

**Fourth Session - Thirty-Ninth Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**  
**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**

**Official Report**  
**(Hansard)**

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable George Hickes  
Speaker*

**Vol. LXII No. 60B - 1:30 p.m., Thursday, June 10, 2010**

ISSN 0542-5492

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Ninth Legislature**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Constituency</b>	<b>Political Affiliation</b>
ALLAN, Nancy, Hon.	St. Vital	N.D.P.
ALTEMEYER, Rob	Wolseley	N.D.P.
ASHTON, Steve, Hon.	Thompson	N.D.P.
BJORNSON, Peter, Hon.	Gimli	N.D.P.
BLADY, Sharon	Kirkfield Park	N.D.P.
BLAIKIE, Bill, Hon.	Elmwood	N.D.P.
BOROTSIK, Rick	Brandon West	P.C.
BRAUN, Erna	Rossmere	N.D.P.
BRICK, Marilyn	St. Norbert	N.D.P.
BRIESE, Stuart	Ste. Rose	P.C.
CALDWELL, Drew	Brandon East	N.D.P.
CHOMIAK, Dave, Hon.	Kildonan	N.D.P.
CULLEN, Cliff	Turtle Mountain	P.C.
DERKACH, Leonard	Russell	P.C.
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	N.D.P.
DRIEDGER, Myrna	Charleswood	P.C.
DYCK, Peter	Pembina	P.C.
EICHLER, Ralph	Lakeside	P.C.
FAURSCHOU, David	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Lib.
GOERTZEN, Kelvin	Steinbach	P.C.
GRAYDON, Cliff	Emerson	P.C.
HAWRANIK, Gerald	Lac du Bonnet	P.C.
HICKES, George, Hon.	Point Douglas	N.D.P.
HOWARD, Jennifer, Hon.	Fort Rouge	N.D.P.
IRVIN-ROSS, Kerri, Hon.	Fort Garry	N.D.P.
JENNISSSEN, Gerard	Flin Flon	N.D.P.
JHA, Bidhu	Radisson	N.D.P.
KORZENIOWSKI, Bonnie	St. James	N.D.P.
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Lib.
LEMIEUX, Ron, Hon.	La Verendrye	N.D.P.
MACKINTOSH, Gord, Hon.	St. Johns	N.D.P.
MAGUIRE, Larry	Arthur-Virden	P.C.
MARCELINO, Flor, Hon.	Wellington	N.D.P.
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	N.D.P.
McFADYEN, Hugh	Fort Whyte	P.C.
McGIFFORD, Diane, Hon.	Lord Roberts	N.D.P.
MELNICK, Christine, Hon.	Riel	N.D.P.
MITCHELSON, Bonnie	River East	P.C.
NEVAKSHONOFF, Tom	Interlake	N.D.P.
OSWALD, Theresa, Hon.	Seine River	N.D.P.
PEDERSEN, Blaine	Carman	P.C.
REID, Daryl	Transcona	N.D.P.
ROBINSON, Eric, Hon.	Rupertsland	N.D.P.
RONDEAU, Jim, Hon.	Assiniboia	N.D.P.
ROWAT, Leanne	Minnedosa	P.C.
SARAN, Mohinder	The Maples	N.D.P.
SCHULER, Ron	Springfield	P.C.
SELBY, Erin	Southdale	N.D.P.
SELINGER, Greg, Hon.	St. Boniface	N.D.P.
STEFANSON, Heather	Tuxedo	P.C.
STRUTHERS, Stan, Hon.	Dauphin-Roblin	N.D.P.
SWAN, Andrew, Hon.	Minto	N.D.P.
TAILLIEU, Mavis	Morris	P.C.
WHITEHEAD, Frank	The Pas	N.D.P.
WIEBE, Matt	Concordia	N.D.P.
WOWCHUK, Rosann, Hon.	Swan River	N.D.P.

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, June 10, 2010

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

**Madam Clerk (Patricia Chaychuk):** It is my duty to inform the House that Mr. Speaker is unavoidably absent. Therefore, in accordance with the statutes, I would ask the honourable Deputy Speaker to please take the Chair.

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### PETITIONS

##### Multiple Myeloma Treatments

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

These are the reasons for this petition:

Health Canada has approved the use of Revlimid for patients with multiple myeloma, a rare, progressive and fatal blood cancer.

Revlimid is a vital new treatment that must be accessible to all patients in Manitoba for this life-threatening cancer of the blood cells.

Multiple myeloma is treatable, and new, innovative therapies like Revlimid can extend survival and enhance quality of life for the estimated 2,100 Canadians diagnosed annually.

The provinces of Ontario, Québec, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Alberta have already listed this drug on their respective pharmacare formularies.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

That the provincial government consider immediately providing Revlimid as a choice to patients with multiple myeloma and their health-care providers in Manitoba through public funding.

And this is signed by B. Beach, J. Beach, M. MacDonald and many others.

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

##### Waste-Water Ejector Systems

**Mr. Leonard Derkach (Russell):** I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

These are the reasons for this petition:

Manitobans are deeply committed to protecting the environment, and they want to be assured that the provincial environmental policies are based on sound science.

In early 2009, the provincial government announced that it was reviewing the Onsite Wastewater Management Systems regulations under The Environment Act.

Affected Manitobans, including property owners and municipal governments, provided considerable feedback to the provincial government on the impact of the proposed changes, only to have their input ignored.

The updated regulation include a prohibition on the installation of new waste-water ejectors and the elimination of existing waste-water ejectors at the time of any property transfer.

Questions have been raised about the lack of scientific basis for these changes, as a Manitoba Conservation official stated in the October 8th, 2009, edition of the *Manitoba Co-operator*, "Have we done a specific study? No."

These regulatory changes will have a significant financial impact on all affected Manitobans.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request the Minister of Conservation to consider immediately placing the recent changes to the Onsite Wastewater Management system regulations under The Environment Act on hold until such time that a review can take place to ensure that they are based on a—on sound science.

To request the Minister of Conservation to consider implementing the prohibition on waste-water ejector systems on a case-by-case basis as determined by environmental need in ecologically sensitive areas.

To request the Minister of Conservation to consider offering financial incentives to help affected Manitoba property owners adapt to these regulatory changes.

And this petition, Madam Deputy Speaker, is signed by M. Katchin, A. Cottington, D. Katchen and many, many other Manitobans.

#### **Blumenort Christian Preschool**

**Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach):** I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

And this is the background—the background for the petition is as follows:

The community of Blumenort, Manitoba, is quickly growing and changing. Several new developments are in the process of being constructed and many young families are moving into the region.

Blumenort families looking for early child-care education, nursery school, have only one option in the community, the Blumenort Christian Preschool.

Research suggests that nursery school gives children ages three to five several advantages by providing school readiness and interactive play with other children in a structured, caring and clean environment.

Blumenort Christian Preschool is currently without government support and will be unable to continue offering quality nursery school programming without that provincial support.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the Minister of Family Services to consider working with the Blumenort Christian Preschool to ensure that affordable nursery school options remain in the Blumenort community.

And, Madam Deputy Speaker, this petition is signed by K. Plett, B. Plett, J. Plett and many, many other Manitobans.

#### **PTH 15—Traffic Signals**

**Mr. Ron Schuler (Springfield):** Madam Deputy Speaker, I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

These are the reasons for this petition:

In August 2008, the Minister of Transportation stated that traffic volumes at the intersection of PTH 15 and Highway 206 in Dugald exceeded those needed to warrant the installation of traffic signals.

Every school day up to a thousand students travel through this intersection in Dugald where the lack of traffic signals puts their safety at risk.

Thousands of vehicles travel daily through this intersection in Dugald where the lack of traffic signals puts at risk the safety of these citizens.

In 2008, there was a 300 percent increase in accidents at this intersection.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request that the Minister of Transportation consider the immediate installation of traffic signals at the intersection of PTH 15 and Highway 206 in Dugald.

To request that the Minister of Transportation recognize the value of the lives and well-being of the students and citizens of Manitoba.

Signed by E. Lentowicz, D. Van Amelsvoort, B. Beeston and many, many other Manitobans.

#### **TABLING OF REPORTS**

**Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister charged with the administration of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act):** Madam Deputy Speaker, I'm pleased to table the Manitoba Public Insurance 2009 Annual Report.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I am pleased to table the—the honourable Minister for Justice.

**Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Yes, and I'm also pleased to table the Manitoba Human Rights Commission Annual Report on The Discriminatory Business Practices Act for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2010.

#### **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

##### **National Day of Healing and Reconciliation**

**Hon. Greg Selinger (Premier):** Madam Deputy Speaker, I have a statement for the House.

On the occasion of the second anniversary of the Canadian government's apology to survivors of residential schools, I wish to acknowledge and thank all survivors and their families, many of whom join us in the Chamber today, for your courage and commitment to healing and building a better Manitoba for our children. I would also like to honour the memory of survivors no longer with us today and the children who, sadly, did not survive their experience in the residential schools and sanatoriums that were the norm in Canada for so long.

It is also important to acknowledge the intergenerational victims of residential schools. Children and grandchildren of survivors who have never set foot in a residential school have nonetheless experienced their effects. As government, we have a responsibility to these families to keep improving our education and child welfare system to find a better way forward.

Our responsibilities as a government do not end with acknowledging past wrongs, because our words ring hollow without action. We are acting by sharing authority over Child and Family Services for Aboriginal families with Aboriginal people. We are acting by introducing residential schools education into our curriculum to ensure all Manitobans have historical perspective on the difficulties we face today. We are acting by doing everything in our power to support Aboriginal students and ensure the federal government lives up to their obligations in the area of Aboriginal education.

\*(13:40)

The debate in this Chamber over the care of our most vulnerable children has been passionate and heartfelt. We must remember our passion comes from the same place, a profound love for our children. We may have different views on how to improve our system, but the sad reality is there are far too many Manitoba families in crisis right now, and there is a reason for it. It's a reason rooted in a painful past and the same reason we gathered in this building today to honour and remember.

Finding a new way to do things is often difficult, particularly when it's something as fundamental as the welfare of our children. When walking a new path, it is critical to constantly look back at where you have been, assess what is working and what is not. I want to assure Manitobans this is what our government is doing and will continue to do as we go forward.

The Aboriginal people of Manitoba have taken good care of their children for thousands of years, raising them with values and teachings that are being taught and followed today all over the world. That proud tradition has suffered immensely under the burden of a century-old policy that took Aboriginal children away from their families. I am proud to be part of a government that apologized in this Chamber two years ago for Manitoba's role in supporting a paternalistic system that failed Aboriginal families and society.

The challenge we face together was not created overnight, nor will it be solved quickly. It was not created by us all, but will take all of us to fix it. I urge all Manitobans to not lose courage in the face of tragedy. We must learn and do everything in our power to prevent it from happening again.

Ekosani, miigwech, mahseecho, merci, and thank you.

**Mr. Hugh McFadyen (Leader of the Official Opposition):** I want to thank the Premier for his very thoughtful and sincere words on this very important subject. It is a very important day today for all of Manitoba's First Nations as we recognize tomorrow as the anniversary of Prime Minister Stephen Harper's historic apology for the tragic history that unfolded for many people, Aboriginal people, in our country through the—particularly through the residential schools crisis.

The apology came after far too many years and decades of resistance and delay. It was overdue and it was an important step forward. We know that the residential schools were, for many people, a very dark period and something in our history that demonstrates the ways in which we can go wrong and the ways in which society has failed to live up to its potential or its highest expectations. Physical, emotional and spiritual hardships that First Nations people faced as a result of their experiences over the past century have resulted in generations who have suffered greatly.

Today, as we recognize the National Day of Healing and Reconciliation, we look forward to a brighter tomorrow. Progress has been made. We've come a long way from days when Manitoba's variety of cultures were suppressed or treated as second-class cultures or people. We can celebrate our diversity. All backgrounds and traditions can work side by side and learn from one another. All of us who have children realize that they all live side by side with other children of vastly different backgrounds, many of whom are First Nations, many of whom are Métis and many of whom come from other very different experiences, and we have a responsibility in our generation to leave to that next generation a better, more tolerant and more harmonious and united province of Manitoba.

The National Day of Healing and Reconciliation is one step toward that better future. It does bring some hope to every person who is affected by residential schools, and it is a step, although only one step, toward a future of wholeness and a future of

happiness and fulfilment for each individual in our province.

There are still, as we all know, many issues facing First Nations people across Manitoba. We know our northern communities continue to face challenges with limited health care, education and economic opportunities for a variety of reasons. They experience isolation, high costs of living and very many other practical challenges that those of us who live in the city or in southern Manitoba may not face. And we know that Aboriginal people here in Winnipeg struggle with racial discrimination and other challenges that are not of their own making.

So it's with great hopefulness that we look forward to a better future by breaking down barriers of cultural misunderstanding, learning from the tragedies of the past and, most importantly, forging a vision for a better, more harmonious future for all citizens, a more united Manitoba where one's background and one's history does not become the factor in terms of whether one is able to lead a good life here in this great province of Manitoba.

So I want to thank again the Premier (Mr. Selinger) and all members for the recognition of this important day, again congratulate the Prime Minister and the federal government for the steps they've taken, and urge all of us as Manitobans to continue to forge forward in a spirit of understanding, compromise and good will. Thank you.

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

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Does the honourable member for River Heights have leave to speak to the Premier's statement?

**Some Honourable Members:** Leave.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Leave has been granted.

**Mr. Gerrard:** Madam Deputy Speaker, fellow members of the Legislature, those who are here today who are residential school survivors, elders, chiefs, others in the gallery, we are here today to honour residential school survivors.

Over the course of the last 15 years, all Manitobans have become more and more familiar with the story of residential schools and more understanding and knowledgeable about what happened. It has been important that we continue to increase the awareness of the residential schools and the stories of those who attended residential schools

and the stories of those who suffered abuse, whether physical, mental or sexual, when they were in a residential school. It is important that all Manitobans have an understanding of the situation in the past and the subsequent impact it has had on people who attended residential schools, on their families, on their communities and on their children.

We need to understand this so that we can move forward, so that we can help people to deal with issues and so that we can resolve to take action to support families. We must come to understand and know better ways of acting so that families are not subjected to the trauma of being separated from their children.

I welcome today all those who are attending to participate in this historic, memorable anniversary. It is a year since the historic apology from the Government of Canada to Aboriginal people. We are glad for the apology, and yet we all hope, I believe, and want more action. We feel that there is still a long way to go. There are still too many families dealing with the intergenerational results of the trauma of residential schools. There is still much to do to support families and communities.

I want to particularly recognize the activities of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada and the historic events of next week. I want to recognize the chief commissioner, Judge Murray Sinclair; Commissioner Marie Wilson; and Commissioner Chief Wilton Littlechild.

I want to say to Chief Wilton Littlechild, who I believe is here, that the members of the Manitoba Liberal Party, and, I believe, other legislators, salute your efforts and wish you well in the journey that you are undertaking. It is an important one. We hope that it will make a large difference in the healing that we need to see happen and the progress we can make together in achieving a better future.

As an MLA for River Heights and as the Leader of the Manitoba Liberal Party, I personally pledge to do all I can to address the need to continue acting in the recognition that the apology provided a year ago is followed up with more action. I pledge to do what I can to enable and facilitate a better understanding. I pledge to do what I can to help families and communities to heal. I pledge to do my best to ensure children are able to live safely and develop well within their families and communities. I pledge to work with others in the Legislature and outside the Legislature in these efforts.

Miigwech. Ekosani. Mahseecho. Merci. Thank you.

**Hon. Eric Robinson (Minister of Aboriginal and Northern Affairs):** Yes, Madam Deputy Speaker, I, too, have a statement for the House.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The honourable minister, for a statement for the House.

\* (13:50)

**Mr. Robinson:** Madam Deputy Speaker, this is the second anniversary of Prime Minister Stephen Harper's breakthrough apology to Aboriginal people: First Nations, Métis and Inuit of this land. His apology on behalf of the federal government went on particularly to survivors of Canada's residential school system.

I rise today in this Chamber knowing thousands of Aboriginal people across this country are in various stages of recovery and healing from that experience after being traumatized by physical, emotional, spiritual and sexual abuse. But I celebrate that we are still here, stronger and prouder than ever.

I would like to, first of all, acknowledge our honoured guests in the gallery, including: Commissioner Dr. Wilton Littlechild of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission; Chief Donavan Fontaine, representing the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs; and all First Nations chiefs in attendance. Most importantly, I want to convey my deepest and heartfelt respect to the elders and survivors who have joined us in the public gallery here today and honour those who have gone on ahead to the spirit world.

Two years ago, the Government of Canada acknowledged the evil of its failed assimilation policy, and asked forgiveness from the children that were taken from their families and forced into residential schools. Members of this Assembly know the effects these attempts at de-Indianizing had on us. People working for governments and churches sexually and physically abused many of us and tried to steal our language and identity. Their actions damaged children like me and we became the walking wounded—alcoholics, drug addicts and abusers. In turn, this grim legacy became a burden to be carried by our children. Many of our people are battling substance abuse, family substance, family dysfunction, violence, homophobia, incest, suicide and the lure of gangs, but still a spirit remains that will not be snuffed out.

People like my daughter are the first generation of Aboriginal children who are allowed to grow up at home. Courageously, they are embarking on a task and putting their lives and identities back together. In our culture, the youth and the elders are the most sacred elements of society. And, so, today, I want to thank our Creator for the children that have been entrusted to us and commend them on their efforts to improve their lives and those of their brothers and sisters.

I also want to acknowledge the endurance and spirit of our elders. Specifically, I want to honour the mothers of our people. These women experienced the pain of giving up their children to strangers, and, in some cases, were further victimized by being forced to perform sexual acts to the white Indian agents in order to access relief payments—what today we would call welfare—to provide for their babies who were still at home. There were also horrifying instances of forced sterilizations and forced abortions.

While it was the federal government that oversaw those abuses, the government of Manitoba has its own shameful legacy. Our government statistics show more than 3,000 of our children were adopted out or, we might as well say, stolen, and sent to foreign cultures, the practice that we now refer to as a '60s scoop. And I thank the Premier (Mr. Selinger) for today acknowledging that wrong.

A sacred teaching of Aboriginal people is that all of creation is related. The hurt of one is the hurt of all, and the honour of one is the honour of all. Our people are marred by all forms of dysfunction. We have the highest proportion of the province's population in conflict with the justice system, the highest proportion in prisons, and, tragically, high numbers of children in the child welfare system. We have seen the hurt of one become the hurt of all. But we are also beginning to see change.

The Premier today highlighted the new ways the Province of Manitoba is working with Aboriginal people to improve our futures and respect and affirm our proud identity. That work, along with the apology that we first heard two years ago, is the beginning of honour for one and all. With this as our footing, along with the inspiration of our elders and the energy of our youth, I believe we will continue to build a strong and prosperous future for all the people of Manitoba.

Starting June 16th and running to the 19th, Winnipeg will host the Truth and Reconciliation

Commission's first national event at The Forks. We should all take time to participate in the sharing circles and other activities. We can all be a part of this historic event honouring our survivors as they journey through their trail of healing.

Ekosani, miigwech, mahseecho, wopida, hei hei and merci and thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker

**Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Lac du Bonnet):** Yes, I would like to thank the Minister of Aboriginal and Northern Affairs for a very heartfelt statement and bringing attention, I think, to the National Day of Healing and Reconciliation and, of course, the Premier as well.

I would also like to acknowledge the guests in the gallery. In fact, one of the guests in the gallery is Chief Donovan Fontaine who is one of my constituents. I proudly represent—as the member for Lac du Bonnet, I proudly represent two Aboriginal communities, one of which is Sagkeeng First Nation and the second being Little Black River.

It's—I know it's hard to believe how Aboriginal people were treated in residential schools. They went through much physical abuse, mental abuse, sexual abuse, and they somehow survived it—the program, and the—what was happening was similar to a cultural genocide of an entire people, and that was clearly wrong. Prime Minister Harper clearly recognized that and made an apology and I think made everybody in Canada proud that he would apologize to the Aboriginal people for that. I believe that we should celebrate our cultures, not be forced to forget it.

I also commend the minister for introducing a bill this session which recognizes the Manitoba Aboriginal languages, and I've said it before and I'll say it again that we, of course, intend to support it. There's absolutely no doubt that all members of this House will support it because language is really part of culture, and we ought to celebrate our culture not forget it and not to eliminate culture.

Again, I express my thanks to the minister for that very heartfelt statement. We know that it comes from his heart. Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** I request leave to put a few words on the records in regards to the ministerial statement.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is there leave for the honourable member for Inkster to respond to the minister's statement?

**An Honourable Member:** Agreed.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Agreed. Leave has been granted. The honourable member for Inkster.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Yes, thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. We just want to stand in support in terms of what the minister has put on the record in terms of, I think, generally widespread feelings that, not only individuals inside this Chamber, but all Manitobans, share in terms of the—some of the horror stories over the years that we have heard. I know myself, personally, have had opportunities to meet with many different First Nation leaders that have had the opportunity to express some of the feelings that have really gone on far, far too long.

\* (14:00)

And it's always encouraging when we see governments, at whatever level, work with our First Nations people in trying to heal and to rectify some of the wrongs from the past and ultimately believing that as a society we grow together, we need to be sensitive and caring as a people and understand the wrongs that have been done and the damage as a direct result.

And I genuinely believe that all Manitobans have a sense of remorse to a certain degree in terms of the types of things that have taken place and, I believe, as a whole, would be supportive as to what's taking place here in the Manitoba Legislature today.

We recognize and acknowledge the many different efforts of many of the different leaders who, particular within the First Nations community, that have in essence ensured that there was more justice that came to mark the issues of the residential schools and other incidences over the last number of years.

I think today highlights one of the facts that we are moving forward. I do believe that there's still a lot more that can be done, and we look forward over the next number of years in terms of trying to complete the healing that needs to take place.

And with those few words we just wanted to add our comments on behalf of the Manitoba Liberal Party. Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.



**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Prior to oral—oh, I'm sorry—the honourable member for Lac du Bonnet, are you up on a point of order? No? Okay.

#### Introduction of Guests

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Prior to oral questions, may I direct the attention of all honourable members to the gallery where we have with us 29 grade 9 students from Riverton Collegiate institution, under the direction of Mr. Jay Ewart. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable member for the Interlake (Mr. Nevakshonoff).

Also with us today, we have students from south collegiate—Southeast Collegiate, who are the guests of the honourable Minister for Housing and Community Development (Ms. Irvin-Ross).

On behalf of all honourable members, I welcome you here today.

Just prior to oral questions, I would like to ask the members in the gallery—normally there's no clapping from—there's no ability to participate in question period, so there's no clapping in the gallery.

#### MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

**Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Lac du Bonnet):** Yes, Madam Deputy—

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** On a point—are you raising on—rising on a point of order?

**Mr. Hawranik:** I'm rising on a matter of privilege.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** On a matter of privilege.

**Mr. Hawranik:** Yes, Madam Deputy Speaker, a matter of privilege, of course, is a very serious matter because it infringes on and limits our ability as MLAs to do what we're elected to do, Madam Deputy Speaker, and there are two issues with respect to a matter of privilege, two conditions.

First, is the matter being raised at the earliest opportunity? And I would submit that it is, given the facts, and I intend to present the facts here today to the Chamber so that you can make that ruling. And secondly, whether a prima facie case is made for that privilege.

The key to a matter of privilege is whether it can be proved a prima facie case, that the matter complained about will affect our ability as legislators to perform our duties in this House, and I believe that it does. It relates to misleading and false statements from government ministers and political staff. And those kinds of statements certainly do affect my

ability to do what I was elected to do here in this House, Madam Deputy Speaker.

And I simply refer to *Hansard*. On May the 11th, 2010, page 2068 and 2069 where the member from River East asked questions in question period with regard to the replacement of the Children's Advocate because the current Children's Advocate was on leave and would not be returning to the job. She asked the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Mackintosh), and I quote, "...when his office received notification that the Children's Advocate was on leave." End of quote. The minister replied, and I quote, "...in the last several weeks..." which, given the date of question period on May the 11th, 2010, means that the minister was in fact notified somewhere around mid to end of April that the existing Children's Advocate was on leave, which is about two months ago.

The member from River East in that same *Hansard* then asked the following question to the minister, and I quote: "...the legislation states that, where the term of the Children's Advocate will expire within 12 months, a Standing Committee of Legislative Affairs will be called so as to make recommendations on a suitable replacement." That was her statement in question period.

Given the—Madam Deputy Speaker, given the terms of the legislation and that a committee is required to be called to hire a new Children's Advocate within 12 months prior to the term ending, and given the fact that the Children's Advocate term expires on March 31st next year, the government should've already been moving forward toward calling a committee to hire a new Children's Advocate. It's well within that one-year period.

Then the member from River East then asked the minister: Can the government indicate when this committee will be called so as to ensure there is permanency in the Child's Advocate office?

Member from River East was demanding that the committee be called to replace the Children's Advocate two months ago. This minister knew this. He also knew that his department, at the time, was in utter chaos and had likely known for a very, very long time, and the hiring of a new Children's Advocate, a permanent replacement for one that was on leave, would certainly help the department, but, no, he didn't call the committee to start the process.

My question is, Madam Deputy Speaker, is why did the minister not call the committee? I think I

have the answer. The answer is in *Hansard*, page 2069, again on May the 11th. The answer given by the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Mackintosh) in question period, and I quote: "... the Children's Advocate is actually the watchdog of Family Services and Housing . . . ."

Well, obviously the minister was not calling for the replacement of the Children's Advocate because her job is actually to hold the government to account. That's her job. That's directly from the mouth of the Minister of Family Services.

However, I read today's *Winnipeg Free Press*, Madam Deputy Speaker, and that paints a very, very different picture. Instead of admitting that they don't want to replace the Children's Advocate because she might blow the whistle on the department—who knows—the NDP chose instead to blame the opposition for not replacing her, the opposition. They chose instead to spin the issue politically instead of telling the truth.

How would refusing to participate in a committee to hire a Chief Electoral Officer for a period of time prevent the minister from calling a committee to hire a new Children's Advocate? Unbelievable. It boggles the mind how they would be able to even convince the media of this totally nonsensical and ludicrous argument, Madam Deputy Speaker. Unbelievable.

Those committees aren't connected. They're totally separate committees. Not only is the argument nonsense, but the argument that they made to the media demonstrates the fact that the NDP will do anything, anything, to avoid taking responsibility for absolutely anything. How could it become the opposition's fault for the NDP not beginning to hire a new Child's Advocate? It's mind boggling. Unbelievable.

The government calls committees, the opposition doesn't. The opposition has absolutely no power to call any committee. So for those very reasons, Madam Deputy Speaker, I believe this is a matter of privilege. So I move, seconded by the member from Lakeside, that the Premier (Mr. Selinger) and the Minister of Family Services apologize to this House for the false statements made to the media by their government's spokeswoman.

\* (14:10)

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Before recognizing any other members to speak, I want to remind the House

that contributions at this time by honourable members are to be limited to strictly relevant comments as to whether the alleged matter of privilege has been raised at the earliest opportunity and whether a prima facie case has been established.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader):** Madam Deputy Speaker, and thank you for the opportunity to speak to this particular point of privilege.

I think—two things, Madam Deputy Speaker, without wanting to be disputatious, just on the fact or on the argument as to whether or not this is indeed a point of privilege, I think this has to do with things that are said outside the House by spokespersons for the government. It's a dispute as to both the facts and interpretation of what has gone on in the last month or two. But I would also like to say that, in fairness to the Minister for Family Services, it's not really up to him to call the committee that deals with the hiring of the Children's Advocate. It's up to the Government House Leader, and that's me. And that committee meeting has not been called.

I did make a commitment, I think, to the honourable member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson), at one point, that we would try to proceed with this as quickly as possible, and that commitment still stands. But that, Madam Deputy Speaker, is not a matter of privilege, but is a matter of commitment on the part of this government that we would like to move to replace—to find a replacement for the Children's Advocate as soon as possible. It's not that the deputy's Children's Advocate is unable to comment—is unable to act as a watchdog. That role continues regardless of whether we have someone new, and that person, whoever the new person is, won't be coming on-stream for a while. In the meantime, the deputy is able to provide that job as a watchdog.

But in fairness to the minister, it's not his job to preside over the hiring of the new Child Advocate. That would be out of keeping with the rules. So if there's any responsibility to be taken for not proceeding at a pace that the opposition finds to be acceptable, then that would reside with me. On the other hand, one has to acknowledge, Madam Deputy Speaker, that we have had difficulties with the opposition with respect to how we go about replacing independent officers of the House, and to try and separate all those things is sometimes very difficult.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The honourable member for Inkster, on the same matter of privilege.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Yes, thank you, on the same matter of privilege, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I think that if you—and I appreciate the Leader of the Official Opposition bringing forward this matter of privilege. I do believe that it is important for us to recognize that the Child Advocate's office is an independent office, and there is an obligation, Madam Deputy Speaker, on all sides of this House to do and come up with ideas and suggestions as to the hiring of the Child Advocate. I appreciate the fact that the opposition has now been asking for the Child Advocate's office to be dealt with, in terms of the hiring of a replacement, for a while now, and I think that it's important for us to put things in the perspective of the current situation. Given the fact that Child and Family Services in the province of Manitoba, the welfare, in particular, of in excess of 8,000 children, is in a state of chaos in the province of Manitoba, it talks about the urgency of having a full-time Child Advocate.

We have seen two political parties within this Chamber advocate for the need for a Child Advocate. Madam Deputy Speaker, the hiring process has been—is fairly simple and straightforward. You have to have representation from members inside this Chamber. I, for one, have participated in the hiring of a Child Advocate in the past. And it needs to be built in terms of having a hiring committee put together. The government is fully aware that the opposition is quite prepared to meet expeditiously in order to be able to have a replacement Child Advocate. It is not good enough to say that sometime in the next month or two.

And, Madam Deputy Speaker, the member from Interlake said, well, what about the Chief Electoral Officer? If he would have listened to what the government, or the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Hawranik) would have said, he would have realized that it is a false—it is a bogus argument to tie those two together. The child advocacy office is independent, and the hiring process is completely independent from the electoral—Chief Electoral Officer. What we're talking about is the advocate's office. It is the government that has to take the initiative, and I realize they have a vested interest because of the state of welfare and child services in the province today but there is a higher call.

It's a call in terms of meeting the needs of our children, and the way we do that is we recognize the value of having a Child Advocate in place, a full-time Child Advocate. It should not be the opposition coming to the government. It should be the government coming to the opposition, Madam Deputy Speaker, saying, let's have the meeting; let's hire the replacement.

That's what it should be, Madam Deputy Speaker, but because they have sat on their duffs and have done nothing in terms of replacing the Child Advocate, you have opposition coming forward saying, let's do what needs to get done in order to protect the interest of the children of our province.

And now we find the government ignoring the importance of this issue and now putting a spin—and yesterday I heard spins such as it's the opposition's fault, it's Ottawa's fault—anyone but this incompetent Minister of Family Services (Mr. Mackintosh), Madam Deputy Speaker. And if there's someone to blame for the crisis that we have today in child welfare, it's the Minister of Family Services and his pure incompetence in being able to protect the children in the province of Manitoba.

We look to the minister and the Government House Leader (Mr. Blaikie)—and I appreciate—he has now admitted that it was—it's his fault. Well, admission is important but, having said that, what would be good is to—and even more important than receiving the apology, quite frankly, Madam Deputy Speaker, is for the government to stand up and say that we will begin the process immediately in hiring a full-time replacement.

And I suspect that you would even find the government—or Opposition House Leader would be—

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order. I just wanted to remind all honourable members that their comments should relate to whether or not this is a prima facie case, and should not debate on the substance of the issue.

On the matter of privilege raised by the honourable member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Hawranik), to allege that a member has misled the House is a matter of order rather than privilege and is not unparliamentary, whether or not it is qualified by an adjective unintentional or inadvertently.

To allege that a member has deliberately misled the House is also a matter of order. *Beauchesne* citation 31(1) advises that a dispute over the facts does not fulfil the criteria for a prima facie case of

privilege. While Joseph Maingot advises, on page 241 of the 2nd Edition of *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada*, that allegations that a member has misled the House are, in fact, matters of order and not matters of privilege.

I would therefore respectfully rule that the honourable member does not have a matter of privilege.

**Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Official Opposition House Leader):** Challenge the ruling.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The ruling of the Chair has been challenged.

#### Voice Vote

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The question before the House is: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

All those in favour, say yea.

**Some Honourable Members:** Yea.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed, say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

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

#### Formal Vote

**An Honourable Member:** Recorded vote.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The honourable member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Hawranik) has requested a recorded vote.

A recorded vote has been requested, call in the members.

The question before the House is: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

#### Division

**A RECORDED VOTE** was taken, the result being as follows:

#### Yeas

*Allan, Altemeyer, Ashton, Bjornson, Blady, Blaikie, Braun, Caldwell, Dewar, Howard, Irvin-Ross, Jennissen, Jha, Korzeniowski, Lemieux, Mackintosh, Marcelino, Martindale, McGifford, Melnick, Nevakshonoff, Oswald, Reid, Robinson, Rondeau, Saran, Selby, Selinger, Swan, Whitehead, Wowchuk.*

#### Nays

*Borotsik, Briese, Cullen, Derkach, Driedger, Dyck, Eichler, Faurschou, Gerrard, Goertzen, Graydon, Hawranik, Lamoureux, Maguire, McFadyen, Mitchelson, Pedersen, Rowat, Schuler, Stefanson, Taillieu.*

**Madam Clerk (Patricia Chaychuk):** Yeas 31, Nays 21.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The ruling of the Chair has been sustained.

\* (14:40)

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

##### Children's Advocate Report Standing Committee Review

**Mr. Hugh McFadyen (Leader of the Official Opposition):** In the wake of the very significant revelations of payoffs in the child welfare system, we asked the government yesterday whether they'd be prepared to call a public committee to have the Children's Advocate's office come before a committee to identify the significant issues that they have raised and to work with legislators toward finding solutions to some of those very serious challenges within the system.

I understand the House leaders have had some discussion and there's an agreement that committee will be called.

I want to ask the Premier whether there is also agreement on the part of the government, subject to resolving any personal privacy issues, that the report which is now public in the media will be tabled for open discussion at committee so that all members can get to the bottom of the issues—

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order. I'm going to remind all honourable members that the report—the submission to the Legislative Assembly Management Committee is currently being taken under advisement and cannot be referred to in the House.

**Mr. McFadyen:** Madam Deputy Speaker, my question to the Premier is whether the very serious issues, widely reported throughout the Manitoba media over the past 24 hours or so, which relate to the chaos identified by the Children's Advocate within the child welfare system, will be fully tabled and available for discussion of all members when committee is held so that we are able to have a meaningful, productive and forward-looking discussion about the very many significant

challenges that have led the Children's Advocate to refer to the system as being in a state of chaos so that we can get on with undoing the damage.

**Hon. Greg Selinger (Premier):** As we said yesterday, the acting Children's Advocate in Manitoba is free to speak at any time to answer any questions at any time, as has been done in the past and can certainly be done in the future. The committee hearing that has been called will allow for further debate and discussion on any of these matters that are of interest and importance to the House on the future of the child welfare system in Manitoba.

**Mr. McFadyen:** Can the Premier confirm with his statement that the Children's Advocate will be free to discuss issues—that she is free to discuss all of the issues that have been widely reported in the media and which are the matters now of some urgency in terms of public debate and legislative action?

Will that be allowed to take place at committee? Will the government support that and will they be open and transparent? Subject to dealing with any personal privacy issues, will they be open and transparent in terms of the tabling of any and all relevant documents that would allow legislators to ensure that we're getting to the bottom of the very significant chaos within the system?

**Mr. Selinger:** As has always been the case, any officer of the Legislature is entirely free to operate within their mandate to comment on matters of public policy. They can make statements in public; they can file reports in public. This has always been the case. This government has always respected that, and we will continue to do so.

**Mr. McFadyen:** Except that is not, in fact, the case—what the Premier has just said. The Children's Advocate herself has stated in the media that she's unable to address the issues that are being widely reported in the media today.

The need to have a productive meeting rests on her ability to deal with all of the issues. Is the Premier now saying that the government has changed its position on that issue and that the Children's Advocate will, in fact, now be able to reverse the position she's taken in the media and be able to address these very significant issues?

Our concern is that, with the false statements being made by this government yesterday to the *Free Press* blaming the opposition falsely for the delay in

the replacement, that he is again—he and his government, again, are making false statements in the House today, and so can he indicate whether or not he's actually serious about this, or is this yet another one of the many false statements he and his government make publicly in this House and in the media?

**Mr. Selinger:** Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, we've been very clear: We do not interfere in the operations of independent officers of the Legislature. They are free to comment on matters within their legislative mandate as they think is desirable for advancing the interests and the purposes for which they serve all members of the Legislature.

We support that mandate. We will respect that mandate. We have in the past, we do in the present, and we will in the future.

**Mr. McFadyen:** Madam Deputy Speaker, the Premier is—

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** New question?

**Mr. McFadyen:** Speaking on a new question, the Premier is speaking out of both sides of his mouth. He says he doesn't interfere but at the same time acknowledges that the—that this independent officer reports to the Legislature.

We are the 57 members of the Legislature and I'm asking him for his position, given that the opposition—both opposition parties have called for freedom on the part of the Children's Advocate to address the very significant issues now being widely reported in the media, whether they are now reversing their position and saying that it is the position of the 37 MLAs that make up the NDP caucus that that freedom also exists, because this would be a change in position. It would be a reflection of the will of the entire Legislature to whom the Children's Advocate reports, and I think what we need is a direct clear answer, not more dissembling and falsehood from the Premier and his government.

**Mr. Selinger:** Madam Deputy Speaker, it's very clear that the member would like to draw some distinction between his view and our view and how the independent officers of the Legislature should operate.

We believe the independent officers should be able to comment freely without fear or favour on any

matter that they believe is relevant to the mandate with which they are given by this Legislature, and they can do it in public, they can do it at committee, they can do it in the—in all the fora that they think are relevant and important to advance the mandate for which they are given responsibility by all members of this House.

**Mr. McFadyen:** I want to interpret the Premier's statement as being agreement that we are going to be free at committee to deal with all of the issues in the—being widely reported in the media today.

I want to just ask the Premier to confirm that the document that is in question is going to be tabled and available for debate and discussion at committee.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I just want to urge caution to all members in terms of the choice of the wording they put forward for their questions and for their answers.

#### Point of Order

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The honourable member for Lac du Bonnet, on a point of order?

**Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Lac du Bonnet):** Yes, on a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker, and it simply relates to the fact that we all know that if a matter is under advisement there is a rule in the House that we can't talk about that particular subject matter. However, there is an opportunity for all of us, I think, to be able to speak about that matter, provided leave is given in the House in spite of the rule.

\* (14:50)

The rules all can be suspended, and this is one particular rule that, of course, we have to think of the best interests of the children and families, and the reality is that that rule can be suspended. Other rules have been suspended in this House, and I would submit that—I would ask the—

**An Honourable Member:** Leave.

**Mr. Hawranik:** —leave that the subject matter of the matter of privilege be allowed to be addressed in question period and in this House.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order. I just want to remind all honourable members that it's a very long-standing practice of all Speakers in Manitoba that matters taken under advisement are not referred to in the House.

And, in regards to the comments and questions by the honourable Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. McFadyen), I was just putting a caution out there for all members. So I just want to caution all members in terms of their choice of wording.

So, in terms of asking for leave, I will ask if there is leave to take a look at what is currently under advisement and have this put forward as something we could discuss in the House. Is there leave?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**An Honourable Member:** On the same point of order.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** On the same point of order, the Government House Leader.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader):** On the same point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. The honourable member may—rose on a point of order to ask for leave, and I'm rising on the same point of order.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Yes. The honourable member for—order. The honourable member for Lac du Bonnet did rise on a point of order, so I will—if there are other members who would like to put forward comments on that point of order, they are free to do so.

The honourable Government House Leader, on the same point of order.

**Mr. Blaikie:** Well, thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, I think, you know, the House should reflect seriously when thinking about whether or not to give leave in this because it's not giving leave to depart from some course set by the government here, it's giving leave to depart from some course set by the Chair. So this all reflects, not on the government, but on the Chair and on the role of the Speaker in the Chamber. That's what's actually going on here because it's the ruling that had to do with whether or not certain documents can be mentioned in the House. It was not a ruling of the government; it was a ruling of the Chair. And so, you know, people should keep in mind that what we're dealing here is the authority of the Chair.

Having said that, Madam Deputy Speaker, and with respect to the questions that have been asked in this regard, the fact of the matter is, is that the Children's Advocate can go before the committee meeting that we are in the process of setting up and repeat everything that she said to the LAMC, that she's completely free to say whatever she wants to

that committee meeting, whatever she said to the LAMC. We don't have to drag the Chair and the LAMC into this. All we have to do is acknowledge that the Children's Advocate, when she comes to the committee, will be able to say whatever she wants, either spontaneously or as a result of questioning, and be able to repeat the analysis that is reported in the paper.

I don't see what the problem with that is, Madam Deputy Speaker. In the meantime, I think it's important that we support the Chair.

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

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order. I would like to recognize the honourable member for Inkster on the same point of order.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. The Government House Leader is really confusing the issue. It's actually a very straightforward request for leave.

The Premier (Mr. Selinger), in his answer, is trying to give Manitobans the impression that he wants an open process and everything is on the table. What's being asked for in following through with what the Premier says he wants is to allow for leave for us to be able to make reference to a document that's under current advisement through the Speaker's Chair.

So all we're really asking for is for the government to join the opposition members in agreeing to allow us to have questions related to the question of that document that's already been circulated in the media, Madam Deputy Speaker. It's a very simple request. All opposition members are comfortable with a full discussion in question and answer on that document. The question is: Is the Premier sincere when he says that he would like to see a full discussion take place?

So this is time for the Premier to prove that he's sincere and genuine and allow for leave so that we can ask questions regarding the document. The choice is the Premier's.

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

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order. I am going to ask the House: Is there leave to refer to the document that was tabled at the Legislative Assembly Management Committee, despite the fact that that document is currently under advisement? Is there leave?

**Some Honourable Members:** Leave.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Agreed. So there is leave.

Order. I'm going to remind all honourable members that although leave has been granted, this is an infraction of the law of the Legislative Assembly. So I do have some concerns about this, and I'm going to ask the House if there would be permission to recess for 10 minutes to have a discussion with the House leaders.

Is there agreement to have a 10-minute recess to have a discussion with the House leaders? *[Agreed]*

All right, so we will have a 10-minute recess and we will reconvene. The bells will ring. Thank you very much.

*The House recessed at 2:56 p.m.*

*The House resumed at 4:20 p.m.*

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order.

First of all, I would like to thank all honourable members for giving us the opportunity to recess, and I would like to thank the House leaders for meeting with me.

After consultation with the Law Officer for the Legislative Assembly, I have been advised that the interpretation of section 5.1(3)(c) of The Legislative Assembly Management Commission Act now has a different interpretation in this specific case, due to the fact that the submission from the Office of the Children's Advocate to LAMC has been released to the media.

The confidentiality clause of the document, item 5.1(3)(c) in The Legislative Assembly Management Commission Act, no longer applies.

As a result of this, members of the Legislative Assembly can refer to this document and ask questions about it. The Office of the Children's Advocate is also free to answer questions at a committee meeting from members of the Legislative Assembly about the budget submission to LAMC.

\*\*\*

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** And we will now be returning to oral questions.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(Continued)

### Foster Care

#### Movement of Children in Care

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The Leader of the Official Opposition, to ask your second supplemental for your second question.

**Mr. Hugh McFadyen (Leader of the Official Opposition):** Madam Deputy Speaker, with the very significant chaos identified within the child welfare system by the Children's Advocate in the report, the government, under—after initial—initially resisting the calls of opposition, has now agreed to a committee meeting, after resisting the presentation of that report publicly, has now agreed that it should be made public.

I want to ask the Premier now: In light of the fact that the pattern of opposing and then changing their minds has occurred at so many stages along the way, would he now go the next step and ensure, Madam Deputy Speaker, that he issues a directive through his government that ensures that any child currently placed with a secure, stable, long-term foster family remains with that family until such time as they can satisfy all Manitobans that the chaos in the system has been resolved?

**Hon. Greg Selinger (Premier):** Madam Deputy Speaker, as the House knows, in 2008 we made child safety paramount in our legislation, and that is the rule that provides guidance to all the people that work in the field and the authorities that they work under.

So that is the No. 1 criterion upon which decisions are made. The child—the safety of the child is paramount in all decision making with respect to placement of children in the child welfare system.

### Foster Care

#### Movement of Children in Care

**Mrs. Bonnie Mitchelson (River East):** And that legislation that was passed putting the safety of children paramount isn't worth the paper it's written on, and it's a disgrace to Gage Guimond and his short life.

Madam Deputy Speaker, will the Minister of Family Services stand up today and indicate, because of the chaotic situation in our Child and Family Services system, will he stand up today and indicate clearly that he will direct that no child that's in a stable foster home in a long-term placement where

there are no protection issues, that that child will stay in that stable situation while he fixes the chaos in the system he's created?

**Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Minister of Family Services and Consumer Affairs):** First of all, members on this side would be wholly reluctant to take advice from that particular member who—

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

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Well, it's close to the bone, isn't it, Madam Deputy Speaker?

And when it comes to—you know, earlier in this Chamber there were statements made recognizing the damage done taking Aboriginal children from their home. It was also recognized not only about the residential schools, but that there was horrendous damage done by the '60s scoop. In fact, it has been referred to as cultural genocide.

It's important that when speeches are made earlier in the day, that the questions that follow should reflect the importance of allowing Aboriginal children to go home when it's safe to do so.

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Maybe the minister should tell the grandmother, the Aboriginal grandmother, who was searching and seeking for help for her granddaughter that was attempting to commit suicide this week and couldn't get that support from the agency, that she is being well served and that her granddaughter is being well served.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I ask again, in the interests of the safety of children that are in safe foster homes today, that they stay there while the chaos in the system that he has created is fixed. Until that happens, will he ensure that those children that are in safe placements remain safe?

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Well, first of all, child welfare, we will reiterate, is being overhauled in Manitoba with historic investments rather than the cuts that broke the system, Madam Deputy Speaker, by the member opposite. I know that the member opposite—the front-line workers, 65 percent of them, got together and they told her that child welfare was in crises. And, in fact, 90 percent of the social workers told the member opposite that the child welfare system wasn't able to meet the needs of children and families, and it was because, 86 percent said, due to cutbacks from the honourable member that just asked the question.

When it comes to child safety, this House passed legislation to reinforce the rule—



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

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order. I'm having difficulty hearing the questions and answers.

The honourable minister, to finish your statement.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Madam Deputy Speaker, this—it is our view that, particularly on a day like this, that this Legislature should not be agreeing to introduce a law that tells children they can't go home when it's safe to do so and in their best interests. That would be a sad day.

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** But front-line workers today are telling us that this government rushed ahead with the devolution process to a degree where the agencies, the Aboriginal agencies that were set up, were set up to fail by this government because they didn't have trained staff in place and they didn't have the mechanisms in place to protect children, and that's what front-line workers are telling us today, those that are working within this minister's Child and Family Services system.

So I ask again: For the sake of the children that are safe in foster homes today, in long-term placements, will this minister not now indicate that they should remain in those safe homes till he fixes the chaos that he created in the Child and Family Services system?

**Mr. Mackintosh:** The protection needs of children, the best interests of the children, are issues that are decided on each and every day by social workers in the child welfare system. We also know that no one knows more the pain of saying good-bye than a foster parent. It is very difficult and heartbreaking, and, indeed, it is a moment of grief that can extend for many, many months when a foster parent has to say good-bye to a foster child who has become very attached and part of the family.

We also know that we have to provide supports for foster parents, but they know from day one, and, in fact, part of their whole training process is to accept that fostering is temporary help for a family so that the child eventually, hopefully, can be safely returned home. We want children to go home safely.

#### **Foster Care Appeal Process**

**Mrs. Bonnie Mitchelson (River East):** And on a new question.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** On a new question.

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** On a new question, Madam Deputy Speaker. The minister has set up an appeal process for foster families when children are being removed when there are no protection issues. They go through three levels of appeal. The final appeal is to the minister and to his office.

Is that appeal and the decision from that appeal binding?

\* (16:30)

**Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Minister of Family Services and Consumer Affairs):** The member keeps coming in with false allegations. We had one in here a couple of days ago, and, you know, we always follow up on those allegations, and always, you know, it always ends up that she's just dead wrong. Once again, the minister is not a final level of appeal.

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I'd like to ask the minister today why, when a foster family appeals that when a child is going to be removed when there are no protection issues, and the agency denies that appeal with no written reasons, when the authority denies the appeal with no written reasons, and the third level of appeal that comes to the minister's office, we get a five-page written document and ruling that says the child should remain with the foster family. Is that binding?

**Mr. Mackintosh:** You see, the first question, she said the minister is the final level of appeal; now, she says that it wasn't. So, you know, I guess I don't have to correct the record to just let her supplementary questions show the basis.

The member raised a particular matter with my office and, from what I understand, in fact, there was an appeal decision by an independent adjudicator and there was follow-up according to that decision.

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Madam Deputy Speaker, but then why is the agency now planning to move that child again? One year after the minister's office made the decision that that child should stay with the foster family, why are they—why is that child being removed again today?

**Mr. Mackintosh:** I hope that the member, when she was minister, was not making decisions—

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

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order. Once again I want to ask for decorum from the House. I am having

some difficulty hearing the questions, hearing the answers.

The honourable Minister for Family Services has the floor.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** I certainly hope, and I think all members of this House would hope, that the member who just asked the question, when she was a minister, did not make decisions and intervene—as I know the member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard) would also encourage interventions—in particular child welfare matters. Those are left to professional decision making and, in the case that the member raised, an independent adjudicator that is from a panel.

But it's my understanding, Madam Deputy Speaker—it's my understanding—

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order. Once again I'm just going to ask for some co-operation from all members of the House so that we can hear the questions and we can hear the answers.

The honourable minister, to complete your answer.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** It's my understanding that, as a result of the adjudication, that the child remained with the home, Madam Deputy Speaker, and it's my understanding that the agency now is working with the family, actually, for adoption.

Madam Deputy Speaker, there is—there are checks and balances. There are processes in place for adoptions.

### **Phoenix Sinclair Death Public Inquiry**

**Mrs. Heather Stefanson (Tuxedo):** Madam Deputy Speaker, five years after Phoenix Sinclair died alone in a basement after repeated beatings, the Province is no closer to a public inquiry into her death.

Four years, Madam Deputy Speaker, after the premier then, at the time, Gary Doer, announced a commission of inquiry into the death of Phoenix Sinclair, still no public inquiry has taken place to get to the bottom of how such a tragedy could occur in our child welfare system in Manitoba.

Will the minister agree to move forward today with a public inquiry into the death of Phoenix Sinclair?

**Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Madam Deputy Speaker, it has

been the policy to move very carefully when there are criminal proceedings still outstanding. In this case—on the Sinclair case, there remains an outstanding appeal. There is an extension that was granted to one of the accused for a leave to attend to the Supreme Court of Canada. That has not yet been determined. If leave is not given, then the criminal proceedings will be at an end; but, as long as those proceedings are continuing, the inquiry will not proceed.

The Supreme Court could uphold the conviction. The Supreme Court could also order a new trial, and we certainly don't want to do anything that could affect the criminal investigation and the criminal proceedings, Madam Deputy Speaker.

**Mrs. Stefanson:** Madam Deputy Speaker, the potential appeal to the Supreme Court should have no bearing on whether or not a public inquiry is called to get to the bottom of the death of Phoenix Sinclair. So let's just be clear and put some facts on the record for once, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Phoenix Sinclair was a five-year-old child who should have been protected by our child welfare system, and, tragically, she was not. This happened five years ago and, still, no public inquiry has taken place.

The system is in chaos. Manitobans deserve to know why the system failed Phoenix Sinclair. Why is the government stonewalling on a public inquiry?

**Mr. Swan:** Madam Deputy Speaker, there continues to be an outstanding request to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, which is the highest court in Canada. That court can uphold the conviction, and, certainly, the Crown attorney who'll be arguing this case on behalf of the people of Manitoba will put forward that case as best they can.

The Supreme Court of Canada could also order a retrial of this case, and it is shocking, Madam Deputy Speaker, that these members would put politics ahead of a criminal investigation.

We believe that the most important step is to make sure criminal proceedings are taken and are carried through to the end, rather than let them be affected by an inquiry or by political statements that these members seem quite willing to make in the public and in this House.

**Mrs. Stefanson:** Madam Deputy Speaker, this is about a child that died in our public child welfare

system in Manitoba five years ago. Four years ago, the Premier at the time announced that he would commission an inquiry into the death of Phoenix Siquare—of Phoenix Sinclair.

Five years ago she died. Four years ago they announced this. A Supreme—a potential Supreme Court's appeal has no bearing on a public inquiry. If members opposite wanted to do the right thing in Manitoba to get to the bottom of this issue—

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

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order. Once again, I'm going to ask all members of the House on both sides to please allow questions, to please allow answers to go forward.

**Mrs. Stefanson:** If members opposite wanted to do the right thing to get to the bottom of the chaotic system, our child welfare system in Manitoba, they would do the right thing today and move forward with a public inquiry into the death of Phoenix Sinclair. Will they do that today?

**Mr. Swan:** Madam Deputy Speaker, our government is not going to put politics ahead of a criminal prosecution. We respect the police who've gone in and done the investigation. I certainly respect, as I believe members on this side of the House do, the Crown attorney, who's been successful in securing convictions in this case.

One of the parties that's been convicted has applied for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, which, again, could do a range of things, including ordering a new trial.

And I will tell you, Madam Deputy Speaker, that we are not going to prejudice that from happening. I'm very proud of the work the Crown attorneys have done in this case, and we are not going to prejudice the ability to continue to prosecute this because the member opposite believes there's a political opportunity to do so.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

#### **Child Welfare System Premier's Involvement**

**Mr. Hugh McFadyen (Leader of the Official Opposition):** My question to the Premier is: We have very many outstanding and serious issues in child welfare. He—his minister refuses to respond to questions about the current crisis in the system with respect to kids in long-term care.

Will the Premier show the kind of leadership that the province is today looking for and take personal responsibility for dealing with this very serious crisis which his minister seems unable to deal with?

\* (16:40)

**Hon. Greg Selinger (Premier):** Madam Deputy Speaker, this government, myself and the minister have been investing and moving forward on improving the child welfare system in Manitoba. That is why there are additional resources in terms of additional workers. That is why there's over 2,300 additional foster placements, homes, made available in the system. There's over 230 additional workers. That is why there's a move towards prevention programming to ensure that children and families have the resources they need so that they don't have to come into the child welfare system. That is why we have invested in what we call the Healthy Child initiatives in Manitoba, which include home-visiting programs, support for young children and their mothers and the families, parenting resources, as well as practical supports, material supports, where they need it.

All of those things are being done by this side of the government. The members opposite have never supported those things. They've actually worked against them with every fibre of their body. And now they do not want to take personal responsibility for the fact that they tried to block all of these initiatives.

#### **Children's Advocate Report Premier's Awareness**

**Mr. Hugh McFadyen (Leader of the Official Opposition):** And the Premier's right; we do oppose chaos in the child welfare system, Madam Deputy Speaker. We'll continue to do so.

Madam Deputy Speaker, in light of the fact that the very significant report of the Children's Advocate is now a public document, we're able to speak about it here in the House. I want to ask the Premier if he can indicate whether he's read that report, which they've now had for two months, and what his impressions of it were.

**Hon. Greg Selinger (Premier):** Madam Deputy Speaker, what we have done is move forward to improve the child welfare system; and, when we do that, we take the views of all of those involved in the system into account, and their recommendations for things that can be improved. And that's what we have

done in this House. We have made sure that there are more workers available. We have made sure that there are more foster homes available. We have continued to do things that provide proper supports to young families when they get started on the path towards parenthood. We have ensured that there are additional housing resources and supports available to families that want to have stability in their lives. And all of those measures are for the purpose of stabilizing families and have them have an opportunity to raise their family in dignity, and those children to thrive in this Manitoba community.

**Mr. McFadyen:** Madam Deputy Speaker, the report was presented at the end of April. It's now been in the possession of government members for some two months.

I want to ask the Premier again, because he dodged it on the first question, has he read the report? Following his reading, if he did read the report, did he contact the Children's Advocate to ask about the contents of the report? And, what other specific steps has he taken in connection with the contents of that very, very significant and worrisome report?

**Mr. Selinger:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I've been putting on the record the steps we've taken, which the members have opposed with every fibre of their body. They voted against them every single time.

We have taken steps not only to invest in child welfare, which I've enunciated some of the specifics there; we have taken steps to expand our day-care system; we have taken steps around Healthy Child initiatives, including parenting and home-support programs; we have taken steps around making housing available for families. We've done all of these things that have supported families here in Manitoba, and the members opposite have, once again, tried to thwart all of those measures.

It was just a few weeks ago, the members—and just a few days ago, actually, that some of the members were demanding that we make cuts to these kinds of services to balance the budget, to do it all right now, in the name of fiscal discipline, when, in fact, we made a commitment, this government made a commitment, to protect front-line services. And members opposite have opposed those resources being available to support families and children in Manitoba.

## Child Welfare System Minister's Comments

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** Madam Deputy Speaker, our provincial welfare system is in chaos.

It is ironic that today we are honouring residential school survivors, who were taken away from their families, on a very day when we have, in our province, more than 8,600 children who have been separated from their families.

Presiding over this chaos is the minister and the Premier. And, instead of acknowledging the problem and dealing with it appropriately, the minister and the Premier have been engaging in cover-up and blaming others. Yesterday, the minister was putting the blame on families.

I ask the minister: Does he really believe Manitoba families have more problems than families in other provinces?

**Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Minister of Family Services and Consumer Affairs):** Well, yesterday, the honourable member was trying to make a case that things had gotten worse and, of course, then, today, we are reminded of residential schools. We're reminded of the '60s scoop, and I'm wondering why he doesn't think for a moment, was that not chaos, honourable member?

## Standing Committee Review

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** The minister is quite correct that the '60s scoop was chaos. We just don't ever want to repeat that again. The minister himself said yesterday—the minister said there is chaos and breakdown in far too many families. Instead of blaming families causing chaos, the minister should be looking at why his \$112-million investment into the system isn't reducing the number of kids needing services from the system.

I ask because it's important to hear from families: Will the government consent to have a second meeting of the legislative committee after the one where the Children's Advocate presents in order to hear from families their side of the story, so the minister can listen to what really needs to be done?

**Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Minister of Family Services and Consumer Affairs):** The reason that 8,000, over 8,600 children, are, most regrettably, in need of protection is because we have to always provide supports for families. We have to enable

greater parental responsibility across this province, which is why, not just in child welfare, we are redirecting resources to prevention, but why the Province as a whole, through Healthy Child, through the FASD strategy, through the suicide prevention strategy, through Triple P parenting, through Families First initiative, through education investments, even in public health investments, are making efforts to strengthen families. But there are pockets of deep despair and dysfunction in this province.

We need strong partnerships, not only with other governments but also with family, friends and neighbours. We're all in this. We're doing our part, and we will continue—

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Minister of Family Services  
Removal Request**

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** Madam Deputy Speaker, the *Canadian Medical Association Journal* put it very clearly. Children who have a government as a parent, no matter how well intentioned or necessary that arrangement is, are often damaged by this. The evidence of this harm is extensive and consistent.

The minister is in his full NDP, we-in-government-know-best mode. The truth is that this minister has failed to improve the system. We have more than 8,600 children separated from their families. More families are torn apart because they can't get help for addictions and family crises, which are two of the important reasons.

I ask the Premier: Will he fire this minister who's failed to his job and get on with having a new minister who can do it better?

**Hon. Greg Selinger (Premier):** Madam Deputy Speaker, the member posed this question yesterday, and yesterday I wanted him to know and I want him to know today, that this minister has taken the child welfare system and moved it forward with very significant policy improvements, policy improvements that have gone towards doing prevention at the community level with families and children, policy improvements which have expanded the number of foster care opportunities inside of Manitoba and resources, improvements which have put more workers on the front line to support families and children. All of these things were done as part of the budget process here, this year and in previous years.

And the member opposite was one of those members who voted against those supports being available to people. So, if anybody should resign, he might want to consider doing that himself.

\* (16:50)

**Winnipeg Revitalization  
Government Initiatives**

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** Madam Deputy Speaker, over the last decade, many positive community-based initiatives in the inner city and the North End, including Point Douglas and Burrows constituencies, have been supported by the Winnipeg Partnership Agreement.

Since this agreement has come to an end, sadly, I want to ask the Minister of Local Government what our government is doing to ensure continued support of these important initiatives and programs.

**Hon. Ron Lemieux (Minister of Local Government):** The new Winnipeg Regeneration Strategy is designed to support inner-city revitalization. And this initiative would renew infrastructure, stimulate the economy and preserve heritage, and improve the lives of Aboriginal people in Winnipeg. And this strategy confirms the Province's commitment to renewing and strengthening the economic and social vitality of this great city.

And, Madam Deputy Speaker, the first phase of this strategy began with the provincial involvement in the recently launched three-year, \$20-million, downtown residential development grant program. We're very, very proud of this initiative, and we know all the great work that the Winnipeg Partnership Agreement has accomplished. This new agreement, we believe, and all levels of government as well as non-governmental partners, will have a role in the inner-city revitalization. We look forward to this strategy becoming the new cornerstone of the provincial blueprint—

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Children's Advocate  
Recruitment Process**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** With 8,629 children under the provincial care, Manitobans need to be concerned in terms of the direction that this current minister is taking the Province in terms of child welfare.

My question is not to the minister that claims to be responsible, but rather the Premier (Mr. Selinger) of this province, Madam Deputy Speaker, in recognizing the importance of having a new Child Advocate. And I look to the Premier to tell Manitobans: When can Manitobans expect to see a new, full-time Child Advocate put into place in the province of Manitoba?

**Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader):** The honourable member raises an important point, one that was referenced earlier in the Legislature today. The government will see to it that the process begins as soon as possible and that we have a new Child—a candidate for the new Child Advocate in place at the appropriate time.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Madam Deputy Speaker, that's not good enough. An appropriate time could be a year from now. Today, child welfare in the province is in an absolute chaos in terms of situation. We need to have a Child Advocate put into place as soon as possible.

I'm asking for the Premier, once again, to demonstrate leadership and make a commitment that, before the end of June, that we'll have in place a hiring process; that, before the end of the summer, that we will have a full-time Child Advocate in the province of Manitoba.

Will he not stand up for the 8,600-plus children that need to have that advocate today?

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

**Mr. Blaikie:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I look forward to the co-operation of the honourable member and, presumably, that of the official opposition in meeting the kind of deadline that he's just talked about.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Time for oral questions has expired.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY (Continued)

### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

#### House Business

**Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader):** Madam Deputy Speaker, the business of the House today will be moving to second reading of Bills 5 and 3, and then proceeding after that to continuing debate on second reading of 8—Bills 8, 19, 25, 27, 22 and 35.

And, Madam Deputy Speaker, I think if you canvass the House, you would find that there would be agreement to sit until either all the bills just mentioned are dealt with, or the clock is—reads 6 o'clock. [*interjection*] Whichever comes sooner, yes, sorry.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order.

It has been announced by the honourable Government House Leader that we will be dealing with Bills 5 and 3, and then we will resume debate on Bills 8, 19, 25, 27, 22 and 35.

I'm also asking if there is agreement from the House to sit until we have dealt with these bills, or until six o'clock. [*Agreed*] Whichever comes first is agreed.

## SECOND READINGS

### Bill 5—The Cottage Property Tax Increase Deferral Act (Property Tax and Insulation Assistance Act Amended)

**Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Finance):** Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Local Government (Mr. Lemieux), that Bill 5, The Cottage Property Tax Increase Deferral Act (Property Tax and Insulation Assistance Act Amended), be now read a second time and be referred to the committee of the House—of this House.

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

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** It has been moved by the honourable Minister for Finance and seconded by the honourable Minister for Local Government that Bill 5, The Cottage Property Tax Increase Deferral Act (Property Tax and Insulation Assistance Act Amended), 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 the message has been tabled.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I'm pleased to rise today to speak on Bill 5. Manitoba's quality of life advantage includes our natural abundance of accessible beaches, lakes, rivers and parks. Almost 15 percent of Manitoba is covered by over 100,000 lakes and rivers. Proximity to these outdoor activities and affordable vacation homes has given Manitoba one of the highest rates of vacation home ownership in Canada. Many cottages are passed down from one generation to the next,

providing family members with a valued way of connecting and maintaining ties to one another as well as to—with the broader community of Manitoba.

Due to the continuing, strong demand for vacationing properties, many—any cottage owners have experienced significant increases in the values of their cottages. These increases will be reflected in the 2010 reassessments, which are increasing more than other types of properties.

While our government is pleased with the continued strong growth in property value in Manitoba, we also recognize that many cottage owners may experience some financial difficulties adjusting to the higher properties in the short term. Bill 5 will give each cottage owner the option of deferring the increased portion of property taxes on their cottage in 2010 and 2011. Manitobans who wish to take advantage of this program can apply to the Province to defer payment of their property tax increases for 2010 and 2011, relative to 2009. Under this program, the Province will pay the tax increase to the municipality on behalf of the cottage owner.

The cottage owner will agree to repay the Province the amount of deferred taxes, plus interest charged to the—at a nominal fee, when the property is no longer owned by that person or their spouse or their common-law partner. The Province intends to provide each cottager who applies and qualifies for the tax deferral with an annual statement of their tax deferral amount, including accumulated interest charges. In this manner, cottage owners will know where their accounts under the deferral program in—stands, and allow them the opportunity to determine whether their financial circumstances can accommodate early repayment if they so choose.

Bill 5 builds on the Manitoba government's efforts to ease pressures of property taxes on—from property taxes, including increasing the basic education property tax credit to \$650, up from \$250 in 1999; increasing the farmland rebate to 75 percent, up from 33 percent when it was created in 2004; eliminating the residential education support levy in 2006, saving homeowners at least \$100 million each year. Together, these measures save Manitobans \$268 million annually in property tax reductions.

\* (17:00)

The Manitoba government is also helping keep education property tax down by increasing education funding by at least the rate of economic growth each

year and offering tax incentive grants since 2008. Public school funding has increased by \$323 million over the last decade; 2010-11 was the eleventh consecutive year the Province has met the—or exceeded its commitment to fund public education at or above the rate of economic growth. Combined with the 280—68 million dollars in annual property tax savings introduced since 1999, this government's support to education and education property tax now total \$592 million.

The result of our government's effort, Madam Deputy Speaker, are self-evident. Since 2000, the average Manitoba property owner have experienced significant tax relief. Bill 5 builds on other initiatives—on these initiatives to promote Manitoba's image as an affordable, recreational destination, including the commitment to make available to Manitobans a thousand new lots under the Manitoba cottage lot program over the next two years.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I'm pleased that we are able to provide these options that will help Manitobans keep their cottages, maintain their cottages in their family, and I look forward to having this bill discussed in more detail at the—at committee. Thank you very much.

**Mrs. Heather Stefanson (Tuxedo):** I'm pleased to put a few words on the record today with respect to Bill 5, The Cottage Property Tax Increase Deferral Act. And I believe it is fitting that this bill should come forward today into second reading in this House at the very time where, two hours from now, the Manitoba Association of Cottage Owners will be holding a rally on the front steps of the Manitoba Legislature. And I would encourage the minister to be there and to speak to the group. We are certainly going to be there, and we hope that she will also be there to offer them support. And I would hope that she wouldn't be bringing this forward as something that is going to be helping the cottage owners of Manitoba, because it doesn't.

As a matter of fact, Bill 5 is, in my opinion, an ill-conceived piece of legislation that's more focussed, Madam Deputy Speaker, on creating positive spin for the NDP, as opposed to real tax savings for Manitobans. This bill does not make cottage ownership in Manitoba more affordable as it does not exempt cottage owners from an increase in their property tax. Bill 5 simply defers the increasing cost to cottagers, forcing them to repay these loans with interest at the time they sell their property. This

will actually hurt cottage owners by placing a caveat on their property title.

The NDP government has been vague in outlining the details of this legislation. We don't know what it will cost cottage owners. The interest rate on these government loans have yet to be determined and will be done by regulation. The Minister of Finance admitted during the bill briefing that they don't have any estimate of the uptake for this program. They don't know if there will be a single applicant for the program.

*Mr. Rob Altemeyer, Acting Speaker, in the Chair*

This bill is a—nothing more than a PR exercise and does not provide meaningful relief to cottage owners in Manitoba. This NDP government has no real vision for tax reform in Manitoba or for stimulating our economy. Instead, this government implements special programs and incentives more focussed on public relations than meaningful relief. Manitobans don't need more news releases. What we need are programs that make Manitoba more competitive for those who live and work here.

The NDP government has not engaged in any real stakeholder consultations on this issue. Nobody asked for the cottage property deferral—increase deferral act. The Manitoba Association of Cottage Owners hasn't asked for it. The Manitoba home builders haven't asked for it. The Winnipeg realtors haven't asked for it. Bill 5 does not do anything to save property owners money. It is simply a public relations stunt to make it look like the government is doing something and make it look like they're giving—offering some sort of a tax relief to cottage owners in Manitoba. It's nothing more than smoke and mirrors. It does nothing to help them out, but, boy, it looks like a great headline on paper and that's all that members opposite are concerned about.

Cottage owners have also expressed their thoughts on the bill and some have made comments, and I'm sure that more will be making comments at the rally tonight. And I would encourage all the members coming to the rally tonight to sign up to speak to Bill 5, and I would encourage them to read carefully Bill 5 so that they know and understand that this bill does nothing for them. And I would hope that the minister would be there at the rally tonight, that will be—that she will be honest about what this is and that it is nothing more than a PR exercise. It does nothing in the way of tax relief for Manitobans, for cottage owners in Manitoba.

And so we have no choice but to oppose this piece of legislation, but, of course, we're prepared at this point to pass it through to committee so that we can hear from the various stakeholders out there that members opposite never bothered to consult with before they brought this ill-conceived piece of legislation forward.

So, with that, Mr. Acting Speaker, we'll pass this through to committee. Thank you very much.

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** Yes, Mr. Acting Speaker, just a few comments here.

I want to say that this is a typical NDP approach. It says to cottagers, build up debt, don't pay today what you can defer till tomorrow.

**An Honourable Member:** That's the NDP policy.

**Mr. Gerrard:** This is NDP policy all the way, and it's not a good bill. It's not a good idea. There are a number of major problems here, chief of which is that it doesn't tackle the essential issue: the complaints for many, many years that cottage owners who don't have kids going to school in areas where they've got cottages are paying education tax there. And, certainly, there are many other alternatives that the government could have pursued to address the situation in terms of high taxes for cottage owners, and that's what should have been done instead of trying this kind of manoeuvre.

There are some significant problems. Suppose, for example, that a cottage owner dies. Then what happens is the deferred taxes fall to the estate. We don't, you know, do this for other things, and it has the distinct concern that you're going to end up with an unfair and heavy burden on the family and the beneficiaries who have to wait—who find out after their loved one dies—that all of a sudden they've got this huge bill of deferred cottage property taxes falling to the estate.

Just because this government has proceeded with this approach there are—is another problem. It causes a problem for family lawyers dealing with—and couples—who separate. I—there will be couples who separate who have property. What do you do, then, with the deferred property taxes? It makes it more difficult for people to wrap up divorces or separations, places an added burden on family lawyers, judges to ensure that debts incurred over the marriage, which don't present themselves for a year after the separation or divorce, are paid—paid fairly and equally by the couple. Has the government



actually consulted with a family law bar to explain this bill, and with estate lawyers? We'll see.

There are also big questions about how many cottage owners, members of the public the government have actually consulted with this. Based on what we've seen, this is very poorly conceived. It is, as I said, typical NDP—don't pay today what you can defer till tomorrow. Build up that—that's why we're not—we're against this legislation unless there's some major changes and improvements. Thank you.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** The question before the House is second reading of Bill 5, The Cottage Property Tax Increase Deferral Act.

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

\* (17:10)

**Bill 3—The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Municipal Amendment Act (Derelict Property)**

**Hon. Ron Lemieux (Minister of Local Government):** Mr. Acting Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Water Stewardship (Ms. Melnick), that Bill 3, The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Municipal Amendment Act (Derelict Property); Loi modifiant la Charte de la ville de Winnipeg et la Loi sur les municipalités (biens abandonnés), be now read a second time and be referred to the committee of this House.

***Motion presented.***

**Mr. Lemieux:** All citizens want their neighbourhoods to be safe, well-maintained and vibrant places; however, when properties become vacant and derelict, they can cause whole neighbourhoods to decline over time. In some instances, properties may be boarded up and in a state of disrepair for a very long time, even years. When property owners fail to properly maintain them, this can be exacerbated by the time—when time-consuming steps must be taken to locate difficult—and fine property owners. When this happens, there's a real impact on our neighbourhoods. Safety concerns do exist, investment in neighbourhoods may decrease and property values may decline.

All municipalities have a variety of tools available to address concerns about problem properties, such as, tools support the ongoing efforts of local residents and community organizations dedicated to revitalizing our neighbourhoods. The City of Winnipeg has a unique revitalization tool that enables it to take ownership of a vacant, derelict property. When other efforts get—to get the property owner to repair the property have failed, the City can itself redevelop the property or can turn the property over to the community—to a community group, sorry, for a redevelopment. Most recently, Habitat for Humanity will be demolishing a formerly derelict property and building new infill housing.

Winnipeg asked for and was given this unique revitalization tool when the new City of Winnipeg Charter came into effect 2003 to support it—of its revitalization initiatives. After using this authority for several years, the City asked for changes to the process. We are especially pleased to work with the City to identify ways to improve the process. Through this bill, we have introduced several changes that significantly shorten the process and improve a revitalization tool. This is achieved by streamlining and reordering the existing process.

The City also committed to examining their own time frames to further reduce time lines. We have also streamlined the process used to notify difficult—to locate property owners through substitutional service. These changes also mean that community groups that are interested in redeveloping the property will have a greater opportunity to do so.

The bill also includes changes that will make it easier to notify hard-to-find property owners. Through these changes, the City is better able to support important neighbourhood revitalization initiatives that ultimately benefit us all.

At the Association of Manitoba Municipalities' request, we have also extended the authority to take ownership of vacant and derelict properties to all municipal—municipalities in Manitoba. Recognizing revitalization of our communities is a priority province-wide. This new authority for municipalities outside Winnipeg complements their existing municipal revitalization and redevelopment tool, including municipal tax increment financing, as well as the ability to provide tax credits, grants and loans. We expect that this new authority will be of particular interest to municipalities that are actively working to revitalize their communities, such as Brandon.

I look forward to debate and the passages—passage of this important legislation. Thank you. Merci.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** Recognizing the honourable minister for—honourable member for Ste. Rose.

**Mr. Stuart Briese (Ste. Rose):** Mr. Acting Speaker, I'll take the first designation anytime you want to give it to me.

I'm pleased to rise and put a few words on the record on Bill 3, The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Municipal Amendment Act on derelict properties.

Now, the City of Winnipeg has had the—this type of legislation for quite some time in their own jurisdiction. It's being changed slightly to speed up the process a little bit, and it's also being extended to all the other municipalities in Manitoba. The other municipalities usually used to deal with derelict buildings under their unsightly properties by-laws. It's my understanding that there are usually somewhere in the range of 300 to 600 derelict buildings in the city of Winnipeg at any one time, and this is designed to speed up the process of moving them to the point where the City can do something about removal of the buildings.

Now, over a period of time, since the City of Winnipeg actually had the legislation themselves, there have been something like 23 properties went through this process. Since 2003, 19 of them were brought into compliance when this process was threatened. So it appears that most will be brought into compliance without having to be removed or turned over to the City.

The AMM and the City—I've been in contact with both—and they're both fairly supportive of this legislation as are we. There's a lot of other things when you use the word "derelict" that probably would apply a lot more to the NDP than—we're hearing about derelict Child and Family Services the last couple of days and there's a lot of other places that probably their priority list should fall on.

I'd be pleased to see this bill go to committee and see if there's any feedback at committee, and we will debate it at third reading. Thank you very much.

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** Mr. Acting Speaker, I have a few comments on this legislation.

There—one of the things which is going to be very important for this to work properly is that they—

those, and not just necessarily the registered owners, but others with liens, mortgage holders, caveats, in some cases with elderly people that you've got, you know, the heirs or the people who have responsibility, you may want to be sure, for instance, since the time frame for the order is 90 days, that—and we have a number of people who spend, you know, much more than 90 days going south for the winter, that you want to make sure, and whether it's in rules or whether it's in the bill, that the public or the notice gets to the individual or individuals who are concerned. And so that providing an order, serving it and making sure that it reaches those individuals becomes a critical part of this if this legislation is to work in a fair way.

I remember that there were—have been situations where taxes were in arrears and people were gone for a few months and they weren't paid and all of a sudden their property disappeared and was taken for taxes. And we need to make sure that people are treated in a responsible and fair way in this instance. And, of course, that's part of the reason why this has been a longer process for the City of Winnipeg up to this time.

And I'm looking forward to hear the presentations at the committee stage just to see this because, you know, there may be a variety of reasons and legitimate cases where homeowners are absent from their homes or businesses—they could be in a hospital, in a mental institution, in a jail. And there may be circumstances where people have legitimate money problems and can't temporarily afford to fix the properties up or pay the fines involved, but can't sell them. And there's some travelling for business purposes or for the winters.

And I think that there needs to be an obligation for the City to make sure that they have done the due diligence and that this legislation, I think, needs to be firmed up to make sure that that, in fact, is going to happen. Thank you.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** The question before the House is second reading of Bill 3, The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Municipal Amendment Act (Derelict Property).

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

**DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS****Bill 8—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act  
(Safety Precautions to Be Taken When  
Approaching Tow Trucks and  
Other Designated Vehicles)**

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** Now, moving to the resumed debate—resume the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister for Transportation and Infrastructure, second reading of Bill 8, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Safety Precautions to Be Taken When Approaching Tow Trucks and Other Designated Vehicles), which is standing in the name of the honourable member for Lakeside.

**Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside):** I'm pleased to rise today to put a few words on the record in support of Bill 8, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Safety Precautions to Be Taken When Approaching Tow Trucks and Other Designated Vehicles).

\* (17:20)

This legislation is about better protecting operators of certain designated vehicles such as tow trucks, roadside assistant vehicles and vehicles used by government enforcement officers while on the job. Bill 8 provides a number of new definitions under The Highway Traffic Act including what constitutes a designated vehicle as a roadside assistant vehicle or government enforcement officers' vehicle, and who is considered to be an enforcement officer.

Under Bill 8, drivers will be required to take certain precautions while approaching the designated vehicles if the vehicles are using the required lighting equipment and warning signs. As well, a motorist is expected to pass emergency vehicle or designated vehicle only when it's safe to do so.

Bill 8 also provides regulations-making power such as prescribing other motor vehicles that motorists will be required to approach and pass with caution. This could possibly include utility vehicles or highway maintenance vehicles. Lighting requirements for tow vehicles, roadside assistant vehicles and pilot vehicles, will also be prescribed in the regulation.

During the bill briefing, the minister indicated that similar legislation is already in place in other western provinces. In September of 2009, CAA Manitoba launched a campaign, Move Over Manitoba, with two goals in mind. Their first goal

was to educate Manitobans to slow down and move over when passing tow truck drivers. Their second goal was to convince the provincial government to enact legislation to provide greater protection of tow truck drivers—there are more than 500 of them, working roads across the province. Thanks to their efforts, we have legislation before us today.

When the Province signalled it was going to introduce this legislation, a CAA spokesperson noted, and I quote: tow truck drivers are our most important asset and our safety is our top priority when people's lives are on the line each and every day. Can't do it fast enough. End of quote.

More than 1,000 Manitobans responded to CAA Manitoba awareness campaign, contacted the provincial government to let discussion makers—decision makers know about the importance of this issue. Bill 8 is a good example of our democracy in action and the concrete changes that can be achieved when people get involved.

This legislation will bring Manitoba in line with other western provinces and other jurisdictions across the United States that have similar legislation.

Also, I want to put on the record in regards to the AMM, the Association of Manitoba Municipalities, that while Bill 8 explains the list of vehicles that drivers have to take precaution when approaching, legislative changes alone are not enough. Right now, far too many drivers fail to slow down when passing emergency vehicles, service providers at accident scenes.

Bill 8 is certainly a positive step. However, its impact may be minimal without increased public awareness of the level requirement for drivers to take precautions when face-passing emergency vehicles. Therefore, AMM would like to see an education campaign accompany the changes to Bill 8 so that drivers in Manitoba are made aware of the need to slow down and protect emergency service providers. AMM is in full support of Bill 8 and hope that the change that goes along with increased education will have positive results for Manitobans.

And I know today I was out looking at some floodwaters in my area, and I came back to the city right after that tour and there's a tow truck stopped on the side of the road looking after a gravel truck. And I was appalled at the number of vehicles that didn't yield to that tow truck driver. And I can certainly attest to the fact that this legislation is

something that needs to be brought forward, and we will make sure that it will be looked after.

So, with that, we support Bill 8 and look forward to go to committee.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** The question before the House is second reading on Bill 8, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act.

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

**Bill 19—The Protection from Domestic Violence and Best Interests of Children Act (Family Law Statutes Amended)**

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** Up next, resume debate on Bill 19, The Protection from Domestic Violence and Best Interests of Children Act (Family Law Statutes Amended).

This is second reading of the bill. It's a proposed motion brought forward by the honourable Minister of—for Family Services—oh, sorry—no, the honourable Attorney General (Mr. Swan), and debate on this bill is open.

**Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach):** Mr. Acting Speaker, we're prepared to see this bill proceed to committee to solicit public input.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** The question before the House is second reading on Bill 19.

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

**Bill 25—The Manitoba Evidence Amendment Act (Scheduling of Criminal Organizations)**

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** Up next, we will have—resume the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the honourable Attorney General (Mr. Swan). This is second reading of Bill 25, The Manitoba Evidence Amendment Act (Scheduling of Criminal Organizations), standing in the name of the honourable member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck).

**Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach):** Mr. Acting Speaker—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** Before recognizing another speaker, because it is—the bill is standing in the name of the honourable member for Pembina, I do need to ask the House for leave to recognize the member of Steinbach, while recognizing that the bill will remain standing in the name of the member for Pembina.

Try this again. Is there leave for the bill to remain standing in the name of the honourable member for Pembina?

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** Leave has been denied.

Recognizing the honourable member for Steinbach, and apologies, all.

**Mr. Goertzen:** Mr. Acting Speaker, I've had a briefing on this bill and discussed it with the minister. We agree with the intention of the bill and look forward to go to committee to have public input.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** The question before the House is second reading on Bill 25, The Manitoba Evidence Amendment Act.

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

**Bill 27—The Upper Fort Garry Heritage Provincial Park Act**

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** Up next, resuming adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister for Conservation (Mr. Blaikie), this is Bill—second reading of Bill 27, The Upper Fort Garry Heritage Provincial Park Act, standing in the name of the honourable member for Arthur-Virden.

**Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden):** It's a privilege for me to put a few words on the record in regards to this bill, The Upper Fort Garry Heritage Provincial Park Act. And, as I live fairly close to that area of the city when I'm in town, Mr. Acting Speaker, it's a privilege to be able to watch some of the work that's being done on this site at this time.

Our side of the Legislature supports this bill, and we've been briefed by the minister of this particular bill, have had discussions with some of the volunteers that make up the Upper Fort Garry heritage park promotion group and certainly commend them for the work that they're doing on this historic and cultural development in the area of Main Street in the city of Winnipeg.

And so I—with those—I know that this is an important project to protect our historic resources for the future generations, to educate Manitobans on the history of our province. As well, it will be a major tourist attraction, I believe, in this province, and I also believe that it's going to be a very sound, educational facility to be used for future generations.

It's in the location of the city where tourists—tour groups, particularly students, come from all over Manitoba this particular time of year to have tours of the Legislature that tour The Forks, the Man and Nature, and we'll have the Human Rights Museum as well. And this will be one more cultural opportunity for students from across Manitoba and Canada to—and some of our neighbours to the south to continue to learn about the historic importance of the major—of this major settlement as this particular Upper Fort Garry was used and established in 1822, and that's—we're closing in on the 200th year of the development of this particular fort as headquarters of the Hudson Bay Company in western Canada.

\* (17:30)

And I just want to say, Madam Deputy—Mr. Acting Speaker, pardon me, that the make-up of the committee, the advisory committee that will be between five and 10 members that make recommendations to the Minister of Conservation will be established under Bill 27, and I know and commend the various players for putting the funds into this. The government, I believe, has put a million and a half, the federal government as well, and the Friends of Upper Fort Garry have put forward over \$7 million in funds that they've raised privately and indicate to me that they will be raising more as well.

Work is going on by archaeologists and archaeology students at the location as we speak. And I know that the, you know, the findings will be most interesting to the future of this development in the province as well and for that particular site. At present time the Upper Fort Garry façade, the front wall, is still all in existence, but that's going to change when the Grain Exchange curling rink is torn

down after next year's use, Mr. Acting Speaker, and the true construction begins on the facility that will turn this into a provincial park, and that's what this bill does. We commend and support that effort and support the fact that there will be some \$150,000 a year coming forward to fund the maintenance of this new park on an annual basis.

So, Mr. Acting Speaker, with that I just want to say that there's been considerable amount of discussion around this particular land location. I just want to say, as well, that this is an area that is of particular importance to our First Nations and Métis people, that have, you know, that have had representation or they will have representations on an advisory committee, and as well as a member appointed by the government.

I guess you could say that this is the oldest original segment of Winnipeg's early structural beginnings. And the archaeological investigations show Aboriginal activity on and around the site going back nearly 3,000 years, at the confluence of the Red and Assiniboine rivers where the trading, the key trading area for First Nations people applied. And the fort later became the seat of the government for the district of Assiniboia and the Red River settlement. And the fort was headquartered for Louis Riel once, during the Red River Rebellion. The rebellion ultimately led to Manitoba's entry into Confederation, and certainly that history is well known in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I think with those words, I would just move that the, that this bill receive second debate here today and, or second reading I should say, here today, and recommend that it be placed on to committee.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** The question before the House is second reading of Bill 27, The Upper Fort Garry Heritage Provincial Park Act.

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

#### **Bill 22—The Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Amendment Act**

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** Up next is resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister for Family

Services (Mr. Mackintosh), second reading of Bill 22, The Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Amendment Act, standing in the name of the honourable member for Emerson (Mr. Graydon). Emerson? All right.

Is there leave of the House to have the bill remain standing in the name of the honourable member for Emerson?

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** Leave has been denied.

**Mr. David Faurchou (Portage la Prairie):** Mr. Acting Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise this afternoon and participate in second reading debate on Bill 22, The Credit Union and Caisses Populaires Amendment Act, which was first introduced into this House April the 14th of this year.

There has been extensive consultation throughout the province, at all of the respective credit unions and caisses populaires as to the impact of the modernization of the act governing caisse populaire and credit union operations here in the province of Manitoba. I will say that the member organizations are, indeed, supportive of this bill, and we on this side of the House could concur that this is a modernization of the bill, the legislation, and allows for the flexibility of the currently operating credit unions to provide services not only to their member organizations, but through co-operation they will be able to provide for services not only in Manitoba and local communities but elsewhere in western Canada.

May I take this opportunity to recognize the credit unions and their long history here in Manitoba? The first credit union opened in 1937 in St. Malo. Monsieur Benoit brought the concept which was oriented, originated in Europe, but Canada—the first credit union was opened in 1900 in Québec. And so we have a long history of caisses populaires and credit unions in our province.

The credit unions are doing an extraordinarily good job of providing services to communities throughout Manitoba and currently, 41 percent of all Manitobans are members of credit unions or caisses populaires within the province of Manitoba, which is an extraordinary number attesting to the performance of the credit unions and the appeal to Manitobans.

And part of that appeal is that all deposits, 100 percent of the monies on deposit at the credit

unions and caisses populaires within the province of Manitoba is guaranteed. In the current economic climate of uncertainty where governments are borrowing more and more money than they can afford to pay back, within this generation, such as the New Democratic Party and the—across the way. It is uplifting for myself as a member and others, acknowledging the honourable member for Emerson and the honourable member for Ste. Rose (Mr. Briese) are also members of their local credit unions. This goes a long way and is an important selling feature of the credit unions and we certainly are very supportive of that continuation which this bill provides for.

In fact, this bill is designed to merge the caisses populaires and the credit unions within their deposit guarantee operations, and so, therefore, there will be even greater strength within the credit unions and caisses populaires after the passage of this legislation.

It's in the credit unions it must—credit unions must also be recognized for their performance in the marketplace. Even with the continued economic considerations being felt elsewhere in the country and globally, the Manitoba credit unions and caisses populaires have in fact increased their net value by 12 percent in 2008. Their net value currently stands at almost \$17 billion dollars, \$780 million for the caisses populaires and \$16 billion for the credit unions throughout the province. They do indeed also provide services to communities throughout the province of Manitoba and are serving 68 communities where there is no other financial institution.

In conclusion, credit unions have become integral financial institutions in Manitoba. Government needs to support credit unions, especially as credit unions look to expand beyond the borders of Manitoba and work closely with partners in other provinces. The future of credit unions in this province, indeed, looks promising. We must work to implement policies that streamline the administration of credit unions and to ensure that they can continue to serve their clients with excellence and contribute to the wider Manitoba economy.

Thank you very much, Mr. Acting Speaker.

\* (17:40)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** Is the House by any chance ready for the question?

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** The question before the House is second reading on Bill 22, The Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Amendment Act.

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

**Bill 35—The Condominium Amendment Act  
(Phased Condominium Development)**

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** We'll now resume the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister for Family Services, second reading of Bill 35, The Condominium Amendment Act (Phased Condominium Development), standing in the name of the honourable member for Emerson (Mr. Graydon).

Is there leave to allow the act to remain in the name of the honourable member for Emerson?

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer):** Leave has been denied.

**Mr. David Faurshou (Portage la Prairie):** I appreciate the opportunity to rise and participate in second reading debate of Bill 35, The Condominium Amendment Act (Phased Condominium Development), which was introduced for first reading in this House on May the 12th of this year. I would like to take note that this legislation has been in the development stage for many, many, many years in attempting to facilitate and the—and accommodate those developers here in the province of Manitoba and to negate the unnecessary time delays that are currently involved in dealing with the Land Titles branch of government.

*Ms. Marilyn Brick, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair*

I would like to make mention that the legislation is indeed supported by stakeholders and they are very much looking to further participate in the development stages of the regulations that are attached with this bill. However, I would like to make the point known to all members of the House that this particular piece of legislation, although the stakeholders were consulted about its development, they were taken completely unaware of its introduction into the House and expressed their very significant disappointment with the current government that not even a phone call was placed to the offices of the stakeholders giving them prior

knowledge of its introduction, and it is indeed very disrespectful of this government to do so.

Having made that point, I will say that there—the developers in this province are anxiously looking forward to the passage of this legislation because the current condominium act does not provide specifically for development in phases. The current process is cumbersome and extremely costly, especially in terms of the delays, as I've earlier mentioned, with the Land Titles registration requirements.

It also does provide for changes to the overall development strategy and content, provided there is 80 percent consent by the earlier phase individuals within the development.

So, having said that, I'm very much looking forward to the passage of this legislation on to committee that the public input can take place.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Question. The question before the House is second reading of Bill 35, The Condominium Amendment Act.

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

**House Business**

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The honourable Minister for Justice, on House business.

**Hon. Andrew Swan (Acting Government House Leader):** On House business, Madam Deputy Speaker. I would like to announce the Standing Committee on Justice will meet on Monday, June 14, at 6 p.m., to consider the following bills: No. 8, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Safety Precautions to Be Taken When Approaching Tow Trucks and Other Designated Vehicles); Bill 19, The Protection from Domestic Violence and Best Interests of Children Act (Family Law Statutes Amended); Bill 25, The Manitoba Evidence Amendment Act (Scheduling of Criminal Organizations); Bill 27, The Upper Fort Garry Heritage Provincial Park Act.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** It has been announced that the Standing Committee on Justice will meet on

Monday, June 14th, at 6 o'clock, to consider the following bills: Bill 8, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Safety Precautions to Be Taken When Approaching Tow Trucks and Other Designated Vehicles); Bill 19, The Protection from Domestic Violence and Best Interests of Children Act (Family Law Statutes Amended); No. 25, The Manitoba Evidence Amendment Act (Scheduling of Criminal Organizations); and Bill 27, The Upper Fort Garry Heritage Provincial Park Act.

**Mr. Swan:** Further on House business, Madam Deputy Speaker, I'd also like to announce that the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development will meet on Monday, June 14, at 6 p.m., to consider the following bills: Bill 22, The Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Amendment Act; and Bill 35, The Condominium Amendment Act (Phased Condominium Development).

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** It has been announced that the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development will meet on Monday, June 14th, at 6 p.m., to consider the following bills: Bill 22, The Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Amendment Act; Bill 35, The Condominium

Amendment Act (Phased Condominium Development).

**Mr. Swan:** Further on House business, Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to announce that the Standing Committee on Legislative Affairs will meet on Tuesday, June 15, at 6 p.m., to consider the following bills: Bill 3, The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Municipal Amendment Act (Derelict Property); and Bill 5, The Cottage Property Tax Increase Deferral Act (Property Tax and Insulation Assistance Act Amended).

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** It has been announced that the Standing Committee on Legislative Affairs will meet on Tuesday, June 15th, at 6 o'clock p.m., to consider the following bills: Bill 3, The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Municipal Amendment Act (Derelict Property); and Bill 5, The Cottage Property Tax Increase Deferral Act (Property Tax and Insulation Assistance Act Amended).

The time being after 5 p.m., this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. on Monday.



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, June 10, 2010

## CONTENTS

<b>ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS</b>			
<b>Petitions</b>		Foster Care	
Multiple Myeloma Treatments		McFadyen; Selinger	2914
Driedger	2901	Mitchelson; Mackintosh	2914
Waste-Water Ejector Systems		Phoenix Sinclair Death	
Derkach	2901	Stefanson; Swan	2916
Blumenort Christian Preschool		Child Welfare System	
Goertzen	2902	McFadyen; Selinger	2917
		Gerrard; Mackintosh	2918
PTH 15–Traffic Signals		Minister of Family Services	
Schuler	2902	Gerrard; Selinger	2919
<b>Tabling of Reports</b>		Winnipeg Revitalization	
Manitoba Public Insurance, Annual Report, 2009		Martindale; Lemieux	2919
Swan	2902	Children's Advocate	
Manitoba Human Rights Commission, Annual Report on The Discriminatory Business Practices Act, 2009		Lamoureux; Blaikie	2919
Swan	2902		
<b>Ministerial Statements</b>		<b>ORDERS OF THE DAY</b>	
National Day of Healing and Reconciliation		<b>(Continued)</b>	
Selinger	2902	<b>GOVERNMENT BUSINESS</b>	
McFadyen	2903	<b>Second Readings</b>	
Gerrard	2904	Bill 5–The Cottage Property Tax Increase	
Robinson	2905	Deferral Act (Property Tax and Insulation	
Hawranik	2906	Assistance Act Amended)	
Lamoureux	2906	Wowchuk	2920
		Stefanson	2921
		Gerrard	2922
<b>Matter of Privilege</b>			
Hawranik	2907	Bill 3–The City of Winnipeg Charter	
Blaikie	2908	Amendment and Municipal	
Lamoureux	2909	Amendment Act (Derelict Property)	
		Lemieux	2923
<b>Oral Questions</b>		Briese	2924
Children's Advocate Report		Gerrard	2924
McFadyen; Selinger	2910, 2917		

**Debate on Second Readings**

Bill 8—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act  
(Safety Precautions to Be Taken When  
Approaching Tow Trucks and Other  
Designated Vehicles)

Eichler 2925

Bill 19—The Protection from Domestic  
Violence and Best Interests of Children Act  
(Family Law Statutes Amended)

Goertzen 2926

Bill 25—The Manitoba Evidence Amendment  
Act (Scheduling of Criminal Organizations)

Goertzen 2926

Bill 27—The Upper Fort Garry Heritage  
Provincial Park Act  
Maguire

2926

Bill 22—The Credit Unions and Caisses  
Populaires Amendment Act  
Fauschou

2928

Bill 35—The Condominium Amendment Act  
(Phased Condominium Development)

Fauschou 2929

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>**