

**First 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**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Constituency</b>	<b>Political Affiliation</b>
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
McFADYEN, Hugh	Fort Whyte	PC
MELNICK, Christine, Hon.	Riel	NDP
MITCHELSON, Bonnie	River East	PC
NEVAKSHONOFF, Tom	Interlake	NDP
OSWALD, Theresa, Hon.	Seine River	NDP
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
TAILLIEU, Mavis	Morris	PC
WHITEHEAD, Frank	The Pas	NDP
WIEBE, Matt	Concordia	NDP
WIGHT, Melanie	Burrows	NDP
WISHART, Ian	Portage la Prairie	PC

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, June 7, 2012

*The House met at 1:30 p.m.*

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

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### PETITIONS

##### Personal Care Homes and Long-Term Care—Steinbach

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

And these are the reasons for this petition:

The city of Steinbach is one of the fastest growing communities in Manitoba and one of the largest cities in the province.

This growth has resulted in pressure on a number of important services, including personal care homes and long-term care space in the city.

Many long-time residents of the city of Steinbach have been forced to live out their final years outside of Steinbach because of the shortage of personal care homes and long-term care facilities.

Individuals who have lived in, worked in, and contributed to the city of Steinbach their entire lives should not be forced to spend their final years in a place far from friends and family.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request the Minister of Health ensure additional personal care homes and long-term care spaces are made available in the city of Steinbach on a priority basis.

Mr. Speaker, this is signed by E. Butland, E. Dueck, E. Henzel and thousands of other Manitobans.

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

##### PTH 16 and PTH 5 North—Traffic Signals

**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:

The junction of PTH 16 and PTH 5 north is an increasingly busy intersection which is used by motorists and pedestrians alike.

The Town of Neepawa has raised concerns with the Highway Traffic Board about safety levels at this intersection.

The Town of Neepawa has also passed a resolution requesting that Manitoba Infrastructure and Transportation install traffic lights at this intersection in order to increase safety.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request the Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation to consider making the installation of traffic lights at the intersection of PTH 16 and PTH 5 north a priority project in order to help protect the safety of the motorists and pedestrians who use it.

This petition is signed by R. Smith, W. Zachowski, T. Unger and many, many, many more fine Manitobans.

### COMMITTEE REPORTS

**Mr. Speaker:** The honourable member for Rossmere.

**An Honourable Member:** Concordia.

**Mr. Speaker:** Oh, pardon me. Concordia.

#### Standing Committee on Human Resources Second Report

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

**Madam Clerk (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 June 6, 2012 at 6:00 p.m. in Room 254 of the Legislative Building.*

### **Matters under Consideration**

- **Bill (No. 2)** – *The Protecting Affordability for University Students Act (Council on Post-Secondary Education Act Amended)/Loi sur la protection de l'accessibilité aux études universitaires (modification de la Loi sur le Conseil de l'enseignement postsecondaire)*

### **Committee Membership**

- Mr. EWASKO
- Hon. Mr. KOSTYSHYN
- Mr. NEVAKSHONOFF
- Hon. Mr. ROBINSON
- Mrs. ROWAT
- Mr. SARAN
- Mr. SCHULER
- Hon. Ms. SELBY
- Mr. SMOOK
- Hon. Mr. SWAN
- Mr. WIEBE

Your Committee elected Mr. WIEBE as the Chairperson.

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

### **Public Presentations**

Your Committee heard the following twenty four presentations on **Bill (No. 2)** – *The Protecting Affordability for University Students Act (Council on Post-Secondary Education Act Amended)/Loi sur la protection de l'accessibilité aux études universitaires (modification de la Loi sur le Conseil de l'enseignement postsecondaire)*:

Jack Zupko, Private Citizen  
 Jennifer Black, Private Citizen  
 Bilan Arte, President, University of Manitoba Students' Union  
 Zach Fleisher, Private Citizen  
 Allen Mills, Private Citizen  
 Nicolas Audette, President, Local 38 University of St. Boniface Student Association  
 Mohamed Ammoumou, Canadian Federation of Student Manitoba  
 Pamela McLeod, The University of Winnipeg  
 Lloyd Axworthy, Private Citizen  
 Tyler Blashko and Nawal Tajdin (by leave), Private Citizen  
 Sharon Alward, University of Manitoba Faculty Association

Matt McLean, Canadian Union of Public Employees - local 3909

Kwesi Bruce, Private Citizen

Kyra Wilson, Private Citizen

Ashley Shewchuk, Private Citizen

Wendy Josephson, Private Citizen

James Beddome, Leader, Green Party of Manitoba

Monica Igweagu, Private Citizen

Irene Fubara-Manuel, Private Citizen

Jordan Poitras, Private Citizen

Kaleigh Krochak, Private Citizen

Cameron Monkmaa, Private Citizen

Theodoros Messinezis Zegeye-Gebrehiwot, Private Citizen

Paula Ducharme, Private Citizen

### **Written Submissions**

Your Committee received the following three written submissions on **Bill (No. 2)** – *The Protecting Affordability for University Students Act (Council on Post-Secondary Education Act Amended)/Loi sur la protection de l'accessibilité aux études universitaires (modification de la Loi sur le Conseil de l'enseignement postsecondaire)*:

Alexandra Dansen, Private Citizen

Lauren Bosc, President, University of Winnipeg Students' Association

Ericka Beaudry, Private Citizen

### **Bill Considered and Reported**

- **Bill (No. 2)** – *The Protecting Affordability for University Students Act (Council on Post-Secondary Education Act Amended)/Loi sur la protection de l'accessibilité aux études universitaires (modification de la Loi sur le Conseil de l'enseignement postsecondaire)*

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

**Mr. Wiebe:** I move, seconded by the honourable member for The Maples (Mr. Saran), that the report of the second committee-report of the committee be received.

### **Motion agreed to.**

### **Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development Second Report**

**Mr. Clarence Pettersen (Chairperson):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development.

**Madam Clerk:** Your Standing Committee on Social and Economic—

**Some Honourable Members:** Dispense.

**Mr. Speaker:** Dispense.

*Your Standing Committee on SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT presents the following as its Second Report.*

### **Meetings**

*Your Committee met on June 6, 2012 at 6:00 p.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative Building.*

### **Matters under Consideration**

- **Bill (No. 3)** – *The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Speed Limits in School Zones)/Loi modifiant le Code de la route (limites de vitesse dans les zones scolaires)*
- **Bill (No. 5)** – *The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Inter-City Bus Service)/Loi modifiant le Code de la route (service d'autobus interurbain)*
- **Bill (No. 10)** – *The Securities Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les valeurs mobilières*
- **Bill (No. 18)** – *The Affordable Utility Rate Accountability Act/Loi sur la responsabilisation en matière de tarifs de services publics abordables*
- **Bill (No. 20)** – *The Planning Amendment Act (Inland Port Area)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire (zone intermodale)*
- **Bill (No. 27)** – *The Insurance Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les assurances*
- **Bill (No. 31)** – *The Bilingual Service Centres Act/Loi sur les centres de services bilingues*
- **Bill (No. 32)** – *The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Powers of Traffic Authorities over Cycling Traffic)/Loi modifiant le Code de la route (pouvoirs des autorités chargées de la circulation à l'égard des bicyclettes)*

### **Committee Membership**

- *Hon. Mr. ASHTON*
- *Ms. BRAUN*
- *Mr. BRIESE*
- *Mr. DEWAR*
- *Mr. EICHLER*
- *Mr. HELWER*

- *Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX*
- *Mr. PETERSEN*
- *Mrs. STEFANSON*
- *Hon. Mr. STRUTHERS*
- *Mr. WHITEHEAD*

*Your Committee elected Mr. Pettersen as the Chairperson.*

*Your Committee elected Ms. Braun as the Vice-Chairperson.*

### **Public Presentations**

*Your Committee heard the following seven presentations on **Bill (No. 3)** – The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Speed Limits in School Zones)/Loi modifiant le Code de la route (limites de vitesse dans les zones scolaires):*

*Doug Dobrowolski, President, Association of Manitoba Municipalities*  
*Christian Sweryda, Private Citizen*  
*Charles Feaver, Bike to the Future*  
*Dr. Lynne Warda, Winnipeg Regional Health Authority – Injury Prevention Program*  
*Tom McMahon, Private Citizen*  
*Jon Giroux, Private Citizen*  
*Anders Swanson, Active and Safe Routes to School Program*

*Your Committee heard the following presentation on **Bill (No. 5)** – The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Inter-City Bus Service)/Loi modifiant le Code de la route (service d'autobus interurbain):*

*Doug Dobrowolski, President, Association of Manitoba Municipalities*

*Your Committee heard the following two presentations on **Bill (No. 18)** – The Affordable Utility Rate Accountability Act/Loi sur la responsabilisation en matière de tarifs de services publics abordables:*

*Gloria Desorcy, The Consumers Association of Canada - Manitoba Branch*  
*James Beddome, Leader, Green Party of Manitoba*

*Your Committee heard the following three presentations on **Bill (No. 27)** – The Insurance Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les assurances:*

*Frank Zinatelli and Gary Senft (by leave), Canadian Life and Health Insurance Association and Great West Life Assurance Company*  
*Lindsay Olson, Insurance Bureau of Canada*

Scott Feasey, IBAM – Insurance Brokers Association of Manitoba

Your Committee heard the two presentations on **Bill (No. 31)** – *The Bilingual Service Centres Act/Loi sur les centres de services bilingues*:

Daniel Boucher, Société Franco-Manitobain  
Phillipe Richer, AJEFM – Association des juristes d'expression française du Manitoba inc.

Your Committee heard the following two presentations on **Bill (No. 32)** – *The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Powers of Traffic Authorities over Cycling Traffic)/Loi modifiant le Code de la route (pouvoirs des autorités chargées de la circulation à l'égard des bicyclettes)*:

Charles Feaver, Bike to the Future  
Jason Carter, Sport for Life

#### **Written Submissions**

Your Committee received the following written submission on **Bill (No. 18)** – *The Affordable Utility Rate Accountability Act/Loi sur la responsabilisation en matière de tarifs de services publics abordables*:

Peter Miller, Green Action Centre

Your Committee received the following two written submissions on **Bill (No. 32)** – *The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Powers of Traffic Authorities over Cycling Traffic)/Loi modifiant le Code de la route (pouvoirs des autorités chargées de la circulation à l'égard des bicyclettes)*:

Dean Kriellaars, Private Citizen

Doug Dobrowolski, Association of Manitoba Municipalities

#### **Bills Considered and Reported**

- **Bill (No. 3)** – *The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Speed Limits in School Zones)/Loi modifiant le Code de la route (limites de vitesse dans les zones scolaires)*

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

- **Bill (No. 5)** – *The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Inter-City Bus Service)/Loi modifiant le Code de la route (service d'autobus interurbain)*

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

- **Bill (No. 10)** – *The Securities Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les valeurs mobilières*

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

- **Bill (No. 18)** – *The Affordable Utility Rate Accountability Act/Loi sur la responsabilisation en matière de tarifs de services publics abordables*

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

- **Bill (No. 20)** – *The Planning Amendment Act (Inland Port Area)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire (zone intermodale)*

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

- **Bill (No. 27)** – *The Insurance Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les assurances*

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

- **Bill (No. 31)** – *The Bilingual Service Centres Act/Loi sur les centres de services bilingues*

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

- **Bill (No. 32)** – *The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Powers of Traffic Authorities over Cycling Traffic)/Loi modifiant le Code de la route (pouvoirs des autorités chargées de la circulation à l'égard des bicyclettes)*

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

**Mr. Pettersen:** I move, seconded by the honourable member from Rossmere, that the report of the committee be received.

**Motion agreed to.**

#### **TABLING OF REPORTS**

**Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** I wish to table the report prepared in accordance with section 43(1) of The Fatality Inquiries Act.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have a report to table. In accordance with subsection 58(1) of The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act and subsection 37(1) of The Personal Health Information Act, I am pleased to table the annual report of the

Manitoba Ombudsman for the year ended December 31st, 2011.

### Introduction of Guests

**Mr. Speaker:** Prior to oral questions, I have—I'd like to draw the attention of honourable members to the Speaker's Gallery where we have with us today the Consul General for India, Ms. Preeti Saran.

On behalf of all honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

And also, in the public gallery we have with us from Sherwood School 23 grade 9—grade—it doesn't say—students under the direction of Mr. Edward Khinich. This group is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Concordia (Mr. Wiebe).

On behalf of all honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

And also, from Neil Campbell School we have 23 students under the direction of Mr. Alvin Dyck. This group is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway).

On behalf of honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Flooding Financial Compensation Consideration of Lawsuit by Claimants

**Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach):** What we have in Manitoba is a Premier who is known for saying one thing and then doing something else.

Before the last election, he said that he would not raise taxes on Manitobans; after the election, a record tax increase, Mr. Speaker. Before the last election, he talked about strengthening election laws; after the election, we found out that senior members of his Cabinet had actually broken those election laws.

But, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, most concerning of all is that this is a Premier who said something to flood victims: He said that they could expect quick and complete compensation. He said to them, we're all in it together.

Mr. Speaker, can he tell us, if he promised those things, why did 400 flood victims go to a meeting last night contemplating suing his government?

**Hon. Greg Selinger (Premier):** Once again, the member repeats the same aspersions in his preamble to his question.

The question is: What is being done for people that were victimized by the flood on Lake Manitoba? I can inform the House today that the payments now made available to all the flood victims in Manitoba are \$880 million. This is a largest payout that has ever been done in the history of the province of Manitoba. It provides a relatively rapid response to a tragic set of events on Lake Manitoba, and more work is yet to be done.

We've hired additional appraisers. We've hired additional staff to do the work of processing the specific claims that people are putting forward.

And if there is a case for somebody who's not satisfied with the compensation payment that they've received, they have the right to appeal it to an independent commissioner. The person is named Mr. Ron Bell.

**Mr. Goertzen:** Well, Mr. Premier—or Mr. Speaker, the Premier is trying to convince Manitobans and these flood victims that everything's okay. He's almost taking the words from the member for Interlake (Mr. Nevakshonoff): things could be much worse.

Well, I don't think they could be much worse. My experience, Mr. Speaker, is that 400 people don't go to a high school on a warm June night to talk about suing the government if things are going so well. That's not what people do.

Mr. Speaker, those in attendance at that meeting said that this government was dragging its foot on compensation. One individual said that he lost his entire property and not only was he not getting compensation, he had not even been contacted yet.

Mr. Speaker, when the Premier says that we're all in this together, doesn't he really mean, we're all in it together until the election is over, and then those flood victims are on their own?

**Mr. Selinger:** Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate the member from Steinbach takes such a cynical tone to a process that has put hundreds of Manitobans in an extremely difficult position.

And unlike any other government in the history of the province, we put forward, Mr. Speaker, for the first time ever, a compensation program for cottagers. We put forward unique programs not funded by any other level of government for people with respect to forage loss. We put forward unique programs not funded by any level of government, nor supported, even, by the members of the opposition,

for Greenfeed Assistance Program. We put forward a program for the spring blizzard livestock mortalities issue.

Mr. Speaker, there have been programs put in place unlike never seen before in the province of Manitoba.

\* (13:40)

**Mr. Goertzen:** Mr. Speaker, the Premier wants us to believe that everybody's happy with the programs that are in place, and yet 400 people go to a high school on a warm summer night to sue the government. He's simply ignoring the facts.

You know, I'll give him credit for something. When the Premier wants to move quickly, he can move quickly. When he wanted to find a soft landing for one of his former MLAs, he managed to make them the 50th–eighth MLA, Mr. Speaker. When he wanted to have a political stunt in the Legislature, he quickly got organized with his Minister of Immigration and had a big stunt here; that blew up, but he moved quickly. So he can move quickly when it involves his political friends or his political agenda.

The question is whether or not he could actually move quickly in keeping his promise, a promise he made to Manitobans affected by the flood before the election when he said, we're all in this together. Or does he only move quickly to help his political friends?

**Mr. Selinger:** Mr. Speaker, not only did we move quickly to put programs in place to support the people impacted by the spring flood, but we brought in programs never seen before in the province of Manitoba. And we have never had a declaration by the members opposite whether they support those programs and whether they think those programs should be covered under the disaster financial assistance program which is normally contributed to by the federal government.

So the members led by the member for Steinbach are really trying to have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. They want to pretend that they're on the side of flood victims, but they do not stand clearly for which programs they support. They do not make clear to this Legislature whether other levels of government should support those programs.

On this side of the House, we roll out the programs. We put our money on the table and then

we wait for the members opposite to clarify whether they even support that—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

### **Bill 217 Government Support**

**Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside):** Obviously, these programs aren't working. Otherwise, these 400 people would not have turned out for the meeting they did last night, Mr. Speaker.

This morning we debated my private member's bill, 217, The Portage Diversion Compensation Act. The purpose of this important bill was to compensate Manitobans who were so badly flooded by the operations of the Portage Diversion last year.

During the debate, the member from Interlake, who represents many of the flood victims around Lake Manitoba, had the audacity—had the audacity—to say, the private bill disgusts me and I will vote against it.

Mr. Speaker, does the First Minister share the 'ideaters' from the member from Interlake, or is he going to stand up for all Manitobans?

**Hon. Greg Selinger (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, what I saw was the member from Interlake working—what I saw was the member from the Interlake working seven days a week to aid the flood victims. I know the member doesn't want to face the facts, but the member from the Interlake—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** I'm having a great deal of difficulty hearing the response to the question that was posed by the honourable member for Interlake.

The honourable First Minister has the floor to respond to the question.

**Mr. Selinger:** Not only did I see the member from the Interlake out there helping people in his area, but he took a concern for all the people around Lake Manitoba, regardless of what constituency they're in, just like this government who brought in programs never seen before in the province of Manitoba.

And instead of waiting for other levels of government to decide whether they were going to fund them, we moved forward, Mr. Speaker, with funding in anticipation that the right thing would be done by other levels of government.

Even the members of the opposition have not, to this day, indicated whether they support those



programs and whether they should be funded by other levels of government. That's cynicism, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Eichler:** That was why we brought the bill forward this morning to debate it, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, what's truly 'disgustion' is the member—disgusting is the member from Interlake's disregard for victims of the man-made flood on Lake Manitoba. After all, this is the same member who had the First Minister stand up and apologize, saying, the situation could have been worse.

By passing Bill 217, they would ensure that those peoples whose lives and livelihoods are put on hold by the mismanagement of this government has to be accounted for.

I ask the minister again: Will he stand up for all Manitobans, pass Bill 217 or bring in something comparable?

**Mr. Selinger:** Mr. Speaker, it's very unfortunate that the member has to decide to attack a member that worked so hard to help the people on Lake Manitoba. It shows the level of debate that he wants to go on this tragedy.

The reality is, if the member is serious about his bill, he will indicate in the House in his next question whether he supports the programs for which the money has already flowed in Manitoba.

Does he support the \$880 million that has flowed out, and does he believe that other levels of government should support those programs? Or is he going to hide behind a bill for which he does not identify who should pay for it?

**Mr. Eichler:** Mr. Speaker, very clearly, I stand up for all the flood victims of Manitoba that deserve compensation, not rhetoric.

Those impacted by a loss lost part of themselves. These flood victims deserve fair compensation in a timely manner. Those people suffered incredible losses, both financially and emotionally, to help protect all Manitobans. We need to get to the plate.

Some of them are so frustrated that they're talking about suing the government. Nobody wins in a lawsuit, Mr. Speaker. We all know that.

Let's do the right thing. Let's bring in compensation. Let's look at what we've got to do to right this wrong. Let's do it today, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Selinger:** Mr. Speaker, it's interesting the member brings in a bill for compensation when \$880 million has flowed and he has not even—neither he nor any member of his caucus has indicated whether he supports the programs 100 per cent by the—funded by the people of Manitoba. That is hypocrisy.

It's very unfortunate. If the member's serious, let him stand up and say if he supports the programs we have already funded. Let him say whether there should be other levels of government that will support those programs. If he's serious about compensation, Mr. Speaker, ask whether those programs should be covered under the disaster financial assistance program. That's where the rubber hits the road.

### **Flooding Financial Compensation Consideration of Lawsuit by Claimants**

**Mr. Ian Wishart (Portage la Prairie):** Mr. Speaker, it would appear this NDP government has managed to antagonize yet another group of citizens they promised to help. Hundreds of flood victims around Lake Manitoba met last night to consider taking very serious step of suing this NDP government over its handling of the flood. As Dennis Turek of the Twin Lakes Beach flood action committee told CJOB today, people are frustrated. They're disappointed in their settlements they received, and they're simply had enough.

Mr. Speaker, can the minister responsible explain why it has so badly failed Lake Manitoba flood victims when they believe they now have no choice but to sue their own government?

**Mr. Speaker:** There appears to be members of the Assembly here today that want to have some private conversations. Might I suggest that they have a loge to my left and a loge to my right and perhaps outside the Chamber if they wish to have those conversations.

**Hon. Steve Ashton (Minister responsible for Emergency Measures):** I certainly appreciate, Mr. Speaker, any member of this House speaking out in terms of floods. I'm disappointed that members opposite seem to want to turn it into a debate.

Mr. Speaker, the member asked a question in terms of lawsuits. I don't know if he's referring to the people of the Grande Pointe area, who after the 1997 flood sued the government of the day, the Filmon government.

I can tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker. One thing you never heard from our Premier (Mr. Selinger) or any member of this government was any blame for anybody living in a flood plain, unlike happened in 1997.

So if the members want to debate these kind of issues in a political context, we can do that, but our focus is on the thousands of Manitobans who've been impacted. And thus far, we have invested \$880 million, \$700 million of which has gone directly to flood victims. That's the record.

**Mr. Wishart:** Mr. Speaker, Lake Manitoba flood victims are extremely frustrated by this man-made flood. They are frustrated by the level of bureaucracy it takes to make claims, frustrated by the turnover in staff processing the claims, frustrated by the delays in getting adjusted, and frustrated by the slow payments. They are frustrated by the lack of clear direction, the lack of leadership demonstrated by this NDP government in handling this flood.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this government again: Why has it driven Lake Manitoba flood victims to the point where they believe a lawsuit is the only alternative?

**Mr. Ashton:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what the member opposite is talking about in terms of a turnover staff. I visited the staff, the MASC staff in Portage. They've had exactly one person quit. They have people that drive in regularly from as far away as Brandon because they are committed to what we're committed to, which is getting assistance to the people that need it.

And I want to stress that 65 per cent of the applicants under all programs have received at least some form of assessment.

\* (13:50)

I'd like to remind the member—and he should know this, coming from his area—that we're still not even below flood level in some areas of the province. But notwithstanding that, Mr. Speaker, in 141 municipalities right now we're into cleanup as well. So we're working 24-7, just like we did in the flood, on the recovery stage.

**Mr. Wishart:** Mr. Speaker, I really don't know where he gets his information. I actually live in that constituency. I know most of those staff on a personal basis, and I do know the staff turnover has been horrendous there because they're deeply

frustrated with the lack of direction they've been getting from this government.

I'm very familiar with this lever of frustration, having experienced the Lake Manitoba flood victims living in my constituency. It's been a life-changing event for many of them. They've seen their homes, their cottages, and their farms badly damaged by this man-made flood. This artificial flood has exacted a heavy financial and emotional toll on flood victims for which it will take many, many years to recover.

This government repeatedly promised that the paperwork would flow seamlessly, the aid would flow very quickly, and the recovery process would go smoothly. These promises have not been kept. In fact, there's a very good comparison with the province of Québec, who had a flood about the same time and had their issues dealt with in eight weeks.

Mr. Speaker, will the minister responsible concede the flood victims' lawsuit is a sign this government has failed?

**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Speaker, you know, the member, clearly, is not looking at this fact. There was flooding in Alberta. There was flooding in Saskatchewan. There was devastating flooding just across the border in terms of Minot, North Dakota.

He may want to feed some sense, Mr. Speaker, that somehow this just happened, but it didn't. It was a major national event and that natural disaster impacted 141 municipalities. Many of those have been into cleanup for months. Many of them had payout through the DFA program. The flood around Lake Manitoba, Lake St. Martin and in around a couple of the other areas of the province has been historic. That will take longer.

But for him to make that statement, I think, is just a disservice to the many people, not just on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, but our staff, the municipalities that are working 24-7 on the recovery. And, yes, it's going to take time, but we will get Manitobans back to normal. That's our goal.

#### **Lord Selkirk School Division Bullying Incident**

**Mr. Cameron Friesen (Morden-Winkler):** Mr. Speaker, Manitobans were troubled to learn this week that on a recent school canoe trip, two grade 8 students were tricked into eating moose pellets by adults in charge, while teachers, the principal, and other students looked on and laughed.

It's alarming that an adult supervisor would show such a lack of judgment and not recognize that this was not just a harmless prank. It is more alarming still that teachers and the principal reportedly witnessed this and did not intervene. Teachers are required to know their school's code of conduct. They are required to know about the government's Safe Schools Charter.

Will the minister tell this House what went so terribly wrong?

**Hon. Nancy Allan (Minister of Education):** I can guarantee the member opposite that officials in my department have spoken with the school division and that there has been an investigation into the matter and that disciplinary action has been taken.

**Mr. Friesen:** Mr. Speaker, the students have a right to feel safe and secure when they are at school or participating in school events, and yet here we have all the elements of a classic bullying case. We have the bully, we have enabling bystanders, we have a victim, and we have suggestions afterward to not report the incident.

Mr. Speaker, this very week the Minister of Education spoke in this Chamber on an antibullying resolution, and she talked about the Safe Schools Charter that requires schools to have codes of conduct stating that bullying is unacceptable and holding bystanders accountable to intervene and stop bullying. Something is clearly wrong in our schools when teachers aren't getting the basic message that this kind of thing is wrong and that they have a duty not to stand idly by.

Can the minister tell this House why her Safe Schools Charter is failing to get the message across?

**Ms. Allan:** Well, obviously, Mr. Speaker, this is a very unfortunate incident—very unfortunate—and we would certainly hope that this kind of thing would never happen again.

The school division has dealt with this at the local level. The appropriate intervention has occurred. The investigation has been undertaken. There has been disciplinary action. The volunteer that was involved in the incident will not be allowed to volunteer in the school again. And we certainly hope that no other incidents like this would ever occur again in any school division in the province of Manitoba.

**Mr. Friesen:** Mr. Speaker, this government's new Bill 28, reporting bullying and other harm, sets out

clear expectations for all persons to report bullying incidents in schools, and earlier this week in the Chamber this minister talked about it. She said: We believe that we had to make it very clear that there was a responsibility for people in our school system, regardless of whether they were teachers, perhaps they were volunteers, parents working in our public education system that would see an incident, not just in the school but maybe on the playground or on a field trip where they would be helping to supervise, and if they saw that kind of incident there needed to be a very clear expectation that they would report the incident and that the incident would be reported to the principal so there could be follow-up. Well, that did not happen.

Will the minister admit that the real issue here is not this one incident, but rather the extent to which this incident shows this government has failed to get across clear expectations about acceptable conduct in schools?

**Ms. Allan:** We're very confident that the legislation that we have in regards to 'reporting'—reporting bullying is effective in our school division. When the incident occurred, it was reported and actions were taken.

And I just want to remind members opposite—I just want to remind members opposite—that in regards to our public education system, when they had the opportunity to do report cards, they backed away from it. When they had the opportunity to do anything in regards to public education, they've been nowhere. If they would like to come up with a new idea about public education, my door is always open. We're here, we're waiting, but I think we're going to wait a long time for a new idea from members opposite on our public education other than cuts, increased taxes and staff being laid off.

#### **Emergency Rooms Patients Leaving Before Examination**

**Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, over 12 years ago, the NDP promised to end hallway medicine in six months with \$15 million. They were going to be the saviours and fix wait times in the ERs.

Today, what do we see? Twenty-two thousand patients left the ERs without being seen in 2011 because they were too frustrated with the long waits to see a doctor. That's 5,000 more patients left than did in 2004 when the ERs, at that time, were considered to be in crisis. You can't have patients in

hallways if they can't even get in through the front door in the first place.

So I would ask this Minister of Health to please explain: Why have these numbers been allowed to explode under her watch?

**Hon. Theresa Oswald (Minister of Health):** We know that all Manitobans want to have as rapid access as is possible to emergency care when they go to an emergency room. We believe this to be true, which is why we've been investing in increasing the number of doctors we have on the front line. And, Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to report that today Manitoba has a net increase of 500 more doctors than we did in 1999 when 28 people routinely lined the hallways under the Tory watch.

Further, we also know that we need to work on efficiencies in our emergency rooms, which is why we have renovated every emergency room in the city of Winnipeg and the Grace Hospital is on the way. We're working on streamlining processes. We know that people that are in emergency situations want to get care as swiftly as possible.

**Mrs. Driedger:** Mr. Speaker, with that answer the Minister of Health obviously does not understand this issue.

I have an interesting FIPPA that shows that the Grace Hospital ER had 13 per cent of their patients leave without being seen, and that was the worst rate of all Winnipeg hospitals. Health Sciences Centre had 10.7 per cent leave without being seen, and St. Boniface had 8.8 per cent leave without being seen.

These are very, very serious numbers, and I'd like to ask the Minister of Health why she hasn't done something to fix these long waits in ERs, because by ignoring this problem she has put patients at risk.

**Ms. Oswald:** The reason the member opposite has this information is because we now track what is happening with people and we track patients who are leaving without being seen.

Furthermore, patients that leave an emergency room without being seen are followed up by a nurse in the hospital, a nurse at Health Links to ensure that there are no medical issues that require further follow-up, Mr. Speaker.

\* (14:00)

We want to ensure that those individuals that are going to an emergency room are indeed there in an

emergency situation. We want to have our families in Manitoba to have alternative places to go to seek medical care in non-emergency situations, like access centres and, indeed, our new QuickCare clinics, three of which have already opened. We want to take pressure off emergency rooms by increasing choices, Mr. Speaker, and that's what we're doing.

### Triage Wait Times

**Mrs. Driedger:** Mr. Speaker, 22,000 have left without being seen because of the mess she has left the ERs in. She does not seem to understand that.

And I have another interesting FIPPA, for the very first time showing the length of time it takes patients to be triaged in Winnipeg ERs. Concordia and Grace hospitals take twice as long to triage patients than most other hospitals.

But the Health Sciences Centre adult ER, our major trauma centre, takes 17 minutes to just triage a patient, and that's almost three times longer than the other ERs. Brian Sinclair comes to mind when I think of that number.

So I want to ask this Minister of Health to tell Manitobans why patient safety is being put at risk because it—of the length of time it takes to be triaged in our hospitals in Winnipeg in our ERs. Why would she allowed this to get so bad?

**Ms. Oswald:** As I said to the member already, we have endeavoured to provide alternate options for individuals who are not in emergency situations but need emergency care, which is why we've opened access centres, why we've opened our QuickCare clinics, Mr. Speaker, and why we have committed that all Manitobans who want one shall have a family doctor and we've committed an aggressive target of 2015.

I would note, Mr. Speaker, that, indeed, at Health Sciences Centre we are investing \$5.2 million in an ongoing renovation to assist with processes, to assist in allowing the medical professionals to have more space to deal with what is admittedly a very busy ER.

But, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you this: It is not the policy of this government as it was of the Tories to routinely allow, day after day, 28 people in the hallways across the system. Today, that count is zero or one.

**Assistant Deputy Minister  
Distribution of Email**

**Mrs. Mavis Taillieu (Morris):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday after the minister was forced to release freedom of information documents to us, we found our suspicions were confirmed. There were indeed many emails flying among at least seven Immigration Department staff on April 18th, the day before the minister's political rally. The email strings have been—that have been provided start at 12:50 p.m. on April 18th, with an attached invitation to attend the Legislature with a copy of the resolution. A footnote says: letter revised, needs final approval before sending out.

Mr. Speaker, who had the final approval for the letter and the resolution before Ben Rempel sent it out?

**Hon. Stan Struthers (Acting Minister of Immigration and Multiculturalism):** I really am very glad that the member for Morris got the information that she was asking for. I'm very glad because maybe when she reads through it and the more information she can have, the more she will begin to understand how important it is for us to stand up—on the basis of our provincial economy alone—Mr. Speaker, how important for us to stand up and say to the federal government that we want to work in partnership with them, not watch as the federal government dumps on the province its own ideology in terms of dealing with immigration in the province of Manitoba.

So, you know, the more information they can have across the way, the more confident I am that they will finally come to understand that it's time to stand up for Manitoba.

**Minister of Immigration  
Request for Appearance at Standing Committee**

**Mrs. Mavis Taillieu (Morris):** Well, what's important, Mr. Speaker, is this—that this government stop politicizing the civil service. The minister in Estimates denied that she knew anything about any email, effectively saying her ADM, Ben Rempel, acted on his own. Mr. Rempel sent an email directive to staff in the Department of Immigration and asked them to pass it on to their respective distribution lists. And several did, and although the distribution list has not been provided, it appears extensive from the amount of blank space that was left.

Mr. Speaker, we've asked the Premier (Mr. Selinger) to call this minister before a

committee of this House to determine the extent of her politicization of the civil service. Why is he protecting that minister? Does he condone the politicization of the civil service?

**Hon. Stan Struthers (Acting Minister of Immigration and Multiculturalism):** Mr. Speaker, the minister has answered questions in Estimates. The minister I've seen answering questions here in the House.

I want to say I'm very pleased that the member has some information now that she can use to maybe convince her colleagues across the way there to understand the importance of this issue to our provincial economy. Maybe she can stand up with us and with the western premiers who have also said that our immigration system must be managed jointly by the federal and provincial and territorial governments.

I think we all have to come to the realization that this is a very important issue for our province and that sometimes it calls for members opposite to stand up and take on their friends in Ottawa rather than bailing out—

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

**Mrs. Taillieu:** Why won't the Minister of Immigration (Ms. Melnick) stand up today and answer questions?

The documents reveal that another of the bureaucrats involved in doing the NDP's political work was, in fact, a former NDP political staffer. Colin Lemoine was a member of the NDP's Cabinet communication office. Now he is a bureaucrat doing political work for the NDP.

The documents reveal that an NDP political staffer, Rachel Morgan, from the Premier's own Cabinet communications office was getting involved in this issue before the debate on the resolution even happened. This shows the intent of the NDP motion—all politics, period.

Mr. Speaker, will the Premier (Mr. Selinger) continue to support the politicization of the civil service by his Minister of Immigration by sitting by and doing nothing? Or will he act and demand she be—appear before a public committee of this Legislature? Does he support democracy or does he support the politicization of the civil service?

**Mr. Struthers:** What is absolutely clear, Mr. Speaker, is that the civil servants within the province

of Manitoba, our public servants, worked very hard for a long time to make—and to work with us and along with federal civil servants and federal decision makers to turn this program into the No. 1 Provincial Nominee Program in the country.

Other provinces approached the federal government so that they could emulate the work that was being done in this province by this government and by the—by civil servants.

Instead of running down the public service, as members often are, I think we should stand up together and fight for this program, fight on the behalf of our Manitoba economy, and make sure your friends in Ottawa know the damage that they're doing to our economy.

### **Jordan's Principle Implementation**

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** For over six years I've championed the implementation in Manitoba of Jordan's Principle, that the child's needs come first and jurisdictional battles later. The principle is named for Jordan River Anderson from Norway House Cree Nation, who suffered for years in hospital and away from home while this government bickered with the federal government over who would pay for items like a shower head. He died never having a chance to go home.

Now, after Liberals put on a lot of pressure in a three-year campaign, the NDP government finally signed an MOU with the federal government in 2008. And yet the working group has sat for four years with no delivery of a public policy, nor properly involving First Nations in the interpretation of Jordan's Principle.

I ask the Premier why he's been so ineffective in implementing Jordan's Principle, helping kids in crisis in Manitoba.

**Hon. Greg Selinger (Premier):** And I thank the member from River Heights for the question. Our officials do work in the spirit of Jordan's Principle.

He is correct: There are still ongoing meetings with the federal government to clarify the joint roles of the two jurisdictions with respect to people impacted in Manitoba. But where a case arises and a need needs to be fulfilled, our officials will act in the spirit of Jordan's Principle and then work with the federal government on any necessary recoveries.

**Mr. Gerrard:** The NDP's plan to implement on a case-by-case approach in regard to these children has

clearly been shown to be another way of governments to pass the buck and stall decision making.

The problems in Manitoba continue, as we see from the human rights complaint filed by Harriet Sumner-Pruden, who isn't getting prompt and fair treatment in respect to her nine-year-old disabled son, Dewey. Harriet pleads that governing bodies shouldn't deprive on-reserve First Nation children with disabilities of equal rights and opportunities in their policies and programs.

\* (14:10)

I ask the Premier, who says he supports Jordan's Principle: Will his government be supporting the Pruden-Sumners' human rights complaint, which has been brought forward to the Manitoba Human Rights Commission and to the Canadian Human Rights Commission?

**Mr. Selinger:** Well, Mr. Speaker, just to put some information on the record from Sheila Fraser, the former auditor general of the government of Canada. She said in—on February 12th, 2009, with respect to Jordan's Principle and its application in Manitoba, she said: We've been very actively involved with Health Canada and the provinces, particularly Manitoba where this has come up, and we have active case management. Kids are being dealt with and the principle's being applied. There's still work with the federal government to discuss the financial side of it, but even the auditor general of Canada has affirmed, as early as 2009, that in Manitoba, we do act in the spirit of Jordan's Principle.

So I want the member to know that. We don't put kids at risk because the federal government hasn't agreed to pay part of the cost. We act in the spirit of Jordan's Principle. We still look for a solid agreement with the federal government. The Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs is working with us on case conferencing. We're doing things on the ground to protect children. We expect the federal government will come forward and be supportive, just like we're going to do on the flood.

**Mr. Gerrard:** Mr. Speaker, now, in 2012, three years after 2009, an article by Dr. Noni MacDonald in the *Canadian Medical Association Journal* has exposed the empty words of the Premier when it comes to Jordan's Principle. The Canadian Paediatric Society has put the NDP government at no better than fair in implementing Jordan's Principle. And Dr. MacDonald has said that the Manitoba

government is merely playing lip service to a politically correct idea. Many see the Premier's lack of action as shameful, since Manitoba is the homeland of Jordan Anderson.

Dr. MacDonald says the Manitoba government does not have a strong and effective implementation plan, and I ask the Premier: When will he put in place a cohesive and effective implementation plan for Jordan's Principle that's reflective of what First Nation children and families are pleading for?

**Mr. Selinger:** Mr. Speaker, I actually do appreciate the question because it raises important issues of how we provide services to First Nations families and children.

In the case of dialysis, we've gone ahead and built dialysis treatment centres in First Nations communities without waiting for the federal government to come forward. In the case of prenatal benefits for young pregnant mothers, we provide benefits without waiting for the federal government to participate in that. We do that with respect to child welfare cases and other health-related matters.

We, on the ground, operate in the spirit of Jordan's Principle. We continue to work with the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, which have agreed to a case conferencing approach. We continue to work with the federal government to see their participation and clear rules on how finances are arranged to cover the cost of cases where services are provided through the provincial auspice and agencies related to the Province.

But we do act in the spirit in Jordan's Principle. It is important that we get an agreement. It would help not only Manitoba, but First Nations children all across the country.

#### **Commercial Electric Bus Pilot Initiative**

**Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley):** My fan club is here again today.

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. It's quite clear that the opposition, once again, is missing not just some but all of the good news that exists in this province. It's a gorgeous day outside. When they leave, I'm sure they're going to be looking for the blizzard that they've been casting.

The recent announcement that our government made, indeed, by our hard-working Minister of Innovation, Energy and Mines, is setting a tone for

an incredible technological and economic breakthrough in the world of green transportation.

I'm going to give the members opposite a chance to hear this good story one more time. See if it brightens their mood a little.

**Hon. Dave Chomiak (Minister of Innovation, Energy and Mines):** Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Manitoba Hydro, Red River Community College, and New Flyer Industries for unveiling a first in North America, that is, a commercial full-scale electric bus, zero emissions, powered by clean hydro. It's a credit to innovation and a credit to the potential market for New Flyer, which already has 40 per cent of the hybrid market in North America.

And I'd also like to thank the former vice-president of Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Mr. Fukue, who had the vision to select Manitoba as the place in the world to launch this project and to work co-operatively to have a first full-scale commercial electric bus in North America.

That's vision, Mr. Speaker. That's the future, and that's where we want to go. And I wish members opposite would come on board.

#### **Provincial Sales Tax Government Support for Proposed Increase**

**Mr. Dennis Smook (La Verendrye):** The NDP broke their no-tax-increase election promise, and the union bosses that control the NDP are pushing them to do it again. It's no wonder small business confidence in this promise—in this province is plummeting.

The Canadian Federation of Independent Business Business Barometer shows that since the re-election of the NDP, small business confidence declined by almost 10 per cent. The NDP raised taxes by \$184 million in the last budget on small business necessities like gasoline and property insurance. The NDP hiked fees by \$114 million for basic business services like land titles documents. Obviously, the Minister of Entrepreneurship does not think small business is taxed enough.

Why is he planning to now increase the PST on top of all of this?

**Hon. Peter Bjornson (Minister of Entrepreneurship, Training and Trade):** Mr. Speaker, 1999 small business tax, 9 per cent; 2012 small business tax, zero. Mr. Speaker, 1999 corporate tax, over 17 per cent; 2012, 12 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, there are over 106,000 businesses in Manitoba, and I have travelled to a number of them to see first-hand what they're doing, what they're manufacturing, what their opportunities are, what their challenges are, but I have an incredible amount of confidence in what they are doing here in Manitoba, an incredible amount of respect for what they're doing here in Manitoba. And, Mr. Speaker, they talk to us about how our economy has been booming and how they're looking to grow and expand here in the province of Manitoba.

Maybe the member opposite should look at the glass being more than half full, because he's certainly on the half empty side, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Time for oral questions has expired.

#### Introduction of Guests

**Mr. Speaker:** I would like to draw the attention of honourable members to the public gallery where we have with us today gold medalists with the Canadian national women's hockey team Bailey Bram, Jocelyne Larocque.

On behalf of honourable members, we welcome you.

#### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

##### Russell Anderson

**Mr. Reg Helwer (Brandon West):** I rise today to honour Russell Anderson, a recipient of the annual Vision in Action Award of Distinction at Toronto-Dominion Bank for 2012. The Vision in Action Award of Distinction is an award that celebrates the best of the best globally within the TD Bank Group. It is the highest level of employee achievement and it is awarded to only one in a thousand TD Bank employees annually.

Mr. Anderson was chosen for his branch's performance and his remarkable leadership and community service during the flood of 2011 in Brandon.

While Mr. Anderson volunteered his time and energy to the sandbagging efforts to protect the city of Brandon from the rising Assiniboine, he also opened his home to a displaced family of newcomers who had lost their home and belongings to the flood. He treated the family as guests in his home for as long as they needed to begin rebuilding their lives and finding more suitable accommodation.

Mr. Anderson's effort in the flood of 2011 is but one story amongst many of the incredible acts of

kindness and generosity that residents in flood-affected areas were offering to each other and their communities every day. We are indebted to those efforts and the many volunteers like Mr. Anderson who demonstrated incredible leadership in a time of crisis.

The leadership qualities Mr. Anderson brings to the table have also given his branch at TD top-quartile performance for 2011 and a sterling reputation in the city of Brandon. Mr. Anderson will attend a four-day event in New York City for award presentations later this month.

I'd like to thank him and all of all—all of our volunteers during the flood of 2011 and wish them success in their future endeavours.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

\* (14:20)

#### Bailey Bram and Jocelyne Larocque

**Hon. Ron Lemieux (Minister of Local Government):** I'm honoured and pleased to acknowledge today the accomplishments of two exceptionally talented Ste. Anne women: Bailey Bram and Jocelyne Larocque.

On April 15th, they and the rest of their Team Canada teammates won the world women's hockey championship held in Burlington, Vermont. Team Canada defeated their main rivals, the United States, 5 to 4 in a thrilling overtime finish. The victory came for Team Canada despite a bruising 9 to 2 loss to the Americans in the opening game of the tournament earlier that week.

Bailey and Jocelyne both played important roles for Team Canada throughout the tournament. These team meets—teammates share a deep connection that goes back to their days as toddlers growing up together in Ste. Anne, Manitoba. Bailey is now a forward and plays US Division 1 college hockey with Mercyhurst University. She has twice been named to the top 10 female US college hockey players and was a rookie on Team Canada this year.

Jocelyne is a solid defensive player and former NCAA champion while at the University of Minnesota Duluth. She was called upon often to match up against the top US players in the shutdown role along the blue line. The victory for Team Canada was especially sweet as they turned the tables on their main rivals after last year's loss to the Americans, doing so on the opponents home soil.



Mr. Speaker, I am proud to commend Bailey and Jocelyne as they are such inspirational female athletes who play at a very high level in one of our national sports. I wish them well in their future endeavours as they continue with hockey and look towards future league world champions, as well as the 2014 Winter Olympics.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Bailey and Jocelyne and all members of Team Canada for a 2012 World Hockey Championship, and I want all members to please join me in thanking them very, very much.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

#### Joan Wheeler

**Mr. Blaine Pedersen (Midland):** It is my pleasure to rise today to recognize the achievements of Mrs. Joan Wheeler of Crystal City, who was recently bestowed the Lieutenant-Governor's Award for Historical Preservation and Promotion for her work with the Star Mound Historical Society, which she helped form with her sister in 1966.

Mrs. Wheeler and her sister are former pupils of the one-room Star Mound school which—that is now part of the Manitoba Municipal Heritage Site.

Star Mound, a large hill surrounded by the flat prairie land in the Pilot Mound area, was also a spot of great significance to the mound builder natives.

When Joan receives visitors, she often points out the shape of a beaver mound—mounded—up on top of the hill where the natives buried their dead, which is now blanketed by crocuses.

The annual July 1st wiener roast and fireworks display at the school is attended by hundreds of children and adults. If Joan isn't pouring coffee, cutting birthday cake or helping to place marshmallows on sticks for youngsters to roast, she'd be inside the old school answering questions and pointing out the history of objects on display.

Countless school field trips and tourist groups have visited Star Mound where Joan has pointed out the buffalo rubbing stone, the beaver-shaped mound and many interesting artifacts in the school. Many of the original arrowheads, school books, maps and more have been procured by Joan for the Star Mound museum.

The school is quite authentic looking with the original school desks, a picture of King George, roll-down maps, blackboards and the old stove where

woollen mitts would have been dried. Joan uses this backdrop to ignite the imaginations of the children and tourists to envision what it would have been like to attend this one-room school decades ago.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Joan Wheeler for receiving the Lieutenant-Governor's Award for Historical Preservation and Promotion and for more than 45 years of dedication to promoting our pioneer heritage and keeping Star Mound's history alive.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

#### Cuthbert Grant Day

**Ms. Sharon Blady (Kirkfield Park):** Manitoba is a diverse province, a place where various ethnic and linguistic groups have come together to build a positive future. This notion of Manitoba is perhaps summarized best by our Métis heritage, a culture that has continued to thrive for centuries. The Métis have had many great leaders, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to highlight the legacy of one of them.

Cuthbert Grant was a revered Métis leader who was born in 1793. Considered a founding father of St. François Xavier, Grant led the Métis in 1816 at the Battle of Seven Oaks. Grant was so respected that he was later named a warden of the plains by the Hudson's Bay Company after its merger with the North West Company.

Grant was also a pioneer in the use of water mills in the territory. He built one of the first water mills on the banks of the Assiniboine River, which today is recreated as Grant's Old Mill near Grace Hospital and run by the St. James-Assiniboia Pioneer Association. Grant served, as well, as sheriff and chief magistrate in the district of Assiniboia and was a member of the council of Assiniboia.

This summer Winnipeggers will pay tribute to his legacy by celebrating Cuthbert Grant Day at Grant's Old Mill on July 14th. This will be an extra special occasion as Lord Strathspey, the chief of the Grant clan, will be attending from Scotland. Descendants of Cuthbert Grant will also be attending from across Canada, and Strathspey will officially declare them a new sept of the clan.

A major fundraising dinner was held for the celebration in April, which I was happy to attend. And the importance of Cuthbert Grant to Assiniboia and to the future of the province of Manitoba cannot be understated.

I would like to especially highlight the dedicated work undertaken by celebration organizer, Sandra Horyski, and her family, who are descendants of Grant. Her son often plays the role of Grant at the mill.

I hope that all members will join me in celebrating this great Métis leader and his contributions to our province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### **Royal Canadian Air Force Band**

**Ms. Deanne Crothers (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, members of the Royal Canadian Air Force Band are brave and selfless men and women, who risk their lives to boost morale for troops at home, internationally and in war zones.

In May, they took on a different type of challenge, to raise funds for a charity that's close to their hearts. They competed in Global TV's show choir competition, *Canada Sings*. I'm proud to say that they won and earned a \$25,000 donation for Support Our Troops, a charity that supports current and former Canadian Forces personnel and their families.

Thirteen members of the locally based Royal Canadian Air Force Band competed in *Canada Sings* under the name Super Sonic. Although every member is a professional musician, most of the team had never sung or danced in public before. Team captain, Sergeant David Grenon, noticed—noted that it took guts for the musicians to step out from behind their music stands to perform onstage. They worked hard and impressed the show's judges, Laurieann Gibson, Rob Van Winkle and Jann Arden.

Super Sonic members were thrilled to be awarded the reality show's top prize for Support Our Troops. This charity encourages ill and injured Canadian Forces personnel to maintain a healthy, active lifestyle and supports them in increasing their independence, developing new skills and achieving their goals.

Many soldiers and their families live in St. James, and it is important to my constituents and all Manitobans that these brave men and women receive the supports they need.

I would like to congratulate Super Sonic on their win, and thank them for drawing attention to such an important cause.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

*(Continued)*

### **GOVERNMENT BUSINESS**

#### **House Business**

**Hon. Jennifer Howard (Government House Leader):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, on House business. Could you please canvass the House to see if there's leave to allow for two sections of the Committee of Supply to meet concurrently with the House this afternoon, in order for the House to consider second reading of bills?

Is there leave such that the Department of Health be considered in room 254 and the Department of Children and Youth Opportunities be considered in room 255?

Further, is there also leave for the Estimates from the Chamber for Innovation, Energy and Mines and Sport to be moved into committee room 255 following Children and Youth Opportunities and Immigration and Multiculturalism?

Last, is there leave to waive the quorum requirements in any recorded votes arising in the two sections of Committee of Supply sitting in rooms 254 and 255?

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave of the House to allow for two sections of the Committee of Supply to meet concurrently with the House this afternoon in order to consider—in order for the House to consider second reading of bills? *[Agreed]*

Further, is there leave such that the Department of Health be considered in room 254 and the Department of Children and Youth Opportunities be considered in room 255? *[Agreed]*

Further, is there also leave for the Estimates from the Chamber for Innovation, Energy and Mines and Sport to be moved into committee room 255 following Children and Youth Opportunities and Immigration and Multiculturalism?

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** Honourable member for Morris?

**Mrs. Mavis Taillieu (Official Opposition House Leader):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that Immigration and Multiculturalism and Innovation, Energy and Mines are still open. Would we not close those first?

**Mr. Speaker:** My understanding is—and if I misstated it, please let me correct it, then.

Just to be certain that I've put the correct information on the record, it was to be following the Department of Innovation, Energy and Mines and Sport to follow in the committee room after—following the Children, Youth Opportunities and Immigration and Multiculturalism, if it has been dealt with. But there is—not necessary need to have those departments dealt with prior to. That's my understanding.

\* (14:30)

So is there leave of the House for that to occur?  
[Agreed]

And last, is there leave to waive quorum requirements and any recorded votes arising in the two sections of Committee of Supply sitting in rooms 254 and 255?

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** Leave has been denied.

**Ms. Howard:** Also on House business, I'm rising to table, for the information of members, an agreement signed by myself, the Opposition House Leader (Mrs. Taillieu) and the member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard), regarding House proceedings over the coming week.

**Mr. Speaker:** Information has been to table—tabled—an agreement signed between the honourable Government House Leader and the honourable Official Opposition House Leader and the member for River Heights, regarding the House proceedings over the coming week.

**Ms. Howard:** Also on House business, I'd like to announce that the Opposition Day motion put forward by the member from Morris will be considered on Monday, June 11th.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been announced that the Opposition Day motion put forward by the honourable member for Morris will be considered next Monday, June the 11th.

**Ms. Howard:** Would you call for the resumption of debate on bill—on second reading debate on Bill 8 and 24, start second reading debate on Bill 23, followed by resuming second reading debate on Bill 38.

**Mr. Speaker:** We'll be calling bill—to resume adjourned debate on bills 8 and 24, followed by second reading of Bill 23, and then to be followed, resumption of adjourned debate on Bill 38.

And the Committee of Supply will be meeting in rooms 254 and 255 simultaneously.

## DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

### Bill 8—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Use of Child Safety Seats)

**Mr. Speaker:** We'll start by calling Bill 8, then, to resume adjourned debate of Bill 8, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Use of Child Safety Seats), standing in name in the honourable member for Morris (Mrs. Taillieu).

The honour—is there leave for the—to remain—bill to remain standing in the name for the honourable member for Morris? Agreed?

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** Leave has been denied.

**Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood):** I appreciate the opportunity to stand and put a few comments on the record in regards to Bill 8, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Use of Child Safety Seats), and to indicate that I rise in support of this legislation.

We have seen, actually, in the last number of years, Mr. Speaker, with the encouragement of the public to use booster seats that, indeed, booster seats were effective up until a certain size of a child. And we also know that sometimes at the age of five, once a child has been allowed to not have to use a booster seat and then be in the position of having to use a safety seatbelt that, indeed, the size of the child could make a difference.

So, as we have seen more medical research on this and we've seen more accidents and incidents around this issue, certainly there has been more learning that has occurred over time. And, Mr. Speaker, injuries and death that result from vehicle accidents are devastating and we know that they are largely preventable. We also know that wearing seatbelts and using booster seats are absolutely vital for the safety of our children, and we, on this hide—side of the House, understand the importance of enforcing safe vehicle practices.

Also, families should feel secure in knowing that their children are protected while driving. However, conventional seatbelts will not protect all children in case of an accident. Smaller children are only adequately safe in a booster seat.

Mr. Speaker, motor vehicle crashes are a leading cause of death for four- to eight-year-olds. So this legislation will undoubtedly help to save children's

lives. This legislation will move Manitoba forward in joining other jurisdictions that already have similar legislation. An increased standard for booster seats across the country will help mitigate the effects that vehicle collisions have on children's injuries and death.

Mr. Speaker, Manitoba currently has legislation in place to enforce the use of booster seats for children under the age of five, but many children are not big enough at this age to be properly protected by a seat belt. Experts say that, depending on a child's height and weight, seat belts could actually do more harm than good during an accident for children that are small. Specifically, children are more susceptible to abdominal and spinal cord injuries with the improper use of a seat belt and, therefore, could be seriously injured. A properly used child safety seat can reduce fatalities by 71 per cent and the risk of serious injury by 67 per cent. Height and weight are significant factors in determining the adequacy of a seat belt or child safety seat. So age has been proven not to be necessarily a good benchmark, as all kids, we know, grow at very different paces.

So there is no doubt that we, as elected officials, certainly need to do more to protect kids who face a heightened risk of injury and death during vehicle collisions. And we know that booster seats have been proven to decrease serious injury and fatalities significantly for some kids.

So it's important that we follow the lead of other provinces that have imposed the use of booster seats for more kids. So we would note, Mr. Speaker, that, indeed, what the government has done is look across other jurisdictions to find out what has been happening in other jurisdictions and to find out what would be most appropriate here.

And, certainly, what the formula has been that appears to be effective and has been adopted elsewhere is looking at age or height or weight, rather than just picking the age of five years old after which a child can be, you know, allowed from not using a booster seat and only use a seat belt.

However, we have heard of an incident where a child that was too small was allowed to not be in a booster seat but did have a seat belt on, but it did lead to a spinal cord injury. And as this one physician has indicated, that there's really quite nothing more devastating than having to deal with a child that may have had a severed spinal cord because of a situation like that.

So we would note that other provinces are moving ahead in this. And as the criteria now is going to be looking at age or height or weight, and it will be related to either a child being nine years old or four point nine–four feet, nine inches tall or less than 80 pounds, so we think that this will enable child safety in situations and we will support the legislation.

We do note, though, and it's interesting to note, that the Liberals have proposed booster seat legislation three separate times in recent years, and I would note that the NDP firmly opposed that legislation. Now it's interesting that the NDP have flip-flopped on this issue and they have introduced this legislation now on their own because suddenly they've had a change of heart.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is one particular comment that I would like to put on the record, and it does come from the member of Wolseley, because it is interesting to see where the NDP were in this position earlier and where they have ended up now. So the member from Wolseley—and he was referring to the member of the—or the Leader of the Liberal Party when he said it, and I quote: "Why on earth he feels that he needs to bring in a law which some people can't comply with and which isn't necessary in the first place leads me to the obvious conclusion that he didn't have anything else to talk about today, and he just needs to do some grandstanding. I'm not going to be much of a party to that." End quote. So I hope the Minister of Healthy Living (Mr. Rondeau) has had a good conversation with his colleague from Wolseley and I hope that he's got him on side with this legislation, because it wasn't that long ago that he made those comments.

\* (14:40)

And I would indicate he has also said, and I quote: ". . . the proposal that we have before us today really doesn't bring a whole lot more to the table than what's already necessary." And—end quote. And the member from Wolseley made those comments not that long ago.

And I would also note that the member for Kirkfield Park (Ms. Blady), at the time the Liberals brought this legislation forward, also said, and I quote: But I don't know if we can legislate absolutely everything, and I don't know if using these kind of markers, arbitrary height and weight markers, are really going to work and ultimately be safest for everyone. I think we have to do something that's very holistic. End quote.

And, again, I would hope that the Minister of Healthy Living (Mr. Rondeau) has a conversation also with his colleague from Kirkfield Park so that he can straighten her out in terms of her understanding of this legislation and, hopefully, he's got all of his caucus members on board and he has spent some time educating them on the issue, because their comments really are—their comments were really quite pointed in their remarks when they made them a few years ago.

So, trusting that the minister is doing that, we certainly stand in support of this legislation. It seems to be what the research is showing. It seems to be what physicians are recommending and have found to be most useful for child safety across Canada. So we certainly support the legislation and look forward to it getting to committee.

**Mr. Speaker:** Any further debate on Bill 8? House is ready for the question then?

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**Mr. Speaker:** The question before the House is Bill 8, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Use of Child Safety Seats).

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

#### **Bill 24—The Energy Savings Act**

**Mr. Speaker:** We'll now proceed with Bill 24, The Energy Savings Act, on adjourned debate, standing in the name of the honourable member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard), who has 15 minutes remaining.

Is there leave for this bill to remain standing in the honourable member for River Heights' name?

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** Leave has been denied.

Any debate on Bill 24?

**Mr. Reg Helwer (Brandon West):** I'm pleased to rise and speak on this bill. I do have several concerns, and we will go through a few of those on how this will all roll out.

I understand it is intended to replace a part of a fund that already exists, but the intent and the delivery of this, we do have some concerns about who will actually dispense the funds and how they will be dispensed and where they would possible go. So, while I understand that the bill does intend to fund this program through our export program from

Manitoba Hydro, of course, there's a concern there because Manitoba Hydro has been losing money on their export program, and, in that case, then, I guess the fund—'munds'—funds might come from Manitobans, and that would be how we would possibly fund the program.

There's lots of unknowns there, Mr. Speaker, so, answers that we need to figure out.

It refers to renovations and training, and I can understand that the fund would want to fund renovations. That is certainly an admirable object that we can look at and how we can improve insulation, improve energy sufficiency and that type of thing; however, there's a bit of a reference also here to training. *[interjection]* Okay. And, you know, the training side is a little ambiguous on who could be trained in this, what they would possibly do, if there's any reporting mechanism, and if we measure this at all.

So, you know, it could be something that I'm quite concerned about: no reporting mechanism and how that would all be done. You have possibly a make-work program that, indeed, we could see no real benefits in energy savings, and the money could come from the fund to go to individuals or agencies. And I'm sure some of these agencies and individuals are all excellent agencies and well meaning, but some of that could go to places that we're not sure about, and, indeed, there could be some abuses there because there is, as I see here, no real reporting mechanism for the effectiveness of that training and where the funds would actually go.

You know, it would be nice to see that there could be an annual report or something of that nature that says, you know, what the total support of the fund was that was paid out and how much, you know, what the amount that's presently in the fund. Other types of things, would be nice to see a report of who got funding, social enterprises or community organizations or any other businesses or structures that did receive some money from this fund.

So it would be nice to see a report, perhaps, with the name, the amount received, the program's service, or, possibly, the project of that support that it did receive, so that we can measure and see that this is actually having an effect in Manitoba as opposed to just money disappearing. Because that's the last thing, I would believe, that this government would want to happen—is for money to just go somewhere where it wasn't actually traceable or that there was no real effect. I would believe that we want to be open

and transparent in this type of thing so that Manitobans can be assured that the money that this program is paid out for is, indeed, having benefits to Manitobans, and it's not just something that we're seeing have no effect, because we all want to see more effective energy resources.

We want to see more effective use of those resources, and, indeed, if we are looking to develop, you know, better sources and uses of energy, then that's all a great thing. If we want to put this into— you know, there have in a number of things here. They talk about more efficient insulation, better insulation, in some programs. We do have some reference here, I think, to low-flow toilets, which I'm not sure why Hydro, necessarily, would be in that environment. Except, maybe, if you have low-flow toilets, you use less water in Manitoba; there's more flowing for the dams. That's a real stretch, Mr. Speaker, but you could possibly go there, I guess. I don't know. You know, you always wonder about those things. So, you know, the windows might be something that you might want to look at a bit better, because, certainly, replacing windows can be an effective use of reducing your energy footprint. And, as I understand it, that in this program, the only portion of the windows that would be available would be the percentage of energy saved—would be available for financing under it.

And, of course, it goes on the meter, and Hydro, in essence, becomes a lender, and that's something that Hydro does have some experience at. But, you know, those—being a lender is a very complex situation and it, indeed, needs to be treated as a separate company or a division, essentially, to be a lender on real property. There's some amendments here that have to happen to The Real Property Act. If you borrow on this program, or you receive money on this program, it would go—essentially, you'd be on your title. So some concerns there for people. I—obviously, I understand that the program would stay with the title of the building if it's sold, or the property, but, you know, amending things like that are always of concern.

And when Hydro becomes a lender, I guess, where does that fall in the priorities, or the structures, of security? There's always a question on who has first right. Is it the mortgage agency? Is it a bank? Is it a federal institution? Which one has priority in lending here? And you don't want—or the last thing you want to do is get into a court fight if there is a problem with the security and who would take order of precedence on that. So I don't believe we'd want to

see that, and I think there needs to be some consultation with the various lending agencies and authorities to make sure that this legislation would fall somewhere in the federal-provincial jurisdictions for who has the first claim on the property for any of that. And—you know, because those things are all big concerns when you have lending.

Does this—indeed, lending—fall into someone's credit? If you have a mortgage, and you go and take out a loan for a car or something of that nature, will this fall on your credit reporting? Should, I would imagine. You're borrowing, essentially, from Hydro to do some renovations. And, you know, you want to make sure that everything is reported correctly, but when you go to those particular reporting agencies, it has to be clear and concise on what you've borrowed and who you owe it to. So we want to make sure that all those bases are covered in this.

But I guess—so those are a lot of some of the concerns that we have, Mr. Speaker. And I'm sure some of my associates will speak to this, as well, but it seems to be the intentions are respectable, but we do have some concerns on how the whole process is going to work out.

And I think that the reporting is a pretty critical part of that; that we want to make sure that this House can look at this program and say it is effective or it is not effective and make changes to it, because I don't see in this particular bill any of that type of reporting in terms of who gets the funding, how it's been paid out, what it's been paid out for and, indeed, were those programs effective, whether they were training or, in fact, renovations to a property.

\* (14:50)

You know, I can understand there'll be privacy restrictions to some of this information, but you want to make sure, I believe, at the end of the day that these programs are effective for Manitobans and that we are not seeing any money wasted, because that would be the last thing that I'm sure our government will want to do, would be to waste any money.

And especially in an environment like Hydro where funds are fairly—*[interjection]* Well, you know, but, yes, this is a different programs. We want to make sure that it's effective; we want to make sure that, you know, Hydro isn't paying out for something and losing money in this regard, so—because they have to fund the program and the money does have to be paid into it, I would assume is how it's going to work over time, but, you know.

Other things, like what kind of interest rate are we going to do? Are we going to fix the interest rate to prime plus? Does it depend on the risk? Is this high-risk? Is this low-risk? Just because it's on the meter and you owe it doesn't mean that it's a low-risk type of environment.

So it really depends on the individual that is going through the program to get this type of training or type of application for their renovations, and we want to have to take a look at each of them individually.

Is the structure in place to do that? Because this is a great deal of work, to assess that the risk is fair. And is Hydro set up to do that work, or who in Hydro would do it? Because it is something, as I said, would need to be almost a separate group or agency with risk assessments would be able to look at that and make sure that this is an—all appropriately done and well done and everything is in place for when and where you want it to happen. And, of course, timeliness, Mr. Speaker: How long would it take to apply the program and get a response?

So those things are all very necessary for us to find out before we can determine how this bill should move ahead. And I think, at that point, I'll leave it and we'll see where we can go on this.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Cliff Cullen (Spruce Woods):** And I thank you for the opportunity this afternoon to speak to Bill 24, The Energy Savings Act, and I certainly thank the member for Brandon West (Mr. Helwer) for his comments. He certainly laid out some of the issues that arise in this particular legislation. And, obviously, we'll be interested when this bill goes to committee, to see what Manitobans have to say about the proposal here, and it's a very interesting piece of legislation.

First of all, certainly with most of the government legislation they bring forward, it comes with a nice title, and one of those nice titles that seem that it would be hard for opposition members to vote against those nice titles. And I'm sure that's probably the intent of the legislation they do bring forward, so I certainly want to acknowledge the nice, rosy title again on this particular legislation.

And this particular legislation does—sets out three different issues relative to energy and energy savings. And first of all, the first component of this bill is to set up a—affordable energy fund, and, Mr. Speaker, if you remember a number of years ago, we

did change some legislation and we brought into play The Winter Heating Cost Control Act. And that has implications in this piece of legislation as well. I know there was quite a bit of debate on that particular legislation when it came forward and, in essence, this particular legislation fills in the gap, in terms of that preliminary legislation that was introduced some time ago. So, certainly, the affordable energy fund speaks to The Winter Heating Cost Control Act.

So, in essence, what this legislation does, it sets up an affordable energy fund. The interesting thing, Mr. Speaker: the money that will be allocated to this fund comes from Manitoba Hydro, and I think that's something that Manitobans should be aware of, where the money for this particular fund comes from. In fact, the money for this fund comes from sales—export sales, which, of course, are predominantly into the United States. What the legislation will be will take a percentage of the revenue from export sales and put it into this fund.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as we all know, markets are—have fluctuated substantially in the United States market, and actually we're not making near the money on our export sales as we were at one time. So certainly, when you want to look at Manitoba Hydro's bottom line, they're impacted directly by export sales and, in fact, that declining market value in the United States.

Now, we know some of our contracts into the United States are on a long term; they're fixed rates. However, on the downside, a lot of those markets that we sell into are on a floating rate as well, and in today's market those rates are certainly down.

You know, when we look at what's happening in terms of shale gas, natural gas, the very low prices that we're seeing for gas in the marketplace, that's driving the cost on the floating market down substantially. And, as a result, it's directly impacting the revenue that Manitoba Hydro is generating in terms of export, and also quite dramatically impacting the bottom line, and the positive bottom line, for Manitoba Hydro.

And that's why, you know, we on this side of the House question the capital projects that we're going enter into here in terms of Manitoba Hydro development, in the time we're in here right now, with the low rates that we're receiving on our product and on the export side. And I think we'll get into that discussion in a—at another day; I know we had a good discussion on that this morning. But certainly

that revenue that we're going to generate from the export market is going to have a demand in terms of this fund as well, so we're not sure exactly what kind of money is going to be allocated into this particular fund.

And the second point that I raise is—arises out of this particular fund, is how is that fund going to be used? And, if you look at the explanatory note under this legislation, it leaves the window pretty wide open. And I think Manitobans may have a concern when they have a look at some of the options in terms of what this fund will be used for.

Certainly, you can't argue with improvements in energy efficiency and conservation and reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. I think that's something that all Manitobans would—*are* striving to achieve, and we certainly understand that, but some of the things here get a little more questionable, Mr. Speaker. The fund may also be used to support social enterprises and community organizations in assisting people or neighbourhoods to participate in such activities. Now, we—we're not exactly sure on this side of the House what all that may mean in terms of what this fund will be used for, so—and I guess the same old story holds true in this case, that the devil's in the detail.

And depending on what regulations come forward as a result of this legislation, you know, Manitobans have a right to be hesitant in terms of moving this legislation forward, because at the end of the day, we are all stakeholders in Manitoba Hydro. And we want to make sure that any revenue that Manitoba Hydro gets is used in the best interest of us as stakeholders and us as shareholders in Manitoba Hydro.

So that is really one of the issues that we want to raise and hopefully Manitobans will pick that up and we look forward to their comments coming forward in—to committee once this bill passes second reading.

Mr. Speaker, the second component of this legislation is the formation of an energy efficiency plan, and, again, I think that's a laudable goal. It's probably something that Manitoba should have developed in the past. You know, we should have a pretty clear direction of how and when we're going to move to reduce our energy requirements and improve our energy efficiency, and it's certainly very important.

And, obviously, with Manitoba Hydro as a key Crown corporation here in Manitoba, we all have a—

certainly, an interest in that. And, obviously, if we can reduce energy consumption here in the—Manitoba, it will allow us to sell more electricity to other jurisdictions. Hopefully, that will increase revenue to Manitoba Hydro, again, lower the debt and reduce some of the expenses on the debt side of things.

So, clearly, an energy efficiency plan is something that we look forward to seeing on the table. And, I think, the other thing, too, Mr. Speaker, is the setting of targets in terms of that energy efficiency, and that's—I think that's pretty critical going forward.

And, certainly, Manitoba is not relying just on hydro-generated electricity, but we have opportunities as well in other forms of renewable energy. Certainly, we've got a start in terms of wind energy production here in the province of Manitoba, but I think there's other opportunities that we can certainly look at here in terms of renewable energy.

\* (15:00)

So, hopefully, those components could be tied into the energy efficiency plan as well, and I think that would be important for all Manitobans. I think Manitobans should be involved in that dialogue in terms of that energy efficiency plan. You know, we certainly are in favour of communication and consultation with those involved in the industry and those around the province that have an interest in energy efficiency.

The other key component of that plan, too, Mr. Speaker, is to make sure that we're on the right track in terms of the programs that we develop, and making sure that those programs that we develop and the money that we invest in those programs are going to be put to the best use. It's all about getting value for money and hopefully the energy efficiency plan will lay out a clear, concise vision how we're going to get value for our money here in Manitoba. And, clearly, Manitoba Hydro will be important in implementing some of the strategies involved in that energy efficiency plan. So that's certainly very important.

Mr. Speaker, the third component of this legislation is the on-meter efficiency improvements program, and I believe the member for Brandon West (Mr. Helwer) talked quite extensively about this component of the legislation. It's a concept that's not that entirely new to Manitoba. It really—what it looks like it's going to do is expand some of the



existing programs and, also, it has a look at what some of the other jurisdictions are doing around the country as well. So it may be something that—it'll be interesting to see how it does unfold.

And, again, Mr. Speaker, I just—a word of caution, you know, the devil's in the detail, as the member for Brandon West said. There's a lot of issues in there, questions that are raised, that we don't have answers for at this particular time. So we just—I wanted to throw out caution in terms of that component of this particular legislation as well.

And as a result of the legislation, there's also amendments have to be made to other pieces of legislation and, in particular, The Residential Tenancies Act, and also in regard to The Manitoba Hydro Act and The Real Property Act. Because, Mr. Speaker, it's an on-meter type system, there has to be an acknowledgement that there will be indebtedness to that particular piece of property going forward and that's why there has to be consequential amendments made to those other pieces of legislation. So there, again, as the member pointed out, there's lots of issues there that have to be addressed. There's certainly a number of questions that are raised with changes in that regard.

So, Mr. Speaker, certainly, having said all that, we do think there's opportunity in this principle moving forward. Obviously, the legislation raises some questions. We certainly are interested to see what people have to say in the committee side of things.

The other thing I should raise here at this point in time, as well, we're in an area of renewable energy and it's certainly—that whole field will certainly be enhanced by the—putting investments into research and development. And I'm not sure the money that's talked about in this particular legislation will lead to any enhancements in terms of research and development here in Manitoba. But it'll be something that we should have an opportunity to flush out into the future to see if there's opportunities to develop new technologies here in Manitoba which could benefit the economy in the short term and in the long run as well.

I'd also, at this time, like to mention, Mr. Speaker, some of the Power Smart programs that we have through Manitoba Hydro. Certainly, some of those programs have been very successful in the past. And we heard at Hydro committee, just a couple of months ago, about the amount of electricity that we're saving due to those Power Smart programs

here in Manitoba and, actually, over the course of time it has been quite significant. And the point that Manitoba Hydro raised themselves, you know, if these programs are successful, and they have been in the past, that also allows us to reduce our investment in terms of the capital. So not as much capital is required to build dams in the future because not as much electricity is required.

But, having said that, that's just our domestic load, and into the future, obviously, we—I think there's opportunities in terms of our export market. I know the current NDP government is certainly focusing on export sales into the United States, and that's kind of been a key component of their sales. And every time they get a term sheet signed, they're certainly—bring those issues forward to the public. And we certainly hope that will continue and we hope those contracts will be financially rewarding to Manitoba Hydro as well.

But, having attended, Mr. Speaker, an energy seminar in Ontario just a few months ago, it was quite interesting to hear the demand for energy in Ontario. Certainly, over the next several years, as we know, Ontario will be trying to move away from their coal-generated electricity.

So, as a result of that, they're going to be looking for alternatives to replace that amount of energy from coal production. And when we look at the market in Ontario, the coal—the electricity generated by coal is a very substantial amount of power.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's clear that there's tremendous opportunities for Manitoba Hydro in the Ontario market. So what we're—what we're expressing to the government is that there's a tremendous opportunity for sales, export sales, into Ontario.

Now, obviously, that—now, clearly, if we want to sell electricity into Ontario, we also need a transmission line into Ontario, and that—that—I think it's incumbent upon the government of the day to be having discussions with Ontario in terms of their energy needs.

So, hopefully, they will take that into context. We certainly look forward to having this legislation go to committee, and I thank you for that time, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Any further debate on Bill 24?

Seeing no further debate, is the House ready for the question?

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**Mr. Speaker:** The question before the House is Bill 24, The Energy Savings Act.

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

## SECOND READINGS

**Mr. Speaker:** We'll now proceed with Bill 23—second reading on Bill 23, The Local Government Statutes Amendment Act.

### Bill 23—The Local Government Statutes Amendment Act

**Hon. Ron Lemieux (Minister of Local Government):** I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Struthers) that Bill 23, The Local Government Statutes Amendment Act, be now read a second time and referred to a committee of the House.

#### *Motion presented.*

**Mr. Lemieux:** I'd like to make just a couple comments to put on the record about Bill 23. This proposed legislation would strengthen accountability, transparency in municipal governments. Proposed amendments to municipal legislations are aimed at supporting municipalities and governing objectively, fairly, with the best interests of their communities in mind.

And Manitoba municipalities make important decisions every day that impact the lives of their citizens. We know that municipalities take this responsibility seriously and strive to govern in an accountable and transparent manner.

Bill 23 would require all municipalities outside of Winnipeg to put in place policies and practices aimed at strengthening the accountability of municipal councils and supporting transparent decision making, including following a code of conduct that would set standards of behaviour for municipal council members and exercising the authority to censure a member who has breached that code, providing notice and information to the public about capital projects prior to borrowing funds for projects so citizens would have information to enable them to voice their concerns before projects move forward, following a tendering and procurement policy to ensure spending decisions are objectively fair and municipal resources are used in the most efficient and effective way, following a policy to ensure practices for the private use of municipal

equipment are clear and consistently applied, and reporting on the council's response to any recommendations made in a report by the office of the Auditor General so that citizens will be aware of the recommendations and be able to hold their councils accountable for responding to them.

\* (15:10)

Bill 23 would also expand existing legislation to reduce the potential for conflict-of-interest situations when municipalities work regionally. Employees of a regional municipal body would be required to take a leave of absence before they could be nominated or elected to council. As well, all municipal council members, including those in Winnipeg, would be required to disclose a new annual statement of assets and interests, all properties they own in the province, not just property they own in the municipality. Council members' statements of assets and interests are available for review by the public.

It is an expectation that municipal councils, like all governments, make decisions that are in the best interest of the municipality as a whole, and this strengthens citizens' trust and confidence in their municipal government.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Stuart Briese (Agassiz):** Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise to put a few comments on the record on The Local Government Statutes Amendment Act, Bill 23.

There are a couple of areas of this bill that I find a little troubling. Most of the things in the bill are things that probably municipalities have been doing for quite a number of years already. I've had a lengthy background in municipal politics, and municipalities are near and dear to my heart. And I know the jobs that they do out there and I'm very proud of the municipal councillors and their employees all over this province, and the—they're the ones out in the ground. They're the ones that really, actually, make things happen and they're the closest to the people, and they react the most to the people and—carry—carrying out their duties.

This bill calls for a code of conduct for council members, as did the one on the school boards the other day, and this one doesn't go into, I don't think, quite as much detail as the school board one did. But I still am a little taken aback, as some of my other colleagues were the other day, on the code of conduct. And a code of conduct may be—well be a good thing. But, obviously, the members opposite

don't live by any code of conduct by many of the things we've seen happen since this sitting in the House started.

One of the things that I am somewhat concerned about, it says that if the municipality has to develop a code of conduct and then if a councillor breaks that code of conduct, he's subject to censure, and censure's a fairly vague term. It says he's—he or she is subject to censure from a majority of that council, 50 per cent plus one. It doesn't say what censure means. It doesn't say what the penalties might be and it doesn't give that councillor any appeal mechanism, which I find very strange.

We've had municipal councils from time to time, and I ran into them when I was involved with the Association of Manitoba Municipalities, where there's a definite split on council, where there's two councillors on one side of things and three on the other and a lot of our municipal councillors—councils are made up of five people. So you get three people on one page and two on the other page and those three censure them; what's the penalty? Are they censured out of the council meetings? Are they put on a—probation for a month or 30 days or what happens? And I could see it happening over and over again.

I think this could open up a lot of battles at the council table. So, really, that's the big question. What's the penalty? What's censure really mean? Does it just mean you slap their wrists and say, oh, you were bad, don't do that again? What does it really mean? And if they feel they're being taken advantage of, where's an appeal mechanism? Who can they go to and say this is wrong, what's happening to me on this municipal council is wrong?

So I think that—I actually think that clause should be pulled right out of the bill until it's either strengthened or something else happens. But I think right at the present time that clause should be taken right out of the bill.

Things like a borrowing bylaw, money from reserves, the—wouldn't be covered, of course, but that's—one of the questions I would have on that situation is, really, what happens in joint ventures? And the one that comes to mind for me is the Neepawa Personal Care Home, where five municipalities banded together, entered into a tax-sharing agreement and, basically, did an almost, somewhat of a joint-borrowing process. And I would presume from what the legislation says, they would all have to go the individual public meetings with

their own—or individual public disclosure with their own municipality on a venture like that, and if you had one of those five where the people said, no, we won't go through with this—we won't let you go through with this borrowing bylaw, it destroys the project for the other four municipalities, which, I think, is rather a sad way to have a project come to an end. And the course on those things like the personal care home, there's a requirement of 10 per cent to be put up by the local community, and when there's a new one.

The Auditor General—the section that deals with the Auditor General's response—response to the Auditor General's reports, I think that's probably a good part of the legislation; municipalities are required to respond to the Auditor General's report. They can respond by saying, we're not going to do anything with your recommendations, but at least they have to respond and that's consistent with what's happening in the Legislature when the Auditor General makes a report.

Private works. I would be really surprised—and this is putting a fee schedule on municipal equipment that you're using in—for a private that goes outside of the municipal boundaries a little bit. I'd be really surprised if there's any municipalities out there that haven't got fee schedules in place, and the same thing with procurement policy, and that's where you're gaining more equipment and stuff for the municipality.

*Mr. Tom Nevakshonoff, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair*

And the conflict to—policy. One of the comments I would make is I don't understand why this bill says that you have to claim all properties you own anywhere in the province. I think it's quite acceptable that you have to claim a properties you own in the jurisdiction that you're on council in. But if you extrapolate on that a little bit, that would be the same as saying to the members of this Legislature, if you own a piece of property in BC, you've got to put it on your conflict-of-interest thing here. That's not necessarily true. We're only required to put the properties that we own or are affiliated with in this province. Not like some people, I'm sure, in this House, probably have a winter home somewhere that they go to for a couple of months in Arizona or Florida or Texas, and I can't see what the point is of having to state those ownerships outside the jurisdiction that you're actually serving in.

You know, that I—when I talked about the censure, the one thing I forgot to mention—but we do

live in a democratic system. I don't think we need councils censuring each other. The people that vote will decide next election who's going to be there and who's not.

So, there—as I said, there are a number of things in this bill that I'm not necessarily in favour of. There's—but there's a lot of this bill that are things that municipalities were already doing, and there's a lot of these things that I certainly support. Some of them are things I've asked for over the years when I spoke about municipal issues. So I look forward to this bill going forward to committee and seeing what presentations are made on this bill.

And, with those few words, I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

\* (15:20)

**Mr. Ron Schuler (St. Paul):** And before this bill goes to committee, I, too, would like to put a few comments on the record. It mirrors very much the bill that we saw yesterday when it came to accountability for school boards. And now we have a second bill that somehow wants to bring a code of conduct for councillors, which is interesting, because somehow it doesn't apply to Cabinet ministers and minister of the NDP.

In fact, I would like to draw attention, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of the House to an incident that happened just in the last month, month and a half, where the Premier (Mr. Selinger) held really, an unprecedented press conference in which he requested that two of his Cabinet ministers, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Struthers) and the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak), that they should both apologize to the Manitoba Legislature and to the people of Manitoba for certain things that they had done and the way that they had, inadvertently, misled Manitobans.

Now, for the first time in the history of this Manitoba Legislature, for the first time in the history of Manitoba, we had a minister, the Minister of Finance get up and read quite an eloquent letter of apology. Now it didn't quite apologize, apologize. It kind of said he was sorry that he inadvertently misled, but I think we all got the point that he was sorry that he done what he had done.

Now, we are still waiting for the member for Kildonan to follow his leader's orders and read a letter of apology of some kind, and we'll wait patiently. We still have another three and a half years

for that letter to come, and he should listen to his boss. He should listen to the Premier, because you know what? On this one—and I don't give the Premier much credit for being right—but on this one I would have to say the Premier is absolutely right. The member for Kildonan should apologize, because at least in this case they would have been leading as an example.

And perhaps the member for Kildonan could look at Bill 23, and it's interesting in the explanatory note where it says, councils are required to establish a code of conduct for council members. A member who is found to have breached the code may be censured by the council. And the member for Kildonan would actually be leading by example if he would—and he was found to have breached some kind of code of conduct by the Premier. Perhaps he should listen to his Premier and take the censure that he got from his Premier and apologize for it.

In fact, in Bill 23, if members of the House would turn the—to page 2, it says under censure: A council may censure a member if it determines that the member has breached the code of conduct. Well, you know what, Mr. Speaker? That would be an appropriate thing to, perhaps at committee or at some stage, to add an amendment right here: 84.1(3) in which we would add a second clause which would say: The Manitoba Legislature may censure a member of the NDP Cabinet when it determines that those members have breached the code of conduct. And you know, it's good that the Minister of Finance, for the first time in the history of this province, for the first time in history of this Legislature, apologized for having misled the House, that there should actually be some censure for that. And again, as said, we're waiting for the member for Kildonan to follow his example.

But there's another case, Mr. Speaker, where there could be an amendment made to this bill, whereby the Manitoba Legislature would actually lead by example, and that would be the member for Seine River (Ms. Oswald) who has been found in breach, if you will, of the conduct of the election law. And, fact, the member for Seine River, the Minister of Health, was found to have breached the election law and, unfortunately, there doesn't seem to be any repercussions. Now, if you look at this bill, it says that if you are found to have been in breach of the code, that you can be censured. And perhaps there should be a clause put in at 18.1.3 that says that the Manitoba Legislature may censure ministers of

the NDP who are found to be in breach of the Manitoba election act.

And it's important that this House should be a beacon. It should be a shining light on the hill showing others where they should go, and when they get off the path how they should walk back onto the righteous path. And we should lead as an example here in the Legislature, and that's why I call on the Minister of Finance (Mr. Struthers), I call on the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak), and I call on the member for Seine River (Ms. Oswald) to—perhaps, we should—they should lead by example. And, Mr. Speaker, before I conclude, I would like to say that in this group should be the member for Riel (Ms. Melnick), who actually took the public service and politicized it; the member of Southdale, instead of standing up for students, took tickets to a professional game—hard-working students; and the member for Dawson Trail and La Verendrye. But that will be for another day.

And we would like to see this bill go to committee, and, perhaps, government members would agree to have some proper amendments come forward, where this House would actually lead by example.

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

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Question before the House is second reading of Bill 23, The Local Government Statutes Amendment Act.

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

## DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

### Bill 38—The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2012

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** We move on to resume the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the honourable Attorney General (Mr. Swan), second reading of Bill 38, The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2012, standing in the name of the honourable member for Morris.

Is there unanimous consent of the House for the bill to remain standing in the name of the—*[interjection]* Oh, okay. I recognize the honourable member for Morris.

**Mrs. Mavis Taillieu (Morris):** I guess what this bill does is, really, it's basically a housekeeping type of

bill where there are corrections made to—minor corrections made to the statutes over the course of the term.

We did have some questions on it, which were provided by the member for Minto (Mr. Swan), the Justice Minister, and we, as well, did take some time to look through it, and did have some questions, which I believe we have got answers to. So, with that, I think that we can just pass this bill to committee, and if there's any questions that come up between now and then, we can deal with them at committee. Thank you.

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** Yes, just to note that I'm content to see this go forward, and thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**An Honourable Member:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Question before the House is second reading of Bill 38, The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2012.

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

**Hon. Dave Chomiak (Deputy Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I think the list is—I'd like to call the bills in the next following order: Bill 7, Bill 34, and, well, I'll leave it at that point.

### Bill 7—The Community Renewal Act

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Question before the House is debate on second reading of Bill 7, The Community Renewal Act—one moment—on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Housing and Community Development (Ms. Irvin-Ross)—okay—standing in the name of—one second—the member for—pardon me—Portage la Prairie, who has 25 minutes remaining.

Is it the will of the House to allow the bill—is it the—is there unanimous consent of the House for the bill to remain standing in the name of the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Wishart).

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Leave has been denied.

Is the House ready for the question?

The member for River Heights.

\* (15:30)

**Mr. Gerrard:** I'd like to just put a few words on the record, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I think it's interesting that the very name community renewal bill here indicates, and is a sign of the tremendous deterioration that there's been in so many communities under this government. And, that, obviously, is one of the reasons why there has to now be some renewal, because of the problems in so many communities.

And, of course, this last year, we can point to, you know, communities which have been devastated as a result of action taken by this government—Lake St. Martin, Twin Lakes Beach, Big Point, you know, Sandy Bay has been hurt, Delta Beach and so on—as a result of the flood and diversion of a lot of water. One would hope that there should be some very significant community-renewal activities for these communities which have been so devastated. Clearly, that should be a priority.

There are a whole variety of other communities, Mr. Speaker. I have a list here of 122 communities which have lost population in Manitoba under this NDP government. And, it is a long list, and I won't read the whole list into the record, but I will just say that, clearly, losing populations in communities which are hurting—122 separate communities in Manitoba which need help because of the problems which—and the deterioration which has been happening under this government.

I think it's quite concerning that this bill creates an additional committee; you know, it creates an additional layer of bureaucracy. It may well reduce the actual funding going to the communities. And, when some of the things that have been accomplished are quite productive, one doesn't want to have money going to administration that's not critical, in terms of the forward movement of this activity to renew communities which have encountered so many problems under this NDP government.

Then, I could of—should, of course, talk about some areas of inner Winnipeg where there's been, you know, huge problems under the NDP and, obviously, these are areas which need renewal as well.

So I'm very much in favour of community renewal. I'm just not convinced that you need another layer of bureaucracy to do it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**An Honourable Member:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The question before the House is second reading of Bill 7, The Community Renewal Act.

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

Move on to second reading of Bill 34.

## SECOND READINGS

### Bill 34—The Public-Private Partnerships Transparency and Accountability Act

**Hon. Stan Struthers (Minister of Finance):** I move, seconded by the Minister for Innovation, Energy and Mines (Mr. Chomiak), that Bill 34, The Public-Private Partnerships Transparency and Accountability Act; Loi sur la transparence et la responsabilité en matière de partenariats public-privé, now—be now read a second time and referred to a committee of this House.

#### *Motion presented.*

**Mr. Struthers:** Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to bring this act forward today for second reading. It is legislation that requires Manitoba public sector entities to follow a process of due diligence, transparency and accountability, when proceeding with public-private partnership methods of procurement for capital projects of \$20 million or more.

The legislation will make mandatory many requirements that have been identified by experts as best practice in the P3 field, including PPP Canada, the federal government's Crown corporation responsible for P3s.

The federal P3 process and the provincial P3 legislation align closely in terms of requirements to determine whether a P3 procurement process should be used. The requirements of both are based on best practices and appropriate due diligence.

Alignment occurs at several points in the process, including the preparation of a public sector comparative for analysis of value for money, and a detailed risk analysis, the appointment of a fairness monitor to oversee the procurement process, and the promotion of competitive procurement and appropriate reporting.

Under the proposed legislation, Manitoba public sector entities considering P3 projects would be required to publicly consult before proceeding with the P3 procurement. The Auditor General will also be granted powers to review P3 agreements involving Manitoba public sector entities, comment and provide recommendations that will be made public.

This bill takes a balanced approach to assuring that P3s are undertaken in a transparent and accountable manner while taking steps to ensure value for money for Manitoba taxpayers. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, and I hope we all vote for it. Thank you.

*Mr. Speaker in the Chair*

**Mrs. Heather Stefanson (Tuxedo):** I'm pleased to rise today and put a few words on the record with respect to Bill 34, The Public-Private Partnerships Transparency and Accountability Act. Mr. Speaker, I have some very serious concerns with respect to this bill. I have had the opportunity to speak to many stakeholders in the community, and they were—many of them were not consulted with respect to this legislation. So we know that this legislation affects projects only over \$20 million, and primarily that is centred around projects that are in the city of Winnipeg.

And I just want to say—so it's really is a direct target, I believe, at the City of Winnipeg. I'm not sure where this legislation came from and who asked for it, Mr. Speaker, because we know that this is not something that was brought up during the last election. It's not something that the NDP mentioned that they would be bringing forward in this—if they were to win the election. It's not something that they brought forward in their recent budget that they introduced in this House, and so we're just—you know, I'm very concerned when various stakeholders in the community that this will have a tremendous effect on and a negative impact on, that they were not consulted.

And so I do just want to say that with respect to P3s—Mr. Speaker, P3s are a very important part of how various infrastructure projects get built in Winnipeg, and Winnipeg—the City of Winnipeg and some of the projects that they have done by way of P3 have been recognized nationally and internationally for the savings of money that they've made and as well as getting projects completed on time, actually ahead of time, and in many cases, under budget. And so those are ways, I think, when

various municipalities and various levels of government are looking for ways to save money with respect to infrastructure projects. We know that there's a big infrastructure deficit in the province of Manitoba right now, that I would think it's incumbent upon the NDP government to find ways to make sure those dollars can get used on more projects, not less. And I think that this will have a negative impact on P3 projects in the province of Manitoba, which I think ultimately will cause the cost of many projects in the—this province to go up.

Public-private partnerships are a valuable tool to help build the infrastructure needed for Manitoba—for Manitoba's future. P3s give cost certainty to governments so they can better plan for the future. P3s also have a strong track record of being completed on time and on budget, as I mentioned, Mr. Speaker.

This is vastly different, Mr. Speaker, than the traditional government capital projects under the NDP, and we know that many—there's been many projects that the NDP has done where they've been over budget and have—and they have not been completed on time. And those are capital projects and infrastructure projects that were not—you know, that were not a part of P3s.

And so, I'm very concerned about where this bill has come from. We do know, for example, on a project that was over budget—well over budget, I can recall the Manitoba Hydro building downtown. You know, the original budget for that was \$75 million and it's now over \$300 million in terms of the cost of that building, Mr. Speaker.

\* (15:40)

We do know that there's been some—again, some tremendous projects that have been done under the P3. The Chief Peguis Trail is one of those. The Bill Clement—the William Clement Parkway, Mr. Speaker, is one of those examples, and I think that the government should be looking at more ways to set better examples across the province, not finding ways to do away with P3s in Manitoba. And, you know, I'm bit reluctant. I know that the unions are not in favour of, necessarily of P3s, and I'm just hoping that this is not where this is coming from. That this is not coming from one group or series of groups and the unions across Manitoba, who are talking to the NDP and saying to the NDP that we don't want these P3s to go forward. I would hope that the NDP government would listen to more than just the unions across the province, but would also listen

to the various stakeholders, those that—those companies that are a part of buildings—are a part of these P3s and what they have to say.

So I think it's very important at this point in time, with respect to this legislation, that we do move this on to committee and that we do hear from those stakeholders in the community who do have reservations with respect to this piece of legislation. I've had the opportunity to talk to a few of them that I believe will be out at committee to present at committee. And I think it's incumbent upon the government and I hope they do, very seriously, listen to what it is that those stakeholders have to say, whether or not it's those at the City of Winnipeg, those businesses who have been involved in P3s, those that have been successful in parts of projects that have been internationally renowned, nationally renowned projects that have been a part of those projects here in the province of Manitoba, because I know that that was the concern among many of those people is that they weren't properly consulted.

And so I have serious reservations about this legislation, but I do want to give those stakeholders in the community the opportunity to come forward and to speak and to—on this bill, and to ensure that their voices are heard.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** Just a few words on this bill which relates to P3s, public-private sector partnerships.

I think it's been broadly realized that public-private sector partnerships, done well, can be very useful in involving the private sector and some of the risks associated with infrastructure projects. But, at the same time, there are risks to taxpayers, and it's very important that the appropriate and fundamentally strong, due diligence be done. I think that, for example, when we're looking at, you know, whether it's the building of roads, or buildings, or bridges, that if you've got a private sector partner who is involved not only in the building, but in, you know, what will be the long-run maintenance and operating costs, then it's a very, very strong incentive for the private sector partners to make sure that that was built to the highest quality standards so that you lowest—have the lowest number of problems and lowest operating costs.

But, you know, that being said, I do have some real issues with the way that this bill is put together and the specific concern about the fairness

commissioner and, you know, ensuring that there be a—well, I—I'm not sure that it's—what we're looking for is high quality here. We're looking for low overall costs. You know, I'm not sure that fairness is the right word here, but I think that the way that this commissioner is to be appointed and precisely the role, I think there needs to be some clarification. There needs to be some assurance that this is not just adding extra costs in the way that this is being set up. And so I'm very much looking forward to the comments that will be made by various people at the committee stage. Thank you.

**Mr. Reg Helwer (Brandon West):** I'm pleased to rise and speak to this bill, The Public-Private Partnerships Transparency and Accountability Act, and, you know, very, very fine words, but it seems to me it's a bit of a bill in search of a problem because we really don't seem to have a problem. My understanding is P3s in Winnipeg, which is where they have tended to be, have been very successful partnerships, and I'm not sure why we need to put an additional layer of bureaucracy on there because it is certainly aimed at Winnipeg.

When I've spoken to people in Brandon and out in the other municipalities, it would be probably difficult to find a project of this size that this bill would apply to either in Brandon or in other municipalities. You know, there are certainly bridges in Brandon that are in need of repair, but most of them are, you know, provincial bridges anyway, so it would not apply to the P3.

So those ones wouldn't fall under there. They still need repair, but we're going to have to leave it up to, you know, the minister here to do deal with those whenever they come around. There is one bridge that the City is working on, the 8th Street Bridge, when they determine where and when and how it's going to move and go, but it probably would not be up to the level that would fall under this type of a particular bill. So, again, it looks like it's aimed at Winnipeg, which is a bit of a concern. And, you know, my understanding is that the P3s here have been very, very successful.

I was on Chief Peguis Trail this morning, and seems like that project worked well. I understand it came in on time and under budget, that everyone involved seemed to be very happy with how that whole process rolled out, and now we have a bill that seems to criticize that very process, and it's a little disturbing, then, to see that if everyone was happy with it that now we're taking shots on it through



legislation here, and, you know, we're not quite sure where that's all going to go.

You know, obviously, the other issues talking to—*[interjection]*—it's a very good question—talking to conflict of interest and things of that nature, we've raised those issues in the House here on other issues, and, again, it's a government that wants to issue medicine to other people but doesn't want to take its own medicine in that regard.

And public consultations, you know, we heard a lot about that last night in committee, especially from the students. They were quite disturbed that, you know, this government was not taking appropriate steps in public consultation, that there were short notice given to the student groups in when they had to show up for these, that they could be, you know, properly consulted on things that will impact them down into the future in terms of tuition increases.

And so again, you know, this government saying that we want public consultation, it's something we don't entirely control, but in terms of things that they do control, the universities and such, well, you know, well, maybe we won't do that public consultation.

So, again, it seems to be something that because this P3 program that is out there has been so successful and the Province can't take 100 per cent of the credit for that success that then we're concerned about it, and in that case, we have to make it beholden to the government and let's put another layer of bureaucracy on there and make sure that we have appropriate applications to go through the process and maybe delay this—these programs so that, again, they may not be as successfully if we have to go this—through to this level. If we've got to apply—

**Mr. Speaker:** The honourable member—sorry—order, please. The honourable member for Maples.

**Mr. Mohinder Saran (Chairperson of the section of the Committee of Supply meeting in Room 254):** Mr. Chairperson, in the section of the Committee of Supply—

**Mr. Speaker:** Hold on, hold on. Just one moment, please.

Given that recorded vote has been requested in one of the committees of Supply, one of the sections of the Committee of Supply meeting in the committee room, the House will need to temporarily suspend its business and temporarily resolve into the

Committee of Supply so that the vote can be conducted in the Chamber.

Following the vote, the Chamber section of the Supply will rise and the Committee of Supply will resume consideration in the two committee rooms.

With that being understood, the House will now resolve into the Committee of Supply in the Chamber section.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, will you please take the Chair.

### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (Concurrent Sections)

\* (15:50)

**Mr. Chairperson (Tom Nevakshonoff):** Order.

Will the Chamber section of the Committee of Supply please come to order.

#### Report

**Mr. Mohinder Saran (Chairperson of the section of the Committee of Supply meeting in Room 254):** Mr. Chairperson, in the section of the Committee of Supply meeting in room 254 considering the Estimates of the Department of Health, the honourable member for Charleswood (Mrs. Driedger) moved the following motion:

THAT the minister's salary be reduced to \$10,000, which would represent a token fine for the breaching of an election law.

Mr. Chairperson, this motion was defeated on a voice vote. Subsequently, two members requested that a count-out vote be taken on this matter.

#### Formal Vote

**Mr. Chairperson:** A recorded vote has been requested. Call in the members.

*All sections in Chamber for formal vote.*

\* (16:00)

Order. In the section of the Committee of Supply meeting in room 254 considering the Estimates of the Department of Health, the honourable member for Charleswood (Mrs. Driedger) moved the following motion:

THAT the minister's salary be reduced to \$10,000, which would represent a token fine for the breaching of an election act.

This motion was defeated on a voice vote and, subsequently, two members requested a formal vote on this matter.

The question before the committee, then, is the motion from the honourable member for Charleswood.

*A COUNT-OUT VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 19, Nays 30.*

**Mr. Chairperson:** The motion is accordingly defeated.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Chairperson:** The sections of the Committee of Supply in room 254 and 255 will now continue with consideration of the departmental Estimates, and the Chamber section will now rise.

Call in the Speaker.

**IN SESSION**  
**SECOND READINGS**  
*(Continued)*

**Bill 34—The Public-Private Partnerships  
Transparency and Accountability Act**  
*(Continued)*

**Mr. Speaker:** To continue with Bill 34, The Public-Private Partnerships Transparency and Accountability Act, where the honourable member for Brandon West was continuing his remarks.

**Mr. Helwer:** Mr. Speaker, kind of caught in mid-sentence there so I have to go back to kind of where I was and start over again.

**An Honourable Member:** Start from the beginning.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Helwer:** Well, there we go, you know, as I was saying at the beginning there—I do recall saying that I thought that this bill was a bill in search of a problem and it's obviously something that isn't—hasn't been a problem in the city of Winnipeg or in elsewhere. There's lots of problems; this isn't the one.

This one has been working very, very well as my understanding is the P3 projects work very well in the province of Manitoba, of course, mostly in the city in Winnipeg, but apparently the government needs to—feels the need to dabble in areas where they may or may not have any expertise, and to possibly mess things up again.

So, you know, heaven forbid that we would just let something that's working very well continue to

work. And, you know, I—if something doesn't need to be fixed, then don't try to fix it. And I think it's—

**An Honourable Member:** If it ain't broke, don't fix it.

**Mr. Helwer:** Yes. If it ain't broke, don't fix it. There we go. I think this one, from everything that I have seen and heard and delved into, that the P3s run in Manitoba very, very well, and everybody seems to be happy with them except for, I guess, the Province here.

So they've got a problem, and, again, I think I was talking about conflict of interest, and you know, just an interesting note. If you vote on your own salary, is that not a conflict of interest? But, just—I digress, you know, I don't know. I'm just asking the question. But I would think it might be a problem, but, anyway, you know, the conflict-of-interest procedure here, I believe, is something that obviously is very important and we need to make sure that that is clear and it's critical that everything is well laid out and that. But, if the government's not really willing to follow the conflict of interest or to skirt the issue here, why are they trying to apply this type of thing to other people when I don't believe that I heard any conflict-of-interest allegations in any of these P3 projects. I believe they all ran very, very well there. The public was happy with them because they got done ahead of time or on time and on budget, and isn't that the intent of a project, that we set a budget, we want to stick to it, we want to stick to the timeline, and we know how to deal with wind and rain and other issues like that? So, you know, those things work very well.

But, when the Province seems to get involved, then we have problems, like in stadiums, or other bridges, other environments that run over budget, over time, and, you know, cost us millions of extra dollars. And wouldn't it be nice if we could have saved those dollars, you know, paid for the bridge as we anticipated the cost would be? And in the case of Brandon, for instance, I think it was over budget 12 or 13 million dollars. Heck, we could have put that into health care. We could have hired more staff at the dialysis unit instead of having people travel to Winnipeg on their own coin and take the risk of travelling in the winter.

So, you know, here we have again a bill that I'm really not sure is a useful bill. It did kill a few trees in its printing and maybe that's quite sad, Mr. Speaker, because it's—we shouldn't waste things in that regard. You know, what else can we really say

about this bill? It's—it also involves the Auditor General, and I know in our discussions with her we've had several meetings of Public Accounts that have been changed. The Auditor General prepares for these accounts, and then they're changed and her staff is, you know, out of—just has to prepare for them again.

So here we're asking the Auditor General to get involved in P3s here, and another task for her. So, you know, in that case I know that her—she and her staff are—they have a lot of things to do right now, and to add yet one more, well, I guess we can always go to the Auditor General to ask her to look at these things, but it's explicit in here more or less how she would be involved and where the recommendations would go so that, you know, we can determine if the appropriate measures have been taken.

And, frankly, Mr. Speaker, I'm quite happy with how P3s work and I think most people in Winnipeg and the rest of the province are, so I really don't know why we're going into this process with this bill. But I imagine it could create employment, you know. That could be one of the things, if we're going to hire more people to work for the Province to look into this. And I imagine that—that's—you know, creating employment is an admirable thing if you're in the private sector and using your own money to do it. But creating employment just for the sake of creating employment, you know, I really can't always abide by that. We have some excellent, excellent people that work in the civil service, obviously, and, you know, I've never been a civil servant until—I guess I am now, just recently, so—

**An Honourable Member:** Congratulations.

**Mr. Helwer:** Well, thank you. Yes, congratulations to everyone in here. But we have some excellent staff, but we don't always see the need to add more and more staff just to fulfill something that may not be necessary.

So I guess a lot of concerns there, Mr. Speaker, that this bill adds something, add another layer to this process that may, in fact, kill the P3 process, and that would be the concern. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Any further debate on Bill 34?

Seeing none, is the House ready for the question?

**An Honourable Member:** Question.

\* (16:10)

**Mr. Speaker:** The question before the House is Bill 34, The Public-Private Partnerships Transparency and Accountability Act.

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

### House Business

**Hon. Jennifer Howard (Government House Leader):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, on House business. As per the agreement I tabled earlier today between the government House leaders, the Opposition House Leader, and the member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard), I'm asking for leave to be granted and not see the clock until all remaining government bills are referred to committee and I've had a chance to announce those committees.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave of the House to not see the clock until all of the bills in second reading have been dealt with and been referred to the committee? *[Agreed]*

**Ms. Howard:** Would you call for introduction of bills 33—second reading, sorry. Would you call, for second reading, debate on bills 33, 35, 29 and 37?

**Mr. Speaker:** We'll now call for second reading bills 33, 35, 29 and 37, starting with Bill 33, The Election Financing Act and Elections Amendment Act.

### Bill 33—The Election Financing Act and Elections Amendment Act

**Hon. Jennifer Howard (Minister of Family Services and Labour):** I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Struthers), that Bill 33, The Election Financing Act and Elections Amendment Act; Loi sur le financement des élections et Loi modifiant la Loi électorale, be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has been advised of the bill, and I table the message.

**Mr. Speaker:** It's been moved by the honourable Minister of Family Services and Labour, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that Bill 33, The Election Financing Act and Elections Amendment Act, be now read for a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has been advised of this bill, and the message has been tabled.

**Ms. Howard:** I'll speak briefly to this bill. There are three major changes in this bill.

Firstly, I want to talk about the reason why this bill looks so big. The bill is really a plain language rewrite of the election financing act, and, I think, as members look through the bill, I hope, that they will appreciate the effort that Legislative Counsel went to to put a bill into plain language. We know—all of us who run in campaigns know—that the folks who work with The Elections Finances Act, mostly, are often volunteers giving of their time and skills to us to make sure that our elections run smoothly. And so, I think having a plain language rewrite of that act is going to greatly assist those volunteers. And I think, I hope, it points a way forward to more plain language writing of our laws in Manitoba.

The other changes in the bill—first, there's a potential change to Manitoba's set election date. Prior to this bill being introduced, we were on a course for a significant overlap between our next election and the 2015 federal election campaign. A number of other provinces, including Saskatchewan, are facing this situation. I know in Saskatchewan they have their bill moving their election so it doesn't overlap; it's recently received royal assent. The Premier of Saskatchewan, Brad Wall, had called the overlap untenable. We know that overlapping elections can diminish the role of volunteers in elections, can pose problems to hire election staff, and make sure that there are voting locations. So that's why we're putting this forward. It is important to note that the only way that our election date will move is if the federal election date does not move. It would still be our preference to maintain the fall 2015 election date, but in the event that the federal election does not move from that time, then the next Manitoba election would take place in April of 2016. The second major part of the bill is a change to way—to the way the annual allowance for political parties is established. It's a first-in-Canada situation where we'll have an independent commissioner decide the public financing formula for political parties. We know that political parties face a variety of administrative costs in order to comply with provincial statutes. This public allowance is designed to help parties meet those costs. It will be, of course, the first time in Canada that an independent commissioner will be called upon to determine this issue.

Finally, the other main part of this bill is looking at the issue of a permanent voters list. It requires the chief electoral officer to examine and report on whether a permanent voters list should be established. This will follow consultations with an

advisory committee composed of representatives from each registered political party.

I think that this bill does many things to help further our democratic culture in Manitoba, and I look forward to the debate on it. Thank you very much.

**Mrs. Mavis Taillieu (Morris):** I do want to put some comments on the record in regard to Bill 33, the elections finance act and the elections amendment act.

I—you know, I really think there was an opportunity here for the government to improve Manitoban's election system and look really seriously at it. I think that there could have been much more transparency and accountability within this bill. I think they had an opportunity to create a system which was fair and I think what they've done, is they've chosen to bring in a law that's going to favour them in the long run, Mr. Speaker.

I don't know why they would think that they should be treated anybody—any different than anybody else in this province, Mr. Speaker, and what we saw with the Minister of Health (Ms. Oswald), for example—this is a law that she basically broke. She was sitting at the Cabinet table when this law was introduced the last time, and now it's being amended, but she was one of the architects of the legislation and then she ends up breaking this law by going out and making an announcement within a prescribed 90-day-blackout period.

You know, Mr. Speaker, this is a government that says one thing before an election and then, after election, does another. We didn't hear them going out before the election and saying, we will raise your taxes. No, actually, what we heard before the election is a promise not to raise taxes. There was a distinct statement by the Premier (Mr. Selinger) saying that he would not raise taxes.

Well, that was before he got elected, Mr. Speaker, and after he got elected, what was the first order of business? Well, the first order of business was to impose a collection of fees and taxes that accumulated to \$184 million in new taxes for Manitobans.

They promised to eliminate the education tax for seniors, Mr. Speaker, and have they done that? No, they haven't—another broken promise.

Well, we know that they haven't shut the door on raising the PST, Mr. Speaker, because we've been

asking them several times now what they're going to do in regard to the PST, if they're going to increase the PST 1 per cent. And never once have they said, no; never once have they put their position down as a definite no, which means it's a definite yes. That's what's happening; that is going to happen. And, I mean, if you look at the history of this Premier about what he does, he goes out and says before an election that he won't raise taxes, and then after the election, \$184 million in new taxes.

Now, he didn't say he was going to raise the PST before the election, but now, Mr. Speaker, he's not saying that he's not going to. So we know that there's an eventuality there, that there will be a PST hike coming for all Manitobans, because they will be listening to their political masters, the heads of the unions, over the people of Manitoba.

This is also a government, Mr. Speaker, that politicizes the civil service, and I think this is a real affront to democracy in this province. When you allow another Cabinet minister to co-opt her staff—and we don't even know how wide and deep that is, but we do know that she was allowed to do this and that is a—as I said, an affront to democracy, because civil servants in this province are supposed to be non-partisan and do the work of Manitobans and not the government.

And so when this happens and it's allowed to continue and the Premier (Mr. Selinger) does not call his minister on this and bring her to committee so that she—we can determine the extent of what's happened here, then we certainly—we don't have any faith in the Premier and his feelings about politicizing the civil service, Mr. Speaker.

\*(16:20)

We also know that this is a government that misleads this House, Mr. Speaker. It wasn't that long ago where the Minister of Finance (Mr. Struthers) had to stand in this House and make an apology for inadvertently misleading this House. And, really, when you say one thing—and then he had the information. He knew he had the information and he did not state it in the correct manner, and then he was compelled to bring an apology to this House.

Inadvertently, I really don't think that people should be allowed to get away with inadvertent things. I mean, I could say I inadvertently put my foot on the gas pedal a little too hard and I inadvertently let my car go a little faster than I intended, but it's still a law that I should not have

broken. And I can't just go out after the fact and say, oh, I guess I inadvertently did that. No, that was something that he should have been held to account for.

Very similarly, as the Minister of Health (Ms. Oswald) who said that she—oh, she didn't know that she was breaking the law. Well, it's very strange that when you notify media to come to a media event and media are there, and you just stumble into a event going on where there's cameras and people there. And you just inadvertently, I guess, wander into the opening of a birthing centre, inadvertently within the time frame of the blackout period, and then you just go back and say, oh, I didn't realize that was happening. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think she knew exactly what she was doing and she felt it was easier to beg forgiveness than ask for permission. And this is, I think, disgraceful, and I think Manitobans would be very—are—Manitobans are very upset about this because ordinary Manitobans have to be held to account by the laws of this province, and it appears that this government does not have to.

And, you know, we've had a number of things that this government also does. You know, they stack their Crown corporations with NDP donors; we've seen that. We know that they promote people into plum positions without competition. And after all of the things that this government has done in this very short time since they've been elected, all of this poor track record with raising taxes, breaking their own laws, politicizing the civil service, stacking Crown committees with their own people, Mr. Speaker, now they have audacity to bring in a bill that grants themselves six more months in office. And that's the part that I found very egregious, that after all of this they would allow themselves and grant themselves six more months in office.

There could be other things that they should be doing. I think that perhaps they should look at requiring voter identification at the 'ballent'—at the ballot box, things that will improve transparency and improve the voter turnout, Mr. Speaker. They had a chance to do this, but they chose not to do it, and it certainly—you know, I think when you're requiring people to ID before they cast their ballot is significant. I mean, it's done at other levels of government, at the federal level, at municipal level, and, certainly, all it is doing is ensuring that the correct number of people vote at the correct voting station. And I think that they had an opportunity to improve transparency here, and I think that citizens

think that voter ID is a good idea, but the NDP didn't do this. They didn't want to close in on this loophole.

And, certainly, you know, there's a question why they wouldn't want to. I mean, certainly, there were some issues around the last campaign and it's—it—it's, I guess, quite not surprising to me that they haven't actually tried to include this in their legislation.

Also, Mr. Speaker, you know, we did know that during the last election there were some ballot boxes that were not tracked and location of ballot boxes were suspect. You know, it just leaves the system open to potential tampering by people.

And again, the NDP are silent on their approaches to this, and one has to wonder why they wouldn't want to improve the rules around the ballot box, around the voter ID, Mr. Speaker, which would improve people's confidence in what goes on during elections. And I think if people are more confident about the electoral process that that might actually provide incentive to vote, but I know—I note that turnout is down 12 per cent since 1999, so that's very interesting why turnout has gone down. And I think that there's a bit of a—just a lack of confidence in the voter system, and I think that in this legislation there was opportunity to improve that and, certainly, that didn't happen.

So we have some concerns with this bill, Mr. Speaker, but I know others would like to speak as well, so I'm going to yield the floor to my colleagues. Thank you.

**Mr. Gerrard:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, a few comments on this bill.

First of all, I want to thank the counsel who were involved in ensuring that we have simpler, straightforward, plain language.

Second, I think one of the things which should have been looked at more carefully is part 13, the restrictions on government advertising, and what would be the sanctions when such laws are broken. And clearly we had an example this year—or last year when the law was clearly broken but there were no sanctions. And there are many who are concerned that, because there were no sanctions that—you know, this government may keep on breaking the law and breaking the law. And certainly, that's a particular concern when the government itself is bringing in legislation on school trustees and their ethics and providing sanctions for them but is not providing sanctions under sections like this.

The third point that I want to make has to do with clause 111. And as the government and the opposition know well, I think that, while there should be some for—protection from certain forms of liability, that I don't believe that this should exclude liability from gross neglect or gross incompetence or gross mismanagement, and so I think that this protection goes too far.

And, lastly, I would have thought that, given the experience in the last federal election, that there would have been measures put in here which deal with concerns about the potential misuse of robo-calls and other matters of a similar nature.

With those comments, I look forward to the presentations at the committee stage. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach):** Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. Pleasure to speak on this bill.

I was surprised to hear the Government House Leader (Ms. Howard), Mr. Speaker, reference Saskatchewan and spoke very glowingly about Brad Wall and how—I think she was trying to suggest to this Chamber that her decision to move back the election date was because of Brad Wall's decision. Funny that she hasn't also taken Mr. Wall's initiative to lower the debt like they have done in Saskatchewan, hasn't taken Mr. Wall's initiative to lower taxes like they have in Saskatchewan, hasn't taken Mr. Wall's initiative on many things, for example, to join the New West Partnership. But all of a sudden she's a great follower of Brad Wall, and on this item she clearly wanted to use his actions as a defence for her own actions.

But I don't think, in fact, Mr. Speaker, this government has a defence for extending their term, expending—extending their mandate to a level that they didn't run on. I look back over the last several months and I can't think of one thing that would give me any sort of justification why the government should have a longer term in office than it ran on.

\* (16:30)

We've now had set election dates for two elections—and only one will have been followed, so we're barely batting 50 per cent—but if the government didn't want to conflict with the federal election, and I can see that that might be a justifiable reason, Mr. Speaker, they could have moved it up earlier. There wasn't anything that was preventing them from going earlier as opposed to going later.

Some of the issues were raised by my colleague. Over the last six months since the last election, we've seen the Minister of Health (Ms. Oswald) and her 'conspirator' the Minister for Education (Ms. Allan) break election laws, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if they feel that that was a justifiable reason to extend their mandate by six months.

We've seen the Premier (Mr. Selinger), prior to the election, talk about not increasing taxes. In fact, he almost did an impression of an American politician, saying, read my lips. I'm not going to raise taxes, and then right after the election, we read the budget and he'd raised taxes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if he feels that that's a justification for an additional six months in office.

We've seen how the government has manipulated newcomers, and new Canadians, Mr. Speaker, seen that over the last six months, and you know, I took—I take some offence to this. I represent many new Canadians, some of whom I consider not just constituents but who I consider friends, very good friends in fact. And I actually wrote a bit of an article about what was going on here in the Legislature about how the government was upset that they were going to be losing control over a program that they only funded at a level of 3 per cent, and the funding source who controlled 97 per cent of the funding, the federal government, was going to be taking over control.

And I had a response from a number of my new Canadian friends on Facebook, in fact. It's not a secret. They can go and see those Filipino friends who said they couldn't understand what the NDP were doing. In fact, I had a Filipino friend who posted just yesterday and said, well, it makes perfect sense to cut out the middleman to me, he said, and I thought, well, that's a lot of common sense from new Canadians. And I always find that new Canadians, in fact, have great common sense, and when you explain it to them and saying that, you know, who would enter a business partnership where you're going to put in 97 per cent of the capital, but you're going to let somebody else run it at a hundred per cent level. It would make no sense, Mr. Speaker. Nobody would enter a business relationship like that.

But, of course, certainly the NDP were in a relationship like that and they didn't want to end it. I guess I can understand from their perspective that you wouldn't want to end a relationship like that when you are being able to run a program and not being able to actually fund anything, and, in fact,

Mr. Speaker, I know the Minister of Immigration (Ms. Melnick), her department is going to go from a department of \$37 million to a department of \$1 million. And so I can understand why she's upset. She's concerned that she's going to be removed from Cabinet because of changes by the federal government, and, you know, I see some members over there might understand why she would be upset. And, in many ways, I suppose the federal Conservative government is doing what the Premier should have done a long time ago and remove her from Cabinet.

But, at the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, I would say that when you explain it to new Canadians, they understand that, in fact, this makes a lot of sense. They're not concerned. They're not being fooled by the NDP government. You know, they had the little dog-and-pony show here at the Legislature. It kind of blew up in the government's face, didn't work out the way they'd planned. They've been answering questions and defending it now for the last two months after they had that little stunt.

Certainly, most of the new Canadians here, at best, were confused, Mr. Speaker, and when you actually explained to them what was going on, they couldn't understand why the government was making such a big deal over an issue where they weren't going to be able to run a program they didn't even care to fund. I mean if they cared enough to fund the program—if they cared enough to fund the program—they would have been putting more money into it over the last 10 years, but, somehow, the government has decided that, well, you know, we actually deserve an extra six months to govern, based on that little stunt, or maybe there are other reasons, maybe they, you know, looked at what the Attorney General (Mr. Swan) was doing or not doing.

We've seen over the last couple of days, the Attorney General doesn't even know the law, which is a concern, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad that it was printed up in the media that the Attorney General doesn't understand the law, and you would expect if there was anybody in the province who we would believe would understand the law, we would hope and trust would understand the law, it would be the Attorney General, the Minister of Justice, but we had to spend two days in the Assembly explaining to him what the—what section 810 of the Criminal Code was all about. And now I hope he finally understands and will be a little bit more cautious before he speaks about things that he clearly doesn't understand. We had to go and get, you know, individuals in Ottawa,

senior ministers, to explain to the Attorney General (Mr. Swan) here, take him, sort of, almost back to law school to tell him about how this whole process works, and maybe that's good. Now he understands and so that's a benefit. He's now—he's been schooled a little bit in one part of the Criminal Code, and we'll take the time to school him in other things as this session and as this term goes on.

But I wonder if they feel that, by virtue of the Attorney General's inability to do his own job, that they feel they should get an extra six months. Well, that doesn't make any sense to me, Mr. Speaker.

I don't know if—you know, the member for Morris (Mrs. Taillieu) referenced the apology by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Struthers), and, of course, we're still waiting for another apology. It was actually not requested by us, Mr. Speaker; it was requested by the Premier (Mr. Selinger). The Premier indicated that the Minister for Energy was going to be making an apology, so we all sort of waited with bated breath and, well, we're still waiting. Maybe they think if they add another six months onto the term, that'll give the Minister of Energy (Mr. Chomiak) enough time to come and do what the Premier said he was going to do. You know, do one thing—often as opposition members, and I think I've put myself in this category. I've sometimes asked government members to apologize for this, that or the other thing, and I've been ignored often when I've asked—almost all the time—when I've asked for those apologies and, you know, I can kind of live with that. I understand sort of the give and take of opposition and government, but I've never seen a Premier—never seen a Premier—ask a senior minister to apologize for something and then not have it happen. I might think it's unprecedented. I've never seen a situation like that.

So maybe the additional six months that are added into this bill and to the election bill are intended to give the Minister of Energy an opportunity, then, to apologize. And if, in fact, that's the case, if that's the rationale, then the Government House Leader (Ms. Howard) should tell us that, well, we needed the extra six months before another election because the Minister of Energy just can't bring himself to apologize within the time frame that he has.

And, also, and then the final point I'd make—there's so many points that I could make—but, of course, we know that we now have the 58th MLA here, Mr. Speaker, not always present in the

Legislature, but we've now have an unelected MLA, the former elected MLA for St. James, Bonnie Korzeniowski, who is getting paid like an MLA, has an office like an MLA, maybe doesn't have the same workload as an MLA—does have the same office, though. And the government decided just to hire her, you know, ignoring some of the concerns that flood victims have. That was very complicated. They took a lot of time, but, you know, lickety-split, they got the former member for St. James hired into a job. My colleague from Arthur-Virden mentions that it's sort of reminiscent of Scott Smith, how he got a job within government quickly after his severance pay, I think, ran out, and probably before the—or after the conflict rules had expired on him. We didn't even wait for Bonnie Korzeniowski. She's probably getting her severance and her pay. Boy, that's a golden handshake. But maybe the government looked at that and said, wow, we've done such a good job of getting the 58th MLA, we need to extend the election for six months.

In conclusion, I can't think of one good reason, one good thing that this government has done in the last six months that would justify giving them another six months before the next election. And to try to emulate that Brad Wall, if this government wants to emulate Brad Wall there's a whole lot of other things it should start with before giving themselves an extra six months.

Thank you very much.

**Mr. Speaker:** Any further debate on this bill?

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**Mr. Speaker:** The question before the House is Bill 33, The Election Financing Act and Elections Amendment Act.

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

We'll now proceed with Bill 35, The Retail Businesses Holiday Closing Amendment Act.

#### **Bill 35—The Retail Businesses Holiday Closing Amendment Act**

**Ms. Howard:** I move, seconded by the Minister for Entrepreneurship, Training and Trade (Mr. Bjornson), that Bill 35, The Retail Businesses Holiday Closing Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les jours fériés dans le commerce de détail, be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.



***Motion presented.***

\* (16:40)

**Ms. Howard:** This bill implements the consensus recommendations of the Labour Management Review Committee. This is a committee made up of equal numbers of employer and employee members and has provided valuable input into this important initiative. And I want to, of course, once again, thank them for the work that they've done on this issue, but so many others.

We also—in looking at this issue, we asked for input from Manitobans through a website. We received responses from more than a thousand Manitoba families and workers and business owners and under individuals, who shared their views on this issue. A majority of those respondents, about 55 per cent, favoured extended shopping hours on Sundays, and many respondents also asked for protections to help retail workers who wish to maintain Sunday as a day of rest.

We know that Manitoba businesses and consumers have been increasingly voicing their support for extended hours on—shopping hours on Sundays, but we also know that we want to make sure that people who work in those businesses also have a choice to work or not to work that day.

So this bill expands a time period within which municipalities may permit retail businesses to be open on Sundays and certain holidays. If a municipality passes a required a bylaw, these businesses may now operate between 9 a.m. and 6 p.m., providing an additional three hours of opening time in the morning. These changes will also affect opening hours on Louis Riel Day, Victoria Day and Thanksgiving.

The act will allow municipalities to choose any subset of these hours as they deem appropriate for their communities. Municipalities may choose to continue the current arrangement on operating hours from noon to 6 p.m.

It's worth noting, Mr. Speaker, that a number of municipalities in Manitoba have never passed Sunday shopping bylaws. In these communities, Sunday shopping would continue to be prohibited unless a bylaw is enacted.

This bill ensures that retail workers will have a strong right to refuse work on Sundays provided they give their employers sufficient notice, and it also strengthens the enforcement mechanisms for this

right so that if an employee is terminated or disciplined due to their refusal, Employment Standards will have the authority to 'compensate' or reinstate an employee in these cases.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this bill represents a fair compromise in the desire to give Manitobans more flexibility in their lives to do the things that they need to do, while continuing to balance the rights of people who have to work on weekends, to also have some ability to have some time off from their labours and some time with their families.

Thank you, very much.

**Mr. Cliff Cullen (Spruce Woods):** I welcome the opportunity to put a few comments on the record in regard to Bill 35, The Retail Businesses Holiday Closing Act.

I think the first thing I want to do is acknowledge the work of the Labour Management Review Committee and their input in this over the last month or so since this discussion has been brought forward.

Clearly, the minister outlined the changes that are—will be forthcoming in this particular legislation. We, certainly, on this side of the House, are interested in seeing this bill move to committee so that we get a sense of what Manitobans are thinking in terms of the expansion of Sunday shopping hours here in Manitoba.

And, as the minister did point out, the onus is still on the local municipalities to enact their own local legislation, to be able to opt into the extended three hours on the Sunday morning shopping. So that right certainly still exists with the local and municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, if you're been listening in to the discussion today on the legislation, there certainly seems to be a reoccurring theme throughout the afternoon, and that is a theme of broken promises on behalf of this current NDP government.

Mr. Speaker, we went through a provincial election here the—over the last year, and the government of the day were quite often misleading in a lot of their statements they provided to us and sometimes they just completely decided to ignore issues.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to quote what the Premier (Mr. Selinger) of the Province had said, back last September 3rd, just a month before the provincial election, in regard to this particular

legislation. And October 3rd, the Premier said, our view is that, so far, the legislation has been broadly satisfactory to most groups and to most people in society. And that quote would lead most people to believe that there would be no changes pending in terms of the changes to Sunday shopping.

And then, even after the election, October 19th, the Premier went on and stated that he had, and I quote: No plan to change it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, here we are seven months later, we're—here we are with new legislation, and I would offer to you another NDP broken promise.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, we've heard the same comments time after time on legislation today, and it appears that you simply cannot trust this NDP government.

Mr. Speaker, we've seen a budget that came out not too long ago with \$184 million in new taxes, and, as well, \$114 million in new fees and service fees on the backs of Manitoba taxpayers. Over the next four years these new fees and taxes will cost Manitoba families over \$1.1 billion. We haven't seen a rise in taxes of that magnitude since way back in the NDP Pawley government. So it's quite appalling to see these kinds of events unfold.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about business being competitive in Manitoba, this really is just one tool in the tool box. Clearly, Manitobans deserve a government that's going to allow business to be competitive in Manitoba, and hours of operation is just one tool. Clearly, lower taxes, less red tape, less regulatory burdens can play a real benefit to business community around Manitoba. And that's something that we think the government should be looking forward to doing. And we certainly hope when it gets to committee that we will hear that from Manitobans as well. So there certainly is a lot more that can be done to make business competitive, and as well to allow consumers more opportunities here in the province of Manitoba. Clearly, those reduced costs that businesses face could lead to better opportunities, I think, for Manitoba consumers. So there certainly is a lot more things that the government should be looking forward to as well.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I just want to also comment a little bit of the irony in the timing of this particular legislation coming forward, at least the premise of this legislation. We had, as I mentioned, some of the highest taxes coming forward in the provincial budget in years. And, clearly, the

government, playing politics, is looking for any distraction from the bad news in the provincial budget. And, clearly, this legislation, this premise was brought out at exactly the same time as the bad news in the provincial budget. So, clearly, it was designed to distract Manitobans from the real negative issues that were coming out around and surrounding the provincial budget.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I want to close my comments. I look forward to committee next week and hear what Manitobans have to say about this legislation.

Thank you very much.

**Mr. Goertzen:** Just a very brief comment regarding this bill, Mr. Speaker. There were two things that were important to me in particular for my community on this bill, and that is that local control be left in terms of the determination about whether or not Sunday shopping would apply in local communities. The city of Steinbach, for example, largely does not have Sunday shopping. That's a local decision that's been made by the community through its local councillors. I was glad to see and certainly advocated for the fact that that decision would remain there on a local level, and I think that this bill does protect that. And also to ensure that individuals who did not want to participate in Sunday work would have the right to have those views respected. I think that that was important.

So, while I might not agree with everything, I did think, and I do think, it was important to have local decision making at that local level and to have individual rights protected, and I'm glad that we were able to see those two things contained within the bill.

\* (16:50)

**Mr. Gerrard:** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank those who were involved with the panel who helped to bring this forward. I think that one of the things which is apparent is that this bill is coming forward as a result of Liberal leadership in the last election when we brought forward the idea of improving Sunday shopping.

And it was interesting at the time that the NDP said, no, no, we're not going in that direction, but that as soon as the budget came along and they knew they had some, you know, bad news for people, that they wanted to cover up the bad news as the—has been pointed out earlier on, by bringing forward a good Liberal idea and making things a little easier for people for shopping on Sunday. So I'm certainly

ready to support this legislation and look forward to it moving forward. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Any further debate on Bill 35?

House ready for the question?

**Some Honourable Members:** Question?

**Mr. Speaker:** The question before the House is Bill 35, The Retail Business Holiday Closing Amendment Act.

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

We'll now proceed with Bill 29, The Contaminated Sites Remediation Act.

### **Bill 29—The Contaminated Sites Remediation Amendment Act**

**Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Minister of Conservation and Water Stewardship):** I move, seconded by the Minister of Family Services and Labour (Ms. Howard), that Bill 29, The Contaminated Sites Remediation Amendment Act, be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of the House.

#### ***Motion presented.***

**Mr. Mackintosh:** The current act is focused on designated contaminated sites. These are sites that currently pose, or may pose, a threat to human health or safety or to the environment that is associated with a level of environmental contamination.

The act, however, does not fully address sites which have not been designated as contaminated but may still pose a threat. The new bill will require the owner or occupier of a site that is contaminated to a level above the environmental quality standards to report it to Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship. Under the amended legislation, sites that pose an immediate risk will be designated as contaminated. Sites which may pose a risk will be designated as impacted.

The new bill also establishes a new process for the management of these impacted sites. The remediation of any designated site must be authorized by the department. In summary, the proposed inclusion of impacted sites into the act will provide better management of all sites with contamination. Thank you.

**Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden):** Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to be able to put a few words on the record in regards to Bill 29, the contaminated sites remediation amendment.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the minister and the staff for the briefing that we had on this particular bill. The—of course, The Contaminated Sites Remediation Act was brought forward by Progressive Conservative Environment Minister Glen Cummings back in 1996, and I certainly appreciate the work that was done on this. I know Mr. Cummings was known as one of the most thorough Environment ministers that the—in Canada at the time, never mind just his Manitoba goings-on. And so I learned my environmental processes as a new member of the Legislature under his tutelage, I guess, in those days, and when I first came into the Legislature, and respected the views that he had provided and the bills that he had brought in, in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the key to that legislation was to provide for remediation of contaminated sites, to help prevent, minimize or mitigate damage to human health or the environment. And I believe that the minister here has outlined the issues around contaminated sites. Nothing is changing in this bill, it appears, in regards to contaminated sites. And some of the agenda that was put forward under the original bill some 15, 16 years ago by the Progressive Conservative Party were—included some of the principles of polluter pay, that—when it came to who would take financial responsibility for cleaning up contaminated sites. The act set out a process for apportioning responsibility for site remediation as well.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this bill talks about contaminated sites as those, as the minister said, as those who pose a threat to human health and safety, to the environment and the impacted sites, as well, are maybe a lesser contaminated site, if you will, under this bill. I think it was pointed out very clearly that a contaminated site—first, the difference between a contaminated site and an impacted site is that a contaminated site has a source of contamination, a receptor, either human or animal, and a pathway for transmission of the contamination. And that comes from Mr. Gilbertson, the director of Environmental Services for Manitoba Conservation.

And, of course, the difference there is that an impacted site has one of those three legs or three elements missing from it. And so the threat is not as immediate, I guess, is the way to describe an impact site as opposed to a contaminated site, and that is the particular point to be made with this piece of legislation. A system for identifying, registering impacted sites should be set up, and I know that the

government is in an attempt to do that. We would strongly encourage the government to make detailed information readily available that will help Manitobans be able to readily determine whether they have property that would fall into this category. We believe this is important—an important component of the—making this piece of legislation effective.

We're also interested to learn more about the standards that will be adopted by the provincial government, and we'll wait to see what kind of regulations come around this particular piece of legislation. Are they looking at models used in other provinces or a national standard? Some clarification in these areas would be most helpful, not only to us, but the citizens of Manitoba who may be impacted by this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it was a good idea set in motion back in—when bill—when The Contaminated Sites Remediation Act was first put in place, and it looks like the NDP have caught on to that in dealing with the identification of contaminated sites, because it was in that original bill. And requiring the development of remediation plans for contaminated sites, we believe that this will help in regards to the dealing with the impacted sites as well.

The owner of an impacted site, however, the onus is put squarely on them in this particular bill, to notify the provincial government about this situation. If the site is designated as impacted, the owner of the site will be required to develop a remediation plan and file it with the director.

Mr. Speaker, the director may then issue a remediation order so that that site remediation can begin and notice of designation of an impacted site must be filed in a registry along with the other required information, such as remediation orders for those sites. Information about contaminated sites is also supposed to be—continue to be put in that registry.

The impacted site designation can be revoked and the site removed from the registry if the site is no longer contaminated at a level that may pose a threat to humans' health or safety or the environment, in other words, if it's cleaned up.

So, Mr. Speaker, the other part of this bill that I wanted to just touch base on is that there is a—if—that responsibility for cleanup will default to the owner—current owner of the contaminated site. If, however, they feel that they're not responsible, there is an

appeal process, a proportional amount of responsibility, if he or she is not responsible for the—if he feels that he or she is not responsible for the remediation of the site or one or more other persons should be responsible for the remediation at that site besides themselves or with themselves.

And I wanted to—I'd be remiss if I didn't mention here that in the cases of emergency cleanups, as authorized or is forced by the government, the costs incurred by the Province for the emergency remediation would go back to the owner of the site. And so we need to know more about the regulations around some of these particular decisions.

I guess that another thing about this bill is, Mr. Speaker, it's—it is to be fixed in a proclamation at a future date, and so, therefore, we—it may be like a number of the other bills that the NDP have brought forward; it may sound good, but we're concerned about the fact that they may never get it into implementation. I hope that's not the case with this. It does clarify those kinds of concerns, and so I guess I want to say that since its creation in 1996 by the PC member, Mr. Cummings, the contaminated site remediation act has been an important tool on identifying sites that need remediation and in initiating the needed site cleanup measures.

And so we look forward to hearing the public input on this legislation as it goes forward to committee, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

**Mr. Gerrard:** Just a few comments. I've long been a strong advocate of environmental cleanup of contaminated and impacted sites. This bill is certainly a step forward. There remains, of course, many sites that are contaminated, impacted, which need to be cleaned up yet in Manitoba, and I look forward to this bill progressing to committee stage and becoming law. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Any further debate on Bill 29?

**An Honourable Member:** Question.

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

**An Honourable Member:** Question.

\* (17:00)

**Mr. Speaker:** The question before the House is Bill 29, The Contaminated Sites Remediation Act. Pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? *[Agreed]*

We'll now proceed with Bill 37, The Highway Traffic Amendment and Summary Convictions Amendment Act (Bicycle Helmets).

**Bill 37—The Highway Traffic Amendment and Summary Convictions Amendment Act (Bicycle Helmets)**

**Hon. Jim Rondeau (Minister of Healthy Living, Seniors and Consumer Affairs):** I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Swan), that Bill 37, The Highway Traffic Amendment and Summary Convictions Amendment Act (Bicycle Helmets), now be read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

***Motion presented.***

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, this bill amends The Highway Traffic Act to amend—to add a new section requiring the use of bicycle helmets for cyclists under 18 years of age. I'd like to publicly thank the former member for Inkster for his work in bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

Cycling is a popular pastime and mode of transport for the children. However, all cycling injuries for children are one of the most common forms of injury. This is truly unfortunate. Many of these injuries can be prevented through proper use of bicycle helmets. Research has shown that correctly used bicycle helmets can reduce the risk of serious head and brain injuries by more than 80 per cent.

This bill would require specific bikes, helmets, standards as prescribed in regulation. It is also proposed that an exemption is prescribed in regulations for essential religious practices. These amendments would come into force on proclamation. This will allow for regulation, development, public education, a time for the public to purchase the bike helmets.

And I'd like to publicly say, thank you very much, to the Liberal Party who have been very consistent on this, because they have been pushing it.

So, Mr. Speaker, many of the provisions of this bill are a reflection of best practices currently being used by injury prevention in health community. I strongly recommend it to the House.

**Mr. Gerrard:** Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the minister for recognizing the Liberal efforts in this area for many years, and I will talk about some of those briefly.

Going back to when we had the Healthy Kids task force, we produced a minority report at the time called Six Lost Years, It's Time For Action. And one of the things that we called for was mandatory bike helmet legislation, recognizing that making it

mandatory was the one ingredient which would increase dramatically the use of bike helmets and increase the safety of children in Manitoba. There were some fairly dramatic presentations there during our Healthy Kids task force which emphasized the damage, brain damage which can result from bicycle accidents and the long-term consequences to the individuals as well as the long-term consequences to, and the costs to the health-care system because of the nature and the costly effects of brain injury.

We, on May 26th, 2005, introduced what was then Bill 210, to make the use of bicycle helmets mandatory riding a bike in Manitoba. The bill went to second reading in June the 2nd, 2005. We were strong advocates of this. The NDP opposed the bill at that time. They argued that education was going to make a difference and was going to be enough, but time has proved otherwise, and I'm glad that the NDP have seen the light and are now supporting this bill.

We, again, in April 15th, 2008, introduced what was then Bill 225, to make the use of bicycle helmets mandatory, riding a bike in Manitoba. It went to second reading on September the 16th, 2008. Once again the NDP failed to support it, arguing that, you know, education was enough, but they either weren't doing a good enough job of education or, as in many other jurisdictions, it's proved that what, in fact, is the need to make this mandatory, and, in part, so that parents can say to their children, I mean, it's the law. We—it was able to increase compliance and effect a change in behaviour just as mandatory seat belts have done before.

We tried again in 2009. Kevin Lamoureux and I, June 8th and 9th, once again, this legislation was rejected by the NDP. We tried again later, in 2009 and 2010. It went to second reading, April 20th, 2010, and once again the NDP refused to support it.

It should be noted that in June of 2010 Statistics Canada reported that, in spite of all the NDP's efforts, only 22 per cent of Manitobans were using bike helmets. The NDP approach, clearly, was not enough, and mandatory bike helmet legislation was clearly needed.

In that same year, in June, Dr. Patrick McDonald on CBC reviewed the evidence. He emphasized that the only thing that really increases helmet use is legislation making it mandatory, and he talked specifically about the very large financial and social cost which results from not introducing and having

mandatory bike helmet legislation. He also talked of how a child can be perfectly well one moment and the next, after a head injury when riding a bike without a helmet, can have to live in an institution, a very sad circumstances.

He also talked about the millions of dollars per person that a major head injury can cost for medical care and social care, and he asked children and parents what can be done to help, and the obvious solution is making bike helmets mandatory.

We've been pushing this for many years, as the MLA for Assiniboia has noted, Kevin Lamoureux has been a very forceful voice for this effort in the Legislature and, as some have been remarking, it would be great if we could call this the Kevin Lamoureux bill.

I would note, that, even as late as January of this year, Manitoba got poor marks from the Canadian Paediatric Society, because it had failed to implement mandatory bike helmet legislation. I'm glad the NDP have finally listened to the Liberals on this and that we're going to proceed.

I would add one more comment, and that is that the evidence in other provinces is that including adults as well as children is beneficial. I suspect that in due course Manitoba will move in that direction, but it would've been an addition which could be considered, and perhaps, as a result of presenters presenting at the committee stage, Mr. Speaker, there might even be an amendment considered.

With those comments, I thank you, and look forward to this bill proceeding to committee and to becoming legislation.

**Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood):** I'm very pleased to have an opportunity to stand and just put a few comments on the record about Bill 37, and I won't repeat a lot of the history, because the member from River Heights has certainly gone over the history of what's happened with this legislation over the last number of years.

And, indeed, Mr. Speaker, we stand in support of this legislation. Its time has come, and it is time for us to move this issue forward in Manitoba, because it is an issue of safety for children.

And, Mr. Speaker, we do note that the Liberal Party has brought this forward four times in a private member—in private members' bills, and we would

also note that each time it was adamantly opposed by the NDP government.

And I don't want to take up too much time, but there are some fascinating quotes, that if people want to look at to see the comments or hear the comments from some members across the way on why this bill shouldn't have been supported when the Liberals brought it forward.

\* (17:10)

The member from Interlake, he actually had some really pretty strident comments. Interesting now we see this flip-flop by the NDP government and, indeed, they have decided to move forward with this legislation instead of opposing it.

Well, some of my colleagues are indicating they want to hear some of these quotes. Well, I would indicate that the member from Interlake said, and I quote: It's another example of going a little bit too far of imposing upon the freedoms of individuals. We live in free and democratic society and people should allow—be allowed to make some choices. The member from Wolseley said, it's not going to work, it's not worth pursuing. And, I guess, we have an instance here where the Minister of Healthy Living (Mr. Rondeau) needs to talk to a few more of his colleagues. Some of the same ones that made similar comments about booster seats. So it looks like he's got some education to do with some of his own members and get them up to speed with what the research is showing, and certainly the research is showing that deaths resulting from bike accidents dropped by over 50 per cent in jurisdictions with mandatory bike helmet laws. So, despite the fact that there might be some people that don't like wearing them, the research is really there to back it up. And, between 1999 and 2008, Manitoba saw 27 children and adults die from cycling injuries, while a larger number suffered serious injuries. So, certainly, the medical proof is there that it is valuable, and it's interesting now that the NDP have gone down the road of the flip-flop and agreed to move this forward.

They are—I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that there are some people out there that really need a lot of credit for moving this forward and there are a number of people within the medical community that I think do need some specific mention.

I have met with Dr. Patrick McDonald, who's a pediatric neurosurgeon at the Children's Hospital, and we spent a lot of time talking about the importance of bike helmets and what it can do to

reduce injury and death. And Dr. Patrick McDonald has been a very, very strong advocate for the use of bike helmets in—particularly, in children. As a pediatric neurosurgeon, he's actually been the one that's had to operate on kids that have had a head injury, and I suppose if you end up doing that a few times, you become very aware of the need for legislation like this. And I think Dr. McDonald deserves a lot of credit. He has worked very, very diligently since he moved here from Toronto to move this issue forward to the point that it can be brought forward as legislation in Manitoba.

So he has been very instrumental in providing the kind of information all of us need to support this legislation. He has also been very instrumental in speaking with a number of his colleagues and ensuring that all of their voices are heard in this debate. And I just want to, also, you know, say to the third-year pediatric residents that went so far as to put out a petition out there with the names of many, many people in the health community—nurses, doctors, pharmacists; there were a number of people that signed the petition, the people within the health-care system who deal with these issues on a regular basis, all passionately committed to seeing Manitoba do whatever it can to reduce the number of head injuries in children. And I also want to indicate that there have been a number of nurses, some former neuroscience colleagues of mine that have also been in touch with me and urged us to have a really good look at this bill, and as a former neuroscience nurse, I never did have a chance to, thankfully, have to work with children with head injuries. It was certainly an emotional and difficult challenge working with adults with head injuries.

But I want to say to all of those nursing colleagues of mine, that we have listened and we are in support of this legislation, and I want to credit all of them. There was a concerted effort out there by people within the medical and nursing and other health professional—professions that feel very strongly and have worked very hard to encourage all of us to get behind this and move it forward.

So we look forward to moving it to committee and hearing further comments and we look forward to seeing it put in legislation in Manitoba. Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** Any further debate on Bill 37?

House ready for the question?

**An Honourable Member:** Question.

**Mr. Speaker:** Question before the House is Bill 37, The Highway Traffic Amendment and Summary Convictions Amendment Act (Bicycle Helmets).

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

#### House Business

**Hon. Jennifer Howard (Government House Leader):** On House business, I'd like to announce that the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development will meet on Monday, June 11th, 2012, at 6 p.m., to consider the following bills: Bill 7, The Community Renewal Act; Bill 8, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Use of Child Safety Seats); Bill 21, The Public Schools Amendment Act (Code of Conduct for School Trustees); Bill 24, The Energy Savings Act; Bill 25, The Groundwater and Water Well and Related Amendments Act; Bill 29, The Contaminated Sites Remediation Amendment Act; Bill 37, The Highway Traffic Amendment and Summary Convictions Amendment Act (Bicycle Helmets).

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been announced that the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development will meet on Monday, June the 11th, 2012, at 6 p.m. to consider the following bills: Bill 7, The Community Renewal Act; Bill 8, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Use of Child Safety Seats); Bill 21, The Public Schools Amendment Act (Code of Conduct for School Trustees); Bill 24, The Energy Savings Act; Bill 25, the groundwater and well water and related amendments act; Bill 29, The Contaminated Sites Remediation Amendment Act; and Bill 37, The Highway Traffic Amendment and Summary Convictions Amendment Act (Bicycle Helmets).

**Ms. Howard:** Yes, on further House business, I'd like to announce that the Standing Committee on Human Resources will meet on Monday, June 11th, 2012, at 6 p.m., to consider the following bills: Bill 6, The Regional Health Authorities Amendment Act (Improved Fiscal Responsibility and Community Involvement); Bill 23, The Local Government Statutes Amendment Act; Bill 33, The Election Financing Act and Elections Amendment Act; Bill 34, The Public-Private Partnerships Transparency and Accountability Act; Bill 35, The Retail Businesses Holiday Closing Amendment Act; and Bill 38, The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2012.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been announced that the Standing Committee on Human Resources will meet

on Monday, June the 11th, 2012, at 6 p.m., to consider the following bills: Bill 6, The Regional Health Authorities Amendment Act (Improved Fiscal Responsibility and Community Involvement); Bill 23, The Local Government Statutes Amendment Act; Bill 33, The Election Financing Act and Elections Amendment Act; Bill 34, The Public-Private Partnerships Transparency and Accountability Act; Bill 35, The Retail Businesses Holiday Closing Amendment Act; and Bill 38, The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2012.

Seeing no further business, this—it's—the hour being past 5 p.m., this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. on Monday.

**COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY  
(Concurrent Sections)**

**HEALTH**

\* (14:30)

**Mr. Chairperson (Mohinder Saran):** Order. Will the Committee of Supply please come to order.

Before we begin, I would like to remind members to ensure their electronic devices are in silent mode and to also speak more closely into the microphones.

This section of committee—this section of the Committee of Supply will now resume consideration of the Estimates for the Department of Health. As previously agreed, questions for the department will proceed in a global manner. The floor is now open for questions.

**Hon. Theresa Oswald (Minister of Health):** Yes, Mr. Chair, and I will do this swiftly, but if I would be permitted to just follow-up on some answers that the—to questions that the member from Charleswood asked me and wanted me to read that into the record swiftly. I could do that just quickly and then the member could put his question, if it's—he's fine with that.

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** I think it would be smart if that was actually done when the member for Charleswood (Mrs. Driedger) is here, and I'm sure that there'll be no problem in doing that when she arrives. Yes. Yes. I think she would appreciate that.

**Ms. Oswald:** That's fine with me. He can go ahead with his questions then.

\* (14:40)

**Mr. Gerrard:** Yes, let me start out with a question that I've asked from time to time, and that is: What is the latest number for the number of people in Manitoba who have diabetes?

**Ms. Oswald:** Yes, indeed, we are working, as usual, on tracking that number through our annual report. We're trying to put our fingers on that answer just right at this moment. We'll continue to look for it now. If we, in the coming minutes, don't have the number at our fingertips, I'll commit to the member to provide that information for him swiftly.

**Mr. Gerrard:** Yes, thank you. Now, I note that the number of people in Manitoba who are waiting to get into a personal care home has been steadily rising from 1,223 in March 31st, '09, up to 1,328 a year later to 1,343, March 31st, 2011, and 1,369, March 31st, 2012.

It's a little disturbing that, you know, with each passing year, there's more people waiting to get into personal care homes, and I wonder what the minister is planning to do to address this.

**Ms. Oswald:** Yes, and thank the member for the question. Certainly, we know that seniors and their families are interested in having a—varieties of supports available to them as they reach stages in life where they may need more supports to carry on a vibrant life.

And we would concur with the member that we are seeing our population age, and we are seeing more need for personal care home environments, as well as seeing more need for home care. I know the member would agree with me that ultimately if our seniors have the opportunity to stay at home—often in homes in which they've dwelled for over 60 years and more sometimes—certainly that is the No. 1 choice for seniors and for their families.

The member will be aware that last winter we announced a renewed long-term care strategy. We have committed \$200 million to build hundreds of more personal care home beds, and at the same time we have committed to provide more home care to support seniors who want to live in their homes longer.

We have also added a few additional pillars to the strategy, and we continue to work on the road of providing supportive housing options.

So I believe the member is aware that, at the time of that \$200-million commitment, we announced an expansion of Holy Family here in



Winnipeg. We announced that we would be expanding in Lac du Bonnet, and indeed, I know the member's aware that we opened Manitoba's first Aboriginal personal care home in south Winnipeg just this past year.

So I would say to the member that we're working hard not only to provide more capacity, but to really work hard in making our decisions in an evidence-based manner. He's aware, I'm sure, that we commissioned the Manitoba Centre for Health Policy to do an analysis for us of needs for supports for our seniors, including personal care home beds. I don't mind saying that here in Manitoba and, indeed, across Canada there was some advice being given that we were overbedded as a nation. It just did not wholly ring true for us when we know that there are wait-lists and wait times for personal care homes.

We did commission the Centre for Health Policy to do this analysis. They came back with a very good report stating what we, certainly around this table, intuitively knew and that was that there was more personal care home bed need than, certainly, we had in Manitoba, which is why we made that \$200-million commitment. And, indeed, we've asked them to do phase 2 of this analysis to really drill down into our regional health authorities and to our populations to look at where there is the greatest need. I know the member is aware that practically every community would like to have a personal care home and, indeed, many have come forward asking for personal care homes to be built in their areas. We want to make sure that we are making those investments in a way that is going to meet where the needs, in fact, are.

So, again, I would acknowledge, as the member says, that we do have a need for more personal care home beds. I would acknowledge that we have a plan to meet those needs, and I would suggest that we're going to continue to work on all of the elements that relate to individuals making a journey into a personal care home, including working on improving discharge from acute care settings. We think that there are some opportunities there to improve the process and we're very dedicated to doing that.

**Mr. Gerrard:** One of the issues that continues to be there is the continuing, very significant use of second-generation antipsychotic drugs which carry black label warnings against their use in people with dementia. And I note that we have some personal care homes in which more than 60 per cent of residents are on second-generation antipsychotics,

and I wonder what the minister is doing that will have an impact.

**Ms. Oswald:** And I thank the member for the question. I know he is very passionate about this issue, and I commend him for that. I do think it is a serious issue that requires constant review and, certainly, ongoing education about best practice in this area.

We—I would remind the member that when it comes to the use of restraints in our personal care homes, we do have a very rigorous policy for all forms of restraint, which would include antipsychotic drugs. The emphasis in the policy is that of least restraint to ensure patient safety and personal independence are maximized. And I am pleased to let the member know, of course, that it is mandatory that residents or their families consent to the use of any restraint. I think this is critically important, and this consent must be documented.

Further, I would say that there is an exception that exists in the case of an emergency situation to prevent harm to the individual or to others. But even in that emergency situation families must be contacted as soon as possible and most certainly within 24 hours.

I would also let the member know that a full assessment by a team of professionals is required before restraints can be used under this policy, and if a medication type of restraint is used, it also must have a date for discontinuation and further assessment must occur before the use of the drug is continued.

And we know, of course, that when we look across the nation, the use of antipsychotic drugs is—it's not unique to Manitoba. We see their use in other jurisdictions. We know CIHI released a report showing that Manitoba is actually under the Canadian average when it comes to the use of antipsychotic medication in personal care homes, and I'm very pleased to report to the member that we saw an additional decrease last year.

So that's not necessarily happening in other jurisdictions. We're actually seeing their use be on the rise, but Manitoba has seen a decrease and I'm very pleased about that. And we have worked on a couple—a few initiatives, actually, to work on improving prescribing practices and just improving care in this way.

\* (14:50)

I would let the member know that we worked with the Alzheimer Society of Manitoba to implement the P.I.E.C.E.S. dementia education program, which has been getting some very positive reviews from family members of patients and from staff alike, and we're working on expanding that training.

We saw, after a recent six-month trial of that program, the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority found that an innovative variation of the P.I.E.C.E.S. program can be used to help reduce the use of antipsychotic drugs among PCH residents by some 20 per cent, and we think this is significant.

Two Winnipeg personal care homes have nurse practitioners on site. We have piloted this initiative and they have been reviewing medication use and looking at alternatives, and these personal care homes have seen the use of psychotropic drugs drop significantly as a result, and of course for other reasons that I don't have to explain to the member, we are looking at expanding the use of nurse practitioners in more personal care homes across Manitoba.

The Winnipeg Regional Health Authority, I would finally add, does undertake quarterly drug reviews in all personal care homes and is currently very strongly focusing on the use of antipsychotic medications. So we believe a multipronged approach is one that's appropriate and we want to continue to see the use of the drugs trending down in Manitoba.

**Mr. Gerrard:** I think the minister is well-aware that there's been some very serious issues at the Deer Lodge Centre and some raised by Maureen Anderson about what happened with her husband.

Can the minister give us an update on what the situation is currently and what's happening?

**Ms. Oswald:** Yes. I thank the member for the question.

There has been a very serious case that has been brought forward, you know, and discussed in the public. I would let the member know, of course, that we know Deer Lodge is an accredited facility, but when the concerns were raised, the—out of an abundance of caution, the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority initiated an external review. The—in the ensuing time, the Deer Lodge Centre has made a management change coinciding with the review.

I would also let the member know that the review is complete. Deer Lodge Centre has met with

families, with staff, and with patients to share with them recommendations that have come from this review. There is an action plan that has been developed to implement the recommendations and we are, indeed, pleased that steps are being taken to improve quality, to improve safety, and to improve the sense of caring and well-being that absolutely must be present in all of our facilities. Manitobans have a right to expect that their loved ones are being cared for with the highest standards of not only medical professionalism, but compassion as well.

I would say to the member that I had the great privilege of meeting with Mrs. Anderson this morning. She's a marvellous lady, as I know the member knows. She is extremely thoughtful, and we had a very good conversation, a sharing of her concerns, a sharing of her feelings which I value deeply, and I committed to her, as I certainly will to the member, that we want to have the highest standard of care at Deer Lodge, at all of our personal care homes, and we're going to work—continue to work in partnership with our regional health authority, with our personal care homes, with our professionals on the front line who have very good advice to give and, indeed, with families that have the most intimate of experiences in these environments. They have a lot of wisdom to share and certainly I'm committed to hear it and to act on it.

**Mr. Gerrard:** The problems, as I've been hearing them at Deer Lodge, run considerably deeper than just once incident. And I wonder if the minister would make available the implementation plan that she talked about. And what will be done in terms of follow-up to ensure that changes actually occur?

**Ms. Oswald:** As I understand it, we can certainly share information concerning the action plan with the member. And certainly we will be monitoring closely the action items taken on each of the recommendations. Certainly, we have processes that are in place to closely monitor standards in personal care homes as the member is aware, and those processes won't change. And we have mechanisms in place concerning unannounced visits as well. And those processes won't change, and we will avail ourselves of using processes such as that.

But, certainly, we will be monitoring progress very closely on how swiftly the action plan is able to be executed. I know that there are already significant items under way, and we'll be watching that closely—yes.

**Mr. Gerrard:** One of the very serious concerns that has been raised is the untendered contract for \$100 million, which was given to STARS helicopter services. And, of course, one of the very serious concerns is that, whereas Manitoba is paying \$10 million a year, that Alberta is paying, I think it's just slightly over \$5 million a year, and also that there are Manitoba companies who have indicated clearly that they would be able to deliver this service, but that they weren't considered. There really seems to be a major issue in terms of, oh, how this was handled, and it does not appear to have been taken seriously enough.

**Ms. Oswald:** Yes, Mr. Chair, I thank the member for the question. I think if the member reflects back on *Hansard*, from Committee of Supply, he will learn that we've spent roughly four hours on this topic, maybe three. I'm not sure, so at the risk of sounding a little repetitive, I will respect the member's question and just review our thought processing in going through and beg the indulgence of the other members, because we have spent some time on this already.

I would say to the member that we, of course, had experiences with the STARS organization during the flood of 2009, and they were very positive experiences, of course. And, as I've said previously, all Manitobans were captivated by the very dramatic rescue of the young boy that was trapped in the culvert. And it was brilliant to see what might have otherwise been a very terrible outcome for that boy and that family to be as positive as it was.

And that and other certainly less publicized but no less dramatic rescues that happened during that time compelled us to say publicly that we would be very seriously pursuing a helicopter-ambulance program for Manitoba. And we went away and set about in doing our work, and a lot of analysis, you know, predominantly on, you know, or essentially on two main choices: Do we grow our own helicopter-ambulance program here and have a made-in-Manitoba model, very appealing on a number of levels? Or do we seek a partner, such as STARS in order to push forward and gain the benefit of their—at that time, 25 years of stellar performance, experts in the field of trauma care.

\* (15:00)

STARS came back in 2011 in a situation of a flood that was considerably worse. And, at that time, we had been able to do our homework and our analysis that showed, at that time, that the

projections for being able to do a made-in-Manitoba model would take, you know, roughly 18 months to do. There were some folks that were saying it would take longer to grow from the ground up; there were others that said, perhaps, shorter. But, on average, at the time, the information we were getting was it would take us 18 months or so to grow our own program.

We were, again, having a positive experience with STARS integrating into our system. STARS had a tour of our Medical Transportation Co-ordination Centre in Brandon and were thoroughly impressed with what Manitoba had done on that front and said that, while you folks don't have a helicopter-ambulance program in Manitoba, you are, in some respects, light years ahead of us in terms of your ability to co-ordinate EMS. And they said they were going to run home to Alberta and make sure that they got something like MTCC started there, and it was a very proud moment for the staff in EMS in Manitoba.

At that time, STARS was also, themselves, more ready to ask us if we wanted them to stay. And so, while we absolutely do support the fact that tendering processes should occur in the vast majority of situations, it was our view that it was in the public interest to offer uninterrupted service for Manitobans going forward, and that is what we were able to achieve by contracting with STARS.

We did let the public know that we were entertaining the idea of engaging with STARS and, indeed, we did go forward with the contract and using those criteria of ensuring uninterrupted lifesaving service. In addition to being with an industry leader with vast experience, we felt it was in the public interest.

I can assure you that we went through the appropriate processes through Treasury Board to ensure there was oversight in the negotiating of the contract. And we also have, within the context of that contract, and agreement with STARS, a fundraising target.

The member cited a number that it costs other jurisdictions. That, of course, is with a well-established foundation from which funds flow into the agreement. We believe Manitoba will grow its STARS Foundation as well, and that we will see the cost from the taxpayer decrease. But, at the outset, that was the agreement that we felt was appropriate and we think that roughly the 100, 105 transports that that—that the STARS organization has done, in

that uninterrupted time, are worth their weight in gold. And that's why we made that decision in the public interest.

**Mr. Gerrard:** One of the things that minister is doing is bringing in a bill to amalgamate a number of regional health authorities. I mean, one presumes that the minister has done a careful analysis of the additional costs that will result, as well as the additional savings. I wonder if the minister could table that analysis?

**Ms. Oswald:** Yes, indeed, we have now seen the transition from 11 regional health authorities to five regional health authorities. Our department, I would argue—well, I mean, I could only argue as far back as about 2007—has been looking at options for configuration of regional health authorities from a variety of lenses: certainly from those involving fiscal issues; from a lens involving the sharing of health-human resources that kind of a lens; from the lens of building efficiencies on things such as bulk purchasing and sharing programs.

You know, we did an external review of regional health authorities and the advice at that time wasn't overwhelming to amalgamate, but we knew that we were at a moment in time where we needed to make a move that would further drive efficiency and would help us ensure that we were protecting front-line service and giving the best possible care.

And, when I speak about a moment in time, I would speak, really, in two key areas: No. 1, all of the information that we know about our population growing as it is, expectations of numbers of seniors expected to double, and we know that innovations and pharmaceuticals, while splendid in doing wonderful things for people, also coming in at a very high cost. You know, there's a national dialogue, of course, on the sustainability of publicly funded health care.

So all of those things were coming at a time when, of course, we saw some decisions coming at the federal level that, to say the least, are quite concerning, you know, unilateral discussions on funding models that really will take us from a partnership that started, you know, back in Tommy Douglas's time as a 50-50 arrangement to roughly 20 per cent coming from our federal partners, and if we go forward, in the years ahead that will decrease to 11 or 10. We hope that that will not be the case. I hope that the member is going to join with us in articulating strongly for all Manitobans that that's not the case.

But in the event that that's where we end up, we felt that we needed to make as significant moves as we could without compromising front-line care, and one of those moves—you know, in addition to that, we've got an EMS review under way and a variety of other issues—but in this context, is why we chose to make the decision to merge regional health authorities this year.

**Mr. Gerrard:** Turn this back to the MLA for Charleswood.

**Mr. Cameron Friesen (Morden-Winkler):** It's my pleasure to just appear briefly here at Health Estimates.

I wanted just to briefly discuss with the minister and ask her regarding the Tabor Home. And, of course, on November 15th, 2010, that Tabor Home project was announced and the community is very grateful to have that project going ahead. I was also at that announcement. It was a great announcement for the community.

And at this point in time I want to ask a question specific to timeline, because I understand at this time there is a Manitoba Health approval needed to issue tender and get the project going. The project timeline basically indicates that construction would commence in March of 2013 and the project completion and occupancy has been targeted for February the 2nd, 2015.

My question for the minister: Is this project currently behind schedule?

**Ms. Oswald:** And I thank the member for the question.

You know, without a doubt, the Morden-Winkler communities have been excellent partners in the planning and the development and the—and their advocacy for this project has been second to none, and they are excellent, excellent people to work with.

To the best of my understanding, I believe that we are on track. We are working carefully on timing and pacing of tenders. Our construction industry is very, very busy at the moment. This is a good thing; we don't want that to stop.

But we are working to stay on track with our plans, and we do understand that its movement through design and development is moving on pace. In fact, it's moving swiftly, and so I can commit to the member to endeavour to get some more specific dates when I have him, but I don't have a sense from my folks in Capital Planning that we need to be

concerned that there are delays in place. It's still looking very much on track.

\* (15:10)

**Mr. Friesen:** I thank the minister for that response.

The reason I bring it—the issue up is I had a—the opportunity recently to talk to the CAO—CEO for Tabor Home, and she had indicated to me that, at this point in time, there is a class C estimate that was noted as November 25th, 2011, being needed to complete, and that class C estimate has not yet been signed off on, meaning they cannot go on to the next part of the process, which, I believe, would be the design development, and local stakeholders are saying that there has basically been very little perceptible movement from their angle at least in the last number of months.

And they would appreciate, I think, some specific information that might allay their fears and allow them to have the confidence that the project is still slated for completion as of February 2nd, '15.

So my question, then, would be: Has the class C estimate been now approved, or is there an approval still needed by the Department of Health?

**Ms. Oswald:** Yes, I thank the member for the question, and I will commit to him to find where the—where Tabor Home is in the process. I will investigate, if, indeed, there is a delay.

My understanding is there is not, but I will make sure that folks from the Capital Planning branch are in contact with the community to reassure them that the processes are moving forward as appropriate and provide them with that comfort.

So I will have our branch contact folks in the community, and I'll let the member know that I'll get back to him with specific information about where it currently is in the process.

**Mr. Friesen:** I thank you, Madam Minister, for that willingness to supply that information.

Just another question related to the project, and that is when the project was announced, it was, of course, announced as an 80-bed personal care home plus 20 supportive housing bed configuration.

At this point in time, I wanted to just remind the minister that got some new information on the table that wasn't there, of course, when the agreement was signed when the project was first slated to go forward.

The first one, I would just refer to is the fact that that community of Morden-Winkler and Stanley, according to StatsCan figures, has grown 22 per cent in the last five years. The information emerging just last week is that specifically to that segment of the population in Morden 65 years old or over, Morden has a population there of 23 per cent of its population 65 or over, where the national average is 14.8 per cent.

I wanted to ask the minister today: In lieu of the fact that this is new information that wasn't available to her then, and in lieu of the fact that the MMP report originally called for 140 beds—and I understand that in Manitoba we don't really have a practice of proceeding to 140-bed personal care units.

Would there be a willingness to revisit, or is there still the opportunity, at this stage in design and construction, to revisit the actual configuration and perhaps go to a hundred, not blended 80-20, but a hundred full personal care home beds to better suit the needs of the community? Would there be that willingness to even go there?

**Ms. Oswald:** I know the member and I have spoken about this briefly before regarding my conversations with the mayor and with individuals in the community when I was there a couple of months ago, and, indeed, I'm informed that this particular analysis—the requests from the community to look at an option that hadn't been presented earlier between Morden and Winkler concerning the conversion of those supportive housing opportunities, if you will. This is actually what is happening with the class C estimate right now, is that analysis is being done. So I still don't think that it's going to cause a delay per se, but that work as requested by the member and the mayor is under way.

I will be frank with the member and say that we have budgeted, you know, very carefully and certainly the initial budgets and projections did not capture a net increase of 20 beds either for supportive housing or—of personal care home status, and so I'm not going to sugar-coat it and that it'll be very challenging to somewhat, you know, outside of the original agreement look at this net increase of beds. But the member's point is well made as I believe the mayor's was in that we do have an opportunity here, and so I have asked my department to look at every possible arrangement and configuration to see if and how we can make this possible.

I also know that I have had a clear message from those folks at Tabor that while they're very interested in looking at a new arrangement they're not especially interested in seeing it cause any sort of delay in the process. So we're really working hard to balance those two interests because I think if we can manage to get it done it will be in the best interest for people of the area.

So again I'll commit to stay in touch with the member on how this unfolds, and we're going to do our very best to try to make everybody's hopes work out in admittedly a time where, you know, we have to pay close attention to what's happening with the budget.

So I thank the member for the questions, and I do commit to him to keep him posted on the evolving story on this project.

**Mr. Friesen:** Thank you, Madam Minister, for that response. Just one supplemental then. I think I've identified an opportunity where there might at least be some chance to do exactly what you say, and I appreciate the fact that it's very difficult to revisit projects, you know, and to be looking at emerging information and trying to revisit that project on the fly at the same time, you know, these new StatsCan figures are really shining a light on the degree to which these communities are growing rapidly and especially in that area of 65 and over.

I notice that on the original news release of February 18, 2011: Province renews long-term care plan to meet growing demand for services, in the backgrounder there is a place where it specifically indicates that there will be further details and additional bed expansions possible under the full construction plan announced over the next year based on further analysis and projections of personal care home bed needs within health regions, and I thought that might present one opportunity exactly because this new information it would be part of what further analysis and projections could show. Would the minister agree?

**Ms. Oswald:** I would agree with the member. When we issued that particular release—and it's worthwhile to note that Tabor Home was outside of that \$200-million agreement—so we had announced Tabor prior to announcing the \$200 million, which I think is good news for all of us except the Treasury Board people. But I digress, and I can also say that the member may not have been here when I was speaking to the member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard) that we aren't expecting our own

department to do that analysis in its entirety. They are constantly working with our regional health authorities to gather the kinds of information that help us with our decision making.

But in addition we are asking the Manitoba Centre for Health Policy, who came out with an initial report that helped really validate our intuition that despite getting advice from a variety of sources that there were lots of beds in Manitoba.

We knew that with wait times and wait lists that we needed to revisit that, and the Manitoba Centre for Health Policy validated that. They were the inspiration for the \$200-million announcement, and indeed we've asked them to do part two, which is to drill down now into these kinds of numbers that you're raising and to give us very good advice about where we need to be building, how much we need to be building, where we need to be adding.

I know I don't have to explain to the member that many communities in Manitoba wish to have a personal care home in their environment. I can think of a couple right offhand. And we want to ensure that we're getting the best possible independent, third-party advice on this as possible. So not only will we be doing this work in the department, but the Manitoba Centre for Health Policy, a very trusted collection of brains, will be doing that work as well. So I want to assure the member that his community and that region of the province will be wholly captured in that analysis.

\* (15:20)

**Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach):** That's an appropriate segue, Mr. Chairperson, into my question. The minister knows, from the petitions that we've been presenting, about the need for a personal care home and long-term care spaces in the city of Steinbach. I appreciate the fact that she was on a local radio station confirming that need and saying that the region certainly did need more care facilities, and I appreciate her doing that. That is—that's a good step and I think it was recognized by the community as a good step.

But my understanding is there's more of a process than that. It's not enough for the minister to just say we need more personal care homes and then it happens. One of the processes is that a study needs to take place as required under the Manitoba Health capital project planning manual. I understand that the HavenGroup in Steinbach has put forward a letter of request to do that very study, and I wonder if the

minister can give me an update on where that request is at.

**Ms. Oswald:** I thank the member for the question. That's a really nice radio station in Steinbach. Yes, that's the nicest one I've ever seen. Anyhow, I was out there and I did speak to members of the media concerning this, and I think the member—the request that he's making about more personal care home beds in his community is consistent with what we found through the Manitoba Centre for Health Policy document, in that while it is true that we have Manitoba families that want additional supports along the continuum of care, we know that our seniors want even more access to home care. With one or two extra hours a day of care, they would be able to stay in their homes where they ultimately want to be even longer, and so we're working to invest in that.

We know we need to continue to build more supportive housing environments for those that aren't yet appropriate for a personal care home setting, and we certainly do know that we want to strengthen that element of our—of the continuum as well.

But we also know that the report showed us what the member intuitively knows that we do need more actual personal care home beds, and the South Eastman regional health authority did prioritize the St. Adolphe-Niverville project as their top priority, and we worked with the regional health authority to get moving on that project as swiftly as we could. And we know that that project certainly is well under way, and that will replace the 42-bed facility in St. Adolphe with a new 80-bed facility.

So we will see a net increase of beds in the region. The project is targeted to finish in 2013, and I know that my most recent view of what is now the former South Eastman capital planning rankings, if you will, of priorities did have the Rest Haven project, or concept, listed.

At the time that I most recently looked at this, it was not listed as their top priority, but it certainly is my view that as the new regional health authority takes shape, the CEO and the executive will be doing a very comprehensive and swift analysis of what were the previous priorities and what should the current priorities be, and we're encouraging our regional health authorities, as newly formed, to be using the kinds of data that the previous member was citing to make sure that their priorities are as up to date and appropriate. So we are going to work with

the region, with Rest Haven to review how it is their capital plans will be focused in the coming months.

**Mr. Goertzen:** Just to be very specific: A letter of request went in from the HavenGroup board, supported by the South-Eastman Regional Health Authority, asking for funding to do the exact study that the minister says is important. Is that—has that been approved—the letter of request to do the study?

**Ms. Oswald:** Well, that kind of study and analysis would need to be done through the regional health authority. Manitoba Health wouldn't independently fund one group to do an analysis that would not be in concert with the plans of the regional health authority. The whole idea is to build and ensure that we have capacity across the region in the ways that are most needed, so information from MCHP, Manitoba Centre for Health Policy, as well as from the region, would be very important.

So we will redirect Rest Haven to work directly with the regional health authority and also avail themselves of the resources that are there to enable them to develop a case for an expansion or a redevelopment of their facility.

Again, I would say to the member that, at my last viewing of the prioritization within the former South-Eastman Regional Health Authority, certainly Rest Haven had status there. I wouldn't see, without further information brought before me, reason for that to change. But we will be asking Rest Haven to work in partnership and in concert with the regional health authority, as we need that to happen for system planning.

**Mr. Goertzen:** An initial letter of request for a study went in to Manitoba Health about two months ago, and the HavenGroup indicates they have not heard back yet from the department. Can she follow up and let me know what the status of that is?

**Ms. Oswald:** Oh, yes. I thank the member for the question, and, certainly, I will find out the status of that letter, and again reiterate for the Steinbach community and, indeed, any region across the province, these kinds of analyses will need to be done in direct partnership with the regional health authority.

And I think the member has made, I think, an excellent case. I think members of the community have made an excellent case, and so I don't imagine that it's going to be very difficult for Rest Haven or any other proponent, I suppose, in partnership with

the region to build a very good case to expand personal care home capacity in his region.

But I certainly will, as he has asked, find the status of the letter and let him know about a response that clearly needs to be forthcoming.

**Mr. Goertzen:** Last question, and now we're on a different topic: This is actually on behalf of a resident who lives in Lorette, which isn't in my constituency, but is in the constituency of the member for Dawson Trail (Mr. Lemieux), but he works in the city of Steinbach. Individual has psoriasis and eczema and, I understand, has to go into Winnipeg for phototherapy. He indicates that he drives from Lorette and then into Winnipeg and then back to Steinbach for work and then back to his home in Lorette. And he's been doing that for several years on a regular basis. He emailed me, and I will share the correspondence with your colleague the member for Dawson Trail as well, wondering why there isn't phototherapy treatment in the Steinbach area.

**Ms. Oswald:** And I would appreciate if the member would share that correspondence—if he's comfortable and has the consent of the individual to share it with me directly—I would be happy to receive it. And we will endeavour to do our work and speak with our health professionals in the regional health authority in Steinbach to see if indeed there can be any amendments made to treatment options there that might be more convenient for this individual or for other individuals in the region that might have these needs.

I certainly don't have those—that information at my fingertips, but I do commit to the member, if he has the consent of that person to share that health information with me, that I will most certainly receive it and investigate.

\*(15:30)

**Mr. Ian Wishart (Portage la Prairie):** A couple of quick questions for the minister. Portage District General Hospital currently only uses six out of 10 beds that are available for dialysis. Many patients are travelling out of our immediate area, either to Boundary Trails or to one of several Winnipeg hospitals, often at very extended hours, 2 and 3 in the morning, to get dialysis completed.

The Central Regional Authority, now southern, has applied several times for additional funding to run these additional spaces and has never been successful, being told that Winnipeg has longer

waiting lists. And, updating some of their waiting lists the other day, they discovered that a number of the people that were on our waiting lists were also on the Winnipeg waiting list.

Would the minister commit to making sure that the right decision has been made here, that the priorities based on proper listing of the waiting lists have been done and that there hasn't been some confusion, because, certainly, sending people into Winnipeg that could be dealt with locally makes far more sense?

**Ms. Oswald:** Oh, yes, thank you very much, and I thank the member for the question. I was speaking with the CEO of the regional health authority on a few matters recently, and the issue of dialysis in Portage did come up. And so we—I've asked my department to take a very close look and validate current situations regarding those individuals that would have Portage as their No. 1 choice for dialysis, and to review resources as appropriate to be able to maintain and manage wait times and wait-lists for individuals.

So I want to let the member know that that work is currently under way, and certainly it has been our goal to, wherever possible, bring dialysis closer to home. It's why we have opened new dialysis stations across Manitoba and in the north, while at the same time working very hard to expand our home hemodialysis for those patients for whom it would be appropriate. It—I'm informed by medical professionals that it isn't appropriate for every patient, regrettably, but it can be for some. And I think that Manitoba has a very good opportunity to work on expanding that as an option as well.

So I want to let the member know that we are already on the case in looking at what is emerging in Portage. And it certainly would be in our interest to have the dialysis unit working at its full capacity if, indeed, there were individuals that could be serviced there appropriately. So I thank him for the question. It's an important one, and we're going to work on it straightaway.

**Mr. Wishart:** Thank you very much, Madam Minister. We would certainly like to see more dialysis done there. We're sending quite a large number of people out of the community. And you did make reference to a home hemodialysis as one of the options that needs to be expanded, as long as—also with home peritoneal dialysis, which is less technical and maybe easier to do in many cases and, certainly, far less intrusive. People that are able to do



dialysis in their own home certainly have a much better record once they're able to handle the technology. And I'm told that we're one of the jurisdictions that actually seems to be behind the curve on that, with other jurisdictions in Canada and around the world having moved more aggressively in this area.

And, given the heavy load of dialysis that we do have in this province, I would certainly encourage the minister to look far more aggressively at doing this as a much better option. And perhaps you could commit to doing further analysis on that. 'Periten'—peritoneal dialysis—I have trouble with that word—does seem to be another solution, and I recognize it is not for severe cases, but most people emerge at a relatively low level and then work up. So, certainly, I'd appreciate a commitment to look at this.

**Ms. Oswald:** And I agree with the member that we need to work even harder on providing opportunities for home hemo, peritoneal, whatever kinds of options that can be available where medically appropriate, for people to have as much choice as possible. I think we do have a bit of catching up to do compared to other jurisdictions on this front. I can see that point openly, although we have, in the last while, made some very, very good strides. We have focused on providing dialysis in some of our more remote environments where other jurisdictions have not chosen to go that route.

In fact, we have, as they say, crossed the Rubicon and built dialysis and put a provincial program on land and for people for whom the federal government has a fiduciary responsibility. We decided to make these decisions because of the kinds of access situations that the member is raising. Make no mistake, I want the people that live in Portage and the surrounding area that can have dialysis in Portage to get their dialysis in Portage. But you can certainly understand that, for those people living in remote fly-in environments, that the commute is even more profound, and we wanted to get dialysis into those regions as best as we could.

So while our focus has been there, and I think it's been a good decision, I agree that we need to continue to work to build those home hemo options wherever possible. And I hasten to add that in these dialysis centres that we have been building, we're not actually calling them that: dialysis centres. We're calling them renal health centres so that they are more than just environments where people go for dialysis, but environments where there can be

healthy living programs and advice for those people that may be candidates to develop diabetes, and we're going to do everything that we can to stem the tide of those that eventually need dialysis. And I think that that's a critically important part of our investment as well. We have to provide dialysis for those people that need it, and we must have, as a goal, bending the curve, so that we don't have so many people on dialysis in the years to come. So those centres are full renal health centres, and we think that's a very good idea.

But I thank the member for the question, and I want to let him know that we're taking the Portage la Prairie dialysis situation very seriously.

**Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood):** I think at this point in time we should probably get into the line-by-lines, and there's numerous other questions, but we will have the minister up again in concurrence in order to ask the—a number of other questions.

**Ms. Oswald:** Yes, just prior to getting into that, I did have a couple of responses that I don't think will take but a minute, from questions from the member earlier. Would she like me to read them into the record now or not?

**Mrs. Driedger:** The minister never does anything in just a minute, so I don't know if indeed she can do it that quickly. If she can, go for it.

**Ms. Oswald:** I'm comprehensive. Here we go.

Regarding offload delays for STARS, the department confirms that offload delays are not currently happening in Winnipeg ERs. STARS are—is transporting high acuity patients and, therefore, they pass right through.

Maintenance on the helicopter and who does it: clause 6.3 of the agreement requires STARS to maintain a helicopter in fully operative and airworthy condition, and the maintenance is paid for through the contract. Our existing agreement ensures that the hangar is in place for the chopper and it is paid for within the context of the contract to show \$220,000 per year as part of that.

The foundation board section 3 of the contract dictates that at least one Manitoba rep is on each of the STARS board and the STARS Foundation board. We did pay for the cost of the helicopter separate from the contract. We've paid \$2 million for the helicopter. It's currently being outfitted for medical equipment, and upon completion of that

commissioning we will have the helicopter. A further \$1.2 million will be paid for a total of 3.2 for the helicopter.

The monies for fundraising do indeed stay in Manitoba. Clause 9.3 of the agreement stipulates that. The agreement also gives Manitoba a say in the use of donated funds via clause 4.6. Again, the cost of the hangar, \$220,000.

How many transports since the election? There have been 152 missions, 97 patient transports since October the 4th, 2011. There were 120 missions, 79 transports during the flood.

\* (15:40)

**Mr. Chairperson:** Hearing no further questions, we will now proceed to consideration of the resolutions relevant to this department. I will now call:

Resolution 21.2: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$75,680,000—again, RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$75,680,000 for Health, Provincial Programs and Services, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

**Resolution agreed to.**

Resolution 21.3: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$11,326,000 for Health, Health Workforce, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

**Resolution agreed to.**

Resolution 21.4: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$48,947,000 for Health, Public Health and Primary Health Care, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

**Resolution agreed to.**

Resolution 21.5: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$21,787,000 for Health, Regional Programs and Services, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

**Resolution agreed to.**

Resolution 21.6: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,475,000 for Health, Office of the Chief Provincial Public Health Officer, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

**Resolution agreed to.**

Resolution 21.7: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding

\$4,807,332,000 for Health, Health Services Insurance Fund, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

**Resolution agreed to.**

Resolution 21.8: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$112,403,000 for Health, Capital Funding, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

**Resolution agreed to.**

Resolution 21.9: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$5,301,000 for Health, Costs Related to Capital Assets, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

**Resolution agreed to.**

Resolution 21.10: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,723,000 for Health, Capital Assets, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

**Resolution agreed to.**

The last item to be considered for the Estimates of this department is item 21.1.(a) the minister's salary, contained in resolution 21.1.

At this point we request that the minister staff leave the table for the consideration of this last item.

The floor is open for questions.

**Mrs. Driedger:** I move

THAT the minister's salary be reduced to \$10,000, which would represent a token fine for the breaching of an election act.

**Mr. Chairperson:** It has been moved by the honourable member for Charleswood

THAT the minister's salary be reduced to—order, order—that the minister's salary be reduced to \$10,000, which would represent a token fine for the breaching of an election act.

The motion is in order. Are there any questions or comments on this motion?

Is the committee ready for the question?

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Shall the motion pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Yes.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

### Voice Vote

**Mr. Chairperson:** All those in favour of the motion, please say aye.

**Some Honourable Members:** Aye.

**Mr. Chairperson:** All those opposed to the motion, please say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Chairperson:** In my opinion, the Nays have it.

### Formal Vote

**Mrs. Driedger:** Recorded vote, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Does she have support by two members?

A formal vote has been represented by two members.

This section of the Committee of Supply will now recess to allow this matter to be reported and for members to proceed to the Chamber for the vote.

*The committee recessed at 3:47 p.m.*

*The committee resumed at 4:07 p.m.*

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order.

I would like to call the Committee of Supply back to order. This committee will resume with this business where we left off prior to the recess.

The floor is still open for questions on resolution 21.1.

**Mrs. Driedger:** I'd like to ask the Minister of Health (Ms. Oswald) if the EMS branch has been without a medical director for over a year.

**Ms. Oswald:** That is not my understanding but I will commit to the member to give her an update on the complement of staffing in the branch.

**Mrs. Driedger:** I had been given some information that the director quit, the medical director quit, somewhere around a year ago and that there's been an acting person in place. My question was then related to whether or not there has just been an acting person in place, and that in fact, there is no medical director in the position; just an acting position. So if the minister could find out that, that would be great.

The follow up question to that would be that if the medical director is the person that approves drugs and medical equipment and if there isn't a medical director in place, who would be doing all of that?

**Ms. Oswald:** Again I will commit to the member to answer her specific question. But certainly we know that in our regional health authorities there are medical directors that are providing oversight for emergency medical service operations. And certainly it would be my understanding, you know, in the absence of having my folks to consult with at the moment, it would be our understanding that they would be providing, you know, medical advice and oversight where appropriate. But again I will let the member know specifically about that medical oversight of equipment and drugs as she states and the status of acting, or otherwise, in the department.

**Mrs. Driedger:** And just to clarify the—for the minister, that we are talking about the EMS branch medical director; the person that would be the medical director over all of EMS in Manitoba.

I'm also given the information that the medical advisory committee, related to the EMS branch, hasn't met for two years and I wonder if the minister could indicate why not.

\* (16:10)

**Ms. Oswald:** Yes. I would have to check with officials in the EMS branch as to the status of that group and when, indeed, their last gathering was. And I'll commit to the member to get back to her on that.

**Mrs. Driedger:** It is my understanding that that group needs to meet to revise protocols or policies, and that they haven't met for two years. And one of the protocols that was brought to my attention was for ACLS, that they're working on 2008 protocols and that the protocols changed in 2010 but because—and they're—EMS is trained for it, but they can't use a new protocol because there is no approval given by the medical advisory committee. And I guess without a medical director things aren't moving forward. So that sounds like quite a long stall and lack of progress without the people in place to make things happen.

So if the minister—she might want to have a look at that and just, you know, find out what is happening.

**Ms. Oswald:** Yes. Again, I would say to the member that that is not my understanding of what the current process is regarding updates in protocols and so forth. But, you know, certainly if the member is gathering such information from individuals, you know, there may be misinterpretation of facts out there, and it would certainly be in everyone's interest

to have the correct information. And for that reason, I will commit to her to find out that information and to get back to her post haste.

**Mrs. Driedger:** I wondered if the minister has had a look at the administrative costs within STARS. And I would note that they spent \$5 million in 2010 on administration, and that was about 17 per cent of the budget. I wonder if the Minister of Health is aware of what they include in that particular cost.

**Ms. Oswald:** Yes, Mr. Chair, and I would say to the member again, you know, we have had some discussion about this issue and about STARS and the contract and the payments and so forth. And I would certainly let the member know that any issues concerning administrative costs in the STARS contract have been negotiated in good faith. They are consistent with the costs that we see being paid in Saskatchewan, in Alberta.

We know that the STARS organization is very interested in converting their monies into front-line care and upgrades of equipment and so forth, wherever possible. So again, we see those costs as being consistent with what the other two jurisdictions are paying. And, of course, as is the case with all of our organizations across the health system, we will be paying close attention to monies that we're investing, ensuring that wherever possible, our investments are going to the front line and trying to minimize administration.

And, of course, now that these agreements exist across jurisdictions, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, looking to see where we might be able to find efficiencies and streamline wherever possible, which will be in the best interests of all three provinces and, indeed, for the Canadians that are beneficiaries of that service.

**Mrs. Driedger:** I understand that the STARS Foundation spends—in their last annual report I guess for 2010—\$2.3 million on fundraising, which equated to about 7 per cent of the foundation costs go towards administration for the fundraising. Does the minister have any sense of what \$2.3 million on fundraising administration is spent on?

**Ms. Oswald:** Yes, so I will certainly endeavour to get a breakdown and some specifics for the member on—of the kinds of things that the STARS organization expends money on in order to do the very good work that they do in raising funds. We had quite a lengthy conversation the other day about the great success of the STARS Foundation in Alberta.

We're seeing some emerging, you know, good success in Saskatchewan with a substantial donation from the potash industry there to STARS, and, again, as I said to the member, we already have interested parties here in Manitoba, private and corporate, we are informed, from STARS that are expressing interest in making donations to the foundation.

So, again, I can commit to the member to provide some more detailed analysis about what it is they're spending their money on to mount their fundraising campaign to the staff that are dedicated to do that fundraising, any sort of administrative office-type costs that are required to do that. And, again, I would reiterate to the member that administrative costs in—are consistent in each province—in Alberta, in Saskatchewan and, indeed, in Manitoba. The foundations that are more established in the other provinces may be paying for some of that cost, whereas in Manitoba the province is paying for some of that cost.

But as we talked about for hours, we certainly will see those costs lowering in Manitoba as the fundraising number goes up, and that's consistent with the plan. But, certainly, I commit to the member to get some information about office space and pens and papers and people and any advertising and outreach that they're doing in a more detailed way.

**Mrs. Driedger:** Can the minister indicate whether the information is accurate to say that for each mission right now in Manitoba that the cost is coming to about \$55,000 per mission?

**Ms. Oswald:** Certainly, you know, we will endeavour to do that breakdown for the member, bearing in mind that as soon as they fly the next mission the cost is lower and that it's lower on the mission after that, and so forth. The more missions that you fly the lower the cost and, you know, we have been operating now, you know, for much less time than is the case in Alberta. But, you know, of course, when we endeavoured to engage in a relationship with STARS, we had our department do lots of work on the analysis concerning cost, concerning impact in—regarding lives changed in a very positive way and, indeed, lives saved.

So our analysis was about the ability to sustain and afford a helicopter ambulance, and also in what it means to the families that have had their outcomes so much profoundly improved as a result of having the ambulance helicopter in our existence.

So, yes, we'll have a look and see if the number that the member is citing today is indeed an accurate one and, of course, point out that the arithmetic does change as each mission has flown.

\* (16:20)

**Mrs. Driedger:** Just a couple more questions on STARS. Can the minister tell us if it flies at night, and if it can fly in ice? Or does it have an anti-icing ability—or capability?

**Ms. Oswald:** The helicopter does fly at night, and they did fly during the winter. And, as far as specific ice crystals in the air, I would, you know, have to have a look at the specs and get back to the member. But I am not aware of occasions where the helicopter was called during the winter and wasn't able to fly as a result of ice, but I'll certainly check.

**Mrs. Driedger:** In the Supplementary Information book, on page 111, it shows that the Estimates of Expenditure, 2011-12 and then 2012-13, it shows that the funding for Long Term Care Services has dropped by \$16 million and Home Care Services is down by \$1.7 million. Can the minister indicate or tell us why in both of those critical areas she would have cut back funding?

**Ms. Oswald:** And I want to be very clear about the fact that we are continuing to invest in expanding home care and long-term care and, of course, we spent some time earlier today in talking about our expansion of personal care home beds.

The—some—this year, some home care and personal care home funding appears in the provincial budget under acute care, reflecting our emphasis on facilitating more timely discharges. I was speaking about this earlier to one of the member's colleagues. We know that part of moving along our system in a more responsive way really has to do with these more timely discharges. You will see a significant increase under acute care, and we have invested money there to ensure that we're improving throughput.

The whole emphasis on improving front—our long-term care, really, we're viewing as a system-wide initiative, so we continue to look at different ways to improve the long-term care experience.

This would also include our successful pilot program, known as the virtual ward—I think, more appropriately known—or will come to be known as the hospital-home teams, where we are seeing

doctors going into people's homes to provide them with care.

We've seen pretty substantial decreases in the need for these individuals to appear at the ER during the pilot project. Those individuals that were involved in that project were conveyed to emergency rooms 27 times compared to 64 times for the very same patients in the previous 12 months. We also saw very positive results regarding hospital admissions. Those patients were admitted 10 times compared to 25 times the previous years, and days spent in hospital for those people went to 138 compared to 319 in the previous year.

So, we're working to provide innovations on the spectrum of long-term care. We're really working to emphasize our efforts to have more timely discharges with those wraparound kinds of supports that individuals need as they're headed home. And we think that, you know, around the \$24 million of funding in acute care, that you'll find there is utilized for our long-term care and home care-related services. So we are not, in fact, going to see a lessening of supports for long-term care. We're actually going to be seeing increased supports for long-term care, but we'll see it profiled in a way that's really going to help that from hospital to PCH or back-to-home transition which we think needs some work. And I'm reasonably sure the member would agree on that point.

**Mrs. Driedger:** On page 109, it is—and I only have the one question on Pharmacare so—and this will be it. I note that under the Pharmacare line that the expenditure has gone up about \$4 million from last year's budgeted number. So it appears that there is a \$4-million increase to Pharmacare coverage. That doesn't seem to me that that is even going to cover cancer drugs. So are cancer drugs funded in some other place?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order, please. I'm interrupting the proceedings of this section of the Committee of Supply because the total time allowed for Estimates consideration has now expired.

Our rule 76(3) provides in part that not more than a hundred hours shall be allowed for the consideration of the business of Supply. However, our rule 76(5) provides that when time has expired, the Chairperson shall forthwith put all remaining questions without debate, amendment, or adjournment.

I am therefore going to call in sequence the resolutions on the following matters:

Resolution 21.1: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$10,062,000 for Health, Administration and Finance, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2013.

*Resolution agreed to.*

#### LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

**Mr. Chairperson:** Resolution 1.1: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$8,723,000 for Legislative Assembly, Other Assembly Expenditures, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2013.

*Resolution agreed to.*

Resolution 1.2: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$6,582,000 for Legislative Assembly, Office of the Auditor General, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2013.

*Resolution agreed to.*

Resolution 1.3: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,075,000 for the Legislative Assembly, Office of the Ombudsman, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2013.

*Resolution agreed to.*

Resolution 1.4: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,521,000 for the Legislative Assembly, Office of the Chief Electoral Officer, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2013.

*Resolution agreed to.*

Resolution 1.5: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,425,000 for the Legislative Assembly, Office of the Children's Advocate, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2013.

*Resolution agreed to.*

Resolution 1.6: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$60,000 for the Legislative Assembly, Cost Related to Capital Assets, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2013.

*Resolution agreed to.*

\* (16:30)

This concludes our consideration of the Estimates in this section of the Committee of Supply meeting in room 254.

I would like to thank the ministers, critics and all honourable members for their hard work and dedication during the process.

Committee rise.

#### CHILDREN AND YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES

\* (14:40)

**The Acting Chairperson (Melanie Wight):** Will the Committee of Supply please come to order.

This section of the Committee of Supply will now consider the Estimates of the Department of Children and Youth Opportunities.

Does the honourable minister have an opening statement?

**Hon. Kevin Chief (Minister of Children and Youth Opportunities):** Yes, I do.

On behalf of the new Department of Children and Youth Opportunities and on behalf of the 10 ministers of the Healthy Child Committee of Cabinet and their departments, and the Healthy Child Manitoba strategy, I'm pleased to present to this committee for its consideration the 2012-13 Expenditure Estimates for Children and Youth Opportunities.

It is an honour to lead a department dedicated to prevention and promotion from the prenatal period to age 29 and to work with all departments and communities to maximize opportunities for all of our young people in Manitoba.

This new department continues over a decade of commitment to children and youth, and brings together the major prevention initiatives for young people from across government into a single department. I am proud to chair the only legislated standing Cabinet committee in Canada that is dedicated to improving the lives of children and youth.

As a government, we are continuing our commitment to Healthy Child Manitoba's strategy which focuses on evidenced-based, cross-sectoral prevention and early intervention for children and youth, families and communities.

In 2007, we announced a provincial FASD strategy to build on the important investments we have made since taking office in FASD prevention, intervention, support services and research. In 2012-13, we will invest, across government, to support key components of the FASD strategy. This new funding

will bring the total provincial investment in improving the lives of people and families living with FASD to over \$13 million.

Through the Healthy Child Manitoba some of these funds will support the Mothering Project at Mount Carmel Clinic, the Touchstone FASD Program, Vision and Voices for adults to share their experience in living with FASD, and an annual gathering of 14 FASD community consultation services for youth ages 7 to 18 years with FASD, expansion of the FASD Research Scientist Award at the University of Manitoba, a new data specialist contract position to support the evaluation of the provincial FASD strategy, and a pilot of New Rule FASD parent support program to help families and service providers understand FASD and connect effectively with local support and services.

The remaining funds for the provincial FASD strategy will be provided through the departments of Family Services and Labour for rural and northern support for youth and adults with FASD, and to expand the Winnipeg site of Stepping out on Saturdays, a respite recreation program for children; Health, for rural and northern diagnostic support; and Justice, for a youth justice worker.

Manitoba continues to learn and act upon the latest research evidence on the importance of investing in children across the life course, especially during their earliest years. That is why, in 2012-13, we're analyzing our model of early childhood development centre in Lord Selkirk Park toward a full year implementation modelled after the evidence-based Abecedarian Approach. The centre provides co-located, integrated, and culturally appropriate services with an enriched early childhood development program and family resource centre as core components.

We are also providing support to nearby Dufferin School parent and child centre, the fourth community school to receive such support. An increase will be provided through Healthy Child Manitoba to continue the provincial pilot and evaluation of PAX-The Good Behaviour Game in grade 1 classrooms across Manitoba.

Children and Youth Opportunities supports a range of programs and services developed to meet the interests and priorities of youth up to age 29 years across Manitoba. I am pleased that the 2012-13 Estimates contain expanded programming

for youth. This includes an increase to Manitoba mentors to continue connecting high school students and youth with local businesses and organizations for career exposure, preparation, and increase to work program to continue reaching youth who are facing multiple personal barriers to gain employment and life skills for entering the job market.

This year's Estimates also includes funding to develop and implement a new after-school program in Manitoba that will provide positive opportunities for youth to explore a range of careers, increase their positive development, and reduce youth problem behaviour. Reflecting the needs of Manitoba youth, this new program will build on some of the existing after-school programs currently supported by Manitoba and we'll be getting this in the coming school year.

For the past few months, we've been hearing from Manitobans across the province in both our crime prevention consultations and parent-child coalitions which have been hosting regional community forums and leadership meetings on early childhood development, where we have seen hearing about importance of working together across sectors at the regional level to strengthen partnerships and opportunities for supporting children, youth, and families right from the start.

I want to thank the member from Lac du Bonnet for his own commitment to children as a schoolteacher and as a community leader before and after being elected to the Legislature. I was proud to sit together with him at a recent community forum April 13th, in 2012, in his North Eastman Region along with other local leaders to discuss improving ECD. In addition to both being new to the House, we were both fathers, and we both know how important it is to support all parents of families to promote health, child, and youth development. Before becoming MLAs, we both worked hard to make Manitoba better for our young people. We both value evidence-based supports for young people and evaluating the outcomes of these investments.

I am proud that we live in a province and work in a Legislature that knows that a non-partisan approach is the best approach to serving Manitoba's children and youth, and I am committed to continue working together with the member opposite and with our other colleagues in the House as well as in Cabinet to make Manitoba the best place in the world to raise a family. I believe that all members of the

Legislature believe in a policy of prevention for Manitobans throughout their lives from the earliest years into the young adult years and beyond. And I can agree it is more important than ever to have a department dedicated to prevention for our province's young people and their families and to working with all departments and community partners in making Manitoba the best place for children and youth to grow into adulthood.

I look forward to this committee's review of the 2012-13 Estimates of Expenditure for Children and Youth Opportunities and I welcome the feedback from the committee members.

**The Acting Chairperson (Melanie Wight):** We thank the minister for those comments.

Does the official opposition critic have any opening comments?

**Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Lac du Bonnet):** I do. At this time I would like to congratulate the minister for his—or on his election, first October 4th and also his appointment as the Minister of Child and Youth Opportunities. I'd also like to thank all of the staff who has put in a great deal of work and I've had the pleasure of listening to a couple of them over the past few years as well.

The minister mentioned the April 13th forum that was held in Beausejour, very, very powerful forum, educational forum and inspirational forum.

We often talk about—in the Chamber we often talk about hydro, water, and our forests as being our most important resources. But I have to disagree with this. Our most important resources here in Manitoba are our children and our youth. So with this I truly believe that we have to get that piece right. And I do look forward to working with the minister and on the different initiatives and also questioning, at times, which direction we exactly are going.

\* (14:50)

One of the—one of my other statements that I'd really like to put on the record is that I am not questioning, and I will never question, the minister's commitment to children and youth and improving their lives. But I do have to question the need for the creation of a brand-new department to achieve this goal. This is what government should strive to achieve; that is, helping children and youth achieve their full potential. Was the creation of a whole new department actually necessary?

And for that, I'd like to end my introductory comments and get down to some questions because I know we have a limited time.

**The Acting Chairperson (Melanie Wight):** We thank the critic from the official opposition for those remarks.

Under Manitoba practice, debate on the minister's salary is the last item considered for a department in the Committee of Supply. Accordingly, we shall now defer consideration of line item 20.1.(a) contained in resolution 20.1.

At this time, we invite the minister's staff to join us at the table and we ask that the minister introduce the staff in attendance.

*Mr. Chairperson in the Chair*

**Mr. Chairperson (Rob Altemeyer):** Thanks, all. Honourable Minister, perhaps you'd be kind enough to introduce staff that have joined us.

**Mr. Chief:** Yes. We have Jan Sanderson, deputy minister of Children and Youth Opportunities, CEO of Healthy Child Manitoba office; Dave Paton, the executive director of Administration and Finance; Jennifer Hibbert, director of financial services; Susan Tessler, executive director of Program and Administration, Healthy Child Manitoba office; Rob Santos, executive director of Science and Policy, associate secretary to Healthy Child Committee of Cabinet; Annette Willborn, executive director of MB4Youth and Recreation and Regional Services; Tiffany Creaghe-Harder, special assistant to the Minister of Children and Youth Opportunities; Andrea Ormiston, program and policy analyst, deputy minister's office.

**Mr. Chairperson:** We thank the honourable member for that.

There's one other item to consider before we proceed with questions and that is how we want to proceed with questions.

The options are a global or a chronological approach. Any suggestions?

**Mr. Ewasko:** Global, please.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Global's been suggested. Is that acceptable, Minister? *[Agreed]*

Okay, very good.

Duly noted that Estimates for this section will proceed in a global manner, and surprise, surprise, the floor is wide open for questions.



**Mr. Ewasko:** Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you, honourable Minister, for the introductions.

Just a quick question, you know what? We'll leave it there. We'll carry on.

Can we just start off just putting on the record, Minister: what is your total budget for Children and Youth Opportunities?

**Mr. Chief:** Mr. Chair, \$44,611,000.

**Mr. Ewasko:** Thank you, Minister, for that answer.

So, then we—and I am reading that in Estimates as well, so then when we turn the page and I look at grants to external agencies, what's your total expenditure on grants to external agencies?

**Mr. Chief:** Mr. Chair, \$47,366,000, less recoverables from other appropriations \$13,395.

**Mr. Ewasko:** Mr. Chair. Thank you, honourable Minister, for that answer. Can you then just explain to me, because, as you noted in your opening statement, I'm a newly elected MLA, as you are, and we've got a total budget of \$44,611,000, we have grants totalling \$47,366,000?

Why would the 13 million and change not show up on the expenditures summary in some sort of fashion on page 6 of the departmental expenditure Estimates?

**Mr. Chief:** So we put out the door through grants, \$47,366,000. The \$13,395,000 we collect back from other departments, which then gives us our net expenditures of \$44,611,000, and there's some examples of that as well.

**Mr. Ewasko:** Yes, Mr. Chair and thank you, honourable Minister, for that answer. I would actually like some examples of that. Just because when we have got a budget of \$44,611,000 and then we come across and then start talking about the amounts of grants that are actually going out which is \$47,000,000, then automatically I would think the public would be questioning why are we going over budget by \$3,000,000? So, as far as the \$13,000,000, yes, I'd like some examples of that.

\*(15:00)

**Mr. Chief:** So, for the member, on page 31 of the Estimates book, there's a breakdown of the different departments that we recover—we have the recoveries from. So an example would've been, we just highlight it as an urban and rural economic development initiative. We would recover that, and we would

actually deliver the programs for them. So we're not actually overbudget.

**Mr. Ewasko:** So now—but this might be just an accounting type of question and straight to Finance, but then, why in the world would we not just say Children and Youth Opportunities' total budget is \$58 million, expenditures is \$44,611,000, with 13—oh sorry, let me back that up—\$47,366,000 going to grants and external agencies and then \$13,395,000 being transferred in from other departments, so that we can sort of just show ins and outs as opposed to a budget or \$44 million, and then—I don't know. Hopefully, that question's relatively clearer than I—than it sounded to me.

**Mr. Chief:** Trying to get through some of the accounting lingo here, so—from what I was told and discussions with people who do the accounting and getting through the language that this is a standard accounting practice that multiple departments do. And it's just the idea that other departments will contribute, in essence, to a fund so we can deliver the service. But this is something that we have done for years through Healthy Living, and other departments do this as well.

**Mr. Ewasko:** Thank you, honourable Minister, for your answer. On page—just, if you've got the Estimates booklet handy, page 6, under schedule 3, we're looking at the Estimates of Expenditures for 2011-2012, being \$31,579,000, and this year '12-13 is \$31,789,000. We're looking at, you know, roughly, \$200,000 difference, \$210,000 difference.

*Mr. James Allum, Acting Chairperson, in the Chair*

Last year's Estimate booklet, under Healthy Child Manitoba office, we were looking at \$29,024,000, and this year's booklet shows that 2011-2012 was \$31 million. So that's a 2-and-a-half-million-dollar difference, and I'm not quite sure where those numbers are coming from. So if you could just shed some light on that.

**Mr. Chief:** So I just want to be clear with the question. So the question is from two—he's asking the difference of two and a half million from '11-12 year to '12-13?

\*(15:10)

**Mr. Ewasko:** Basically my question is: Is that last year's Estimates booklet showed that the 2011-2012 Estimates were \$29,024,000. This year's book is showing that last year's estimate was \$31,579,000, so

I'm not quite sure why that number had increased by \$2.5 million just in the Estimates of last year.

**Mr. Chief:** So the first part of that would be that there's been new funding into the Healthy Child Manitoba office. Some of that is what I actually—some of those programs are actually—were part of my opening statement.

And also there has been transfers from existing programs from some other departments coming into this new department.

**Mr. Ewasko:** I mean, I apologize to the minister for this question, but I understand that your budget on that line, Healthy Child Manitoba office for 2012-2013, is \$31,789,000. I understand that. I got that solid. Last year's Estimates—so we're not moving into last year's booklet at all, we're just looking at that Estimates of Expenditure, 2011-2012—was \$31,579,000. So that's telling me the difference that—of Estimates from last year to this year is a \$210,000 difference.

Now, I was looking through last year's Estimates booklet, and last year's Estimates booklet showed their Estimates was \$29 million. So all I'm saying is that the cut-and-paste from last year's booklet to this year's booklet—somebody messed up on the cut-and-paste.

**Mr. Chief:** Okay, so I think I got this question figured out now. So I do understand the question.

It's a—so this is a restatement of the budget which now reflects the reorganization of government and the actual transfers from existing programs from other departments into Children and Youth Opportunities, so it's a restatement of it.

**Mr. Ewasko:** Thank you, Minister, for that answer. So, then, last year Healthy Child Manitoba office was—that was under the Healthy Living, Youth and Seniors portfolio. What was its budget last year for 2011-2012—the estimated budget?

**Mr. Chief:** Do you want—we need to—do you want Healthy Child Manitoba or Healthy Living?

**Mr. Ewasko:** Thank you for the clarifying question. The—I want the Healthy Child Manitoba office—what was its budget for 2011-2012 Estimates last year?

**Mr. Chief:** So the 2011-12 Healthy Child Manitoba budget Estimates was approximately \$29.5 million approximately. I can get you the exact number. We don't have that here.

**Mr. Ewasko:** Okay, thank you, and that's my point, Minister, is that in this year's Estimates booklet—yes, I'm with you that you've transferred these funds in, it's a new department but it still means that Healthy Child Manitoba office is showing this year \$31.5 million. From what I'm understanding if I look at last year's Estimates booklet at the \$29 million just for Healthy Child Manitoba office—I don't want to get confused amongst other avenues here—but we've got \$29,000,024, this year \$31,789,000 that's roughly \$2,765,000 difference. Why the increase? Thank you.

**Mr. Chief:** Okay, so the difference represents programs transferred into our budget in the middle of a budget year, and it's accounting practices to adjust the budget retroactively, and that's what has been done in this 2012-2013 supplement.

\* (15:20)

**Mr. Ewasko:** Thank you Minister, for that answer. So then, with that being said, that will take care of—if that's the answer, then that will take care of my other couple questions, which are along the similar lines.

So, turning to page 8, grants to external agencies, can the minister shed some light on \$500,000 difference from last year's Estimates booklet to this year's on Grants to External Agencies?

**Mr. Chief:** So the \$500,000, in terms of the increase to grants to external agencies, that the member's asking is reflective of the increases in the budget of new programs or the expansion of programs that currently exist. And some of those programs were some of the ones that I actually read in my opening statement.

**Mr. Ewasko:** Thank you, Acting Chairperson—I believe that's your title—and honourable Minister for your answer.

I'd like, if the minister could just highlight the mandate, the department's mandate and the top priorities for his department for the upcoming year.

**Mr. Chief:** Prioritizing children and youth just makes good sense, as I said in the opening statement. And, of course, we want to continue to build on the momentum that we have for the past 12 years. If we can create opportunities for every child, and support him or her to maximize their potential, we'll all reap, of course, the rewards and benefits of that, supporting healthy, physical, emotional and cognitive development across systems. Health,

Education, Family Services and, of course, we have The Healthy Child Manitoba Act and The Healthy Child Committee of Cabinet brings 10 departments together, which as I said in the opening statement, of course, is the only legislative body of its kind in the country, has short-term, immediate benefits for kids and families from prenatal attachment, school achievement, community commitment and long-term economic and safety benefits for all of us.

The very investments that work to promote healthy development also work to keep our kids on the straight and narrow. I've been travelling the province doing crime prevention consultations and have—and talking, literally, to thousands of Manitobas, and we know that—we all understand that safer, strong communities, we need more than just simply locking young people up, that we want to make sure that we're preventing young people from—and preventing young people from getting into challenging situations in the first place. We all know the best way to keep young people out of trouble is to make sure they stay in school, get an education and have productive ways to spend their time.

Manitoba families know that reducing crime isn't just about more police on the streets; it's about making investments in crime prevention programs with proven results. Recreation, sport, education programs, cultural activities help give kids positive ways to contribute, feel connected to their community, and make them agents, of course, of positive change.

I will put on record, for the member, that the department includes programs, policies, partnerships supporting families from prenatal to age 29. From Healthy Baby programs to recreation programs to Green Team summer employment, to career exploration, we are weaving a network of supports to enable every family to maximize opportunities for children, youth and families.

**Mr. Ewasko:** Thank you, Mr. Chair—Acting Deputy Chair, and the minister for his answer. Just a quick question in regards to—can you explain, and I heard in your opening statement originally and then you just repeated it, as well, about the youth and your department working with youth up to the age of 29 years of age. Can you list those programs that are targeted for adulthood to say 29; 18 to 29, what are specifically targeted for those—that age group?

\* (15:30)

**Mr. Chief:** So I'd like to let the member know, from 18 to 29 years old, there are programs that do start earlier than 18 years old. So what I could do is give him a detailed list of some of those programs. There's a lot of emphasis on career exploration, of course, mentorship, the education and 'employability', all sorts of transition programs, enrichment initiatives. So some of them do cross over, but what we could do is give the member a detailed list of all the programs that are 18 to 29, but some of them also—those programs are actually for young people under the 18 as well. So, when he gets that list, there will be some crossovers.

**Mr. Ewasko:** Thank you for that answer. And so then what I'll do is is—yes, actually, if you could supply me that list, but, you know what? We'll just make it maybe a little bit even simpler. If you can just give me—make me a list or get me a list of all the programs that—and services that your department has, and then you can just, you know, pass it along to me at a later date, unless they're too many to, you know, to say on the record for today.

**Mr. Chief:** We will get the member a list, of course, of all those programs and services we provide. They would be—we would actually be into Estimates probably until late tomorrow night if I started to try to read them all out, but we will make sure that we get him a detailed list of all those programs and services.

**Mr. Ewasko:** So, then, with that list, honourable Minister, do you have targeted numbers as well as students or children and youth that have been in those programs in the past, and then sort of where you're going for the future, and would those be able to be included on those lists as well?

**Mr. Chief:** What we can do is try to give the member as much information in terms of the goals and objectives of the programs. Where we can actually give numbers of young people participating and what our goals are for those programs, we'll definitely do that. You know, and if we can—sometimes, though, there are challenges with collecting specific numbers in terms of data. Some programs, like through some of the grants that we give to run recreation programs, we would certainly know and be able to be supportive. We collect as much information and data as possible, but not every program has the capacity to collect as much information and data as other programs and initiatives.

So, where we can give the specific numbers and give as much content, we will. And where we—and where there's challenges, we certainly can say why one program is able to collect very good data on participation, and why maybe another program may not be able to collect that type of information.

**Mr. Ewasko:** I appreciate the minister for that, and, yes, that would be absolutely fantastic. Could I possibly get it by—you know, by the end of next week? Is that possible?

**Mr. Chief:** We will try to do our best for that, for sure.

**Mr. Ewasko:** Thank you. Honourable Minister, could you please take a few seconds and explain and put a few comments on the record: How is your department—your new department—distinguished from the Healthy Living and Youth and Seniors on the issues that affect youth?

**Mr. Chief:** So the new department—not only does it help us build and maintain momentum of a series of programs and initiatives and partnerships we've created for the past 12 years, so it allows us to put a lens, or a focus, specifically on children and youth and how those actually can support healthier, safer communities.

*Mr. Chairperson in the Chair*

As I've said, the Healthy Child Committee of Cabinet already naturally brings 10 departments together, and so there's already a legislative body discussing and looking through the lens of how we support children and youth and families. And so it brings—it'll allow us to bring programs and initiatives under one department and create some efficiency in government.

\* (15:40)

But, as the member in an earlier question talked about grants going out to the community and the partnerships we've actually—we've been able to invest in front-line supports for non-profit organizations, family resource centres, community-led organizations, so this new department will actually create and enhance those existing partnerships that we've been able to establish. And so, instead of them necessarily working with maybe two or three departments to support early childhood development or career exploration, they're basically now having the opportunity to work with one department. So in essence it creates and streamlines the opportunities

for our community partners, which, of course, can enhance those types of things that we're doing.

And a good example of that would be something like Brighter Futures, which is an advanced literacy—you know, there were partners that were working with Healthy Living and Youth and they're also—those same partners are also working with the department through advanced literacy on Brighter Futures. Now they're together, so we can actually look at how we can build on that.

It also very uniquely positions us to support tens of thousands of young people even before they're born. So we're able to see now and talk about how, through our Healthy Baby program, the importance of supporting pregnant mothers and starting that continuing of support.

As we know, not every family only has one child, and so when everything is under one umbrella, you start to be able to see how from early childhood development can streamline all the way up to something like the age of 29 on bursaries and scholarships and those types of information. So in essence you're able to look through one lens and one department often, not always but often, on how we can support children and young people from prenatal all the way up to the age of 29.

**Mr. Ewasko:** Thank you, honourable Minister, for that answer.

Just in consideration of time, if we could turn to page 6 on schedule 3, the reconciliation statement. We have a certain amount of money that had been transferred into your department all the way down the page—the bottom half of the page, basically, and then we have allocations of funds as well that are coming out of your department or shows as a deficit in the—again, in attention to time, could your department supply to me a list of those funds that are—that have been transferred in? What funds have been transferred in, and what programs are those funds then going to be targeted towards?

**Mr. Chief:** So we can provide to the member the reconciliations of the transfers in and the transfers out.

**Mr. Ewasko:** Thank you, honourable Minister. So is that—I mean, that's what's sort of showing here, because, I mean, hopefully we're not going to just take a photocopy of this page. What I'd like it is itemized as far as that, and I'm just—I'm thinking that the minister is just going to clarify his answer.

**Mr. Chief:** So what I can do, or, I mean, I could actually read out the—each detail of what the member's asking for now, or I could provide him a list of that.

**Mr. Ewasko:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, but I think we'll go with the list—would be great. Thank you for that though. So I'm going to move on to my next question then. Is providing a list okay then, to the minister?

**Mr. Chief:** We'll provide you the list, yes.

**Mr. Ewasko:** As the minister stated, funds are being—are coming in from other departments. We have two or three departments that were sort of running certain programs in the past. And now, in order to strengthen those programs, we're sort of streamlining it into one.

When I first received the Estimates booklet, I was going through the departmental role and mission and then also the statutory responsibilities of the minister. And I've noticed one of the points that have come from Healthy Living, Youth and Seniors Estimates, one of the bullets on the departmental role and mission, developing and delivering recreational opportunities, wellness practices, volunteerism, physical activity and community development opportunities at the local and regional level—that's that one bullet on page 2.

Then I look over at statutory responsibilities of the minister, and we have The Fitness and Amateur Sport Act. My huge question to the minister is, we've talked about two or three departments now being streamlined into one; we've got a couple sports things that I'm thinking, you know, could have been possibly handled by Sport, but at the same time, I'm sort of wondering why the Premier (Mr. Selinger) didn't necessarily bring in Sport into your portfolio, because that would make sense to me, dealing with children and youth in today's world.

**Mr. Chief:** So I would like to, first off, sort of acknowledge that Minister Robinson has been a very—has been a champion for sport and has done some remarkable things there, and so there is some consistency of work that has happened with Minister Robinson there.

I'd also like to be able to acknowledge that Minister Robinson also sits on the Healthy Child Committee of Cabinet, which, you know, sport is part of that. But beyond that, that's a decision that was made by the Premier and I think the member opposite had the opportunity to ask the Premier directly about that decision. And so, yes.

\* (15:50)

**Mr. Ewasko:** And thank you, honourable Minister, for that answer, and I just—I probably will ask the Premier that specific question.

Now, in order to try to not complicate things, though, those two points that I mentioned, reading out of the Estimates booklet, what I'm worried about is the—is not necessarily the muddling, but I guess a little bit of the confusion as far as what people might think or maybe they don't even know that your department is in—is actually responsible for The Fitness and Amateur Sport Act. So then, like, was that pulled out of the minister of Sport's responsibilities then?

**Mr. Chairperson:** I'm interrupting these proceedings because a recorded vote has evidently been requested in another section of the Committee of Supply.

I'm therefore recessing this section of the Committee of Supply in order for members to proceed to the Chamber for a formal vote.

*The committee recessed at 3:51 p.m.*

—————  
*The committee resumed at 4:07 p.m.*

**Mr. Chairperson:** We'll now resume consideration of Estimates, department for children, youth and opportunities. I believe the minister had the floor when we were interrupted.

**Mr. Chief:** Yes, can I ask the member to restate his question? We've just had a very exciting vote in the Chamber and—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Honourable member for Lac du Bonnet.

**Mr. Ewasko:** Mr. Chair, I thank the honourable minister for that task he has bestowed upon me, to repeat the exact wording of my last question. And since I didn't have it written down, I'm just going to go off the top of my head.

As we were talking, or as I had stated, my previous question or the question before that, I was mentioning the two bullets off of the departmental role and mission on page 2 in the Estimates booklet, and also page 3, the statutory responsibilities of the minister, The Fitness and Amateur Sport Act.

And, I was wondering why, or what's the difference between that act and something that the Minister for Aboriginal and Northern Affairs, who's

also the minister of Sport—what the difference between those two would be.

**Mr. Chief:** So the fitness and amateur—fitness and sport amateur act, is with—has always been with recreational and regional services and it includes fitness, sport and recreation. So it's found its home with Recreation and Regional Services.

**Mr. Ewasko:** Thank you, honourable Minister.

Now, as I stated in my opening statement, I just want to make it clear that I am not questioning the minister's commitment to children and youth and improving their lives. I'm just—I'm—I am questioning the development of a whole new department, especially when this government has been talking about saving Manitobans money and how trying not to waste any type of funds.

\* (16:10)

I do strongly support the children and youth, and especially with my background, and as far as the minister's background, as well, I am just not quite sure why we had to create a whole new department, which in my estimation of looking at the different programs and where they've come out of—and we are going to, I am going to, get a list from you in regards to all of the programs that your department and services—or, sorry, all the programs and services that your department is going to be handling. I just strongly feel that the Premier (Mr. Selinger) obviously was very unhappy in the last 12 years for how this government has been dealing with many of the child and youth issues. And so that must be why he's created this new department.

But, that being said, it looks like I'm going to leave quite a few questions for either the remainder of this session or the fall session. And I'd like to go to a line by line, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Hearing no further questions, we'll now proceed to consideration of the resolutions relevant to this department. I will now call:

Resolution 20.2: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$31,789,000 for Children and Youth Opportunities, Healthy Child Manitoba Office, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

**Resolution agreed to.**

Resolution 20.3: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$11,974,000 for Children and Youth Opportunities,

Youth Opportunities, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

**Resolution agreed to.**

We'll now ask staff to leave the head table as we are at resolution 20.1, which contains the minister's salary. Thanks to staff for their time with us this afternoon on this mild summer day.

The floor is open to questions, if any. Seeing none, the committee's ready for the resolution.

Resolution 20.1: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$848,000 for Children and Youth Opportunities, Administration and Finance, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

**Resolution agreed to.**

This concludes our consideration of the department for—of Estimates for the Department of Children and Youth Opportunities, so thank you to the critic and to the minister.

## IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURALISM

**Mr. Chairperson (Rob Altemeyer):** The next set of Estimates to be considered by this section of the Committee of Supply is for the Department of Immigration and Multiculturalism. *[interjection]* No?

All right. Just so we're all more or less in the same book, if not even on the same page, we are at this time considering a final resolution in the Estimates process under the Department of Immigration and Multiculturalism. We thank Minister Struthers in his secondary role for this department for standing in. *[interjection]* There we go. We—I just need the resolution, and I'll ask, does the opposition member have any questions or comments to make on the resolution? This is the minister's salary consideration for Immigration and Multiculturalism. *[interjection]*

All right. Just to reiterate: We are in section of Supply, Estimates consideration of Immigration and Multiculturalism. I'm about to read out resolution 11.1. But, first, I will test the committee.

Are there any questions from committee members on this resolution before I do so? Seeing none, I will read out resolution 11.1.

Resolution 11.1: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$413,000 for Immigration and Multiculturalism,

Executive, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

**Resolution agreed to.**

And that, remarkably, concludes the Estimates for the—[interjection] No, for the Department of Immigration and Multiculturalism.

\* (16:20)

**INNOVATION, ENERGY AND MINES**

**Mr. Chairperson (Rob Altemeyer):** The next department to be considered by this section of the Committee of Supply is the Department of Innovation, Energy and Mines. We'll ask the minister to come forward.

So we are now—in this section of the Committee of Supply, we are continuing the Estimates for the Department of Innovation, Energy and Mines, which has already begun previously in another committee—or another setting, another room—in this consideration of the Estimates.

It had been previously agreed the questioning for this department would follow in a global manner, and the floor is now open for questions, if there are any.

Seeing none, is the committee ready for consideration of resolutions?

**An Honourable Member:** Question.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Question has been called. [interjection] Yes.

Resolution 18.2: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,949,000 for Innovation, Energy and Mines, Energy Development Initiatives, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

**Resolution agreed to.**

Resolution 18.3: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$22,761,000 for Innovation, Energy and Mines, Science, Innovation and Business Development, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

**Resolution agreed to.**

Resolution 18.4: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$41,679,000 for Innovation, Energy and Mines, Business Transformation and Technology, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

**Resolution agreed to.**

Resolution 18.5: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$11,120,000 for Innovation, Energy and Mines, Mineral Resources, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

**Resolution agreed to.**

Resolution 18.6: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,645,000 for Innovation, Energy and Mines, Costs Related to Capital Assets, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

**Resolution agreed to.**

Resolution 18.7: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,050,000 for Innovation, Energy and Mines, Capital Assets, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

**Resolution agreed to.**

We are now at the last item to be considered for the Estimates in this department—is item 1.(a). It contained the minister's salary contained in resolution 18.1. The floor is now open for questions, if any.

Seeing none, is the committee ready for consideration of the resolution?

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Resolution 18.1: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$752,000 for Innovation, Energy and Mines, Administration and Finance, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

**Resolution agreed to.**

This concludes consideration for the department of—or for Estimates for the Department of Innovation, Energy and Mines. Thanks to all.

Some semblance of order. I'm interrupting the proceedings of this section of the Committee of Supply because the total time allowed for Estimates consideration is now expired.

Our rule 76(3) provides, in part, that not more than 100 glorious hours shall be allowed for the consideration of the business of Supply. Further, our rule 76(5) provides that, when time is expired, the

Chairperson shall forthwith put all remaining questions, without debate, amendment or adjournment. I am, therefore, going to call the resolutions for the Department of Sport.

### **SPORT**

**Mr. Chairperson (Rob Altemeyer):** Resolution 28.1: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$11,970,000 for Sport, Sport, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2013.

*Resolution agreed to.*

This concludes—that was it? *[interjection]* Yes, this concludes our consideration of the Estimates in this section of the Committee of Supply, meeting in room 255.

It's been fun. I would like to thank the ministers, critics, and all honourable members for their hard work and dedication during this process. Special thanks to the Clerk and the pages who have had to put up with me.

So adjourned.



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, June 7, 2012

## CONTENTS

<b>ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS</b>			
<b>Petitions</b>		Jordan's Principle Gerrard; Selinger	2242
Personal Care Homes and Long-Term Care—Steinbach Goertzen	2231	Commercial Electric Bus Altemeyer; Chomiak	2243
PTH 16 and PTH 5 North—Traffic Signals Briese	2231	Provincial Sales Tax Smook; Bjornson	2243
<b>Committee Reports</b>		<b>Members' Statements</b>	
Standing Committee on Human Resources Second Report Wiebe	2231	Russell Anderson Helwer	2244
Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development Second Report Pettersen	2232	Bailey Bram and Jocelyne Larocque Lemieux	2244
<b>Tabling of Reports</b>		Joan Wheeler Pedersen	2245
Section 43(1)—The Fatality Inquiries Act, Report to the Minister of Justice Swan	2234	Cuthbert Grant Day Blady	2245
Annual Report of the Ombudsman (Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act and Personal Health Information Act, 2011) Reid	2234	Royal Canadian Air Force Band Crothers	2246
<b>Oral Questions</b>			
Flooding Financial Compensation Goertzen; Selinger	2235		
Wishart; Ashton	2237		
Bill 217 Eichler; Selinger	2236		
Lord Selkirk School Division Friesen; Allan	2238		
Emergency Rooms Driedger; Oswald	2239		
Assistant Deputy Minister Taillieu; Struthers	2241		
Minister of Immigration Taillieu; Struthers	2241		
		<b>ORDERS OF THE DAY</b> <i>(Continued)</i>	
		<b>GOVERNMENT BUSINESS</b>	
		<b>Debate on Second Readings</b>	
		Bill 8—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Use of Child Safety Seats) Driedger	2247
		Bill 24—The Energy Savings Act Helwer	2249
		Cullen	2251
		Bill 38—The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2012 Taillieu	2257
		Gerrard	2257
		Bill 7—The Community Renewal Act Gerrard	2258

<b>Second Readings</b>		Goertzen	2270
Bill 23–The Local Government Statutes Amendment Act		Gerrard	2270
Lemieux	2254	Bill 29–The Contaminated Sites Remediation Amendment Act	
Briese	2254	Mackintosh	2271
Schuler	2256	Maguire	2271
Bill 34–The Public-Private Partnerships Transparency and Accountability Act		Gerrard	2272
Struthers	2258	Bill 37–The Highway Traffic Amendment and Summary Convictions Amendment Act (Bicycle Helmets)	
Stefanson	2259	Rondeau	2273
Gerrard	2260	Gerrard	2273
Helwer	2260	Driedger	2274
Bill 33–The Election Financing Act and Elections Amendment Act		<b>Committee of Supply</b> (Concurrent Sections)	
Howard	2263	Health	2276
Taillieu	2264	Legislative Assembly	2290
Gerrard	2266	Children and Youth Opportunities	2290
Goertzen	2266	Immigration and Multiculturalism	2298
Bill 35–The Retail Businesses Holiday Closing Amendment Act		Innovation, Energy and Mines	2299
Howard	2268	Sport	2300
Cullen	2269		

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>**