chamber that it was a personal issue when it is clear that it was a personnel issue? Will the Minister of Health apologize today for putting inaccurate information on the record of this Legislature?

Ms. Oswald: Because the day we were speaking of, Mr. Speaker, a nurse practitioner employed at that clinic had some personal circumstances that allowed for only an RN to provide care that day. That's the fact, but allow me to go back to where I was.

A Selkirk journalist investigated his accusations made, and I would read as follows: The Manitoba—and this is from a Selkirk journalist in the Selkirk Record, August 22nd—the Manitoba PCs attacked the NDP government for what they called locked doors at the QuickCare clinic—[*interjection*—thank you—but a trip to the Manitoba Avenue clinic Tuesday revealed it was definitely open for business.

* (14:30)

Licensed Locum Positions Saskatchewan

Mr. Cameron Friesen (Morden-Winkler): Also on the subject of credibility, the minister said about me and about registered locum physicians yesterday, he said that Saskatchewan had over 82; this is not true. Well, Mr. Speaker, in my hand is the Saskatchewan College of Physicians and Surgeons numbers for licensed locums: 82, as I quoted.

Now, only this NDP minister would have the arrogance to attack the statistics received directly from the regulatory body of another

province, as if she has more accurate information about Saskatchewan's physician workforce than Saskatchewan does.

Would the minister agree that her time would be better spent searching for real solutions to her own health-care workforce issues than trying to misrepresent other—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member's time has expired.

Hon. Theresa Oswald (Minister of Health): Well, Mr. Speaker, we contacted the Ministry of Health in Saskatchewan ourselves to confirm how many locum doctors they had. They advised us there are two pools of locum doctors: one that includes eight to 12 at any given time; the second, that they are in the process of recruiting for now, that will include up to 20. So once staffed up, the Saskatchewan province will have 28 to 32 locums.

On my list, Mr. Speaker, of other factual failings of the member opposite, I can tell you, of course, that he suggested that Manitoba only has seven locums. I can tell him we have 25 locum doctors in the Manitoba locum tenants, plus there are locum doctors in the RHAs: Northern health region, 19 providing services; Prairie Mountain, three providing services—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister's time has expired.

High-Risk Sex Offender Repeat Offender Concern

Mr. Reg Helwer (Brandon West): Well, perhaps if the minister paid more attention to her department rather than Saskatchewan's, we'd be able to staff more.

Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Integrated High Risk Sex Offender Unit has issued yet another warning to Manitobans. The Minister of Justice has said that, where appropriate, Manitoba Justice can move to put measures in place to guide a high-risk sex offender and limit their ability to reoffend. I note that Manitoba Justice and the RCMP are moving to do just that for a convicted sex offender.

Mr. Speaker, we recently had two instances of high-risk sex offenders reoffending, and in both cases the victims were young, 13 years of age.

Why did the NDP government fail to protect those young victims?

Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Certainly, the police and our Crown attorneys, that take their responsibility very seriously, I will try to have the member understand, once again, they can only deal with the information that they're given, and when they receive that information they consider very seriously whether there are appropriate grounds.

I know the member has spoken about other cases. In fact, just in concurrence a few days ago, he acknowledged the case he was talking about was an individual who'd been released on parole by the federal parole board. The federal parole board had decided it was appropriate for someone to be released out into the community.

I hope the member for Brandon West can understand why that would make it much more difficult for a Crown attorney to try and get in front of a judge and make an argument when the federal appointees on the federal parole board made a decision about an individual that had been in a federal jail. Perhaps the member could contemplate that.

Mr. Helwer: Well, once again, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice is quick to blame the federal government, as if they live in a different world.

Manitobans are concerned when the government does not know what is going on in the justice system, and they expect this minister to know.

Mr. Speaker, why has this NDP government failed yet again to protect the victims of violent crime, and in particular those young victims of a repeat sexual offender? Apparently, he does not know what's happening in Manitoba.

Mr. Swan: Indeed, there is a protocol when an individual gets to the end of their term in a federal penitentiary. There is a very good protocol where that information is given by the federal corrections service to Manitoba Justice, who can then decide on the facts if it is appropriate to make an order or a request for a particular kind of order.

Let me again explain to the member for Brandon West that that does not occur when the federal parole board has made a decision that it is appropriate to allow someone who was in a federal penitentiary to serve their federal parole out in the community. That is not a decision made by Manitoba Justice. That is not a decision made by a Manitoba judge. That is a decision made by the federal parole board.

I'm not going to speak to the correctness or wrongness of that decision, but the member needs to understand it is the federally appointed parole board that makes that choice—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister's time has expired.

Order, please. Order, please. I want to advise our guests who are with us here in the gallery this afternoon there is to be no participating in the proceedings of the House here this afternoon, including—and that includes applause.

Mr. Helwer: Well, one of the individuals that the Department of Justice is dealing with, Mr. Speaker, is coming from another province. So apparently we can deal with offenders in other provinces but we can't in our own province. This NDP government likes to blame everyone else for their own failures.

Mr. Speaker, how can this Minister of Justice defend his government for their inability to protect Manitobans from violent crime in their own province?

Mr. Swan: Well, it's true. I can't tell the federal government what to do. I can't tell the federal parole board what to do.

But, thankfully, I am surrounded by colleagues who care about public safety in the province of Manitoba. So when I go to my Finance Minister, my colleagues, and say, please support more police in the province of Manitoba, I'm proud to be surrounded by New Democrats who are prepared to make those investments even though they're voted against by the Leader of the Opposition and every single Conservative and the Liberal in this Legislature. And when I go to my colleagues and I say, we need more Crown attorneys to make sure we process cases, to make sure that our Crown attorneys have an appropriate workload, I'm pleased I've got colleagues who support me, unlike the Conservatives who vote against public safety, who vote against those investments and have the audacity to stand up afterwards and complain. Shame on them.

Horse Racing Industry Government Consultations

Mr. Cliff Cullen (Spruce Woods): Well, Mr. Speaker, when a government has been in office too long, they believe they know better than taxpayers. This is clearly the case with the NDP and their dealings with the horse racing industry in Manitoba.

The NDP are determined to undermine and potentially kill both the thoroughbred and the standardbred industry in Manitoba. They've refused to enter into meaningful discussions with stakeholders to come up with long-term strategies and solutions to the industry.

Mr. Speaker, I ask: Why is the NDP government not engaged in proper consultation with the horse racing industry in Manitoba?

Hon. Stan Struthers (Minister of Finance): Well, Mr. Speaker, back in January we made it very clear with the Manitoba Jockey Club just what it is we were going to do. We had all the authorities to move forward and do what we said we would do. We put it into the budget. It's been a subject of debate in this House over and over again. We had meetings with the Jockey Club.

We made it very clear that we were going to move \$5 million from horse racing into health care. Our priorities are right on this side. I'd suggest their priorities are all screwed up.

Legal Proceedings—Costs

Mr. Cullen: Well, Mr. Speaker, that wasn't consultation in my books.

Now, we know the NDP have withheld funding from The Pari-Mutuel Levy Act that was legally to go to the horse racing industry. The judge subsequently ordered the Minister of Finance to forward the funds to the industry. The NDP now, of course, propose to change that legislation.

Several NDP Cabinet ministers are involved in this file, Mr. Speaker. Two of them are named in conflict-of-interest allegations. The NDP have got a myriad of lawyers looking—working on these court proceedings. All these proceedings cost money.

How much money have taxpayers been on the hook for to defend the NDP position?

Mr. Struthers: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member for Spruce Woods is absolutely incorrect. He can believe whatever conspiracy theory he likes, but what we did was outline in meetings with the Jockey Club, in writing to the Jockey Club—it was outlined in the budget we presented in this House—we made it very clear that that money from the parimutuel fund was going to stay within horse racing, was to be diverted from the Jockey Club to the Great Western Harness Racing to—because that particular group needs help as well.

But, Mr. Speaker, our priorities are very clear. The money that we will save—members feign interest in saving money—but the money we will save will go towards health care.

Mr. Cullen: The minister's lawyers didn't write the legislation that way.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP have withheld money owing to the industry. They propose to change the legislation. They're also proposing to tear up the existing lotteries contract.

And the government also plans to pass legislation to protect themselves from this move. They are doing this through Bill 47.

Now the NDP face legal challenge on this proposed legislation as well. The court proceedings just pile on.

* (14:40)

Mr. Speaker, we're asking: How much are the taxpayers of Manitoba on the hook to date and how much more is going to be on the hook for Manitoba taxpayers in the next proceedings to have happen?

Mr. Struthers: Mr. Speaker, members opposite can defend a 90 per cent subsidization rate of the Manitoba Jockey Club if they so choose. That's not the choice we've made on this side of the House.

On behalf of Manitoba taxpayers—which, again, members opposite feign to represent around here—on behalf of those very same taxpayers, we are saving \$5 million, and that money will be dedicated to priorities that Manitoba families have, which include health care.

That's our priorities. I think they've got their priorities backwards across the way there.

Education Property Tax Manitoba Farm Families

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): This NDP government, during the last election, went door to door telling Manitoba farm families that to eliminate a hundred per cent of the education taxes off farmland.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Finance, ET and T, Local Government, member from Interlake and all members on that side of the House lied at the door about removing one hundred per cent of the education—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

I think I've cautioned the members of the House on more than one occasion, and the word lied has been used quite liberally in a non-political sense in this House through this session and I've permitted that to occur because it has not been in direct relationship or pointed at any particular member of the Assembly.

The comments that are made by the honourable member for Lakeside just a moment ago appear to be directed to specific ministers as individuals within this Assembly. And I must ask the honourable member for Lakeside to withdraw that reference and that unparliamentary word, please.

Mr. Eichler: I withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: Rise in your place, please.

Mr. Eichler: I withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the honourable member for Lakeside.

Now, the honourable member for Lakeside, please, to continue with his question.

Mr. Eichler: Mr. Speaker, all members of that side of the House misled the farmers of Manitoba and the farm families at the door.

I ask the Minister of Agriculture why he has not stood up to those same Manitoba 'fam' families. Why did they mislead those families?

Hon. Stan Struthers (Minister of Finance): Well, Mr. Speaker, this side of the House owes no apologies to anyone in terms of the kind of tax support that we have given Manitobans over the years, including the Manitoba farm families the member for Lakeside speaks of today.

Mr. Speaker, it's this side of the House who has worked towards the elimination of the education support levy on residential property. It's this side of the House that increased the basic education property tax to \$700.

That's a lot better—a lot better—than what was at present when the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Pallister) had his chance—him and Gary Filmon, I might say, had their chance to do that kind of support. They didn't do it when they had the chance, and now they're green with envy—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable minister's time has expired.

Mr. Eichler: Mr. Speaker, not only did this NDP government mislead Manitoba farmers about removing the education tax off farmland, they also put a cap of \$5,000 and a deadline for applying for the refund.

Terry Titchkosky went in recently, paid his education tax on his farmland and went to apply for the refund. Guess what? There was no application for refund. This government can't get it right.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Agriculture: What is happening in his department? Does he have any clue about what's going on in his department?

Mr. Struthers: Mr. Speaker, over the years of this government, we have increased that very same farm school-tax rebate up to the point of 80 per cent. That is a lot better than what members opposite ever did when they were in government.

Not just in area of tax credits and tax rebates for the farm families, this government has over and over again contributed to programs that have helped farmers, helped farm incomes. Those farm incomes, in turn, help the communities in which they live. It builds the Manitoba economy. It puts people to work, and that's one of the reasons why we have the third lowest unemployment rate in Canada at—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister's time has expired.

Mr. Eichler: Mr. Speaker, we have given the Minister of Agriculture some time to get settled in his role as the Ag Minister. What have we seen? Job cuts, offices closed, no increase in processing capacity for our beef producers—it's in total chaos. This Minister of Agriculture is not standing up for Manitoba farm families.

Now farmers cannot even get their tax rebate because there's no application forms.

What is this minister doing? I suggest—I suggest strongly—during the break he get his department under control and find out what's going on in his own department. Do that.

Mr. Struthers: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that during that very same break the member for Lakeside take a look at every single time he's voted against an increase to the tax rebate that his very same farmers in his constituency have benefited from because this government, this side of the House, this government is committed to the family farm.

This side of the government has moved forward budget after budget after budget in terms of tax rebates for farmers, Mr. Speaker. Farm families know that this side of the government they can count on to make sure that they get those rebates at 80 per cent, which is a whole heck of a lot better than what members opposite ever put forward for the farm family.

Member for St. Norbert Participation in Cabinet

Mrs. Bonnie Mitchelson (River East): This Premier (Mr. Selinger) has absolutely no credibility. No one can believe a word that he says.

Just a few short weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, he talked tough, saying that he was stripping the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Gaudreau) of his responsibilities for the homophobic comments that he made. However, he's already, this week—the Premier has allowed the member for St. Norbert to sit in the Chair during concurrence on behalf of his government.

Mr. Speaker, over and over again, he says one thing and he does another. Will he now admit that he has no credibility, that his words mean nothing?

Hon. Jennifer Howard (Acting Premier): Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, we've sat here in committee for the last several nights and heard—and I know the member for river heist has—River East has been in that committee and heard some extremely moving presentations from people on the subject of homophobia and the homophobia that they have experienced in their lives. And we've—you know, one of the ones that I remember most is a man who I've known for many, many years who came to that committee with the suicide letter that he wrote when he was 16 and talked about how the teacher saved his life.

And so we can spend some time on this, but I would say to the member opposite she—her time would be better spent convincing her caucus to—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order, please. The minister's time has expired.

Order, please. The honourable member for River East has the floor.

Mrs. Mitchelson: I certainly wasn't standing in my place in support of this government and that member's comments.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier (Mr. Selinger) speaks out of both sides of his mouth. Time and time again, he has said things and then not followed through on what he has said.

He said before the last election that he wasn't going to raise taxes. Mr. Speaker, what did he do after? He robbed Manitobans of \$500 million, took that right of their pockets through taxes and fee increases. How can we believe anything he says?

Then again he talks tough when he's got a member of his own caucus that has made homophobic comments, and he puts him in the Chair as the face of his government.

How do they have any credibility?

* (14:50)

Ms. Howard: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the next couple of days, we will see what the commitment is in this Chamber to protecting the rights of all Manitobans. We will see what the commitment is. We have put before this House a bill that very clearly protects all children from bullying. That bill very clearly cites every ground of discrimination in the Human Rights Code.

You know, the members opposite have asked a question. I would like to answer it, and I am endeavouring to do so.

And we will see, Mr. Speaker, in the coming days, who in this Chamber is willing to stand with our young people, who are willing to stand with our young people in their efforts to combat bullying. You will see, in this Chamber, who is willing to stand with young people who are seeking equality and who are not willing to stand with those people.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for River East, with a final supplementary.

Mrs. Mitchelson: We've already seen how this government treats the bullies in their caucus that stand up and make homophobic comments. They reward them by putting them in the Chair and making them the face of their government.

Mr. Speaker, will someone—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I understand there are very strongly held views on this matter. I've cautioned honourable members about the level going up in the House. We're doing pretty good to this point, but I'm going to specifically ask the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Gaudreau) to control himself, please, keep his comments down, and to make sure

that I have the opportunity to hear the questions and the answers.

The honourable member for River East, to continue, please.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but the list of double standards and backtracking grows day by day in this Chamber. We have a mini—or a Premier and a government caucus that has absolutely no credibility. They say one thing and they do another. They talk tough, but their actions don't reflect the talk.

Mr. Speaker, will they stand up today, will the Premier stand up and indicate—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member's time has expired.

Ms. Howard: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to tell you, as a person who is proud and out as a lesbian in my community, that I stand with a Premier and a leader who protects my family, who stands with me. I stand with a leader and a Premier who supports my right to get married. I stand with a leader and a Premier who supports my right to have my name on my child's birth certificate.

She stands with a leader who voted against that right to get married and she voted—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order, please. I want to caution the honourable minister, when making comments, please, it's to place them through the Chair. I do not want to personalize the debate in here, because that can lead to other problems for us. So I'm asking for the honourable minister's co-operation in directing her comments through the Chair, please.

Have you concluded your answer, the honourable Minister of Family Services and Labour?

Ms. Howard: Well, yes, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would say, through you, that I sat in this gallery and watched a vote on my right to have my name on my child's birth certificate, and the member for River East voted against that right.

Diabetes Reduction Strategy Government Record

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I tabled the government's own data to show that the government's list of scattered programs to reduce diabetes have had no province-wide impact to decrease the incidence of diabetes. A

province-wide epidemic like diabetes should be treated seriously, with a highly organized command centre, a strong strategic plan implemented with regularly measured outcomes and a continuous effort to update and improve it.

The government has its Diabetes Strategy on its website. I table the first three pages, if they've forgotten.

I ask the minister: How many of the strategy's 53 goals have been fully achieved?

Hon. Jim Rondeau (Minister of Healthy Living, Seniors and Consumer Affairs): I'd like to let the member know that what we've done in this government is we've focused on not just when a person gets diabetes but before they get diabetes.

So I'm pleased to be the minister, in 2004, that committed to increase physical activity by 10 per cent in 10 years. I'd like to inform all members of the House we achieved the 10 per cent goal in seven years and we led the nation.

I'm also pleased to let all members know the other way you deal with diabetes is by diet. I'm pleased that we have almost 1,000 gardens, we have healthier food, we've been working with Grow-a-Row programs, et cetera. We have food in schools that are talking about appropriate, healthier food rather than sugary junk.

And you know what, Mr. Speaker? We have more to do and we're doing it, in spite of how the member opposite votes.

Mr. Gerrard: Mr. Speaker, it is a sad fact that very few of the goals of the Province's Diabetes Strategy have in fact been fully achieved province-wide.

It is evident that the NDP government has been singularly ineffective in actually reducing the incidence of diabetes, but perhaps because they haven't paid that much attention to their own strategy.

So I ask the minister: Will he at least commit to providing a full accounting of the implement status—implementation status of the Diabetes Strategy by providing, within two weeks, a full accounting of the status of each of the 53 goals in the strategy and what has and has not been implemented?

Mr. Rondeau: I'd like to let the member know that we have a multiple-pronged strategy, and a lot of it has to do with prevention. And it's throughout

government; Health has a part, Children and Youth has a part, Healthy Living has a part.

And I'd like to let members know some of the parts. Children and Youth has a great program on making sure that young moms, pregnant moms eat properly, deal with their condition so that they don't develop diabetes.

We also have all sorts of programs which are talking about food and nutrition, and that's early and it's not just as the person gets diabetes; it starts with the programs in schools, where kids are now not eating junk food, there's actually healthier meals in schools. And there's healthy food policy in schools so places like Frontier School Division, where I previously taught, have vegetables and proper nutrition and not just junk—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister's time has expired.

Mr. Gerrard: Mr. Speaker, this week the Broadbent Institute has graded the NDP government as last of all the provinces when it comes to the social well-being, including health, of our population. And, now, one of the problems clearly is this government believes in multi-pronged, going-every direction strategies which don't achieve results.

The government needs to be accountable on the 'dialbeety' strategy. As I've highlighted, they've been close to hopeless in reducing the diabetes epidemic, the largest and longest health epidemic in the history of our province. Even the annual reports on the strategy haven't been completed.

I ask the minister why he has not at least delivered on the annual reports, an update on the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member's time has expired.

Mr. Rondeau: I'll go through some of the programs that we have initiated as a government to deal with diabetes, nutrition and activity.

In addition to the phys. ed. across the curriculum from K to 12, which was in part of the recommendations the member opposite attended, and all those, we also have a school nutrition program across 190 schools. We have vegetables in school snack programs across multiple programs and initiatives across the province. We have a school nutrition policy. We have the Farm to School fundraiser dealing with Peak of the Market that sold almost three quarters of a million pounds of vegetables versus chocolate bars. We have the

Northern Healthy Foods program. We have the Nourishing Potential, which has millions of dollars that funds healthy living activities. We have packed—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister's time has expired.

* (15:00)

Northern Manitoba Training Initiatives

Mr. Clarence Petterson (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness—I'll say it again—it is with great sadness that we on this side of the House know that the Leader of the Opposition doesn't support our plan to keep building and growing the economy. He wants to make across-the-board, indiscriminate cuts that would hurt the economy and cut jobs that families rely on.

In contrast, our government builds for the future of Manitoba. That's why I was so pleased to hear that the Premier (Mr. Selinger) was in Thompson today to announce the government's commitment to building Manitoba's workforce, creating jobs—paying jobs—for the people in northern Manitoba.

I'm hoping the Minister of Entrepreneurship, Training and Trade can share a bit about what was announced today.

Hon. Peter Bjornson (Minister of Entrepreneurship, Training and Trade): And I thank my northern colleague for the question. It gives me an opportunity to talk about three things that we're very proud of on this side of the House: training and opportunities for Aboriginal people, the development of hydro in northern Manitoba and, of course, partnerships with our colleagues in northern Manitoba with respect to the sector council.

The Premier was there today to announce \$1.9 million in Training to Employment Pathways Initiative, which is a program for skilled jobs and existing workers transitioning to more advanced jobs.

He was there to announce the Northern Apprenticeship Training Co-op, which will get 15 more apprenticeships for heavy-duty equipment technicians. He was there to announce the Process Operator in Training Program in co-operation with Vale operations Manitoba in co-operation with the Northern Sector Council and in co-operation with Nelson House Cree Nation, Mr. 'peaper'—Mr.

Speaker. These are all important investments in northern Manitoba—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable minister's time has expired.

Time for oral questions has expired.

Speaker's Ruling

Mr. Speaker: I have a ruling for the House.

Order, please. During oral questions on September the 9th, 2013, the honourable Official Opposition House Leader (Mr. Goertzen) raised a point of order regarding an answer provided by the honourable Minister of Innovation, Energy and Mines (Mr. Chomiak). The honourable Official Opposition House Leader suggested that the minister's answer was not in keeping with the spirit of a respectful workplace ruling I delivered to this House last month and that the comments reflected on members of the Legislature. The honourable Government House Leader (Ms. Howard) spoke to the point of order before I took the matter under advisement.

When the honourable Official Opposition House Leader raised this matter, I expressed to the House my sincere appreciation for members' efforts in improving the decorum of this House in recent weeks. I would reiterate that sentiment today along with the hope that we can continue with those efforts in subsequent sessions. In this way, I feel that we demonstrate both that we are serious about our work and that we can conduct ourselves in a respectful manner.

As I mentioned in a ruling I delivered to this House on—in August 27th, 2013, I am aware that there are many important issues before this Assembly on which members hold strong and divergent views and opinions. Despite such agreement—disagreements, I believe that members should conduct themselves in an orderly manner and show respect for one another and for the institution they serve.

Turning to the point of order raised, as O'Brien and Bosc stated on page 510 of the second edition of House of Commons Procedure and Practice, in quotations: "The Speaker ensures that replies adhere to the dictates of order, decorum and parliamentary language. The Speaker, however, is not responsible for the quality or content of replies to questions." End of quotations. Several Manitoba Speakers,

including myself on many occasions, have upheld this principle in rulings made from this Chair.

I have reviewed the Hansard transcript from the date in question. In the House that day, the member for St. Paul (Mr. Schuler) and the honourable Minister of Innovation, Energy and Mines (Mr. Chomiak) were involved in an exchange in which they both expressed strong opinions. In my view of that exchange, I observed that there was language used on both sides that inflamed the situation.

While I do not find the comments in question from the honourable Minister of Innovation, Energy and Mines unparliamentary, they were perhaps not as respectful as they could have been. To be clear, there was no breach of a rule or practice in the comments made by the honourable Minister of Innovation, Energy and Mines, and I am not ruling them unparliamentary. But I would urge the honourable minister and the honourable member for St. Paul to keep their comments as respectful as possible, and I would also offer that as general advice to all members of this Assembly.

Now, we'll turn to—

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

The Arden Seven

Hon. Christine Melnick (Minister of Immigration and Multiculturalism): Mr. Speaker, today I rise to tell a story. This is the story of seven brave men who grew up on Arden Avenue and who volunteered, fought and were captured in the Battle of Hong Kong during the Second World War. These men, Fred Abrahams, known as Fred Harding, Bill Lancaster, brothers Alfred, Edward and Harry Shayler, and twin brothers, Morris and George Peterson, have become widely known as the Arden Seven. George joins us in the gallery today.

I first heard of the Arden Seven after being elected as the MLA for Riel in 2003. In preparation for my maiden speech, I spent time at the St. Vital historical museum researching the history of my community. It was there that I came across these—incredible story of the bravery, courage and strength of these comrades.

All seven men fought in the 17-day Battle of Hong Kong in December 1941, and were taken prisoner by Japanese forces. Spending four years in captivity, the men were forced to work in prisoner-of-war camps. Their struggles, their

sacrifices and their stories must live on, and be shared with all members of our community.

And so, Mr. Speaker, their stories will be kept alive. Last month, I joined Hong Kong war veteran, George Peterson, the Premier (Mr. Selinger), City Councillor Brian Mays, and Mayor Sam Katz, to announce that the Jules Mager Park, located at the corner of St. Michael Road and River Road, will be home to the Arden Seven Interpretive Plaza. There, seven chairs will be erected, with commemorative plaques sharing the stories of the seven soldiers who served on behalf of all of us.

Above all, I would like to ask all members to join me in thanking and recognizing George Peterson and the families and friends of all the Arden Seven, and the thousands of brave men and women who have fought abroad to protect our liberty, our peace, our democracy here at home. We will not forget.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Curtis Gray

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, last week, Thursday, we lost a very special member of the Manitoba community, Curtis Gray. Curtis led a remarkable life as a valued member of the community, volunteering all of his spare time for numerous organizations.

Curtis was born and raised in Winnipeg and graduated from Garden City Collegiate in 1974. From his early age, he was a hard worker, spending many years delivering newspapers along one of the longest routes in the city of Winnipeg—for the city of Winnipeg, Winnipeg Tribune. In 1979 he began working full-time as an installer for the family business, AAA Alarm Systems. Through his strong work ethic and keen business sense, Curtis rose to the top, assuming the position of owner, general manager and president of AAA in 1985. Along with his co-owner sister Janet, Curtis expanded the business and made it into the largest privately owned alarm company in western Canada. In 1988, AAA was purchased by Manitoba Telecom System, but Curtis continued to manage the company before retiring from the alarm system in 2001.

* (15:10)

Curtis loved people and was committed to making Winnipeg a better place. He spent years tirelessly volunteering his time to the Winnipeg Winter Club as a board member, to the Progressive Conservative Party through Keystone Club and their

annual golf tournament, the Children Hospital Foundation Dr. Goodbear golf tournament, the Arthritis Society of Manitoba and the creation of Amy Grey Memorial Endowment Fund, and as a board member on the Winnipeg Convention Centre, the Canadian Security Association, board member in the Canadian Association of Family Enterprise Personal Advisory Group.

After retiring from AAA in 2001, Curtis combined his love with sport and business in purchasing the Golf Dome of Winnipeg. Curtis was always an athlete and a lifelong fan of the Bombers. All attendees at his funeral today were encouraged to wear white socks to pay tribute to Curtis's love of golf and sport.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to share with members of this House about the incredible life and work of Curtis Gray. Curtis touched lives of so many people and will be deeply missed not only by the PC Party and families here and the rest of us in Manitoba who offer our sincerest condolences to Curtis's family and friends. Thank you.

Honouring Elaine Bishop

Hon. Kevin Chief (Minister of Children and Youth Opportunities): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honour the work of a truly remarkable woman from Point Douglas who has made a tremendous difference towards improving our community. Elaine Bishop lives in North Point Douglas and has touched the lives of so many people in our area through her compassion, integrity and commitment to peace and social justice. She is dedicated and tenacious.

Elaine has worked for the Quakers in Canada and Scotland and spent four years living with and working with Lubicon Cree Nation in northern Alberta. She has volunteered with the Aboriginal Rights Coalition of the Canadian Council of Churches, Mount Carmel Clinic, Sage House and the Mennonite Central Committee.

Elaine has played an integral role in the development of North Point Douglas Women's Centre, serving as the executive director since 2005. The centre creates opportunities for women in North Point Douglas to develop their potential and to engage fully as citizens in their neighbourhood and the broader community. She has made a significant contribution to local events such as the Austin Street Festival, the annual Butterfly Fundraising Gala and the recently constructed community oven in Michaëlle Jean Park.

In 2009, Elaine received the YM-YWCA Women of Distinction Award for community volunteerism. In 2012 she was awarded a Diamond Jubilee Medal in recognition of her work in North Point Douglas. Elaine is one of those special people who sees possibilities and potential where other people see challenges and barriers. She is a role model and an inspiration to all who know her.

At the end of September, Elaine will be retiring, and the Women's Centre will be hosting a farewell community feast on September 21st in honour of her work in North Point Douglas and lifelong service around the world.

On behalf of the community of Point Douglas and all the members of the House, please join me in congratulating and thanking Elaine for all her efforts on behalf of our community.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Municipal Amalgamations

Mr. Stuart Briese (Agassiz): Another step in this NDP government's attack on the fabric and vitality of rural Manitoba has been taken with the completion of committee hearings on Bill 33, the municipal amalgamation bill. When The Municipal Act was rewritten in '97, the goal was to give municipalities, urban and rural, more autonomy. The premise was that local decision making at the grassroots level was a good thing and The Municipal Act was written to reflect that.

Now, with one stroke of the pen, the NDP government has said we don't care about municipal governments. No respect has been given to municipalities or to the people of Manitoba and the right to decide their own future and local governance.

The presenters at committee were almost unanimous in their disgust and opposition to Bill 33. And what was the minister's response? Well, he pulled out the first aid kit and found a couple of Band-Aids and said, what a wise man I am. I have fixed the bill. One of those Band-Aids was an amendment that gave the minister sole discretion over which municipalities will amalgamate. Municipalities now have absolutely no input, no say in this process.

This has destroyed a respectful relationship between municipalities urban and rural and the provincial government that has been carefully nurtured for 125 years. This is not respect. It is

bullying. The RM of Langford, the municipality I live in, is 120 years old. Now the people of Langford are told by this NDP government Langford will cease to exist and told they have no choice in the matter.

What's the justification for this attack on their existence? What is their failure? What is their crime? What have they done to deserve this disrespectful directive? Well, their population's only 800 people, so presto, you are gone. No other parameters matter. The relationship of municipal and provincial governance has changed forever. They now say, forget about local governance; we know what is best for you, and you will obey. I believe there is room for amalgamation, but not forced amalgamation. Municipalities should be allowed to make their own decisions.

I ask, on behalf of all municipalities in Manitoba, please respect the vital level of governance. Rethink your position. Take the time for meaningful consultation. The minister talks about leadership. True leaders inspire their followers. Dictatorship is not leadership. Make no mistake, Bill 33 is about control, not about freedom. What a poor legacy from a poor minister.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Manitoba Organization of Disc Sports (MODS)– 25th Anniversary

Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, today I proudly congratulate the Manitoba Organization of Disc Sports, MODS, on 25 years of high-calibre athletic performance and amazing recreation opportunities for Manitobans.

Ultimate Frisbee is a unique sport played by people of different genders, ages and skill levels without any referees. Any disagreements on the field are resolved by the players themselves following the code of Spirit of the Game. As my colleague from Concordia can attest, any sport where you run wind sprints for two hours also offers an intense physical workout.

My own introduction to Ultimate happened at Assiniboine Park in the summer of 1995, and I've been hooked ever since. Our local league has grown from a few dozen players back then to well over 4,000 athletes today. I remember volunteering with the MODS Fields Committee over a decade ago, and am proud that our government helped fund the Winnipeg Ultimate Park in south Winnipeg that was

recently used by 180 teams in 41 divisions for this year's league championships.

Manitoba's Ultimate touring teams are also a source of pride, Mr. Speaker. Just last month five teams from Manitoba made it to the medal rounds at this year's national championships, with two of them winning berths in next year's World Championships in Lecco, Italy. Special congratulations are owed to Manitoba's women's team, called Fusion, and to my own team in the Masters Division, named Flood, on this amazing accomplishment. Indeed, had my duties at the Legislature not kept me here, I would have gladly joined my Flood teammates at nationals, though that might have meant we didn't qualify for worlds.

Mr. Speaker, I seek leave of the House to include the names of all the Manitoba athletes who represented our province at the 2013 National Championships. I also wish to acknowledge the hard work of Mr. Corey Draper, executive director of MODS, and to extend my deep thanks to past and present members of the MODS board and to all the volunteers, as well, for bringing this amazing sport to Manitoba and nurturing its explosive growth over the years.

May the handling and hammering, cutting and cupping, forcing and flicking, hucking and hoeing, stacking and snacking, zoning and groaning, celebrating and storytelling continue for many more years to come.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: That concludes members' statements.

Is there leave to allow the names that the honourable member for Wolseley mentioned to be included in the proceedings of today? *[Agreed]*

Team Roster–Flood, Masters Division:

1 George Buri, 2 Trevor Horvath, 3 Brian Cruz, 4 Rob Burns, 8 David Campbell, 9 Jeremie Kuypers, 10 Ian Clegg, 12 Charles Reed, 13 Lee Davis, 14 Tim O'Toole, 15 Brad Gerbrandt, 16 Eddsel Martinez, 20 Corey Draper, 21 Lee Crierie, 22 Daniel Bedard, 25 Mark Mutawe, 27 Cam Jones, 32 Mike Morris, 33 Dave Howes, 34 Ryan Pilgrim, 42 AJ Hunter, 44 Cory Young, 47 Duane Poettcker, 71 Clark Greenfield, 76 Nathan Gerbrandt,

Team Roster–Fusion, Women's Division:

3 Erin McKinlay, 4 Alexa Kovacs, 5 Paige McCullough, 7 Laura Hatch, 8 Kate Scarth, 9 Cayla Mooney, 10 Meaghan Marsland, 11 Cheryl Coulter,

12 Latita Seaman, 13 Emily Forrest, 16 Karen Hatch, 18 Emma Brooks, 27 Hillary Prescott, 28 Melanie Blanchard, 29 Kaiya Seaman, 33 Elan Chochinov, 36 Robin Merasty, 37 Leah Parker, 44 Nicole Vidal, 89 Samie Lovat

Team Roster—General Strike, Open Division:

27 Jonathan Luk, - Jasa Grant, 0 Daniel Plourde, 1 Joshua Magnusson, 10 Jordan Kovacs, 11 Mike Chura, 13 Weichi Truong, 14 Jordan Chochinov, 15 Scott Jones, 2 Tyler Chochinov, 21 Cam Burden, 23 Yacine Bara, 0 Matthew Loxley, 28 Tyler Ganes, 3 Brad Davidson, 4 Jesse Greenberg, 50 Sean Brooks, 7 Kyle Parker, 74 Willem Konrad, 8 Scott Warwaruk, 80 Elliot Wong, 9 Ethan Kovacs, 9 Bailey Herron, 96 Zach Goldberg

Team Roster—Critical Mass, Open Division:

0 Robert Logan, 4 Josh Kerr, 6 Daniel Desrosiers, 10 Dominic Kovacs, 12 Dayton Malegus, 13 Christopher Graham, 17 Liam McLeod, 17 Carlos Villa, 21 Dean Johnstone, 22 Anton Sigurdson, 24 Zack Hawley, 29 Brendan Wilson, 33 Justin Delorme, 34 Annachie Baskier-Pasternak, 55 Quinn Tays, 64 Kyle Thomson, 94 Hugh Wichenko

Team Roster—Red River Rebellion, Mixed Division:

3 Sean Restall, 5 David Samborski, 8 Kendra Borgford, 10 Laura Boman, 11 Bailey Jablonski Armstrong, 13 Jonathan Boman, 16 David Zhen, 17 Julia Laforge, 18 Justin Suss, 21 Stefan Berube, 24 Andrew Stevens, 28 Nigel Russell, 29 Josh Drury, 31 Michelle Fiola, 44 Amy Campbell, 44 Brooke Fletcher, 45 Lisa Harms, 70 Jordan Watt, 74 Dylan Hewlett

Team Roster—MOFO, Junior Girls Division:

0 Somin Park, 2 Hailey Yozenko, 3 Brooke Herron, 4 Johanna Ens-MacIver, 5 Kaycee Hunt, 7 Erika Gustafson-Fish, 10 Jada Lim, 10 Anya Snider, 11 Shannon Kleysen, 12 Joely Valencerina, 13 Megan Mahon, 14 Amy Lam, 15 Ainslee Heim, 17 Cassidy Kelch, 20 Kirsten Hooper, 21 Megan Skakum, 24 Katie Lesage, 26 Katiana Mastin, 29 Parisa Sepehri, 33 Renee Delorme, 36 Aleksandra Ciochon Newton, 64 Amy Song, 77 Krista Aitken

Team Roster—MOFO, Junior Boys Division:

2 David Ladyman, 4 Jacob Meiklejohn, 5 Matthew Ladyman, 7 Jon Kapac, 8 Peter Charles McCarthy, 9 Mark Carlson, 10 Caleb Snider, 12 John Guest, 13 Ethan Duncan, 14 Andrew Langelaar, 15 Alan Scarth, 16 Renz Partido, 18 Jackson Gustafson-Fish, 19 Nicholas Dacquisto, 21 Artur Kivilaht, 22 Luke

Kapac, 23 Gil Binnun, 25 Oren Binnun, 31 Frank Vattheuer, 52 Liam Sawatzky, 76 Steven Brown, 89 Neil Redpath, 95 Shayne Pfeifer, 96 Eric Chen, 98 Quinn Snider

Mr. Speaker: We'll now continue with grievances. Seeing no grievances, we'll move on to—

ORDERS OF THE DAY

(Continued)

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

(Continued)

Hon. Jennifer Howard (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you please call report stage on Bill 33.

REPORT STAGE AMENDMENTS

Bill 33—The Municipal Modernization Act (Municipal Amalgamations)

Mr. Speaker: We'll now proceed to call report stage amendments on—and we'll start with—by calling Bill 33, The Municipal Modernization Act (Municipal Amalgamations).

Are there amendments honourable members wish to propose?

Mr. Stuart Briese (Agassiz): Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move, seconded by the member from River East, the proposed amendment to Bill 33,

THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 4(2) by striking out "preference is to be given" and substituting "preference may be given".

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Agassiz, seconded by the honourable member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson),

THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 4(2) by striking out "preference is to be given" and substituting "preference may be given".

The amendment is in order.

* (15:20)

Mr. Briese: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise and speak to the amendment to Bill 33 proposed—that I proposed here. This is the, of course, the forced amalgamation bill and it states that preference for amalgamation is to be given to the municipality or municipalities that have the strongest community of interest with (a) being the municipality that is looking for amalgamation. There's no definition, nothing that says what a community of interest

is. Is it—has it got—is it based on the size of the community? Is it based on the economic makeup of the community, the linguistic and cultural ties of the residents? What is considered the—what defines community of interest?

Is this bill, as proceeded—we've seen instances when certain municipalities began undertaking the process of annexation to ensure that they will exceed the population threshold that's required. But, as they attempt to annex land, it brings into question why, that they have communities of interest so close by they would need to annex land and population with it.

The amendment will change the clause by striking out the wording preferences to be given and substituting preference may be given. Municipalities thrive on their identity and autonomy and substituting may for is to allow for much more municipal autonomy for all municipalities. Although a small amendment procedurally, it showcases a general respect for municipal—Manitoba municipalities, a respect that the Progressive Conservative has—Party has always worked hard to maintain, something that doesn't—hasn't been happening from the minister or his department on—is respect to the municipalities. There was lack of consultation to start with and then a heavy-handed, forced approach to this whole procedure where he finally did a couple of minor amendments, one of which gave the minister more power than the minister had in the previous scope of the act.

So this is a small change, but it gives the municipalities a little more choice in what they may do. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Ron Lemieux (Minister of Local Government): Over the last few nights, I had the privilege of hearing from many Manitobans about Bill 33. Many travelled from near and far to take place in the democratic process and to put their views forward at committee.

I was happy to move several amendments to address issues that were raised with me at committee and elsewhere on the consultations that I did throughout Manitoba. I'm glad that the opposition have now decided to put forward some concrete ideas, and I'm happy to indicate that we'll support those amendments that make sense. We've asked them for months, indeed, months, Mr. Speaker, to give some suggestions how we can make this bill a better bill, and I'm really pleased to see they finally have seen the light and they realize how important

these—this bill and these amendments that we're introducing and have introduced are going to make—and make the difference they're going to make for municipalities.

But we will not support amendments that completely undermine the positive purposes of this bill, Mr. Speaker. With regard to this particular amendment, our intention has always been for plans to be driven at the local level and this amendment complements that intention. So we'll be supporting this particular amendment.

Mr. Speaker: [*inaudible*] debate. Seeing none, is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment to Bill 33. [*Agreed*]

Mr. Briese: I move, seconded by the member from River East,

THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 5(2) by striking out "and" at the end of the clause (a), by adding "and" at the end of clause (b) and by adding the following after clause (b):

(c) where the amalgamation has been referred to the Municipal Board, the findings and recommendations of the board.

Mr. Speaker: It's been moved by the honourable member for Agassiz, seconded by the honourable member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson),

THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 5(2) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (a), and by adding "and" at the end of clause (b) and by adding the following after clause (b):

(c) where the amalgamation has been referred to the Municipal Board, the findings and recommendations of the board.

The amendment is in order.

Mr. Briese: Once again, in relationship to Bill 33, the Municipal Board is responsible for three things. The responsibilities are an appeal tribunal, local government finance, and miscellaneous matters. Under miscellaneous matters, the Municipal Board is the ultimate authority, directing applications with respect to amalgamations and annexations, the formation or dissolution of a municipality, and the formation of local urban districts. As such, it seems

like the common-sense approach to empower the Municipal Board in matters relating to forced amalgamations. However, clause 5(2) of Bill 33 allows the minister to have regard for the amalgamation plans submitted by municipalities and the relative strength of the communities of interest. That seems like a very limited list of possible considerations and, indeed, is bypassing a very influential and expert panel.

Thus, this amendment, amendment 10, will allow Municipal Board to take an active role regarding amalgamations. We're proposing adding subsection (c), which states: "where the amalgamation has been referred to the Municipal Board, the findings and recommendations of the board," as it is clear that the minister is fundamentally—have his own theories on how local governments should proceed. Any professional guidance we can encourage him to take is well—is a welcome approach, and we feel the Municipal Board is the perfect board for such guidance. We've seen, through the committee hearings, almost total, very close to total, opposition.

I heard the minister speak—talk about it's high time we brought forward some amendments. I still would say it's a poor bill, and this is a last resort to try and improve a poor bill when they indicate no move to pull that bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lemieux: Well, I regret that my colleague is making such partisan comments because, quite frankly, just to make a couple of comments on this amendment, is that, you know, we've tried to work with municipalities; we've listened to them, we've travelled around Manitoba. I've listened to the opposition, trying to give them an opportunity to bring forward reasonable, common-sense amendments in trying to make the bill better. And that's in the spirit that we approach this. That's the approach we have taken all along.

So, as the minister, I have always given great regard to the recommendations of the Municipal Board. Our government has respected the Municipal Board. I know previous ministers have done the same. In the majority of cases, if not all, we've accepted recommendations from the board. This amendment is consistent with how we operate as a government.

So we will be supporting this amendment, Mr. Speaker, in that spirit—in that spirit—of trying to make

municipalities stronger and better going forward into the future, not for one year, not for five years, but for 20 years and into the future. And that's why this bill is so important to Manitoba, and, in that spirit, we were going to—we'll accept this amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on the amendment?

The House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment? *[Agreed]*

* * *

Mr. Briese: I move, seconded by the member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson),

THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 7 by adding the following after Clause 7(1):

Minister must refer if municipality objects to amalgamation

7(1.1) If a council of a municipality that is subject to an amalgamation plan objects to the amalgamation, the minister must refer the matter to the board before making any recommendation that the municipality be amalgamated.

* (15:30)

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Agassiz, seconded by the honourable member for River East,

THAT Bill 33 be amended—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense? Dispense.

The amendment is in order.

Mr. Briese: Mr. Speaker, once again, on the amendment that I just proposed, the Municipal Board has been always responsible under the act, The Municipal Act, for dealing with amalgamations and expropriations. Bill 33, as it's written right now, allows the minister to make those decisions arbitrarily without them being referred to the Municipal Board, and that Municipal Board is the sober second thought to control the—control and make the decisions and then they recommend them to the minister. But at least they look at the possible amalgamation, they look at the possible expropriation, they make recommendations to the minister. The minister can choose not to accept it,

but, after all, he appoints the Municipal Board, so why would he go against their recommendations?

Now, I was on the Municipal Board at one time, as a matter of fact, and—but outside of that, I made a lot of—more presentations to municipal boards than I actually heard when I was on the Municipal Board. So, I was most often on the other side of the fence making presentations to them, usually in opposition to something silly that the government was doing. The Municipal Board, once again, is responsible for three things: an appeal tribunal, local government finance and miscellaneous matter. The municipal council objects to amalgamation. The minister must refer to the matter to the Municipal Board. That's what we're asking for in this amendment. And he must refer the matter to the Municipal Board before making any recommendation that a municipality be amalgamated.

Right now, with the amendment the minister made the other night to the bill, it gives him sole discretion over which municipalities amalgamate. He can decide which ones he wants to have amalgamated and do it without even using the Municipal Board in the process. We heard it strongly confirmed in the public hearings that many, if not all, municipal councils will object to the practice of forceful amalgamations. We feel that the Municipal Board is the expert panel required to provide the minister with some sober second thought.

Mr. Lemieux: I thank the member for bringing this amendment forward. As was mentioned, many, many individuals have spoken to the government through committee hearings, as well as the consultations we did. I call them consultations—we went around and met with municipal leaders, mayors and reeves and had good, open dialogue and discussion with many. Bill 33 is about encouraging and modernizing municipalities and municipal modernization and ensuring strong municipalities that are prepared for the future. I've mentioned this before, and we talked to the opposition in a way that we feel that this is truly important for Manitoba at this time. And we want municipalities to work together, to move forward with stronger partnerships. This amendment would slow down that process, and for that reason we are going to oppose this particular amendment, Mr. Speaker.

We have a great deal of respect for the Municipal Board and the individuals on that board, but the process, we feel, would be grinding to a halt and it would slow down the process. And again, for

that reason, we are going to oppose this particular amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Is there further debate on the amendment?

House ready for the question?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please signify by saying aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed to the amendment will please signify by saying nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In the opinion of the Chair, the Nays have it.

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, on division.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

* * *

Mr. Briese: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson),

THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 7 by adding the following after Clause 7(2):

Board decision-making

7(2.1) If a municipality that is subject to an amalgamation plan objects to the amalgamation, the board must be satisfied of the following before making a recommendation in favour of amalgamation:

(a) that there is a strong community of interest between the objecting municipality and the municipality or municipalities with which it is to be amalgamated under the plan; and

(b) that in the—that the objecting municipality is not able to carry out its purposes (as described in section 3 of *The Municipal Act*) and is not viable on its own because it does not exhibit all or almost all of the following indicators:

- (i) a stable or growing population,
- (ii) a stable and diverse tax base that provides the revenue needed to deliver services on an ongoing basis at a cost the residents can't afford,
- (iii) a strong financial position that allows the municipality to maintain competitive tax rates and take advantage of opportunities for growth,
- (iv) an ability to take advantage of opportunities to work together with other municipalities, local authorities and regional organizations, and
- (v) the strong support and involvement of its residents in the affairs of the municipality.

Mr. Speaker: It's been moved by the honourable member for Agassiz, seconded by the honourable member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson),

THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 7 by adding the following—

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense? Dispense.

The amendment is in order.

Mr. Briese: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'm pleased once again to speak to another amendment to Bill 33 proposed by the opposition.

In the criteria laid out and the criteria that's been followed on the amalgamation, Bill 33, the amalgamation municipalities bill, the criteria has been specific to really one thing and it's been a population number, and they've used the population number of 1,000.

There are so many other factors involved in municipal governments and in healthy, productive municipalities besides population that population is probably one of the lesser of the concerns that should go into it.

Municipalities cover—rural municipalities especially—cover fairly large areas that recovers—requires service. Really doesn't matter how many people live there, they still need these services.

Urban municipalities are a little different phenomena, but there are very healthy towns and villages in this province that are under 1,000 population. The—these towns, villages and RMs are the backbone of rural Manitoba. They're the

level of governments closest to the people and they should be recognized. They will make their own decisions if allowed to proceed with amalgamations.

The AMM's Tools for Change document is a great document, and I was involved with the AMM at the time that it was developed. It highlights examples and outlines potential avenues for municipalities to work towards stronger, more effective municipal government.

It consists of a municipal health check list and an overview of managing change and the examples of successful municipal practices. It's clear this minister did not read that document before drafting Bill 33 or he would have realized what a valuable document it was and used it to develop an amalgamation process for municipalities.

The Tools for Change offers five metrics to measure the vitality of the communities. Those indicators are population, and that's the one that I just referred to as the only one being used in this bill.

Tax base: Despite the size, is the tax base stable or growing, is it sustainable and is it diverse. That was never considered in this, only population was considered.

Finances: Despite the size does the municipality maintain a competitive tax rate required for economic growth. Once again, no consideration, only population was considered.

And partnerships: Does the municipality have any opportunities to share service with other municipalities. And we all know almost every municipality in this province, including the City of Winnipeg, shares some of their services with other municipalities. It doesn't matter whether you're large or small, you're sharing services.

* (15:40)

Civil support: Does the municipality showcase strong support and involvement from volunteers and residents. And certainly in rural Manitoba those supports are there from volunteers and residents. That's a big part of what makes those municipalities unique and, you know, by incorporating these five vitality indicators into the bill, it would empower the Municipal Board with guidelines in which to determine if amalgamations are indeed in order.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lemieux: Just to the point that the member opposite is making. We have a great deal of respect

for Municipal Board. The board consists of professionals who know how to do their jobs and don't need their hands tied by this amendment, quite frankly.

But, having said that, just a couple of points that the member opposite raised with regard to Tools for Change. I, with all due respect, hate to contradict him, but, you know, the Rural Development Institute and others used the Tools for Change document that was put together by AMM and local government working together. They used that document to take a look at the different scenarios with regard to amalgamation and different communities with regard to amalgamation, and they used that document to a great deal of—to a great deal of advantage, quite frankly, when RDI was looking at—from Brandon—looked at some recommendations, and their recommendations was \$130-million tax base as well as the 3,000 population.

I find it really ironic how the opposition is attacking the 1,000 number; all it is is a trigger, but, quite frankly, it's their number. They did a year of consultation in '97 and they came up with a thousand number that said, you know, the population that—municipalities that have a population of a thousand would be viable going into the future. They didn't proceed with it, because they had the Monnin inquiry to deal with and other small items like that, you know, dealing with democracy. But, aside from that, they also had a 1997 flood they had to deal with, so they didn't pursue that 1,000 population base.

So, Mr. Speaker, with regret, we will be voting against this particular amendment because we really believe it ties the hands of the Municipal Board, and we will not be supporting it, regrettably.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate?

Mr. Blaine Pedersen (Midland): Just to the minister's comments. What this—what he's concerned about with this amendment is that it ties the minister's hands, and that's one thing that I know that he does not want to have, that he does not want to see an open and complete dialogue with municipalities and Municipal Board. The other thing is is this continuing misinformation that the minister has used from day one. The existing municipal act sets a threshold of 1,000 for any new municipalities to form. That does not preclude existing municipalities, and I've had to spend a great deal of time informing municipalities and the general public about the misinformation that this minister has put on the record and has spoke to publicly. And

I think that that's a—unfortunate that when the minister misinterprets current legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can do better than that.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on the amendment?

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Speaker: House is ready for the question?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please signify by saying aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed to the amendment will please signify by nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Eichler: On division.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

Mr. Speaker: Now we'll proceed with the next amendment.

Mr. Pedersen: I move, seconded by the member for Emerson (Mr. Graydon),

THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 1(1) by adding the following definition:

"resident" means a person eligible to vote at an election of members of a council under *The Municipal Councils and School Boards Elections Act*. (« résident »)

Mr. Speaker: It's been moved by the honourable member for Midland, seconded by the honourable member for Emerson,

THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 1(1) by adding the following definition:

"resident"—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense? Dispense.

The amendment is in order.

Mr. Pedersen: And we had many presentations at committee over—on Monday and Tuesday nights. We've heard from a lot of municipal people since last November, and we know that this minister brought in an exemption for the beach communities and I—by—I'll refer to the beach communities as Victoria Beach, Winnipeg Beach and Dunnottar.

However, he forgot about the other municipalities that are across this province that have a substantial cottage population. And I can use Park municipality, I can use Shellmouth-Boulton as examples of that. And Shellmouth-Boulton presented. Both the reeve, the CAO, and one of the council members presented, from Shellmouth-Boulton. And they explained—they had pictures for the minister—about the cottage development, the Asessippi ski park that's there that's created so much economic development. They have economic development on hold right now because his department is unable or unwilling to proceed with those development plans.

This amendment would recognize the taxpaying citizens of the municipality. You own a cottage; you're paying municipal taxes; you vote in municipal elections. But yet, we heard from many, many presenters from both the beach communities and from other municipalities that they felt that they didn't exist in this government's eyes. The only time they existed was their property taxes. And I remember one person from Victoria Beach being there, and, holding up his sheaf of property taxes, he says, I exist to pay property taxes, but in the eyes of this government, I don't exist. And that is not right.

And what this amendment simply does—very simple—it would recognize cottage owners in all municipalities, not just the three beach communities, that the minister is so worried about his Winnipeg vote, he's forgot about the rest of the province. He needs to recognize he is Minister of Local Government for the entire province, not just for where his voters are being—are threatening him. Thank you.

Mr. Lemieux: Well, I regret that the member opposite is being so partisan with regard to this argument. Mr. Speaker, we have MLAs that represent every corner of the province—northern Manitoba, I represent the southeast. I believe, as a

government, we've treated and worked with all of Manitoba, quite frankly, as a strong government. And I take exception to his last comments. He is an honourable person. He's worked hard in his capacity as critic. But I really think that's uncalled for, quite frankly.

But, Mr. Speaker, just let me talk a little bit about this amendment. And we asked the members opposite to wrap their heads around this bill and to do something, for months and months. And I know at the last hour they're coming forward—which I appreciate, don't take me wrong. I do appreciate this, very much, because it shows that they know how important this bill is.

I just wanted to say that this amendment that they're bringing forward, quite frankly, would fundamentally gut this bill. And, you know, 1,000 residents has been in The Municipal Act, as the Conservatives brought it in in 1997. It's their number, Mr. Speaker. They did the research on it. They did the consultations on it. And at that time in 1997, they came up with this number that they felt would be a good trigger for amalgamations and would make municipalities viable well into the future.

Now, that was 1997, and in 1997 they dealt with a horrific flood, granted, a flood of the century. They had other things they had to deal with and the Monnin inquiry and other issues, so I understand why they didn't move ahead with amalgamations. But I have to say that, you know, some have even asked us to go and be more aggressive. We have a councillor from, I believe, from the RM—or the reeve from Armstrong wants us to use the population number of 5,000. You know, he wants the 5,000 number as a trigger for amalgamations. And Duff Roblin used the number of about four to six thousand.

So we've also heard at the committee from the RDI, Mr. Ashton, who told us that strong municipalities are in the best position to grow in the future if the minimum population—excuse me—of 3,000. As an expert, they looked at the 3,000 population threshold and they looked at other factors, obviously. But, again, the thousand is just a trigger to have neighbours talking to each other, coming together, and sitting around to see how, quite frankly, they make their region a much, much better and stronger place for their citizens, and the services that are provided to their citizens.

* (15:50)

So, maybe, just let me wrap up, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to vote against this amendment, essentially because what it's doing is it's gutting the whole premise and really gutting the bill and this amendment, and we cannot respectfully accept this amendment, so we're going to vote against it.

Mr. Eichler: I totally disagree with the minister. I heard very clearly when I was on committee the other night which he was at, and we heard from various members of—on presentations. And people that have an opportunity to vote for council, to vote for school trustees feel they should have a right and they should be counted.

It's unfortunate, very unfortunate, this minister has taken the stance that he has to say to those folks—to say to those people around Manitoba that their vote don't count no more. That's disrespectful, Mr. Speaker. I take exception to the government deciding that those people no longer have a voice. It's very unfortunate so he'll have to wear that.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, when looking at this issue, and it's an important one and we heard quite a bit about it from people who presented at committee, I think there's a basic fundamental issue of fairness in how people are treated, and that we have many people who are—they have a permanent home somewhere else who spend months and months and months in these municipalities, who care very deeply for these municipalities and who, I believe, have a right to be able to participate in at least being counted when it comes to the number of people living in the municipality.

We had met people who came up and presented and said, I'm one of the ghosts that the minister doesn't recognize. Well, I think that it's time that people were not considered ghosts, that they were real people and that they were counted in some fashion.

Now I offer the minister—in fact there was a presentation by Florence Eastwood, as I recall, and she suggested, look, these are people who probably on average spend six months a year there. For the purposes of amalgamation, you know, why not, at the minimum, divide the number by two and then you would get at least some representation. It's not quite fair and equitable but it certainly would give them—allow them to be counted in some fashion.

So I think that the minister should consider this carefully and consider it from the perspective of not

just completely dismissing these people, but finding a way to have a compromise so that their numbers can be represented at least, you know, if not fully, at least if they spent six months a year there, half the numbers, add it into the total and move on because I think that that at least would be moving in the direction that we should go to achieve some fairness.

Mr. Cliff Graydon (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a couple of words to this, to what's already been said today.

What the minister has done is he has dismissed five generations, in some places six generations, other places, four generations of people who have—and these are the pioneers of Manitoba. These are the pioneers that have developed these areas and to dismiss them with just a stroke of the pen is just totally wrong. That's a slap in the face to democracy, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on the amendment?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is the amendment to Bill 33.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please signify by saying aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed to the amendment will please signify by saying nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In the opinion of the Chair, the Nays have it.

Mr. Eichler: Mr. Speaker, on division.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

* * *

Mr. Pedersen: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Lakeside (Mr. Eichler),

THAT Bill 33 be amended by striking out Clause 2.

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

THAT Bill 33 be amended by striking out Clause 2.

The amendment is in order.

Mr. Pedersen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and, well, obviously, if the minister is not interested in the previous amendment, this amendment was contingent upon that one passing.

I think it's unfortunate that the minister has now defined many municipalities across Manitoba as redundant, don't count in his eyes, and that is what he has done by opposing the past amendment and, obviously, he will do by opposing this amendment, and that's unfortunate.

Mr. Lemieux: I—again, I thank the opposition for making the effort to take a look at this bill for the first time and actually looking at it for what it's worth and the value that it can be, and I appreciate them bringing forward some amendments, truly.

This amendment would seriously weaken the concept of a resident and move Manitoba away from using census data. Now, the importance of census data, as a province we've said how important census is to us. Quite frankly, their cousins in Ottawa may not take census data seriously, but we do. And, Mr. Speaker, this is just part in parcel of this particular bill, but I have to strongly, again, with respect, say that we are not going to be voting in favour of this amendment. And—but I do thank the opposition for recognizing and coming, even at this late hour, to discuss and talk about a bill.

And I know, because they have really restrained themselves from taking a look at this bill for all the value it is, it has put some municipalities, quite frankly, at an untenable position where they are really scrambling now to put together their plans to amalgamate because of innuendo and rumours that members opposite have been spreading saying that this bill will not pass, and that's regrettable.

But we're putting a lot of energy, time and effort and staffing to bring a lot of those municipalities up to speed that have waited until this day or tomorrow before they're going to start moving and talking to their neighbours. But we know that's going to happen

and we're encouraged that we hear that now they understand that—the value of it and they're going to be moving forward very quickly to catch up to their neighbours. Thank you.

Mr. Eichler: Just very quickly, Mr. Speaker. It's—it is unfortunate the minister has taken this stand. As we know, censuses are only good as the data that's collected, and we know thorough listening to various municipality that some of those numbers have been skewed. This would give the government an opportunity to take another look at that, and, unfortunately, the minister has decided not to do that.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on the amendment?

House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Question before the House, is the amendment to Bill 33.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please signify by saying aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed to the amendment will please signify by saying nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Eichler: Mr. Speaker, on division.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

Mr. Pedersen: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Emerson (Mr. Graydon),

THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 3(1) by striking out "January 1, 2015" and substituting "January 1, 2019".

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Midland, seconded by the honourable member for Emerson,

THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 3(1) by striking out "January 1, 2015" and substituting "January 1, 2019".

The amendment is in order.

Mr. Pedersen: Mr. Speaker, if the minister had truly listened to municipalities from across this province, he would support this amendment, because from across this province municipalities have told him countless times, they told him countless times in committee his timelines are too tight. The AMM has told the minister the timelines are too tight. In committee, as across the meetings that he has attended, councils—municipal councils have told him repeatedly we have shared services agreements. We have many contracts with other municipalities. The timelines—it took years to develop these—development plans. It took years to develop these, and now the minister seems to think that they can erase this and start all over again.

* (16:00)

In fact, I was at one of those municipal meetings where the minister says, well, don't worry about the details, just sign the agreement and you can work out the details later. Either the minister has never been in business, or else his business wasn't very successful, because you never go into a business agreement without knowing the details. And this amendment would allow municipalities the time to work out those details.

And there are many municipalities that are now actually talking about amalgamation, perhaps due to the push from this minister. But those same municipalities that are now talking about amalgamation, the first thing they say is we cannot rush this, we must do it right. And this amendment would give them the time to do it properly. I urge the minister to support this amendment. This is what will make for successful amalgamations, not unsuccessful, forced amalgamations.

Mr. Lemieux: Well, Mr. Speaker, up to this point the opposition have essentially supported this bill in the sense that they brought forward amendments trying to do what they can to make it a much better bill. But to this point, by having this amendment extend the timeline to 2019 is really saying that this bill should be non-existent, and that's not going to happen.

So, with regard to listening, Mr. Speaker, yes, we have been listening. When—and they make light

of the fact that Victoria Beach, Winnipeg Beach, Dunnottar are communities of a very, very—they're very important communities. And our MLAs, the MLA for Selkirk, the MLA for Gimli have been talking to those people and listening to them. And we as the government listened to them and are very flexible by bringing amendments in that would address their historic situation. Also, the MLA for the Interlake has been talking to his municipalities, and they've talked about the issues about catastrophic events that may hinder putting together a plan, for example, like catastrophic flooding. So those kinds of issues are important. So our MLAs have been listening.

And when the members talk about tighten—timelines being too tight, you know, Mr. Speaker, on the one hand, they stress this issue, but they ran around Manitoba telling people, don't bother—you know—there won't be any such law; this act is going to die, so don't worry about. So, now, when it passes, I just hope they go back to rural Manitoba and tell these municipalities, well, you know, we apologize, we're sorry. Yes, it is law. Now, please, hurry up. We got it wrong.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we're going to put resources, staff, people there to help people catch up. And I know many of them, as the member opposite stated, they are engaged now, and they want to do this and they're taking a look at it. And, regrettably, they took the Leader of the Opposition's line bait, hook and sinker. But the problem is they are behind a little bit, but we're going to help them.

So, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, you know, I want to state that, regrettably, with respect, we are not going to support this amendment. And, for that, I just want to say that the amendment being brought forward is not acceptable to the government.

Mr. Eichler: Mr. Speaker, this amendment brought forward by the member from Midland makes sense. I mean, I've been out talking to a number of those municipalities. In fact, one is the Village of Riverton, of which—they're all for amalgamation. In fact, they've made it very clear. What they don't have is enough time. And this would give them the timelines in order to ensure that they would be able to get their amalgamation in place. So it's unfortunate the government has decided to close that door, close that opportunity whereby they would be able to do it in a timely manner, make up sure—make sure that all their electorate, in fact, has been—and I know the mayor there has contacted me. I know he's been in contact

with the minister's office. He's been in contact with his MLA. And I know very clearly, as well, that I was also in contact with Victoria Beach, the Village of Dunnottar, the Town of Winnipeg Beach, and I can assure you that whenever they reached out, they were wanting more timelines. They were asking for us to be able to get our House in order, and some of them were more in favour of amalgamation and made it very clear. The mayor from Riverton said he was more in favour of it, but what he was not in favour of is being rushed and have this rammed down his throat so that him and his municipality and his people would be heard. It's very unfortunate.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Graydon: I'd like to put a few words on the record.

I sat at the committee, as well as a number of other people, but I've also been a councillor in rural Manitoba as well, and I do travel around this province and speak to a lot of people. I've been in business and in the cattle business, so I know a lot of people through that as well. A lot of those are councillors throughout the country.

We did hear at committee that there was a—an amalgamation in the Killarney area. And the individual—I believe his name was Mr. Pauls; I believe he was a reeve—did a great presentation on it. He said, yes, we have benefited from the amalgamation. We have really benefited. But he said, Mr. Minister, we started 10 years ago. And he said the first few years were—we were feeling our way around. He said, in six years we got down to business. And he said the last two years were intense—these were intense.

And this here was long before this minister brought this forward. He said the last two years were intense negotiations so that it was a win-win, that all of the—all the residents of both municipalities were comfortable with what they had done. And they were talking about amalgamating municipalities that were over a hundred years old.

The minister hasn't taken into consideration the planning that has gone into—and as I remember—as the—my colleague from Midland had said, there were planning acts that took years to put together. They got awards of excellence for these planning acts and the minister wants to throw them out within one year—within one year. He doesn't realize the contracts that have been made between the Town of Plum of Coulee, the Town of Altona. These contracts for

policing took a long time to hammer those out, but those are existing contracts and they have a lifespan, and he wants to throw that out. He doesn't take into consideration the assets that have been built up in different municipalities.

And he hasn't taken into consideration a lot of other points, like in—for—in the situation of the RM of Grey, for example. They have a great municipality, but—and the numbers are good. But inside their municipality is the town of St. Claude. Now, the existing municipality is basically Anglo-Saxon, but the town of St. Claude is not; it's francophone. And they have got along for over a hundred years. They get along fine. But now you have to force them together. They have nothing really in common when it comes to their programs, and the minister doesn't take that into consideration.

So I'm suggesting he has an opportunity today to make this right, and everyone—everyone to the person, said, we cannot do this in your time frame; we need time to do this properly. We need to consult with our ratepayers. We need to consult with the people of Manitoba, the very pioneers that built rural Manitoba. I know to this minister rural Manitoba is not really important. He's never had roots anywhere. But to many, many people in Manitoba, their roots are in rural Manitoba, and they're very, very important or very real to them. It's their heritage that they are going to be looking forward to.

This minister has an opportunity to make it right for Manitoba. We're not opposed to amalgamations. Those amalgamations have to be voluntary. And so I would ask this minister to reconsider what he has put on the record. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on the amendment?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Question before the House is the amendment to Bill 33.

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

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please signify it by saying aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed to the amendment will please signify it by saying nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

* (16:10)

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Official Opposition House Leader): On division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

* * *

Mr. Pedersen: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Emerson (Mr. Graydon),

THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 3(4) by striking out "December 1, 2013" and substituting "December 1, 2017".

Mr. Speaker: It's been moved by the honourable member for Midland, seconded by the honourable member for Emerson—

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense? Dispense.

The amendment is in order.

Mr. Pedersen: Again, this amendment relates back to a timelines, and I think it's been said the minister's obviously stated he's not interested in it. He was never interested in listening to municipalities. He's not interested in working with them. He, instead, is going to impose his unrealistic deadlines on municipalities. Unfortunate that he has chosen this route, but it's been made very clear and this amendment would—if he would accept this—would help municipalities achieve that amalgamation goal that he has. But I hope he does see fit to support this, but I will not hold my breath, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lemieux: I am pleased to put a few comments on the record with regard to this amendment. And, again, I just want to comment about I can see why members opposite want to extend the deadline, because they were running around Manitoba telling people, you know, don't worry about December 1st, deadline 2013 because there's not going to be a law, so you don't have to worry about it. You know, the

minister will just crack a U-turn in the middle of the road and go the other way, and don't worry your pretty little head about it because it's not going to happen.

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, now they want to extend the deadline because they know they put some of these municipalities in a terrible position. Now these municipalities are talking to the neighbours, and now they're wondering where they can get the help now—over the next three months, to meet that December 1 deadline, and are putting resources, energy and time to bring a lot of those municipalities up to speed. And now they know that it's going to be law and now they are, quite frankly, now, in earnest, looking to partners that they wish to partner with.

So it's really unfortunate that the members opposite oppose municipal modernization, quite frankly. In doing so, they're opposing clean water, recreation facilities, building and fixing roads, and the opposition even think that it's okay for municipalities to leave millions of federal gas-tax dollars on the table and—that haven't been—when municipalities haven't been meeting the 'reporting' requirements, and so this amendment really is fundamentally flawed and undermines the attempts to work with municipalities on important issues.

And, you know, Mr. Speaker, the member opposite from Emerson made a couple of comments about somehow, you know, I have no roots in Manitoba. Again, you know, I understand that this House can be partisan. I've been a Manitoban all my life, a rural Manitoban. When I lived in Manitoba, I had lived in rural Manitoba and I'm proud to say so, whether that's in Dauphin or just outside of Lorette in the municipality of La Verendrye or Dawson Trail.

So I'm very proud, as a member of this government, to be a rural MLA. We have members that are MLAs from the north, members from rural Manitoba, members from the city of Winnipeg. We represent all of Manitoba to the best of our ability and will continue to do so many, many, many years into the future.

Mr. Graydon: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the key was that he would—he represents rural Manitobans to the best of his ability. That doesn't necessarily mean that it's to the benefit of rural Manitobans and that was plain. He did go around to some meetings throughout rural Manitoba. I went to some of them too. I went to the front of the hall. I sat at the front of

the meeting; I didn't sit at the side door ready to run out the side door.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on the amendment?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: House ready for the question?

The question before the House is the amendment to Bill 33. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please signify by saying aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed to the amendment will please signify by saying nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In the opinion of the Chair, the nays have it.

Mr. Goertzen: On division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

* * *

Mr. Pedersen: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Spruce Woods (Mr. Cullen),

THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 3(6) by striking out "January 1, 2019" and substituting "January 1, 2021".

Mr. Speaker: It's been moved by the honourable member for Midland, seconded by the honourable member for Spruce Woods,

THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 3(6) by striking out—in quotations—"January 1, 2019"—end of quotations—and substituting—in quotations—"January 1, 2021".

The amendment is in order.

Mr. Pedersen: Mr. Speaker, when there's lots of negatives around, there's always a positive. And the positive is the longer this minister speaks, the more he insults Manitobans. And all I have to do is go back to his last comments about what he called

Manitobans, which I will not repeat, but it will be in Hansard, and I can add that to his book of disrespect that he has thickened over the last year.

So, again, I sense that he is not going to support this because he is not in favour of allowing municipalities to determine their own destiny. He has his own interest in heart, his government's interests at heart, and I think the fundamental value, the fundamental core of this is something that there is a lack of trust here by this—the people of Manitoba, by municipalities, because, although, he's given some reasons for why municipalities should amalgamate, only to be thoroughly shot down by the municipalities as false reasons. What municipalities are really wondering, what Manitobans are really wondering, is what his real, true agenda is here? Is this round one of amalgamations? He likes to quote the RDI. He likes to quote the various studies around that show that even bigger is even better.

Mr. Speaker, so there's a mistrust on the point of municipalities. I would hope that he would somehow stop and listen to municipalities because what they're asking for is for time to figure out to make this right, to do amalgamations properly, not haphazardly, like this government operates its own business.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lemieux: I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this amendment, and I really find it passing strange, we have the members opposite now amending it so it would change the date effective, now 2021. Repeatedly, over the last couple of amendments, they keep moving the date. So let's turn the clock back to 1897—to 1997, there was a handful of amalgamations that took place. So let's fast-forward. I suppose the next amendment is going to be: let's move the date to 2097; then we'll have another handful of amalga—

You know, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly where they're at—a do-nothing, not progressive—I mean, I think Duff Roblin would be rolling over in his grave to hear the word progressive Conservative used in this Chamber. So I'll try to keep my comments—I'll try to keep my comments and my thoughts to myself, because I've heard—I've heard some of the comments coming—*[interjection]*

Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't want to delay talking about this amendment, because it's unfortunate that they oppose modernization of municipalities. We don't. We really feel that working with municipalities, it's for the betterment of the

province of Manitoba. And I know all my colleagues on this side really feel how important this is. It's not perfect; we've said that repeatedly and I have said that at many—you know—and I know that I appreciate the amendments coming forward from members opposite, and we have accepted some of them. We accepted some of them with regard to Victoria Beach and Winnipeg Beach and Dunnottar, and you know, we tried to make this legislation as flexible as we possibly can, but the bottom line is that we want to move ahead and modernize our municipalities, and I know many municipal leaders are seeing that, and we certainly look forward to it moving ahead. And, regrettably, we will not be supporting this amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on the amendment?

Seeing none, is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is the amendment to Bill 33.

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

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please signify by saying aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed to the amendment will please signify by saying nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In the opinion of the Chair, the Nays have it.

Mr. Eichler: Mr. Speaker, on division.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

* * *

* (16:20)

Mr. Graydon: I move, seconded by the member for La Verendrye (Mr. Smook),

THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 7(2) by striking out everything after clause (a) and adding the following:

(b) must hold a public hearing; and

(c) may require a vote to be held in each municipality that is proposed to be amalgamated of persons who would be voters of that purposed amalgamated municipality.

Mr. Speaker: It's been moved by the honourable member for Emerson, seconded by the honourable member for La Verendrye,

THAT Bill—

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense? Dispense.

The amendment is in order.

Mr. Graydon: As we've heard pretty well all afternoon now that there has been very little respect shown for the residents of the municipalities. There's been—the minister has been reluctant to look at giving them a reasonable extension, a reasonable time to do what is a very monumental task.

And what this amendment is doing it's—we're saying that the residents, the local residents, five generations, four generations, that have been in their municipalities and carrying on. The municipalities are balancing their books from year to year, they have contracts that they need to honour. We want to give those local residents a say, they deserve a say in matters that affect their livelihood, it affects the identity and the autonomy of that municipality for years and years to come.

Additionally, the Municipal Board should be empowered to require that a vote be held in each municipality that is proposed to be forcefully amalgamated under the tenets of Bill 33.

And we know that the NDP have never commissioned a referendum with regard to the illegally raising the PST. We can only hope that they will allow the people, the good people of rural Manitoba the opportunity, and the Municipal Board the opportunity to have a proper hearing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I propose that the minister will—and I'm sure that he will support this amendment because it is the right thing, the democratic thing and the respectful thing to do for the people of rural Manitoba.

Mr. Lemieux: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and maybe I can make a couple of comments with regard to this amendment.

Bill 33 as it currently is drafted allows for the Municipal Board to hold public hearings. It currently does that. And this is appropriate and the opposition amendment is really unnecessary, quite frankly, and we trust that the Municipal Board to act in a appropriate manner and they think—if they think a public hearing is necessary and needed, there—well—will—one will be done.

Just to make a further comment, Mr. Speaker, members opposite and AMM has often commented about amalgamations and just to make a, I guess, a further point, is that the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities came together as one to make the AMM much stronger.

And we have our member from Brandon East who was there at the time, as a member, who worked diligently to make this happen. We have our MLA for Gimli who is there as a councillor, help bring together the Town of Gimli and the RM of Gimli together. We also have many—number of representatives on this side—like for example the reeve of Mossy River is currently the Minister of Agriculture. So, Mr. Speaker, we do have municipal leaders—and have been municipal leaders and have consulted with their public.

So, yes, we respect the Municipal Board, and we know that in the legislation now it allows the Municipal Board to be active and we trust that the Municipal Board will act in appropriate manner as well, Mr. Speaker.

So, regrettably, Mr. Speaker, we will not be supporting this amendment and we will be voting no.

Mr. Pedersen: I'm not surprised the minister wouldn't support a referendum, like we've pretty well seen that from this—unless it's the—they can throw money towards the Canadian Wheat Board to have a referendum for that but they're totally opposed to a PST referendum. I can see how they would be very much opposed to having local citizens decide what happens to their municipalities. And, obviously, the Minister of Agriculture has had this renewal of some sorts, because two years ago he was opposed to amalgamations.

And, when the minister talks about the AMM and the UMM coming together, the member from Agassiz tells me it took more than three years to do

it. And now this minister expects everything to happen overnight.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on the amendment?

Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Question before the House is the amendment to Bill 33.

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

Some Honourable Members: No.

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please signify by saying aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed to the amendment will please signify by saying nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Eichler: Mr. Speaker, on division.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

* * *

Mr. Graydon: I move, seconded by the member for La Verendrye (Mr. Smook),

*THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 12(2) by adding the following at the end of the proposed section 46.1 of **The Municipal Act**:*

However, this section does not apply if the amalgamated municipality is a rural municipality.

Mr. Speaker: It's been moved by the honourable member for Emerson, seconded by the honourable member for La Verendrye—

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense? Dispense.

The amendment is in order.

Mr. Graydon: For those that don't know this, this has to do with the policing services for the communities, and the municipalities have an option

as they relate to providing policing services to the communities and may strive to get the best service at the best price. And so under the section 41–or 46.1, The Municipal Act, should only apply to municipalities who were previously obligated to provide policing, urban municipalities with a population of over 700. There's no reason why this amendment could not protect costs from being downloaded upon municipal governments, and that was brought out very, very clearly at the hearings the other night.

The mayor for Altona came and spoke. His town, the town of Altona, is not affected any other way except through the policing, and this would add a significant cost to a municipality that—the pop—well over the population level that's been recommended by the minister. But they have a contract with the municipal—or the Town of Plum Coulee who has a population just shy of the fictitious number that the minister has put forward, just shy of that thousand, it's 857 or some such number as that. And that police service works well together.

The community of Plum Coulee said they're totally satisfied with the policing that they have with the local police. One of them lives in the town. When his day is done, his duty is done for the day, he strips off his uniform. He spends time with the people there. I—Mr. Speaker, these contracts need time to decommission these contracts, and if they are decommissioned what has been said is, oh well, then, the RCMP will take over. But that's three or four or five years down the road. There's nothing in this thing that—in this act that suggests when it's going to be. There's no road map to this, and now we have three months and the minister says, wow, you've got to hurry up and we'll provide the services. We'll show you the way. Well, he's had a year to show everybody the way and he hasn't done that. Now is the time to step up. Give the municipalities the opportunity to do it right.

Mr. Lemieux: I'll repeat the often used term from the Minister of Health (Ms. Oswald), I find it passing strange that the members opposite who vote continually against police officers and additional police officers from our Minister of Justice (Mr. Swan), the Attorney General, to the City of Winnipeg, but also to rural Manitoba, I would ask them, though, that, you know, the additional police officers and—for the province of Manitoba is truly important, and to raise it in the same breath of somehow, you know, policing, I do find it passing strange that the comments would be made.

But, Mr. Speaker, we believe that this formula, the formula that's been put in place should remain in place as it is with the previous amalgamations in Gimli, for example, and Killarney and Turtle Mountain. We have a formula in place that ensures that urban municipalities amalgamating with rural municipalities would continue to pay their portion of policing costs. The impact—this amendment would significantly change the bill and affect the principle of the cost-neutrality for both the municipality and the province and eliminate the requirement for urban municipalities over a population.

* (16:30)

So, Mr. Speaker, you know, we look forward to maybe other amendments coming forward that maybe address this, but, as I said before—and we've—have accepted some of their amendments that they raised today. If they're reasonable and make sense, this government will accept them and will include them in this legislation.

So, with this, regrettably, and with respect, we will not be supporting this amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on the amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: House ready for the question?

The question before the House is the amendment to Bill 33.

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

Some Honourable Members: No.

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please signify by saying aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed to the amendment will please signify by saying nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Eichler: On division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

* * *

Mr. Graydon: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for La Verendrye (Mr. Smook),

THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 13

(a) in the proposed subsection 14.1(2) of *The public-Police Services Act*, by striking out "no later than three years after amalgamation" and substituting "no later than five years after amalgamation"; and in

(b) in the proposed subsection 14.1(3) of *The Police Services Act*, by striking out "within three years after amalgamation" and substituting "within five years after the amalgamation".

Mr. Speaker: It's been moved by the honourable member for Emerson, seconded by the honourable member for La Verendrye,

THAT Bill 33—

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense.

Is it the pleasure of the House to 'consit' the—to consider the amendment as printed and distributed? [Agreed]

THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 13

(a) in the proposed subsection 14.1(2) of *The Police Services Act*, by striking out "no later than three years after amalgamation" and substituting "no later than five years after amalgamation"; and

(b) in the proposed subsection 14.1(3) of *The Police Services Act*, by striking out "within three years after amalgamation" and substituting "within five years after amalgamation".

The amendment is in order.

Mr. Graydon: Well, Mr. Speaker—and we're just pointing out that there is a three-year contract, and after that the municipalities and towns have to get their own policing service, and it'll end up with the RCMP and at a bigger cost.

What we're asking this government: If they're going to force municipalities and towns to amalgamate, and if they're going to force these contracts to be broken, at least give the towns and the municipalities the option of a five—of five years to adjust to this. We've heard the minister say, it's already there. Please, put it in there, then.

Mr. Lemieux: Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this amendment. And I mentioned before, when—if municipalities are going to be, you know, moving forward and the amendments that the opposition are going to raise and bring forward, if they're reasonable—reasonable—you know, we'll certainly look at them, consider them.

So municipalities' priority right now should be their—on their amalgamation plan. And the amendment would allow for those plans to remain a priority, while giving more time after amalgamations take place for municipalities to determine their policing service arrangements from three to five years. You know, Mr. Speaker, I believe that fits into the category of being reasonable. And we will support this amendment. And so, on this side, we appreciate it, and we appreciate the amendment. And we'll be supporting it.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate?

House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Question before the House is the amendment to Bill 33.

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

* * *

Mr. Graydon: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for La Verendrye (Mr. Smook),

THAT Bill 33 is amended in Clause 14 of the Bill by striking out "October 22, 2014" and substituting "October 25, 2018".

Mr. Speaker: It's been moved by the honourable member for Emerson, seconded by the honourable member for La Verendrye,

THAT Bill 33—

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense? Dispense.

The amendment is in order.

Mr. Graydon: Well, Mr. Speaker, we heard time and time again at the public hearings that the time frame for the amalgamations were way, way too short—it was impossible. And I'll just reiterate the words of Mr. Pauls from the RM of Killarney, where they'd went through this type of amalgamation: 10 years it was in the works; six years was very

serious debate on it and negotiations, and the last two years, of course, were intense negotiation. They do say that they worked, and it worked out very well for them, but you have to do it the right way in order for it to work out, where there's a win-win for everyone that's involved.

We know that there are municipalities out there that do wish to amalgamate, but they want to do it in a voluntary fashion, where they can evaluate their assets, they know that their residents are all satisfied with the agreement that's worked out.

So I would suggest that the minister seriously consider the democratic rights of the residents of rural Manitoba and the municipalities and towns in rural Manitoba to define their own destiny. Give them the opportunity to do it in a proper fashion. Thank you.

Mr. Lemieux: I thank the member opposite, the member-MLA for Emerson, for bringing this forward.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is really redundant as this issue was dealt with at committee. You know, the communities of Winnipeg Beach, Dunnottar and Victoria Beach wanted to continue the status quo of having their elections in the summer, and they made a strong case why they should. And they want their citizens to be able to participate in those elections, and we certainly agree with that. And I know the MLA for Gimli and the MLA for Selkirk have worked diligently with those citizens and with their councils to talk about the amendments which we brought forward and which we accepted, quite frankly. So it's with respect that we were going to not support this amendment.

Before I conclude, I just want to say, I really appreciate the members opposite, the opposition, coming forward and participating finally at this last hour, you know, in taking a look at modernizing municipalities and the advantages that are there for those municipalities. And I know many municipalities now, even though there was mischief being created by members opposite about telling them, don't worry about it. And now we see members opposite, you know, now, are going to have to go and tell those municipalities that, yes, it will be law, and work with your neighbours, pick your partners, and pick the ones that—pick and select your municipalities that will work best with each other. And we're going to be putting a lot of energy and time and staffing to help these municipalities get up

to speed and we know that it will be successful going forward.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opposition being engaged now in this particular modernizing municipalities legislation. Thank you.

Mr. Pedersen: Mr. Speaker, it's—I appreciate the minister's concern for what we may or may not have said. And I know that he takes great delight in turning it around and using—and that's the advantage of having 192 spinners, that you can do this kind of stuff, you know, like, whereas we hard-working opposition MLAs, we have to drive our own bus and have to drive our own cars around. Like, we don't have the luxury of what the minister does.

So, you know, we've proposed amendments to this bill that would make this, a bad bill, somewhat tolerable. And we've proposed amendments that would allow municipalities the time that they have asked for. But yet this minister has his own agenda. And what it comes down to is he has thickened the book of disrespect again, today, from some of the comments that he made about Manitobans. And I hope that he doesn't lose any sleep wondering about what we're going to say tomorrow, because, really, you know, like, we'll be okay. You know, with those 192 spinners out there chasing us and following us on—hanging on every word that we say, it's okay. He'll hear about it, that's fine.

But what we will do, and I can save him some spinners' time, what we will do is we will tell municipalities that this government continues to bully them, that they continue to disrespect municipalities, that they continue to not to listen. They pretend to listen but they don't really listen to what municipalities have said. And that is—hasn't changed. This continues. This is not something new. This is not going to be headlines tomorrow to the municipalities, because they've heard this time and time again.

The minister talks about his staff going out and helping. They don't even have staff to do development plans. And yet he says, we're going to go out and—with staff. Where is this staff that he has? Can't borrow it from the Minister of Agriculture because they don't have enough staff to get their own forms online. So we don't know where this staff is going to come from.

* (16:40)

Mr. Speaker, this has—this is a classic case of an arrogant government not listening to the ratepayers of Manitoba.

And, with that, I will be glad to take this message out to rural Manitobans. And I can save him the spinners' time; they don't have to follow me. I will go out and tell them the truth, because that you can never go wrong with.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on the amendment?

Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Question before the House is the amendment to Bill 33.

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

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 amendment, please signify it by saying aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair indicates that the Nays have it.

Mr. Eichler: On division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

* * *

Mr. Speaker: I believe that concludes the amendments.

House Business

Mr. Speaker: So, the honourable Government House Leader, on government business.

Hon. Jennifer Howard (Government House Leader): Would you please call concurrence and third readings on Bill 2, 10, 21 and 23.

Mr. Speaker: We'll now call concurrence and third readings on bills in the following order: Bill 2 followed by Bill 10, 21 and 23.

CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS

Mr. Speaker: We'll start by calling Bill 2, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Respect for the Safety of Emergency and Enforcement Personnel).

Bill 2—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Respect for the Safety of Emergency and Enforcement Personnel)

Hon. Jennifer Howard (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Swan), that Bill 2, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Respect for the Safety of Emergency and Enforcement Personnel; Loi modifiant le Code de la route (sécurité du personnel d'urgence et des agents d'exécution de la loi), reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any debate?

Ms. Howard: I just want to put a few words on the record with respect to this bill. This bill is an important safety measure for those people who serve all of us, who help ensure that we are safe, that if there is an accident or something that happens to us, that they're there to help protect us from that. And this is a bill that helps keep them safe by ensuring that when people are passing those vehicles and those—that personnel, that they slow down. And we have seen some horrible injuries and deaths and fatalities when that doesn't happen.

So this is an important piece of legislation. I was fortunate to be able to be on the committee where it was discussed. I think it was unfortunate at that time that the opposition chose to put forward amendments that would've weakened this legislation. I'm glad that we were able to not pass those amendments and that what we have before us today is a strong bill and another step in our attempts to make workplaces safer for all employees.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate?

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): I find it interesting the House leader on the other side finds that slowing down just a little more is going to weaken the bill. That's unfortunate, because we compared notes with other provinces, with consultation with a number of

folks across Manitoba, in fact, with the police in Killarney. And, when we brought those amendments forward, it was through consultation. It's unfortunate the minister decides that's what the stance that she wants to take.

We were very supportive of safety, and, of course, one thing that we need to take another step farther is to ensure—to ensure—that volunteer firefighters are trained, because we know that through help with the Minister of Justice, we passed the licence plates recognizing firefighters in rural Manitoba whereby whenever they come to a scene of an accident, that they'll be able to be recognized as firefighters and they have, then, the authority to which they will be recognized. Whether that's directing traffic, responding to medical needs or assisting, I want that speed limit as low as I can possibly get it. And I know—I know—every member in this House, when we come across—or every citizen, when we come across an accident, the first thing we do is look to that accident. We take our eyes off the road for just one second. That's how quick it can happen. And I can tell you that whenever we slow down just that little bit more—in fact, it just makes it that much safer.

Mr. Rob Altemeyer, Acting Speaker, in the Chair

I know that, you know, the House Leader probably didn't pay enough attention to my comments when I brought that amendment forward, but also back in 2010, what we have seen is that the government had an opportunity at that time to bring these measures forward and it's unfortunate they didn't.

Also, I think it's very important to put on the record that the fees that have not been there, the penalties have not been laid out as well in regards to this. In fact under section 232(8), the base fine for speeding is set at \$7.70 per kilometre over the speed limit plus two demerit points. Section 238(2.1) adds an additional kilometre—an additional \$5 a kilometre to that in construction zones. They are very strict penalties. However, we're not sure if these are going to be the same penalties which are going to be applied to speeding past emergency workers.

I think whenever they're doing the campaign for this particular piece of legislation, they lay out those fines. Be very clear. Let Manitobans know that it's not going to be tolerated in any way, any way, shape or form, whereby somebody has put those responders, those emergency personnel at risk. So

I need to encourage the government to make that part of the campaign.

We are very pleased this legislation has come forward. We were supportive of it. What we were not supportive of was all the exemptions that wasn't quite there and we made those very clear. It's unfortunate the government decided not to support those. With that, we're glad to see the Bill 2 pass.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): I just want to say that I support this legislation. I'm pleased to see that firefighters will be given the right to be able to direct traffic, that we've got some improved provisions in terms of safety.

I think what's going to be very important is making sure that there's an educational and learning campaign for the public to make sure that these provisions are well understood and also that it's important, when there is an accident, as happens most of the time that there's as soon as possible there's signs, flashing lights, what have you, up at the scene so that people can be aware that they need to be slowing down and to be cautious. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on the bill?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is Bill 2, concurrence and third reading, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Respect for the Safety of Emergency and Enforcement Personnel).

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

Bill 10—The Correctional Services Amendment Act

Hon. Jennifer Howard (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Swan), that Bill 10, The Correctional Services Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services correctionnels, reported from the Standing Committee on Justice, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): It's a pleasure to speak to Bill 10, and it's also a chance on behalf of all members of the Legislature to thank Manitoba's correctional officers who do difficult work, many times in difficult conditions, certainly with a difficult

population. And I guess it's not a surprise, Mr. Speaker, that those who have great difficulty living within society's rules among us also wind up creating challenges when they're in our correctional centres.

* (16:50)

And this bill is intended to improve the safety and security within our correctional facilities. It's also intended to enhance public safety of victims, of witnesses and the general public.

This bill will clarify the conditions under which inmate communications including telephone communications may be restricted, intercepted and monitored. Unfortunately, there are those who continue to attempt to conduct criminal activity from inside correctional centres, either by carrying on illegal activities or, in some cases, by threatening or intimidating those who may be witnesses, who may be former domestic partners, and we want to make sure that our correctional facilities have all the reasonable tools at hand to monitor that activity, prevent it from happening and, if necessary, punish those who have engaged in it.

So the bill also includes provisions for more detailed regulations with respect to the control of inmate communications. Again, we want to make sure that, as much as possible, our correctional centres are safe for the people who work there, but also, Mr. Speaker, for the people who live there. This bill will do that. This bill will also provide greater protections for those in our society in general from those who are incarcerated. Thank you.

Mr. Reg Helwer (Brandon West): I'm pleased to rise to speak to Bill 10, The Correctional Services Amendment Act, and, yes indeed, it—if it does its job, it may help to protect Manitobans. But the minister said that they are already doing this in the government. So it's always really interesting when we get legislation in the House here to make something legal that is already occurring. And, indeed, interesting I think at this time that we see this type of legislation coming forward when we've seen the controversy in the United States with the American government eavesdropping on American citizens and foreign citizens as well, if they are communicating with them, and the uproar that that has caused, the government's request to various companies for their services and for their access to their records. So it's all very interesting to see this coming together.

And, indeed, should this prevent a crime, it is indeed something that is useful to put into place. But, like most of this government's legislation, we don't know what this is going to cost, and indeed the cost of maintaining records and reviewing records is something that is substantial. I know that I have 'spoken'—spoken in the House here previously, Mr. Speaker, about the—although the cost of storage is declining considerably over the past number of years, there still is nonetheless a cost not only of recording, but storing and indeed accessing. That information has to be accessible to make sure that you can look at those particular records on a particular day when you need to review them, that they are easily indexed and all of those types of things. So a substantial amount of cost could be as part of this bill, and I think that is a concern that we will have to look to on how much this is going to cost Manitobans. But, indeed, that may be a price that Manitobans are willing to pay should it prevent a serious crime, because we know that this government does have difficulty in keeping Manitobans safe. So, in that regard, there are some opportunities here, I think, to make Manitobans safer.

The question about the costs, of course, and where those things would happen is this: when we look to maintain this type of data is this something that's going to occur in Manitoba? I don't believe that Corrections has the ability to maintain this substantial amount of data by itself. We may have to look at other resources like Manitoba Public Insurance recently went to IBM out of province for its data services, and that happened just recently over the September long weekend and caused some severe—serious angst for individuals where there were no records available from the Friday to the Tuesday, and people that were buying and transferring vehicles were told, well, we have to do this by hand and then, hopefully, it'll go back in on Monday.

So lots of details that need to be ironed out here, Mr. Speaker, but the intent is clear, and, of course, it will cover the government off for things they are currently doing. Thank you.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, with this legislation, the concern really is in the regulations and the details and how this is applied to make sure that it is reasonable, but that it's not infringing on fundamental rights of individuals for privileged communications and so on.

And, yes, certainly, when there is a major concern of danger or concern over safety, this can be very reasonable to do. The problem is in ensuring that this privilege to look at such communications is not abused, that it is not used in circumstances where there are not, you know, very significant grounds for considering that there are—could be potential problems.

So, as I say, the concern here is to make sure that the application is done well. There are considerable—there is considerable potential for this to be 'mifused' if it's not done well and carefully with some significant amount of oversight—we are not told precisely how that oversight is going to occur—and to make sure that the use is selective and appropriate. That would have been good information to have just to make sure that this is used carefully and wisely, where appropriate, but not used at other times. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on Bill 10?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: House ready for the question?

Question before the House is Bill 10, The Correctional Services Amendment Act.

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

* * *

Mr. Speaker: We'll now call Bill 21, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Impoundment of Vehicles—Ignition-Interlock Program).

Bill 21—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Impoundment of Vehicles—Ignition-Interlock Program)

Hon. Jennifer Howard (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Swan), that the Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Impoundment of Vehicles—Ignition-Interlock Program); Loi modifiant le Code de la route (mise en fourrière des véhicules—programme de verrouillage du système de démarrage), reported from the Standing Committee on Justice be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I'm very pleased to speak to Bill 21. This bill will amend The Highway Traffic Act to clarify that operating a motor vehicle in

contravention of ignition-interlock requirements not only constitutes driving while disqualified but also carries all the consequences that flow from the offence of driving while disqualified, including vehicle impoundment. Members will be aware that the law was recently changed, that anybody convicted of an impaired driving Criminal Code offence must have an ignition interlock if they wish to get their licence back immediately after their period of suspension.

The bill will also give the Registrar of Motor Vehicles a narrow authority to modify a restricted driver's licence to allow the driver to operate only in the course of their employment an employer's vehicle that is not equipped with an ignition-interlock device, if using that vehicle is necessary to maintain the driver's employment. We think this is a reasonable accommodation for those who actually require the use of a fleet vehicle where it's not possible to outfit every single vehicle on the fleet with an ignition interlock.

This is a chance, Mr. Speaker, to thank the law enforcement community in Manitoba for all the work they do on our roads, our streets, in all kinds of weather, to protect us from impaired drivers, to take on those who endanger themselves and others by driving while impaired.

Of course, we have the RoadWatch program. Manitoba Public Insurance is very pleased to support law enforcement across the province; I know that's not universally supported in this House. I know some opposition members have a problem with MPI assisting the police. I'm not sure why, but that's for another day's debate.

I also want to recognize the effort of the Brandon Police Service and RCMP in a number of communities who have the Report Impaired Drivers program which has been paying real dividends. Brandon has had a great deal of success in getting impaired drivers off the road because police there really are going the extra mile when they get the call from someone to make sure that they're out there as quickly as possible to intercept that vehicle and prevent tragedies from happening.

I also want to take the opportunity to thank MADD Canada and the MADD Winnipeg chapter for their persistent, fair, constant advocacy to continue moving the goal posts, to change the laws, to get people understanding the dangers of impaired driving, so we can prevent tragedies from happening on our roads.

* (17:00)

Even one death from impaired driving is too many. Even one injury from impaired driving is too many. Unfortunately, on Manitoba's highways, we continue to see people taking risks with their lives, the lives of others in their car and others in the general population. And we hope Bill 21 will be one more step towards getting the message across to Manitobans; they need to make a plan, whether it's a designated driver, taking a taxi, taking a bus, staying over. There are so many alternatives. There are so many better things to do than drinking and driving.

So thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak once again to Bill 21.

Mr. Reg Helwer (Brandon West): I'm pleased to rise to speak to Bill 21, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Impoundment of Vehicles—Ignition-Interlock Program).

And, indeed, it does seem that the government needs to continue to modify its regulations, and, in this case, we're dealing with drunk driving. And the government has had difficulty in slowing the drunk driving down, obviously, and they keep bringing in more measures to deal with it.

Now, in this case, the majority of these measures seem to be reasonable. I am disappointed, though, that the minister put information on the record about the opposition party that is not correct. We do certainly support the police and first responders in our province, and they are an important part of this program, obviously. So I was sad to see the minister put information on the record that is not correct.

However, when we look at this particular legislation, we note that there is, I believe, for both the individual that has offended and has to use an ignition-interlock device in their own vehicle and for their employer who may have a fleet of vehicles, it is an important allowance here that would enable the employee to remain employed, and operate the vehicles in the fleet without having the vehicles with an ignition-interlock device. And I think that is very important for the employer, Mr. Speaker, because that employee is probably a valued part of their company, I'm sure, and, obviously, for the employee as well, that they can remain employed, and creating income to pay this government's sales tax increases, because we know that this government is relentless in how they dip into Manitobans' pockets. But, nonetheless, it will allow that individual to continue to be a viable contributor to society, and make sure

that they have income, so as not to drive them deeper into despair. So, obviously, I think that is an important part.

It is something that deals, though, with a symptom. It does not at all deal with the deeper cause of drunk driving, Mr. Speaker, if there is indeed one, whether it be alcoholism or alcohol abuse, or any other type of that nature, that those are the types of things that we do need to put more emphasis on. And AFM, I know, does a great job of that, but they are limited in their resources and how much they can contribute to that, obviously, because it is a problem that has not gone away.

No matter how much legislation this government has thrown at it, it does continue to be a difficulty, Mr. Speaker, that we are dealing with. And it's the individuals, obviously, on a case-by-case basis that need to be dealt with.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I think there may be others that wish to speak to this, and thank you.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, just a few words at third reading of Bill 21.

I think all of us are concerned about safety. And, of course, we're all aware of the problems with road safety when we have drivers who are alcohol impaired. And so measures to reduce the number of drivers and the impact of drivers who are driving under the influence of alcohol is certainly worthwhile.

There should be some ongoing outcome measures. One would hope that we would see statistics which would show the number of drivers who have been drinking going down, and the number of accidents, where there is a driver who's been alcohol impaired involved.

So it's very important when we put in measures like this, to ensure that they're actually working and have a report, which I hope that the government will provide, on the effectiveness of measures like this.

Certainly, if we want to improve progressively and over the long run, we need to make sure that the measures that we're taking are, indeed, effective, as we hope they will be. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on Bill 21?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Question before the House is Bill 21, The Highway Traffic Amendment

Act (Impoundment of Vehicles–Ignition-Interlock Program).

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

* * *

Mr. Speaker: We'll now proceed to call Bill 23, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Increased Sanctions for Street Racing).

**Bill 23–The Highway Traffic Amendment Act
(Increased Sanctions for Street Racing)**

Hon. Jennifer Howard (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Swan) that Bill 23, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Increased Sanctions for Street Racing); Loi modifiant le Code de la route (sanctions accrues en matière de courses sur route), reported from the Standing Committee on Justice be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to speak to Bill 23 at third reading.

Street racing is inherently dangerous and, if I may say so, stupid activity, and, unfortunately, there have been too many instances in the province of Manitoba where street racing has caused loss of life or serious injuries and, certainly, damage to property. And we want to take steps to increase the sanctions for those who engage in a needless and pointless activity.

At present, The Highway Traffic Act provides the police may impound a vehicle for 48 hours if they have reason to believe that it is being or has been driven on a highway in a race. This bill would amend The Highway Traffic Act, increase the vehicle impoundment period for street racing to seven days. It would also give police the authority to impose a seven-day roadside driver's licence suspension and driving disqualification as a consequence for street racing. The bill would also clarify that the Manitoba Licence Suspension Appeal Board process does not apply to the new seven-day driver's licence suspension and driving disqualification.

It's important to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this bill will add to penalties already contained in the Criminal Code of Canada and sanctions in The

Highway Traffic Act. And perhaps just to anticipate what the member for Brandon West (Mr. Helwer) may talk about, it's important as we move into perhaps some very complex and emotional debates in the next day.

There's a publication of the Manitoba Law Journal each year called, under the Golden Boy, and what law students do is they listen to the debates or read Hansard debates—first reading, second reading, committee, and then third reading, and they're required to write stories and conduct some research on the various pieces of legislation. I'm not sure, with the antics of the opposition, when the cut-off date is. It may be that there's not a lot of bills for the law students to look at.

So, first of all, I'll give a shout out to under the Golden Boy, but also just put some words on the record in anticipation of what the member for Brandon West is going to say.

As the Attorney General, I listen to the advice that's provided by my staff. The people in the Constitutional Law branch, I believe, are some of the brightest lawyers, not just in Manitoba but in the entire country. And when we moved ahead with Bill 23, I did ask for advice on the toughest penalties that we could bring in, and I was advised that a seven-day suspension was likely the highest that could be justified without having an appeal process in place. I accepted that advice, and that's why we've moved ahead.

Now I know when we debated the report stage amendments, the member for Brandon West had his piece, and the member for Steinbach (Mr. Goertzen) then felt he needed to step in. In hockey that's third man in and that's a misconduct, but in this Legislature it's perfectly acceptable, but I do think it's necessary just to put a few words on the record because I can anticipate what I'm going to hear.

Our government has always been at the leading edge of taking steps within our provincial jurisdiction to take measures to keep our community safe, and this is another example that we're moving carefully on this. I know that the member for Steinbach suggested in his comments that we should roll the constitutional dice, as it were, and even though we have good advice and solid advice, we should disregard that advice and move ahead and open up the province to constitutional challenges. And I know he referred to a former Conservative Attorney General who was back in the '90s, who, of

course, used to brag about Manitoba having tough drinking and driving consequences, but it wasn't so funny when many of those provisions were actually struck down by the courts.

*(17:10)

So we continue to lead the country when it comes to taking on impaired driving, when it comes to taking on other dangerous driving exercises, when it comes to taking on organized crime, when it comes to using civil remedies to keep our community safe, and I can assure this House that this is another measure which is carefully considered, which has been thought out with the proper advice and will keep our streets safe.

So, with that, I certainly recommend this bill to every member of the Legislature and I look forward to it passing. Thank you.

Mr. Reg Helwer (Brandon West): I am pleased, indeed, to stand to 'rie'—to speak to Bill 23, Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Increased Sanctions for Street Racing). Interesting caution the minister gave me. Indeed I have read that publication and I—it is part of the process I've gone through. And now, Mr. Speaker, I—you do know—well know that we did try to make this legislation tougher. And the minister has said that he thinks this is the toughest they can do right now. This, while Manitoba is the fourth highest number of incidents of street racing in Canada.

So, indeed, Mr. Speaker, we do need to be tough on this. And I think that there was an opportunity to make sure that the people that were involved in this type of action gave some sober second thought to their actions and the impact that they may have on the driving public and the impact that they may have should there be an accident. And the victims of those accidents that are often very severe when we're looking at high speeds on the roads where people are not expecting to see vehicles travel at that speed and where you're entering a roadway expecting that you have time to make the turn and all of a sudden you are struck by a vehicle that may be travelling at that high rate of speed.

So I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we did offer some reasoned amendments to this that would give the government opportunity to make this legislation a little tougher and hopefully still fall within the guidelines of constitutional challenges. This, while this government has gone forward and is talking about changing the Senate and perhaps delaying any changes to the Senate. I believe the actions of this

minister and this government in intervening in that case may indeed delay any changes to the Senate that they so wish to do away with, and indeed we'll have that for longer as is as opposed to changing it, modifying it, even doing away with it as the minister had mentioned that he wishes to do so, even in flying in the face of an all-party committee. As I understand, they got together with suggestions for how to move ahead, and those areas are things that obviously take time and I believe, in that case, this minister's intervention will delay those things happening.

So, in this case, Mr. Speaker, obviously, we want to make sure that we can look to reduce the incidence of street racing. This bill will probably go through that a little bit and will enable some of that to happen, but, again, we are dealing with the incident, not the cause of it. And early intervention is something that is more necessary than watching it happen and then dealing with the actions afterwards, although that is a necessary part, obviously, but we need to deal with the behaviour as well.

So I had hoped that we could make this a little bit tougher, and the minister chose not to. That is his choice, but he will have to deal with any incidents that may go beyond that, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, just a few words on this bill, which I support, to decrease the amount of street racing in Manitoba. I think it is important that we're actually measuring on an ongoing basis the amount of street racing and the accidents so that we can compare it.

I know that we were fourth, I think, in terms of the amount of street racing and problems related to it in Canada, but hopefully this will be a step in decreasing that. It becomes very important not just to pass legislation, but to make sure that people are very aware of this legislation being passed so that they don't go street racing and get themselves into trouble in this regard, as well as from what they're doing from the street racing itself.

So I think the minister needs to make sure that there's a very strong communications plan around this to make sure that all drivers are well aware. Thank you.

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): I want to put some words on the record in support of the comments that the member for Brandon West (Mr. Helwer) made in regards to the need—the need to have stronger sanctions.

And disappointed at report stage amendments, that we had a government that decided to be soft on an issue that really should have been more serious, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate the fact that our Justice critic wanted to bring forward a stronger legislation. I actually kind of warned him. I said, you know, I've seen this track record of the government in the past. They always shy away from anything that's a little bit tougher on crime. They always have an excuse.

I remember when we tried to get them to go more strongly on electronic monitoring, and the former attorney general, the member—the current member responsible for Hydro, I think, said, oh, the batteries don't work. We can't have batteries in these GPS things because they freeze and they get cold and I phoned Edmonton and I said, do the batteries work in your electronic monitors and they said, yes, we never had a problem. I said, you guys have snow, right? And they said, yes, yes, we have snow. And I said, it gets cold there in the winter, right? And he said, yes, it gets cold there. I said, well, you know, our Attorney General said the batteries wouldn't work here and he kind of laughed and wondered what century he was in but it was a good discussion and I realized then, and I learnt quickly that this government has an excuse always to be soft on crime.

And, in fact, I remember also, it reminds me about the time when I remember suggesting that we shouldn't have to pay for the lawyer of the choice for gang members when they're on legal aid. And I said, you know, why is it that gang members have to—or have the right to select a lawyer of their choice, a lawyer that most other people if they had to defend themselves simply couldn't afford. Yet we pay for these high-end lawyers to defend high-risk gang members. And the Attorney General of Manitoba, said, oh, there's nothing we can do about it, you know, we have to pay for it. It's, you know, the law. We wouldn't want to push anything and I said, there's no constitutional right to allow a person on legal aid to select any lawyer they want but the government, the Attorney General said, no, no, no, there's nothing we can do and then, of course, the court ultimately ruled that there is no constitutional right for a gang member or anybody else on legal aid to be able to select their own lawyer. They can simply have one appointed to them if they qualify for legal aid through the legal aid system.

But that's the track record of this government, they simply can't do anything that is tougher on the

criminals unless they are absolutely forced into it. And that's the problem, it's not a proactive government when it comes to the issues of crime and crime reduction. They have to react to everything. They have to react to the courts making them do something. They have to react to terrible things that happen to individuals and to victims and so I appreciate the member for Brandon West (Mr. Helwer) because what he did was proactive. He said, let's look after the victims first. Let's try to make this a little tougher so that we could possibly cause a deterrent and reduce the number of victims who might be there for street racing.

And I see the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak), the Minister responsible for Hydro, looking at his clock, he's probably wondering, you know, because probably every five seconds there's another victim in Manitoba, so he's looking at this clock and thinking oh, there's another victim. Well, if he's so concerned about victims they should actually do something proactive in terms of reducing crime and we had to rely on the member for Brandon West to bring forward an amendment, wasn't an unreasonable amendment, he wasn't trying to do anything radical, he was trying to add some days to the suspension of the driver's licence.

Surely, you know, there shouldn't be some objection but somehow the Attorney General figured, oh no, an additional seven days, it could cause the whole world to collapse. These poor street racers out there, to deprive them of their driver's licence or their vehicles for another seven days, no, no, let's quickly get them back on the street, you know, but that's the attitude, that's the attitude of this government when it comes to so many things in relation to crime.

You know, how is it we can look after the rights of the criminals over the rights of the victim? So I appreciate the member for Brandon West bringing forward those amendments at report stage. I warned him. I warned him that this probably wouldn't be accepted. He's a common-sense guy, so he said, how could the government not accept this kind of amendment. He was—we didn't put a wager on it but I'm sure he would have wagered that the government would have accepted the amendment because it was so obviously a good thing to do in terms of trying to reduce street racing but had I wagered I would have wagered exactly what happened, that the government wouldn't accept it because they're always looking after the rights of the victim—or rights of the criminals before the rights of the victims and that's their pattern and I expect it's a pattern that will

continue until Manitobans remove them from government.

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): I know before the bill went to committee, I got up and I spoke and—about this particular bill, and I had the opportunity just a couple of weeks ago, on cruise night, down Portage Avenue with a couple of my friends, and I can tell you that we talked about this particular piece of legislation and we were just idling along, in idle mode and I can tell you there were some people who went by—went by and they were a little bit out of control.

* (17:20)

We understand—we understand very clearly that the 'legis'—need for this legislation's important. And, as the member from Steinbach said, the member from Brandon West brought forward amendment that would have made it more responsible for the government to be able to sit down and have another look at this piece of legislation. Unfortunately, they decided not to do that.

But I know very clearly the friends that I was with—the friends I was with, people my age, and there's a lot of baby boomers out there that take their hot rods very seriously and they respect the law. They respect cruise night. They like to be able to go down Portage Avenue at a leisurely pace, and I know the Minister for Mines and Energy, we went actually on the shrine ride, and the member from Steinbach was on there. And we went down Portage Avenue, we ended up out at the Pony Corral. And what a great night it was, and I can tell you that what we talked about, even those, was safety. We talked about safety and making sure that all people are safe. And you know what? We all know, anybody that's been down Portage Avenue around on cruise night, what we see very clearly is people love to be able to sit and watch, drink that little can of Pepsi or Coke or Diet Coke or a glass of water, whatever it might be, just to sit there and listen to the hot rods as they run down the street, idling down the street. But whenever we want to make sure that it—that they're safe, as well.

So, whenever we're talking about safety in regards to this particular bill, we want to make sure that we have the best legislation. It's unfortunate the government decided not to take advantage of that amendment, not to take advantage of the opportunity to strengthen the bill, make it really what it should have been, and they missed that opportunity.

So, with that, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on Bill 23?

House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Question before the House is Bill 23, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Increased Sanctions for Street Racing).

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

* * *

Mr. Speaker: Now, I believe that concludes—the honourable Government House Leader, on House business?

House Business

Hon. Jennifer Howard (Government House Leader): Yes, on House business. Mr. Speaker, would you please call concurrence and third readings on bills 204, 208, 209 and 211.

CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS—PUBLIC BILLS

Mr. Speaker: We'll now proceed to call concurrence and third reading of public bills, starting with Bill 204, followed by bills 208, 209 and 211, and we'll start with Bill 204, The Manitoba Human Trafficking Awareness Day Act.

Bill 204—The Manitoba Human Trafficking Awareness Day Act

Ms. Melanie Wight (Burrows): I move, seconded by the member from Selkirk, that Bill 204, The Manitoba Human Trafficking Awareness Day Act; Loi sur la Journée manitobaine de sensibilisation à la traite de personnes, reported from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Ms. Wight: I really just wanted to say thank you to all of the groups here that have stood together on this particular bill, and I'm hoping that will continue into this reading so that it will end up passed unanimously. I think we all agree that human trafficking is a growing problem around the world, not just in countries far away, but right here in Manitoba, and I believe that we are all standing

together to see awareness for this problem grow in our province. Thank you so much.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on the bill?

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to rise to support this legislation. I think it is critical that we bring greater awareness to the problem of human trafficking, which much as we might like to believe that it does not occur here, is still occurring. And that part of what needs to be done is a greater awareness so that the general public is not only aware, but people who are in at-risk situations can be aware of the problems and what they can do to prevent themselves from getting involved in human trafficking on—from whatever angle. It's clearly something that we need to pay attention to here and, of course, it's a global issue too. But let's focus on doing the best that we can here in Manitoba. I want to thank the MLA for St. James—

An Honourable Member: Burrows.

Mr. Gerrard: —Burrows for bringing this forward and pleased that we have this legislation and look forward to having the first day next year. I think that in this case, you know, I hope that the MLA for Burrows will look at working with members from other parties in terms of organizing an event that could draw some particular attention to the problem of human trafficking and make some progress in creating the awareness and addressing it. Thank you.

Mrs. Bonnie Mitchelson (River East): I just want to stand and briefly put a few comments on the record on Bill 204; it is, I believe, The Manitoba Human Trafficking Awareness Day Act, which was brought forward by the member from Burrows. And I want to say that's—it's great to see private members' bills passed in this Legislature. I know we have a few that are passing this session. And this is one that I believe all parties, all members of the Legislature, regardless of political stripe, can stand united and say, yes, we need to create an awareness; human trafficking is not acceptable in society. We need to be working and ever vigilant to try to ensure that we can stamp out the issue of human trafficking, and when we create the awareness and look at a specific day that can educate the public, I think it's extremely important.

So I want to thank the member for Burrows and the member for River Heights and also my caucus for their support. I know, regardless of political stripe, at the federal level, at the city level, and now at the provincial level, we can all stand together and

say: Let's work to make sure that human trafficking is on the decline, not on the incline. Thank you.

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): I, too, want to join in the celebration of passing of Bill 204 and thank the member from Burrows for bringing this legislation forward.

As a man, a husband, a father of a daughter and granddaughters, I can tell you how important it is for all members, for all Manitobans, for all of Canada and for, of course, all the world, how important it is to bring awareness in regards to safety. And whenever we can do that, as members of this Legislative Assembly, I think that's a step in the right direction.

So we're very pleased to be part of that. I know anytime I talk to my children about safety and making sure that, in fact, that they are always in the safe hands of wherever—whoever they're with. And whenever we can put more awareness out there, I think that's really imperative that we be able to do that.

So, with that, we're certainly pleased to stand and put our support behind this particular piece of legislation and congratulate all members of the House for caring enough to make sure this legislation moves forward.

Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood): I, too, want to echo the comments of my colleagues and to give credit to the member for Burrows for bringing this issue forward and this private members' bill forward.

Certainly, creating awareness around human trafficking is, I think, something that is critically important. I was very thankful that the government supported a private member's bill I brought in a couple of years ago on creating the sexual assault awareness week, and the intent behind all of that is that we need to talk more about these issues.

There are too many people that find these issues very difficult to believe occur. In terms of sexual assault, we know that a lot of people don't come forward because of the—what they feel is a stigma attached to it or the blame that could be brought upon themselves, you know, for a sexual assault, and I think—in fact, the statistics show that the majority of women particularly don't come forward with sexual assault because of the shame and the blame and I suspect that the numbers of men could even be higher, in terms of those that don't come forward, if they were sexually assaulted, because of what that makes them feel like.

* (17:30)

So anytime we can create awareness around these events—and I think this is one time that parliamentarians, legislators, have a chance to really make a difference. And I'm pleased to see this one.

Certainly when I was with Child Find, we dealt with a number of issues around child abuse, child sexual exploitation. It was incredibly difficult to comprehend that these types of things were happening to, particularly, children. But it happens to children, to teenagers, to women, to men. It is something that is absolutely abhorrent and it still continues.

The one thing that I have become much more aware of, too, through social media and through my involvement with Commonwealth Women Parliamentarians, is the scope of the problem on an international level. And it really is alarming, you know, in terms of some of the countries—and Canada's in there too. Our numbers may not be as bad as other countries, but there are huge, huge issues around this.

In fact, the other day there was a case that was blown wide open of trafficking in the United States, and it was—the numbers were hard to believe. And so, we can't ignore it, because by ignoring it, it is not going to move that problem away. And I think we do need to do more around the area of creating awareness around—of sexual assault and certainly in the area of human trafficking. I think we have to continue the fight. I know the federal government is strongly moving in the direction, and we should be. The training ground I had at Child Find in some of these issues has certainly created an incredible awareness in myself about the horrible, horrible challenges that children and adults can face in any of these situations.

So fully supportive of the member for Burrows (Ms. Wight) bringing this forward, and would look forward to working with her on any way of moving it forward. Thank you.

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): I appreciate the member bringing forward this private members' bill. I'm glad that it's reached the third reading stage and will shortly be passed out of third reading and, I assume, receive royal assent tomorrow.

It is an important issue and it's an important topic, and it's one that there needs to be as much attention brought to as is possible.

I want to commend the federal government for the initiatives and steps they've been taking on this issue. Also, in particular, the Member of Parliament for Kildonan-St. Paul, who, for many years, has been championing the issue of awareness and sanctions for human trafficking. She was bringing forward this issue at a time when many Canadians, anyway, were not aware of the issue and not aware of its significance as it pertains to Canada in particular.

I know in speaking with her over the years as she's gone forward on this issue, in the early stages of that campaign, she often heard from Canadians who associated human trafficking as an issue that happened in other countries other than Canada and other than western-hemisphere countries. And I know that for 'hurrows', real passionate—she learned that it is an issue, obviously, that is global and it's not confined to any one country and it is happening in Canada.

And I've become more aware on the issue of new Canadians and immigration, where we've seen situations and I've heard of situations where new Canadians are often brought to Canada with the support of individuals, and then those individuals, who had less than honourable intentions to begin with, have individuals who come to this country put into the sex trade. And they give them the indication that they essentially control whether or not they stay in Canada or not, that they somehow have the authority to remove them from Canada if they don't participate in the sex trade, Mr. Speaker.

And for many who are coming from different countries—and I know this personally in dealing with individuals who are dealing with immigration issues, and though they're primarily handled at the federal level but they do sometimes interact with our provincial office—that they are not always aware of how the system works here. And they're not aware that the immigration system isn't based on fear or favour, that there's a system that's in place and that there's a series of things that have to be adhered to.

Often, in the experiences that they have of the countries that they call home, they're led to believe that it's who you know and it's which government official you know or which individual you know or which person you know that ultimately results in your success or failure in getting into Canada. And because there are so many people who want to come to Canada so desperately and leave the poverty and leave the circumstances of their home countries

behind, they're willing to do things that are unthinkable for most of us.

And so often that is held over their heads. Most often this—in this case, it would be women where they're told that if they don't enter the sex trade, then the individual who has put themselves out is somebody who has the right to have them deported or removed from Canada—continue on that path because they want to stay in Canada so badly.

And so the education is a big part of that, education in ensuring that the people who are coming to Canada understand that in this country that that is not how a person's citizenship—or that is not how a person's landed immigrant or any other status that they have—is determined and that there is absolutely no justification for those sort of threats and intimidation. That ultimately is what it is, Mr. Speaker. So education has to happen on that side as well.

I know that the RCMP have put in place a national strategy after comprehensive research, and I applaud the RMCP at their corporate level and also at the level of the individual officers who are working at that and who are implementing that overall corporate strategy. So the good news is that there's a lot of things that are being done in Canada now on the issue of human trafficking. The bad news is that there's a lot more work to do, and there's a lot more work in terms of education and awareness and enforcement, and I know that legislation can certainly be brought forward on the national level to increase enforcement on issues around human trafficking.

But we all have a role to play and I'm glad that this bill will become a law. It's a step. It's not something that will ultimately end up ending human—or trafficking in Manitoba, obviously, but it is a step. And I think education's an important step in this particular kind of crime and, in particular, when it comes to new Canadians or people who are unfamiliar with how Canada and it's immigration laws work.

So I look forward to seeing this bill pass third reading—there may be others who have comments as well who want to add them to the record—and then seeing it receive royal assent tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on Bill 204?

Seeing none, the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Question before the House is Bill 204, The Manitoba Human Trafficking Awareness Day Act.

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

* * *

Mr. Speaker: We'll now move on to Bill 208, The Universal Newborn Hearing Screening Act.

Bill 208—The Universal Newborn Hearing Screening Act

Mrs. Leanne Rowat (Riding Mountain): I move, seconded by the member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard), that Bill 208, The Universal Newborn Hearing Screening Act, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Speaker: Any debate?

Mrs. Rowat: It's indeed a pleasure to hear the words of the committee to move this back for third reading and move it forward, Mr. Speaker.

* (17:40)

There's so many families in Manitoba that have been following this issue and have been wondering why it has taken so long for this House, this government, to recognize the significance of hearing loss in infants and the need for further intervention for detection, Mr. Speaker. So I believe that 10 years is a long time, but I think that, moving forward, there will be a lot of children who will benefit from the test and actually benefit in life.

In a brochure that was presented at committee, I'm just going to read from it. It's the Hearing Foundation of Canada's brochure that was presented by Dr. Andrea Richardson-Lipon. And it says: Communicating with your baby is one of life's joys. Babies are individuals who grow at different rates and communicate in unique ways. As babies grow, their hearing, sight and voice develop into language skills that will affect every aspect of their lives with friends at play, in school and future success.

And, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is the significance of Bill 208, is to ensure that every child is given an opportunity to succeed and to excel in their lives, giving everybody an equal opportunity if

at all possible. And early detection of hearing loss is significant for newborns in a number of ways. We know that it affects their cognitive skills. We know that it can affect their learning, their self-confidence. There are so many reasons why we need to do this very simple test.

The effects of late identification are significant, of hearing loss. It's so detrimental to the well-being and development of a child that, if we continue to wait to implement this test, more and more children will fall further behind. And it's been noted by the World Health Organization and by Manitoba Speech and Hearing Association, more locally, that hearing loss is actually—it far exceeds the combined incidence of conditions for which newborns are routinely screened, such as congenital hyperthyroidism, PKU and other inborn errors of metabolism.

So we know that there are six out of a thousand children born in this province who have some type of hearing defect. And we know that just screening for at-risk children misses so many other children that have potential hearing loss.

I know that Pam Campbell, who runs the Central Speech and Hearing—I had a conversation with her a number of times, but it was interesting. Her daughter is hearing impaired and has a cochlear implant. But her daughter had a baby about a year and a half ago, two years ago, and so you would think that, because of her hearing loss, the mom's hearing loss, and her sister as well has a hearing loss, that she would've been automatically identified as a parent at risk. So that would mean that her child be tested automatically. Well, she wasn't, Mr. Speaker. She wasn't tested.

Her little girl was not tested, and that just goes to show that the reasons why we need a universal mandatory screening program is so that these types of situations don't occur, that children at risk are actually—are tested, and we have seen, based on, you know, statements in the House that there are individuals who have been missed.

I want to thank Pam Campbell and her staff at Central Speech and Hearing for providing me with as much information as possible and to continually support and respect the efforts that we were putting forward in the House to get this bill passed. I also want to thank Hannah Brown, who, I know, has talked to members on the government side as well as met with me, and she was in the Chamber when she

was 16 years old, a true advocate for universal newborn screening.

She was diagnosed at 14 months of age, and it was in Ontario. She was—her family were in Ontario visiting friends. And it—she was fortunate enough to have been diagnosed by a friend of the family who said, you know, I think Hannah has a hearing impairment; there seems to be something that's a bit off. So the family immediately went to—went—came back to Manitoba, made an appointment with the pediatrician, and, sure enough, at 14 months of age, Hannah was diagnosed with a hearing impairment and, within a few years, was—received a cochlear implant, and as she says, that she's enjoying life to its fullest. She has friends. She plays music. She participates in sports and believes that she has been given every opportunity to exceed in life and believes that—truly believes that this is a bill that needs to be passed and will be passed and will provide those opportunities for so many other children, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank Dr. Andrea Richardson-Lipon, who is an amazing audiologist and an amazing mom. She has been tireless in her efforts to get this bill passed and, I believe, has been a great resource for us in the Chamber and to Manitobans across the board because she has been willing to create brochures. She has taken our bill and taken it to Welcome Wagon events and promoted the need for this and has made sure that new moms or new dads know of this test and ask for it. So I want to thank her for that, and I think a lot of that effort that has been made in this House can reflect back on her.

So, and I also want to thank the member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson) who helped co-ordinate meetings and with her constituents who were strong advocates for this bill as well, Mr. Speaker. So I think, you know, mostly what I'm doing today is just thanking the people that have made a commitment to the importance of this bill, have made a commitment to ensure that this bill passes, and, as I said at committee to a number of the experts, I am committed to ensuring that we do move forward with regard to a universal newborn screening program in Manitoba. And I'll be working with them very closely and ensuring that we do have something in place.

Most unfortunate that we had to agree to an amendment to go to 2016, Mr. Speaker. It's something that I think a lot of Manitoba families

were disappointed to hear because I believe that through the member for River Heights, his advocacy and then following with mine and others within the Chamber, we've had 10 years to move forward on this and to hear that they need time to get their ducks in a row and to get the resources in place just shows to me that this government didn't make it a priority prior to us moving this bill forward. And I really, really believe that there is easily—could easily have been an effort made by this government to implement it sooner.

So, on that, I want to thank the member for River Heights for the work that he has done in this area. He's, obviously, a pediatrician and has seen first-hand on the medical side of things, how important this bill will be to Manitoba families.

I want to thank the members of the House for their support to Bill 08–208. I want to thank the House leader for her ear and for her consideration to agree to pass this bill, and I just think this is something that Manitoban families will be pleased that is in place. And we will be moving forward with healthy, happy and progressive children who will be able to participate fully through their lives. Thank you.

*(17:50)

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about this bill and to thank all the others in the Chamber for contributing to ensuring that this bill will be passed. I want to thank, particularly, the MLA for Riding Mountain. A number of years ago, Andrea Richardson—she was Richardson then, is now Dr. Andrea Richardson-Lipon—came to me and we drafted a private member's bill very similar to this one to implement universal newborn hearing screening, and then after Kevin Lamoureux decided to become a Member of Parliament, I'm pleased that the MLA for Riding Mountain took forth the challenge of becoming a champion of this bill, and so we have today the bill now at third reading and soon to be passed. But this is a happy day for us, but it's—the real winners here are children. And that's what we must recognize, that that's why we are here in the first place, and we recognize that the children are more important than all of us and that's why we're here.

Just to review a couple of things about why this is so critical. You know, there is a critical learning time in the first two to three years of life when children learn to recognize speech, to start to 'underspand' speech and to start developing a

capacity to speak themselves. And this critical period of life is so important that if it is missed, then a child will grow up having not heard the words perfectly or not heard them at all in a way that that part of her brain doesn't—or her—his brain doesn't develop adequately, and they can end up with a lifelong speech impediment, lifelong learning problems, lifelong problems with self-esteem. And, as we all know, that one of the limits—the limiting factors to children is making sure that they have the opportunity to develop that self-esteem and develop that learning and to do well in school.

At the committee stage, Dr. Darren Leitao told the story of a family that he had looked after and what a difference it made to diagnose—for a child diagnosed at age 2 versus one diagnosed at 4 and how rapidly the child diagnosed at 2 could learn and pick up and how much more difficult it was for a child at age 4, and the concern that the child at age 4 might never reach the same level as the child who had been identified at age 2. And, of course, as he mentioned, there was a child in that family who was a newborn or just going to be born—I can't remember exactly—but in that case, that child, identified early, would be even better in terms of learning. And so enabling children to be able to be recognized and diagnosed very early on is so critical, and it's particularly critical today because of the opportunities to treat and help children in this area and to enable them to hear well, whereas, you know, 20, 30 years ago, we were not able to do that because we didn't have the option of things like cochlear implants.

Certainly, one of the things and one of the reasons why this is perhaps particularly important is that in the attachment process in the first year of life, the sound is part of the critical attachment between a child and the parent, mother, father—people who are there with the child. And it makes a big difference in terms of how smoothly the attachment process goes. It's not to say that attachment can't happen without the ability to hear, but it just facilitates it and makes it easier and, as we well know, that that attachment period is so critical to a lot of things later on, the healthy development of children. And so that is another reason why this is important.

I want to say thank you to a number of people. I have already thanked the MLA for Riding Mountain. I want to thank the people who presented at the committee hearing. The MLA for Riding Mountain has mentioned people like Pam Campbell, Hannah Brown, the MLA for River East, who have

contributed to this. I want to thank the House leaders. We came to some—and through—some fairly difficult negotiations to get this session completed. And it took a lot of hours and a lot of debate, and, you know, we were down to one item, and that was this bill and, you know, I said it was a deal breaker and I'm glad we got it solved, and I want to compliment the Minister of Health, all right, for finding a way to enable this bill to come through and to be passed. And so there are a number of us who have, you know, played important and let's, when things are going smoothly, compliment those who were involved.

As I said, this is a bill for children, and I think we can all be very happy that children will be the winners. Thank you.

Hon. Theresa Oswald (Minister of Health): Just to put a few comments on the record. I want to congratulate the efforts of many people in this Chamber who have worked to see this bill go through. I don't suppose it would be an enormous secret to you, Mr. Speaker, to know that from time to time daily the member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard) and I perhaps speak cross words to each other and come to cross purposes, but I do know how deeply he has cared about this issue in his professional life. And I hope I'm not overreaching here when I say I believe this journey for him has been personal, and I commend him for that. He has been very driven on this matter, and I know that the circumstances surrounding Mr. Lamoureux departing and the rules of this House on some levels was very challenging for the member.

And to the member for Riding Mountain (Mrs. Rowat), I believe she understands, at least it's my view, in many ways what was entrusted to her, and I think she's done a commendable job in advocating for universal newborn hearing screening, and so I congratulate her for that.

Certainly, I would also be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I didn't acknowledge the many other members, and I have no doubt, as I list them, I will miss people and I'll apologize in advance. But, certainly, the member for Charleswood (Mrs. Driedger) provided over the months some very good counsel to all members of this House on this matter, and she should be commended for that, as did the member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson). And I know there has been good counsel provided to many on this issue from the member for Fort Rouge (Ms. Howard), the member—at least to me, the member from St. James

and the member for Southdale (Ms. Selby) and so there are many people that have added their voices to the importance of these issues, not the least of whom also are our front-line providers, those people that are working with our babies and children and moms and dads and families every single day, and they are to be commended also. They are doing hard work that needs to be done in implementing this screening.

I think the amendments brought forward by the member for Riding Mountain will ensure that we can implement this in a fulsome way, in the right way, and ensure we always meet the best possible standards for this wherever they come from. Mr. Speaker, we know that 3,000 babies last year were the beneficiary of this kind of screening, and, as we move forward in partnership with our RHAs to make this truly universal, I believe indeed the children of our province will be the beneficiaries.

Members know that Manitoba has a very, very proud history on the subject of general screening for newborns. We're leaders in the nation on this and augmenting this by moving forward with more universal newborn hearing screening is only going to add to what I believe a number of third-party validators have said puts us in the ranking of first place across the board on our screening for newborns.

So I congratulate the members of this House that have cared deeply. I congratulate the parents that have advocated for this. I commend the people in our health system that will work to make this a reality as we go forward, and I think that the children of Manitoba will be better off.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

* (18:00)

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on Bill 208?

Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is Bill 208, The Universal Newborn Hearing Screening Act.

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

Mr. Speaker: We'll now proceed to call Bill 209, The Special Olympics Awareness Week Act.

**Bill 209—The Special Olympics
Awareness Week Act**

Mrs. Heather Stefanson (Tuxedo): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Spruce Woods (Mr. Cullen), that Bill 209, The Special Olympics Awareness Week Act; Loi sur la Semaine de sensibilisation aux Jeux Olympiques spéciaux, reported from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Speaker: Any debate?

Mrs. Stefanson: And I first off, I want to thank Simon Munday, the president and CEO of Special Olympics Manitoba. I mentioned in my—in second reading in my comments on this bill, Mr. Speaker, that the incredible job that he and the volunteers and athletes and families and friends of Special Olympics Manitoba do for people in Manitoba, and I just want to commend him for the work that he does and all the volunteers.

I also want to thank him for taking the time out of his schedule to be down here, in the gallery, the day we brought this forward in second reading and he was very moved and very appreciative of all members of the House working together on that fashion and making sure that this did move through to committee. But I also just want to comment on some of his comments that he brought forward in committee and I think that was a really important—it was very important what he mentioned in committee and I just want to take a moment and reflect on some of the things that he mentioned.

Because one of the most important things about this bill, and the reason why we felt strongly about bringing this bill forward, is that it proclaims the second week of June in each year as Special Olympics Awareness Week, Mr. Speaker, and I think there's a lot of people who maybe have a misunderstanding about what Special Olympics Manitoba is and what they do for our communities and I think often we think and we focus just on the athletes and that it's just about Olympics. But they do so much more in our communities and I know that—I know many of my colleagues have events in their communities that they attend, and I know members opposite have 'commu'—have events, Special Olympics Manitoba events, in their 'ri'—in their constituencies and they attend those events. And it's just so exciting to see the athletes and everything that

this incredible organization does for people with intellectual disabilities in our province. And so, again, I just want to thank Simon Munday.

And I also want to take the opportunity to thank Murdoch MacKay, as well, who's the past chair, honorary, of the board of Special Olympics Manitoba. Simon and Murdoch—I actually had the opportunity to sit on the Special Olympics Manitoba honorary committee and I have really enjoyed getting to work with the many fabulous members of that committee. And from that committee what came out of this is that Murdoch and Simon and I got together and decided what we needed to do to bring more awareness to the province, and more awareness to government and to MLAs and Manitoba Legislature about what it is that Special Olympics Manitoba does. And so I just want to thank them for spearheading it.

I also want to also mention the Minister of Housing, and I want to thank her for her involvement in bringing this forward to her caucus. That—it was great to be able to work with her on this and to ensure that all members of the Legislature, regardless of political stripes, could work together towards this important task of raising awareness of Special Olympics Manitoba in our province, Mr. Speaker. So I do want thank her.

I also want to thank her partner, Doug Stephen, who I have gotten to know quite well over the years and I've had a great opportunity to work with him. He also sits on the Special Olympics Manitoba honorary board of directors with me and so, he—this originally came up at one of the meetings and what a great idea we thought to come down to the Manitoba Legislature and have the opportunity to bring awareness, first of all, to all of us here about what it is that Special Olympics Manitoba does but so then we can go back to our communities and spread the word about this incredible organization. And so I do want to just—I do want to thank, again, the Minister of Housing and Doug Stephen for the idea that we—that the Minister of Housing and I should get together and work on this. And so we did have a great day here at the Manitoba Legislature and I know member—many of the members here were there and took part in it, and it was a great day, June 13th of this year—or, sorry, June 10th of this year, and it was a great kickoff to the games for this year, Mr. Speaker, and it was great to be able to work with all members of the Legislature towards bringing this—bringing awareness to Special Olympics Manitoba.

I know that—I want to also just mention Michelle Augert as well, because she is one of the Special Olympic athletes and she gave an incredible speech at the MLA reception that was held in the Golden Boy Dining Room, Mr. Speaker. And she spoke so eloquently, right from the heart and so well, and she really just—it was just very moving to listen to her and just listen to everything that this organization has done for her and for her family and for her friends. And I just thought it was great and I wanted to bring special mention to her because she is truly a remarkable woman, and she brings so much life to this organization. So I do want to thank her for everything that she does.

So, just in closing, I think this is a—it's an important day, I think, in the Legislature, where we're able to work together on bills that bring awareness to incredible organizations like Special Olympics Manitoba. And I look forward to working together with members opposite as we move forward.

I do know that Special Olympics Manitoba is looking forward to—on an annual basis—the—I know June—the second week of June each year will become Special Olympics Awareness Week, but I know that Special Olympics Manitoba would also like to have an annual event here at the Manitoba Legislature, and I can't think of a better way to spend a day here at the Manitoba Legislature than with the athletes and volunteers and parents of Special Olympics Manitoba. And so I look forward to working with members opposite to ensure that we can continue that tradition here in the Manitoba Legislature on behalf of the athletes and all those involved with Special Olympics Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I do just want to mention, as well, the mission of Special Olympics Manitoba. And the mission says, and I'm just reading from the brochure where it says, what is Special Olympics Manitoba. And it says, our mission is to enrich the lives of Manitobans with intellectual disabilities through active participation in sport. And it's just—again, there's so much that this organization does in all the different communities across this great province of ours, and I think that this awareness week will allow us the opportunity to visit some of those communities and visit the athletes within those communities and to work within those communities to bring more awareness around this province.

And I think it's a great place to start, to bring awareness, is right here at our second home. It has

become our second home in this summer at the Manitoba Legislature. But I just—it's—I think it's a great place to kick off the awareness of this incredible organization and so, again, I want to thank Simon Munday and Murdoch MacKay and Doug Stephen, the other members of our honorary board of directors who helped organize this as well. I'll just mention their names: Bob Sokalski, Barbara Bowes, Dave Brown, Dr. Raymond Currie, Senator Janis Johnson, Kim Orris, Joe Poplawski, Norva Riddell, Bob Vandewater and Gord Wimble. They've been a remarkable group to work with, and I look forward to working with them more as we move forward, and I'm really looking forward to this bill passing through royal assent tomorrow in the Manitoba Legislature.

Simon is very excited about this. He wants to be here and see the whole process through to the end and so he is—I'm going to try and keep in touch with him tomorrow to find out, maybe, what time it may be or whenever we do bring royal assent, whether it's tomorrow or later, Mr. Speaker. But I—he is really excited to come down here and watch the formal part of the process and see this bill pass through. And so I think it's exciting when members of the public come down and see what we do here in the Manitoba Legislature and how it affects their individual organizations.

* (18:10)

And so, again, I just want to thank Simon and Murdoch and all the others who are involved with this great organization.

And I look forward to the years ahead where we can ensure all of us, collectively, here in the Manitoba Legislature as MLAs, that we bring awareness to our own communities across this great province of ours, Mr. Speaker, of what Special Olympics Manitoba is. Thank you.

Hon. Jennifer Howard (Minister of Family Services and Labour): I want to thank the member for Tuxedo (Mrs. Stefanson) for bringing this bill forward, and I want to thank her for the work that she did to have the Legislature be able to host the kickoff to the Special Olympic Games.

It was a really great day here at the Legislature. It was a lot of fun but also inspiring to get to meet the athletes. And I do hope, as she's mentioned, that that can become a regular feature of our time here at the Legislature, happening as it does, in June. And, who knows, perhaps next year it will happen in June,

and it will be one of the last events that happen in our time together here in the Legislature.

I did just want to briefly reflect on the important work of Special Olympics and the important work that is being done by families all over the country, especially families who have children who may have disabilities.

And I want to briefly speak about an opportunity I had to go and visit with families at the Canadian association for parents who have children with Down syndrome. They were holding their convention here in Winnipeg, and I had the opportunity to go and speak and meet with them.

And I shared the stage—unfortunately for me, but fortunately I got to hear her speak—I shared the stage with Lauren Potter, who, as some members will know, plays Becky on Glee. And, of course, she was speaking to an audience of families, but also children and young people who have Down syndrome. So nobody cared particularly who I was or that I was there, just that I was in the way of them getting to hear from Lauren Potter. But I did get to sit at her table. And, of course, she was very popular with the young people that were there. They brought her flowers. They wanted her autograph. She was a bit, I think, overwhelmed by the movie-star treatment that she was getting.

But she gave a very passionate speech about what her life has been like, how, you know, she had been told at every stage of her life that you can't do that, you can't do this, no, I know you want to be an actor but you'll never get to be an actor. And she talked about moving through that and triumphing.

And she also talked about a campaign that she is involved with and many families were involved with there. It's a campaign called Spread the Word to End the Word. And it's a campaign aimed at educating people, and young people especially, about the damaging effects of using words that refer to people with intellectual disabilities, and words that are commonly used, unfortunately, still today in schoolyards and among adults, who sometimes unknowingly are using a word that is very disrespectful and damaging to people who have intellectual disabilities. So she gave a great speech about that.

In this session, of course, I've been privileged to hear from many families who also want to share their experiences and their support for that campaign and their support for doing that kind of work, to educate

all of us, that our words do have power and do have meaning. And especially, as leaders, they have incredible power and meaning, and that we can all sometimes take a moment to learn and reflect on the words that we choose, and the words that they use, and sometimes the unintended consequences of those words.

So I do want to thank, again, the member for Tuxedo (Mrs. Stefanson) for her work on bringing greater awareness to the terrific work that Special Olympics does, not only the work that it does for the athletes that participate, but, really, as an organization that all of us, I think, can be inspired by and can learn from, and can motivate us.

I found one of the most interesting things for me attending the reception at the Legislature was when a couple of athletes asked me what sports I enjoyed doing. And I did not have a list at all. And they talked to me about how much they enjoyed track and field. And I got to say, it was a good reminder for me that physical activity is something that's important. And I looked at them and thought, you know, if these young people can go out there and compete and can take part and can participate even when, I'm sure, in their lives, people have told them they can't do that, then, really, all of us should be taking those steps. Even when sometimes we feel like we may be made fun of when we show up in the sporting arena—

An Honourable Member: House leaders floor hockey league.

Ms. Howard: Excellent, yes; I would prefer arm wrestling but if we had only come up with this a few months ago.

But, just in closing, Mr. Speaker, I do again want to thank the member for Tuxedo (Mrs. Stefanson) for the work that she's doing with this very worthy organization, and I'm pleased that we're able to pass this bill.

Mr. Cliff Cullen (Spruce Woods): I just want to put a few comments on the record regarding Bill 209 today, Mr. Speaker.

I do want to acknowledge the member for Tuxedo for bringing forward this important legislation and certainly a privilege for me to be able to second this bill. And I do want to thank all the members of the Assembly for the positive comments they've made in regard to this legislation and the ability that we will have to bring this bill to fruition tomorrow and at royal assent.

I do want to speak very highly of the people over at Special Olympics and all the great work they do. And, Mr. Speaker, as you know Manitobans certainly are a province and a community of volunteers. And Special Olympics is certainly a great organization which has a tremendous amount of volunteers, and they are volunteers that come from all areas of this great province of ours to help that particular organization with a goal in mind to help all those that are involved with Special Olympics.

So I do want to acknowledge all the members that are part of the organization itself, certainly all the volunteers that spend their time, certainly the athletes that are involved and, also, of course, the coaches that are sometimes the unsung heroes in all this.

Mr. Speaker, the—I know the House leader—Government House Leader talked about it briefly about the athletes involved in this and participating in various events in Special Olympics. And I've, you know, heard the comments, too, back in June, and a lot of the families were commenting on about how their children and the athletes got them involved in participating in sport as well. So, certainly, there is some opportunities for all of us to become engaged in sporting activities, and certainly those athletes were having a positive impact on their families, as well, where their families were partaking in those various activities and the training that goes along with sport.

It certainly is encouraging to see those athletes participate in events across Manitoba. A lot of Manitoba—a lot of those athletes go on to represent Manitoba and they represent Manitoba across Canada, Mr. Speaker. And even from there, many of our Manitoba athletes get to represent Canada on a broader level and the opportunity to go to world competitions, and that is something that's an opportunity for those athletes and for those families to see the rest of the world as well.

I certainly want to commend those that do the fundraising work associated with the Special Olympics in the various regions across the province, I think it's very important work that those individuals do as well.

Mr. Mohinder Saran, Acting Speaker, in the Chair

I hope with this passing of this bill that it will provide a further awareness to all Manitobans of the great work that's going on at Special Olympics and hopefully this will help some of the fundraising

activities that are taking place on an ongoing basis around the province. And, hopefully, our part to pass this legislation will help the activities of Special Olympics and for all the good work that they're doing there for the goals they have before them. And I think it's very important, too, that we have this legislation there to provide that framework, and we certainly want to acknowledge the good work that they do there at Special Olympics.

With that, I would hope that all members of the House will certainly pass on the good word about this legislation and encourage members in their communities to get involved with the good work that Special Olympics does as well.

With that, I thank you very much for the opportunity.

* (18:20)

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): I rise to support this bill which is an important recognition and positive step.

It—let me tell a couple of stories which kind of illustrates how far we have come with children with conditions like Down syndrome. Tell you the story of a pediatrician in Québec, as it happens, who had a child, and I think it would've been in the 1940s or 1950s, and he was, as he was going through training, led to believe, as was the custom at that point, that if you had a child with Down syndrome, that that child would be put in an institution and that that really was the best that could be done with a child with Down syndrome.

Now, fortunately, he was able to, when he, himself, and his wife had a child with Down syndrome, he was able to talk to somebody who persuaded him otherwise. And so, instead of their daughter going into an institution, they looked after her in their home, and she grew up, you know, much like most children with Down syndrome grow up today, very much being able to develop and reach their potential, whether it's in athletics or in other areas. The—I recall it probably would have been in the 1960s when she was, at that point, independent, you know, had a part-time job, was riding the bus or the Metro in Montréal at that point, and she was doing, you know, amazingly well for a child who almost had ended up in an institution.

It's interesting not only what a difference this has made to children with Down syndrome, but, as we have grown up more and more with children around us and in families with Down syndrome, that we are

becoming much more sensitive and understanding and knowledgeable about children who have intellectual disabilities.

I tell the story of another pediatrician, as it happens, who had a brother who has Down syndrome. And he grew up, and he told me later on that for most of the time of his childhood he just believed that everybody had a brother or sister with Down syndrome, that this was just the way it was and that a child, you know, with Down 'sysrome,' this was just a normal part of life and, you know, we helped and worked with and make sure that children were incorporated into the everyday activities and lives that we all have. And I think that said a lot of in terms of the progression, and now it is so wonderful to see children being able to participate in Special Olympics and achieve what 50 or 60 years ago nobody would have ever believed could be achieved.

And I think we have to be very thankful for that, and I want to recognize the work that the MLA for Tuxedo is doing and thank her for bringing forward this bill and as we move forward together in passing and implementing this. Thank you.

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): This bill is long time coming. And I can assure all members of the House that it's a great thing that what we did in passing this legislation, and I thank the member from Tuxedo for bringing it forward.

Simon Munday is actually a personal friend of mine, and I can stand very proudly and say that the work that he does is phenomenal. I know that he works at it tirelessly, and, whenever these athletes get together and compete, it's a—when they're competitive enough to realize that they want to strive to do their best. And every time they get forward the opportunity to compete—in fact, I've helped out a number of those various organizations, tournaments, meets and that type of thing—I can tell you how important it is. And so, whenever we can draw more awareness to it, it's that much better, and this is just one of those small steps.

But at the end of the day, it's really about those people with disabilities. And everybody in this Chamber has someone they know that has disabilities. We can relate to those people that are less fortunate than us in some ways, but they're also—some of them are gifted more than what we give them credit for. And this awareness week is certainly going to be something that's so important.

Mr. Rob Altemeyer, Acting Speaker, in the Chair

In fact, just last Friday, I had the opportunity to meet with the Manitoba Trucking Association, and they're having an event whereby they're having a convoy with Special Olympics people. I think last year they had something like 114 trucks, whereby they had the Special Olympics athletes jump in some of those trucks and run along with them, and, amazingly, they raised a lot of money as well. I can't remember the exact dollar but it was well over \$65,000, almost—maybe \$80,000. Their goal this year is to see that it increases even more than that.

So we have a lot of advocates out there that believe in Special Olympics. It needs to be supported to its fullest. I know there's other events around the province that—where they raise money and awareness. And at the end of the day, the No. 1 thing that we need to keep in mind, as I said before, is those less fortunate, those Special Olympians that go out.

And I remember I talked about this when the member from Tuxedo brought the bill forward. One of my constituents from Balmoral, Todd Wenzoski, had the opportunity to go out to Nova Scotia and compete at the curling championships, and he ended up winning it. And I can tell you how proud he was to represent Manitoba. And every time these athletes have an opportunity to go out and participate in these events, it's a proud feeling, a proud moment, that whenever those athletes are competing, that they're representing not only their community but their friends, their colleagues that they become friends with—same as every other event that takes place at a so-called normal level.

And I can tell you, whenever I watch any of the events, I'm just so inspired of their ability to be able to do some of these events and I—how in the world—how in the world—can they be so gifted, so talented. And it just brings that chill in your spine and makes you feel so proud for those individuals that put their life—and I have another constituent that lives in Stonewall. She's a runner. And I remember when she first started and I was involved with her, and she was in a relay race at the University of Manitoba—I believe it's the Buhler Centre—is that where the indoor track there, or one of those—but anyway, it was the University of Manitoba, and she was competing in the event for the first time. And she took off with her baton to hand it off to the next runner. She went right on by him. She said, I'm not going to hand it off yet; I'm not tired. What she didn't realize is that was part of the race, but she learned that very quickly, and I can tell you that she became

very competitive ever since then. And whenever she got to her next event, she was actually starting to coach others to make it that much more efficient for those Special Olympians.

And I know that all of us have stories we can share. But at the end of the day, the No. 1 thing about this bill is all members of the House should be very proud of the fact that they made this legislation possible. Yes, it was brought forward by the member from Tuxedo. And all members of the House have that opportunity to stand proud and recognize those people less fortunate than others. So we're certainly pleased to see that and looking forward to tomorrow for the next celebration of it receiving royal assent.

Thank you.

The Acting Speaker (Rob Altemeyer): Seeing no further members looking to debate the motion, is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Rob Altemeyer): Question before the House is concurrence and third reading on Bill 209, The Special Olympics Awareness Week Act.

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

* * *

The Acting Speaker (Rob Altemeyer): Up next, we have Bill 211, The Personal Information Protection and Identity Theft Prevention Act, standing in the name of the honourable member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Ewasko).

* (18:30)

Bill 211—The Personal Information Protection and Identity Theft Prevention Act

The Acting Speaker (Rob Altemeyer): Recognizing the honourable member for Lac du Bonnet—no?

Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Lac du Bonnet): I move, seconded by the member from La Verendrye, that Bill 211, The Personal Information Protection and Identity Theft Prevention Act; Loi sur la protection des renseignements personnels et la prévention du vol d'identité, reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Ewasko: Well, as we're seeing Bill 211 coming to fruition, it has been a long time coming, Mr. Acting Speaker, and, first of all, I would like to recognize the hard work of our past MLA from Morris, Mavis Taillieu, who I know had put a ton of hard work, and she was persistent in seeing this bill try to move it forward. She tried that for about eight years. I know back in 2004 another set of accolades must go out to Mr. Brian Bowman, who is a renowned privacy lawyer in the city. I know he had assisted Mavis in developing the bill and with the idea way back in November 2004, as I mentioned earlier, nine years ago—basically, since I had taken over for Mavis in the portfolio of Culture, Heritage and Tourism, as far as the critic goes, she had passed me the bill in last year—last October, 2012, and she had asked if I would—wanted to put the bill in my name and see if I would be willing to put it in my name and move it forward or try to move it forward, because she had attempted this, like I said, for about eight years and now it's coming—it's just shy of its ninth anniversary, and it's sort of, you know, when I first looked at the bill I thought, I couldn't quite understand why this bill had not been passed or, if at the very least—or if at the least, stolen by the NDP government side because it is such a good bill.

We know that identity theft is increasing. Absolutely every day we can open up the newspapers from—throughout the—not only throughout the province, throughout the country, throughout the world, Mr. Acting Speaker, and we see that it is definitely increasing and we know that identity theft is a fairly easy crime to prevent. Basically, if we can prevent information from being stolen, then there can be no crime. We know that other provinces—Québec, BC and Alberta—had similar legislation in the past, and this would bring—this legislation is going to bring Manitoba right in line with some other provinces, and we're being proactive on this issue of identity theft.

Now privacy, as I mentioned the other night in committee, is a legal right and many believe that it's a fundamental human right, Mr. Acting Speaker. It just seems to be prudent, good practice and in the public interest to ensure that the requirements of Manitoba's privacy legislation are better known, more fully considered and more systematically applied than is now the case.

I know another type of identity theft prevention is radio frequency identifier chips. But, Mr. Acting Speaker, these chips basically can be read from various distances, which enable criminals who

purchase simple scanner online to read the information on the chip. If the chip contains personal information or links—or links the individual to information in a database, that person's privacy can be compromised. And so with this legislation, that can now be a protection—or for those Manitobans.

Within the last nine years, we have seen the member from Morris, the ex-member from Morris, Mavis Taillieu, try to bring this forward and fill a gap in privacy legislation by making this a made-in-Manitoba law, which basically is similar to the federal PIPEDA a—PIPEDA law, but it just takes it that much farther, Mr. Acting Speaker. It does fill that gap and it extends coverage to all Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

An example of how this can possibly be the RFDI—or RFIDs can be used, which is the radio frequency identification chips, Mr. Speaker, is that instead of at various food chain restaurants, instead of filling out or punching time cards, hundreds of employees can basically just place their hands on a hand punch. This device automatically takes a three-dimensional reading of the size and shape of the employee's hand and verifies the user's identity in less than one second.

Now, what this bill—this legislation is going to do, it is going to prevent companies that might have that type of technology in their system or in their use, Mr. Speaker, instead—just in case a company by any chance wants to use that information and then take a look and check on a certain employee's, say, criminal record, this legislation puts it into place, where they cannot use it for anything other than what it was intended to do.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, British Columbia, Alberta and Québec have each enacted legislation that is substantially similar to Bill 211, that essentially replaces PIPEDA in those provinces. The legislation had been ignored by this government for a very long time and it—and I'm encouraged and thankful to see that the hard work of Mavis, and the hard work of our side, basically, able to move this legislation into passing through third reading this afternoon and seeing it passed later on tomorrow.

So I thank you for the opportunity to put the words on the record, Mr. Speaker, on Bill 211.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I want to talk briefly on Bill 211.

First of all, I want to congratulate the member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Ewasko) in successfully getting this legislation to this stage, and it will be good to see it implemented.

Personal information should be personal and there should be restrictions on when personal information is collected and in how it is used. That's pretty broadly recognized now with what is happening in the digital world in which we live and with the ease with which personal information can be collected by scanning. As somebody walks by, if your credit card is not shielded by Google, of all things, as they were going down a road taking pictures but also collecting, it appears, a lot of personal information and data.

*(18:40)

And certainly it is timely and it is needed that we have this legislation here in Manitoba as it is present in a number of other provinces. It's important, as this legislation does, that for an organization covered under this act, that it's very clear that it is the organization, which is responsible for the personal information that it's in its custody and under its control and that the organization not only must recognize its responsibilities. But the organization must designate one or more people to be responsible for the ensuring that the organization complies with this act.

It is important, as this legislation does, that there is a requirement for individual consent, under almost all circumstances. There are certain times when consent may not be required but they are relatively few, and, clearly, it is spelled out, the importance of getting individual consent.

There are, in this this act, limitations to the extent that an organization may collect personal information, and that it may be only collected for purposes which are reasonable. And that, again, is appropriate and means that people cannot just go around collecting information for no purpose or for purposes which are not appropriate or reasonable.

Limitations on use are also important. Limitations on use of the information, again, must be for purposes which are reasonable and not, you know, just used for purposes just because the information is there.

There is a limitation on disclosure. Again, this is critical, because, again, it is important to specify that the information can only be disclosed in a way that is reasonable. And there are guidelines and so on, in

this act that will help organizations to collect and use personal information only as appropriate and only as described under this act.

It is important that there are sections which provide for some assurance of accuracy of information as well as the protection of the information. This is, you know, important. I think most of us have been—had an experience probably of inaccurate information being somehow collected. I got an urgent call today from somebody who had inaccurate information collected about him and he was very upset. And I think most of us would be.

So I think it is fitting and appropriate and needed that we pass this legislation, and I'm certainly in support of it.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on Bill 211?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: House ready for the question? Then the question is—oh, sorry, the honourable member for Steinbach, on Bill 211.

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): I'm often easily overlooked. I have no problem with that, Mr. Speaker. You know, one could say it hurt my feelings, but that will be a debate for tomorrow.

I—Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words in supports of this legislation and also echo some of the comments put forward by the member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Ewasko). I appreciate him taking on this particular bill and sponsoring it after the member for—former member from Morris had taken it on. And I know Mavis Taillieu, our former colleague, did a great job—did a great job in working and ensuring that this bill was made a priority.

Now, unfortunately, it's taken nine years. I think I heard the member for Lac du Bonnet say it has taken nine years for this bill. If this bill was a child, it would be entering grade 5, I think, Mr. Speaker; it's taken that long—taken that long for the government to see this as a priority. And that is, to use the phrase that the member for Dawson Trail (Mr. Lemieux) quoted for the member from—Minister of Health (Ms. Oswald), that is passing strange. It's passing strange that the government would take nine years to act on an issue of identity theft because we know that identity theft has been an issue for a long time, and I appreciate the fact that Brian Bowman, a privacy lawyer in Winnipeg, has been actively—who

are actively—been championing the—not this bill, but the issue, the issue of privacy and the privacy protection. And for all of us, it is something that is very, very important.

I think it's so important, I mean, it's—I think it's critical that all of us, in any way we can, demonstrate that we are in support of that. Not every member's had their opportunity to put their words on the record, but I certainly would like to see every member be recorded in supporting of this bill because it's that important.

I do think, in fact, that the issue of identity theft, it's an emerging issue. We know that it's not static. We know that it is always moving, that there are always different things that are happening when it comes to these sort of issues.

I do know, as well, Mr. Speaker, that maybe it's had a lot of different passions, in terms of information protection, and that showed up in a lot of different areas. Whether we're having discussions and debates about AIR MILES and the Liquor Control Commission and the privacy of that information, she was passionate about that and passionate about this particular issue, and also issues of privacy when it comes to information that's held within government. And so I always appreciated the fact that she would raise these issues.

And so, in many ways, I think, we want to share credit, if that's the right word. I know members don't do these sort of things for credit, per se, Mr. Speaker, but I want to share the credit between the member for Lac du Bonnet and the member for Morris—the member for Morris for starting this idea, for being persistent on it, and the member for Lac du Bonnet for continuing it on, for taking it up, for championing the cause. That is something that we appreciate him doing. We appreciate the fact that he's taken it on.

Now, I'm glad to see this bill's going to get royal assent tomorrow, and hopefully the government will take it seriously in terms of its implications and its enforcement. Too often we see bills that get passed and then they're not followed through on, on the necessary enforcement or regulation that go with bills. They sort of languish on the shelf, Mr. Speaker. But that is unfortunate. I think it's important that we not only pass the bill but that the dedication behind that bill is also contained within there.

So I certainly hope that the—that's the case when it comes to this government, that they're willing to do their best in terms of ensuring that this bill will be

enforced and will be something that will be a protection for many Manitobans. All of us have heard the stories. We've all heard the stories of people who've had their credit cards skimmed or the different sort of things when it comes to identity theft. And it is remarkably hard, once your identity has been assumed by somebody else, to obtain money. It's remarkably hard to change that around.

I used to work in the banking industry at the Steinbach Credit Union, and I know, from personal experience, in my experience in the financial institution—now, that was a number of years ago; so things have changed somewhat—but it was—I know it's still difficult to clean up your credit rating. You still get the phone calls from creditors because they assume that it was you that have done things and have not paid their bills. And that is a hard thing. That is a—the hard thing to clean up and to change, Mr. Speaker.

So I'm glad that we've sort of come to this point, but I am still troubled—troubled that it's taken this long to get here. And I wonder how many other people would've been protected, Mr. Speaker, if it'd been done in a different way, would've been protected if this bill had gone forward much, much sooner, and then we would've been able to build from that point where we're at, build up the legislation so that it would've had greater protection.

* (18:50)

I know there are other things that we could do, Mr. Speaker. I know that if we'd looked around, we could find other pieces of legislation when it comes to identity theft. But we spent nine years—nine years trying to get to this point, and, if we'd been able to have this bill pass nine years ago, can you imagine how we could've built on it? Can you imagine how things would've been improved? But we're only left to imagine, because we don't know because it's taken nine years to get to this point.

Now, I've often accused this government of not acting quick enough, but, even for me, this is surprising, Mr. Speaker. Even for me, I have a hard time believing that it's taken this long for this government to see this as a priority—

An Honourable Member: But it's such a great bill—said it was a great bill from the beginning.

Mr. Goertzen: Yes, and, you know, it was funny, because, you know, now you hear some of the government members talk about how it was a good bill. We've—we heard positive things over the last

number of nine years. Many of the people who spoke in favour of the bill on the government side I don't think are even there anymore. And, you know, you wonder—you wonder what their motivation is. In some ways, I might think it's spite against us as an opposition that they didn't want to pass it for nine years. But, on the other hand, they're not really spiting us. They're spiting the public, because the bill is intended to protect the public. It's not intended to protect us specifically as an opposition; it's intended to protect everyone. So it makes no sense to me. It makes absolutely no sense to me why this government wouldn't have brought this forward sooner and allowed it to pass, Mr. Speaker.

But now here we are. And so, hopefully, their lack of motivation for passing the bill isn't reflective of how they're going to treat the bill in the future. It isn't reflective of how they're going to build in the regulations or the enforcement. But I do think it's important that, because of that, because of the lack of clarity in terms of the government's motivation, that we—and we know clearly that every government member is dedicated to this bill and that they'll support this bill, that they won't just say on their words that this is something that they are expressing, but they actually will acknowledge that it's something that each of them individually support, because I've seen too many pieces of legislation where the government's given lip service to—it's passed through and then not much happened after that, Mr. Speaker, didn't have the sort of enforcement. So I look forward to this bill getting royal assent tomorrow. I look forward to it being in place to work for Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on Bill 211?

The House ready—the honourable member for Lakeside.

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): Yes, just very quickly, Mr. Speaker, I do want to go back in history just a little bit. I know that the member from Morris, Mavis Taillieu, brought this bill forward many, many times, and I know how passionately she spoke and the effort and the time that she, along with Brian Bowman, who's possibly one of the future mayoral candidates in the 2014 election, and I think that he'd probably be a good mayor, but time will tell whether or not he's going to get to that hurdle or not—but I can thank the member from Lac du Bonnet. I'd like to thank the government for their support of this particular piece of legislation.

I think it's time. I think it's time that we be able to have this discussion, finally, and look forward—look forward to the bill passing. We look forward to royal assent tomorrow, and I know I've had several conversations with the member from Morris, and she wishes us all well and she's very pleased, even though she's not here to take part in the celebration, but we will 'mak'—carry the message on to her and her and her family, and, of course, we'll make sure that accolades get back to her for her hard work and determination in order for this bill to pass.

So, with that, we're certainly pleased to see it finally get to the stage that it's at and thank the government for their support.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on Bill 211?

House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Question before the House is Bill 211, The Personal Information Protection and Identity Theft Prevention 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 support of the motion will please signify by saying aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In the opinion of the Chair, the Ayes have it.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Official Opposition House Leader): Recorded vote, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Recorded having been requested, call in the members.

Order, please.

The one-hour allocation for the ringing of the division bells has expired, and I'm instructing that they be turned off and we'll now proceed to the vote.

The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 211, The Personal Information Protection and Identity Theft Prevention Act.

Division

A RECORDED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas

Allum, Altemeyer, Bjornson, Braun, Briese, Caldwell, Chief, Chomiak, Crothers, Cullen, Dewar, Driedger, Eichler, Ewasko, Friesen, Gaudreau, Gerrard, Goertzen, Graydon, Helwer, Howard, Irvin-Ross, Jha, Kostyshyn, Lemieux, Mackintosh, Maguire, Maloway, Marcelino (Tyndall Park), Melnick, Mitchelson, Nevakshonoff, Oswald, Pallister, Pedersen, Pettersen, Robinson, Rondeau, Rowat, Saran, Selby, Smook, Stefanson, Struthers, Swan, Whitehead, Wiebe, Wight, Wishart.

Mr. Speaker: Will all those opposed to the motion, please rise.

None? That's it. Good job.

Deputy Clerk (Mr. Rick Yarish): Yeas 49, Nays 0.

Mr. Speaker: Motion is accordingly carried.

The hour being past 7 p.m., this House is adjourned and we will see all of you here tomorrow morning at 10 a.m.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, September 12, 2013

CONTENTS

Matter of Privilege		Member for St. Norbert	
Friesen	5009	Mitchelson; Howard	5031
Howard	5010	Diabetes Reduction Strategy	
		Gerrard; Rondeau	5032
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
Petitions		Northern Manitoba	
East Selkirk Sewage Lagoon Site–		Pettersen; Bjornson	5034
Environmental Licence		Speaker's Ruling	
Pedersen	5011	Reid	5034
Stefanson	5011	Members' Statements	
Graydon	5012	The Arden Seven	
Briese	5013	Melnick	5035
Cullen	5013	Curtis Gray	
Friesen	5014	Eichler	5035
Helwer	5014	Honouring Elaine Bishop	
Smook	5015	Chief	5036
Wishart	5015	Municipal Amalgamations	
Ewasko	5016	Briese	5036
Goertzen	5016	Manitoba Organization of Disc Sports	
Driedger	5017	(MODS)–25th Anniversary	
Eichler	5017	Altemeyer	5037
Mitchelson	5017		
Schuler	5018		
Provincial Sales Tax Increase–Referendum		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
Maguire	5012	<i>(Continued)</i>	
Committee Reports		GOVERNMENT BUSINESS	
Standing Committee on Human Resources		<i>(Continued)</i>	
Second Report		Report Stage Amendments	
Wiebe	5019	Bill 33–The Municipal Modernization Act	
Oral Questions		(Municipal Amalgamations)	
PST Increase		Briese	5038
Pallister; Struthers	5025	Lemieux	5039
Pallister; Howard	5026	Pedersen	5043
QuickCare Clinic (Selkirk)		Eichler	5045
Friesen; Oswald	5027	Gerrard	5045
Licensed Locum Positions		Graydon	5045
Friesen; Oswald	5027	Concurrence and Third Readings	
High-Risk Sex Offender		Bill 2–The Highway Traffic Amendment Act	
Helwer; Swan	5028	(Respect for the Safety of Emergency and	
Horse Racing Industry		Enforcement Personnel)	
Cullen; Struthers	5029	Howard	5056
Education Property Tax		Eichler	5056
Eichler; Struthers	5030	Gerrard	5057

Bill 10–The Correctional Services Amendment Act		Gerrard	5065
		Mitchelson	5065
Swan	5057	Eichler	5065
Helwer	5058	Driedger	5065
Gerrard	5058	Goertzen	5066
Bill 21–The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Impoundment of Vehicles– Ignition-Interlock Program)		Bill 208–The Universal Newborn Hearing Screening Act	
Swan	5059	Rowat	5067
Helwer	5060	Gerrard	5069
Gerrard	5060	Oswald	5070
Bill 23–The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Increased Sanctions for Street Racing)		Bill 209–The Special Olympics Awareness Week Act	
Swan	5061	Stefanson	5071
Helwer	5062	Howard	5072
Gerrard	5062	Cullen	5073
Goertzen	5062	Gerrard	5074
Eichler	5064	Eichler	5075
Concurrence and Third Readings– Public Bills		Bill 211–The Personal Information Protection and Identity Theft Prevention Act	
Bill 204–The Manitoba Human Trafficking Awareness Day Act		Ewasko	5076
Wight	5064	Gerrard	5077
		Goertzen	5078
		Eichler	5079

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>