

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. 64B - 1:30 p.m., Thursday, June 17, 2010

ISSN 0542-5492

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Ninth Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
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 17, 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

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.

This is signed by D. Fjeldsted, L. Mozel, M. Mozel and many, many other Manitobans.

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 provincial environmental policies are based on sound science.

In early 2009, the provincial government announced that it was reviewing the Onsite Wastewater Management Systems Regulation 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 includes a prohibition on the installation on 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 Systems Regulation under The Environment Act on hold until such time that a review can take place to ensure that they are based 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 C. Ireland, S. Bird, P. Bradshaw and many, many other Manitobans.

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.

This is signed by M. Witt, C. Irvine, J. Anderson and many, many others.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development Third Report

Mr. Daryl Reid (Chairperson): I wish to present the Third Report on the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development.

Madam Clerk (Patricia Chaychuk): Your Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development presents the following—

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Dispense? Dispense.

Your Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development presents the following as its Third Report.

Meetings

Your Committee met on Wednesday, June 16, 2010.

Matters under Consideration

- *Bill (No. 4) – The Workplace Safety and Health Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur la sécurité et l'hygiène du travail*
- *Bill (No. 6) – The Manitoba Association of School Trustees Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Association des commissaires d'écoles du Manitoba*
- *Bill (No. 9) – The Electricians' Licence Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur le permis d'électricien*
- *Bill (No. 10) – The Proceedings Against the Crown Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les procédures contre la Couronne*
- *Bill (No. 12) – The Pimachiowin Aki World Heritage Fund Act/Loi sur le Fonds du patrimoine mondial Pimachiowin Aki*
- *Bill (No. 15) – The Franchises Act/Loi sur les franchises*
- *Bill (No. 17) – The Biofuels Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les biocarburants*
- *Bill (No. 18) – The Communities Economic Development Fund Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur le Fonds de développement économique local*
- *Bill (No. 24) – The Aboriginal Languages Recognition Act/Loi sur la reconnaissance des langues autochtones*
- *Bill (No. 32) – The Protection for Persons in Care Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur la protection des personnes recevant des soins*
- *Bill (No. 39) – The Child and Family Services Amendment Act (Children's Advocate Reporting)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille (rapport du protecteur des enfants)*
- *Bill (No. 203) – The Coat of Arms, Emblems and the Manitoba Tartan Amendment Act (Provincial Soil Designated)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les*

armoiries, les emblèmes et le tartan du Manitoba (désignation du sol provincial)

- *Bill (No. 225) – The Public Health Amendment Act (Regulating Use of Tanning Equipment)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur la santé publique (réglementation de l'utilisation des appareils de bronzage)*

Committee Membership

- *Hon. Mr. BJORNSON*
- *Ms. BLADY*
- *Mr. BOROTSIK*
- *Mr. CULLEN*
- *Mr. HAWRANIK*
- *Mr. JHA*
- *Mr. MAGUIRE*
- *Hon. Ms. OSWALD*
- *Mr. REID*
- *Hon. Mr. ROBINSON*
- *Mr. WIEBE*

Your Committee elected Mr. REID as the Chairperson.

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

Substitutions received during committee proceedings:

- *Ms. BRAUN for Mr. JHA*

Public Presentations

Your Committee heard the following presentation on Bill (No. 6) – The Manitoba Association of School Trustees Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Association des commissaires d'écoles du Manitoba:

Robert Rivard, Manitoba School Boards Association

Your Committee heard the following three presentations on Bill (No. 12) – The Pimachiowin Aki World Heritage Fund Act/Loi sur le Fonds du patrimoine mondial Pimachiowin Aki:

Gaile Whelan-Enns, Manitoba Wildlands

Susanne McCrae, The Boreal Forest Network

Eric Reder, Wilderness Committee

Your Committee heard the following presentation on Bill (No. 15) – The Franchises Act/Loi sur les franchises:

Lorraine McLachlan & Andrew Ogaranko,

Canadian Franchise Association

Your Committee heard the following presentation on Bill (No. 17) – The Biofuels Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les biocarburants:

Gaile Whelan-Enns, Manitoba Wildlands

Your Committee heard the following presentation on Bill (No. 24) – The Aboriginal Languages Recognition Act/Loi sur la reconnaissance des langues autochtones:

Gaile Whelan-Enns, Manitoba Wildlands

Your Committee heard the following two presentations on Bill (No. 225) – The Public Health Amendment Act (Regulating Use of Tanning Equipment)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur la santé publique (réglementation de l'utilisation des appareils de bronzage):

Linda Venus, Canadian Cancer Society

Kelly Karam, Joint Canadian Tanning Association

Written Submissions

Your Committee received the following written submission on Bill (No. 12) – The Pimachiowin Aki World Heritage Fund Act/Loi sur le Fonds du patrimoine mondial Pimachiowin Aki:

Alex Peters, Pimachiowin Aki Board of Directors

Your Committee received the following written submission on Bill (No. 17) – The Biofuels Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les biocarburants:

James R. Beddome, Green Party of Manitoba

Your Committee received the following written submission on Bill (No. 24) – The Aboriginal Languages Recognition Act/Loi sur la reconnaissance des langues autochtones:

Alon Weinberg, Green Party of Manitoba

Bills Considered and Reported

- *Bill (No. 4) – The Workplace Safety and Health Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur la sécurité et l'hygiène du travail*

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

- *Bill (No. 6) – The Manitoba Association of School Trustees Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Association des commissaires d'écoles du Manitoba*

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

- Bill (No. 9) – The Electricians' Licence Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur le permis d'électricien

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

- Bill (No. 10) – The Proceedings Against the Crown Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les procédures contre la Couronne

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

- Bill (No. 12) – The Pimachiowin Aki World Heritage Fund Act/Loi sur le Fonds du patrimoine mondial Pimachiowin Aki

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

- Bill (No. 15) – The Franchises Act/Loi sur les franchises

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill, with the following amendments:

THAT Clause 5(2)(b) of the Bill be amended by striking out "the prospective franchisee" and substituting "or on behalf of the prospective franchisee to the franchisor or franchisor's associate".

THAT Clause 5(8)(b) of the Bill be amended by striking out "the prospective franchisee" and substituting "or on behalf of the prospective franchisee to the franchisor or franchisor's associate".

THAT Clause 5(14) of the Bill be replaced with the following:

Interpretation — fully refundable deposit not included

5(14) For the purpose of clauses (2)(b) and (8)(b), the payment of any consideration relating to a franchise does not include the payment of a fully refundable deposit that

- (a) does not exceed the prescribed amount;
- (b) is refundable without any deductions; and
- (c) is given under an agreement that in no way binds the prospective franchisee to enter into any franchise agreement.

- Bill (No. 17) – The Biofuels Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les biocarburants

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

- Bill (No. 18) – The Communities Economic Development Fund Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur le Fonds de développement économique local

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

- Bill (No. 24) – The Aboriginal Languages Recognition Act/Loi sur la reconnaissance des langues autochtones

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

- Bill (No. 32) – The Protection for Persons in Care Amendment Act/Loi modifiant la Loi sur la protection des personnes recevant des soins

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

- Bill (No. 39) – The Child and Family Services Amendment Act (Children's Advocate Reporting)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille (rapport du protecteur des enfants)

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

- Bill (No. 203) – The Coat of Arms, Emblems and the Manitoba Tartan Amendment Act (Provincial Soil Designated)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur les armoiries, les emblèmes et le tartan du Manitoba (désignation du sol provincial)

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

- Bill (No. 225) – The Public Health Amendment Act (Regulating Use of Tanning Equipment)/Loi modifiant la Loi sur la santé publique (réglementation de l'utilisation des appareils de bronzage)

Your Committee agreed to report this Bill without amendment.

Mr. Reid: I move, seconded by the honourable member for Concordia (Mr. Wiebe), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

Introduction of Guests

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order. With us this afternoon in the gallery we have 30 grade 6 students who are here from Gilbert Plains Elementary School who are under the direction of Ms. Dawn Fillion. They are the guests of the honourable Minister for Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives (Mr. Struthers).

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Bill 31

Withdrawal Request

Mr. Hugh McFadyen (Leader of the Official Opposition): Madam Deputy Speaker, with less than five hours remaining in this session of the Legislature, the Premier has an opportunity to end this session on a positive note, and that is to withdraw Bill 31, get it right, and send a message to Manitobans that he's not just on the side of the 19 members of Cabinet but he's on the side of hardworking Manitobans.

Will he do the right thing and withdraw Bill 31?

Hon. Greg Selinger (Premier): Madam Deputy Speaker, the budget we put forward and the bill to support it has resulted in Stats Canada today announcing that Manitoba has reduced child poverty in this province more than any other jurisdiction in Canada.

And this budget supported that by generating 29,000 person-years of employment with our stimulus program. This budget supported that by putting a priority on front-line services. We have teachers in the classroom, police on the beat, workers working with children and families, health-care workers out there doing their job, nurses by the bedside. All of those things are possible because of the budget we put forward.

*(13:40)

We know members want to repeal that bill. They want to visit extraordinary cuts on the people of Manitoba. They want to make people unemployed. They want to roll Manitoba back to the '90s.

We will move it forward. They want to take it backward.

Amendment on Ministerial Salary Reductions

Mr. Hugh McFadyen (Leader of the Official Opposition): Madam Deputy Speaker, this is a budget that creates a sinkhole of debt, debt that will have to be paid off by the children of today who will have to work longer hours for less pay to pay for the waste, mismanagement and deficit spending of this government. The debt is now at \$23 billion and climbing. This year's increase is the largest single increase in debt in the history of the Province. The debt—the increase in payments on servicing the NDP debt was higher than increases for any other area of government.

If they won't withdraw Bill 31 today, Madam Deputy Speaker, will they at least do the decent thing and accept the amendment proposed by the member for Tuxedo (Mrs. Stefanson) which removes the clause protecting their salaries in accordance with the promise they made only two years ago? Will they support that amendment?

Hon. Greg Selinger (Premier): Madam Deputy Speaker, the cost of servicing the debt in this budget is 6 cents on the dollar. When members opposite were in office, they spent 13 and a half cents dollar on servicing the debt. They were proud of themselves. They called themselves good fiscal managers.

They spent 13 and a half cents on the debt; we spend 6 cents on the debt. They laid people off; we hire people. They cut the Faculty of Medicine; we're increasing the Faculty of Medicine. They laid off day-care workers; we're hiring day-care workers, and we're increasing their salaries and working towards a pension plan. They didn't pave the roads of Manitoba; we're paving the roads of Manitoba. They mothballed hydro; we're building hydro.

There's a clear difference, Madam Deputy Speaker. We're moving Manitoba forward; they're taking it backwards.

Mr. McFadyen: Madam Deputy Speaker, after 11 years, only the arrogant NDP could call chaos in CFS moving Manitoba forward. Only the arrogant NDP could call cuts to addictions services moving Manitoba forward. Only the arrogant NDP could call record debt moving Manitoba forward.

Madam Deputy Speaker, Manitobans deserve better than the budget that they have brought down. They have an opportunity today to send a signal to Manitobans.

Will they keep the promise that this Premier made in 2008 when he said, if we don't live up to our legislated obligations we will take the penalty as ministers? Will they keep that promise which the member for Tuxedo (Mrs. Stefanson) has given them the opportunity to do today, or will they continue to put the 19 members of their Cabinet ahead of the next generation of Manitobans?

Mr. Selinger: Madam Deputy Speaker, we will do what Manitobans have asked us to do. We will invest in education so more young people complete high school. We will invest in our universities and colleges so more people can get the qualifications that will allow them to take up the jobs that are being generated in this province. We will move forward on an innovation agenda. We will move forward on improving our health-care system by reducing the number of people that have to wait for lifesaving procedures such as cancer treatment.

Madam Deputy Speaker, it is very clear what is going on today. These members of the opposition would balance the budget on the backs of Manitobans by putting them on the unemployment rolls, by taking away their services.

Only an opposition, after 11 years, that thinks a 10 percent increase in addictions is a cut, it can only continue to be in opposition. Only an opposition that thinks that when you actually increase the number of day-care workers that you're going backwards. Only an opposition that votes against the minimum wage doesn't reduce poverty.

We are reducing poverty. We're increasing the minimum wage. We're moving Manitoba forward.

Bill 31

Amendment on Ministerial Salary Reductions

Mrs. Heather Stefanson (Tuxedo): Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, the fact is that, despite all the money that this government has spent, front-line services have continued to decline in this province. Seniors are forced to wait for much needed health-care services, children are falling through the cracks in our chaotic child welfare system, criminals are caught in a revolving door of this NDP criminal justice system, and the list goes on and on and on. No matter how much money they spend, things get worse. It's the NDP way: spend more, get less.

And now, in Bill 31, the Minister of Finance and other Cabinet ministers opposite plan to pass legislation to protect their own salaries.

Why is protecting their own salaries more important than making sure that front-line services are there for the most vulnerable citizens who need it in our province right now?

Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Finance): Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, we can—the member opposite can talk about front-line services, but I would ask her to look at her record. Every time we have made investments in front-line services, she voted against that. She voted against every one of those investments, whether it's in health care, whether it's in child-care spaces, whether it's funding for education, all of those things, whether it's for police, to put more police on the streets, all of those people, probation officers, the member opposite voted against every one of those. So she can talk the talk, but she certainly hasn't walked the walk when it comes to standing up for Manitobans, to stimulating the economy, to protecting front-line services and keeping Manitoba moving forward.

Mrs. Stefanson: Madam Deputy Speaker, we have no question in our mind that these—that the NDP opposite know very well how to spend money. They know how to spend money, but the question is what are we getting for the money that we're spending? And the fact of the matter is that things are getting worse in our province under their watch.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the NDP made it their priority this session not to protect the most vulnerable citizens in our society, but to protect the Cabinet ministers' salaries of the 19 member—of Cabinet ministers opposite. Members opposite have a choice to make today: they can vote in favour of 31 to protect their salaries, or they can pull the bill, or they can—they have a third choice: they can support our amendment which does away with the protection of their own salaries.

The question is: Which option will they choose? And will they choose to support our amendment, not to protect their own salaries?

Ms. Wowchuk: Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, I'll tell the member which option I'll choose. I will choose the option that increases minimum wage. I will choose the option that creates 29,000 person-years of employment and reduces child poverty. I'll choose the option that has 150 more doctors, 2,000 more nurses, those that the members opposite fired. I'll choose the option that creates 600 more child-care spaces. It's very clear which option I will choose, and it's also very clear what the member opposite would do, because she says, if she was in

power, she'd balance the budget by 2011 and that would mean cuts, cuts, cuts, just like the '90s.

Mrs. Stefanson: Madam Deputy Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the only salaries that members opposite are concerned about protecting is the Cabinet ministers' salaries, the 19 Cabinet ministers' salaries, and that's unfortunate. And what I will say that—and if, in fact, the minister is trying to claim that protecting their salaries is not the priority of her government, then she should have no problem and members opposite should have no problem supporting my amendment this afternoon.

Will she support our amendment this afternoon?

Ms. Wowchuk: Madam Deputy Speaker, I will support the plan that was developed after a lot of consultation with Manitobans. I will support the plan that puts in place a five-year plan to ensure that we are not cutting front-line services, to ensure that we are training more nurses and doctors, that we are keeping nurses at the bedside, teachers in the classroom, police on the street, that we are increasing minimum wage, we are reducing poverty levels, we are increasing immigration so that this province grows.

* (13:50)

I will choose and stand by the plan that we have put forward to stimulate the economy and moving Manitoba forward, rather than the suggestion of the member opposite who says she would balance the budget by 2011, and we know that means cuts like the '90s.

Gage Guimond Death Report Recommendations Implementation

Mrs. Bonnie Mitchelson (River East): And policies rushed through by the members opposite before workers and agencies were ready have had tragic consequences for child welfare in Manitoba. Review after review have suggested ways to improve the system. The progress report on the implementation of the recommendations from the section 4 review of Gage Guimond's death states that recommendation No. 47 would be in effect by December of 2009.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I'd like to ask the minister whether that's happened.

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Minister of Family Services and Consumer Affairs): I believe we already confirmed for the member, the southern authority's confirmed that they have put that into

place. And, in fact, we're interested in not just in one recommendation, but all of them.

But I think it's time for maybe a trip down headline memory lane, as I know members opposite purport to represent the interests of fostering, here: Foster kids warehoused in hotels again; Tory warehousing of kids. January 6, '98: Pay foster parents, not hotels; slashing foster care rates mostly hurts native kids; keep—cuts keep foster parents in short supply; foster care cut hit. What date is that here now? Oh: Foster parents ready to quit; child standards ignored; 1997, of course, probe urged into abused kid's death; 1997, Tories allow reviews into child deaths—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Thank you very much—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order. The honourable member for River East has the floor.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker. And Gage Guimond died as a direct result of the policies of this NDP government.

Madam Deputy Speaker, recommendation No. 47 states, and I'll quote for the minister: That any decision to move a child when there are no protection concerns contain a written reason for this decision, including reference to the impact on the child, the appropriateness of the move in accordance with the child's stage of development, and the degree of attachment to the caregiver.

Madam Deputy Speaker, is that happening today in this minister's system?

Mr. Mackintosh: Just on the issue of credibility: Tories allow reviews into child death to gather dust; provincial cutbacks have child protection agency concerned; teens out in cold; cuts create counselling crisis at CFS; agencies tire of lip-service as funds cut; Province to trim social worker role; minister eyes changing act to cut costs; child welfare agencies told funds frozen; children bear the burden; funding freeze payroll tax double whammy for agencies; family units sacrifice feared in cutbacks to child—oh, there goes the bell.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order.

Foster Care Written Decisions on Child Removal

Mrs. Bonnie Mitchelson (River East): And I'll remind the minister that there were many headlines that said that Gage Guimond died as a direct result of rushed devolution by this NDP government.

Madam Deputy Speaker, will the minister personally explain to parents who are providing loving, long-term stable homes to foster children why they aren't receiving written decisions about their foster children and why they are being moved, especially when there's a high degree of attachment between the child and the caregiver?

Madam Deputy Speaker, it's important for the minister to indicate why these children are being moved under his policies.

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Minister of Family Services and Consumer Affairs): Oh, on April 1998: Funding lack hurts system, children at Child Advocate's; advocate says system fails kids; Tories trying to dump me, Advocate says; Children's Advocate loses his job; kids' advocate axed.

The members opposite are the enemies of fostering. Rest my case.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order. The honourable member for Steinbach, to put his question.

Gang Activity Reduction Strategy Funding

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): Kids in care are in such bad shape, he's 20 years behind in his clippings package readings, Madam Deputy Speaker.

It's never been more clear than this particular session that this is a government that's weak and ineffective when it comes to crime. When faced with a choice between supporting law and order and supporting those who break the crime—break—make crime in Manitoba, the NDP made the wrong choice. This session, they said no to police who were asking for more resources to double the gang unit in Winnipeg. Instead, they said yes to giving welfare payments to criminals—violent criminals, sexual offenders—giving welfare payments to those who were trying to avoid the law.

Why did this minister decide to give taxpayers to the most violent in our society instead of giving it to the police so they could fight gangs in the province of Manitoba?

Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): You know, Madam Deputy Speaker, we're a long way from the World Cup, but there's some real similarities. You turn on the TV and all you hear are vuvuzelas. You can hear them from miles away, but it doesn't take long for them to realize they only play one note, and that reminds me an awful lot of the member for Steinbach, who has one note and one note only.

I am very proud to be part of a government that sees crime prevention and intervention and suppression as being something that touches all of us that we can do as a government. Yesterday I was in my community opening a new day care, which is great. That reduces poverty, takes down obstacles, makes our community safer.

And I'm waiting for the next question because I'll be happy to speak—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order.

Correctional Facilities Need for New Facility

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): As the referee for the Legislature, you should be giving that minister a red card for that answer, Madam Deputy Speaker.

But the priorities of this government are all about protecting their salaries and not protecting Manitobans. We've spent hours in this Legislature trying to stop them from taking a salary increase, from taking salaries that they didn't deserve because they broke legislation.

And, in fact, the guards, they spent hours on the steps of the Legislature trying to get through to this minister. It's no wonder they shouted him down when he tried to speak to them, because they know that he is not listening to their concerns. It's not too late. The session hasn't quite ended yet. He still has the chance before he goes home for the summer hoping that the ticking time bomb which is our jails doesn't go off this summer.

Will he say he'll listen to the guards and get another correctional centre built for them so they aren't put at risk through the summer?

Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Madam Deputy Speaker, he only plays one note and he still can't get it right.

By the time we come back and sit again, we'll have a new police helicopter in the air for the

Winnipeg Police Service, supported by this government. By the time we come back, there will be 30 police cadets out on the street, supported by this government. Over the summer we'll be building 449 additional jail beds in Manitoba, every single one of them opposed by the member for Steinbach and every member on that side of the House. By the time we come back, we'll have more Lighthouses. We'll have more safe places for young people to go in the province of Manitoba.

There's a lot of things we'll be doing while they'll be hitting the horn or whatever it is they're going to be doing over the summer, Madam Deputy Speaker.

* (14:00)

Crime Rate Reduction Strategies

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): Madam Deputy Speaker, 11 years, three failed ministers and countless failed strategies.

Well, we saw the results this session: probation breaches not reported and a Manitoban who lost his life, jail guards protesting on the steps of the Legislature, riots in our prisons, children as young as eight being shot in their home, prisoners accidentally released. And this minister believes that getting tough on crime starts in a Slurpee line and ends at a baseball game.

Won't he just tell Manitobans that when it comes to fighting crime he lacks ideas, he lacks credibility and he lacks the fortitude that Manitobans want in a Justice Minister.

Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Same horn, same note, nothing new from the member opposite.

It's very interesting that when they had their last—no, they don't call it a convention because that would mean listening to members, they call it an annual general meeting. And there was the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McFadyen) standing up and telling his ideas. And I'm sure the member for Steinbach was right at his sleeve telling him what to do.

How many resolutions did they debate on crime prevention?

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order. When the Speaker stands, the Speaker is supposed to be heard in

silence. I'm going to ask for the co-operation of the entire House. I'm going to ask for some decorum in the House on both sides.

The honourable Minister of Justice, to complete your answer.

Mr. Swan: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. And the reason why they're so loud is because the answer is zero. They didn't talk about one crime prevention initiative at their annual general meeting. Why? Because they have no ideas. For them, justice begins when somebody's arrested; it ends when they go to jail. They don't believe in crime prevention. They don't believe in investing in our communities. They don't believe in investing in young people. The Leader of the Opposition has nothing. The member for Steinbach has nothing. They have nothing on that.

Flood-Damaged Farmland Government Priority and Strategy

Mr. Cliff Graydon (Emerson): The Minister of Justice would probably make a better doorman than what he's doing now.

Madam Deputy Speaker, western Canadian farmers are experiencing some of the worst cropping conditions in recent decades. Millions of acres go unseeded. These adverse conditions come on the heels of a disturbing forecast from Agriculture Canada which predicts that the realized net income for farmers across Canada is expected to drop by 91 percent from 2009.

This week's western premiers discussed strategies to deal with the effects of flooding and excess moisture conditions.

Madam Deputy Speaker, can the Minister of Agriculture outline the advice that he gave to the Premier (Mr. Selinger) in order to develop a strategy to help producers immediately deal with these adverse conditions?

Hon. Stan Struthers (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives): And I want to commend our First Minister for the leadership he showed at Vancouver recently. And I'm sure—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order. Once again I'm going to ask for the co-operation of the House in maintaining decorum.

Mr. Struthers: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. They're quite the jealous bunch over there, aren't they?

I'm sure the Premier would also agree that the premiers in Saskatchewan and Alberta and British Columbia, along with the federal minister, are very concerned about what we see happening out there in farm country, Madam Deputy Speaker.

And I know the member for Emerson takes it seriously as well, because he did join with me to tour in south central and eastern Manitoba. And we did talk to many farmers and talked about some of the problems that they're facing. And I think what you'll see is an all-party—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Graydon: Crop reports paint a grim picture. Unseeded acres range from 15 percent in southwestern Manitoba to a high of 50 percent in the northwest. Crop quality is being impacted due to excess moisture. In early July, the federal, provincial and territorial agricultural ministers are meeting in Saskatoon. Undoubtedly, this spring's adverse weather conditions and the responsiveness of business risk-management programs to deal with these disasters will be discussed.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I ask the Minister of Agriculture: What are his priorities heading into this meeting given the serious challenges Manitoba producers have been facing?

Mr. Struthers: I was very pleased today to talk with both of my counterparts in Saskatchewan and Alberta and talk about the problems that our producers are facing, Madam Deputy Speaker. We've talked about working together to put forward programs that will benefit farmers.

Indeed, in our province here in Manitoba, I'm really proud to be part of a government that put together and made improvements to crop insurance plans and programs that benefit farmers. And I'm really very proud to be part of a government that put together the very first permanent excess moisture insurance program in the whole country which does pay out for farmers when they face the times that we're facing now.

I'm open to advice from the member from Emerson. I'm open to suggestions that anybody across the way has. I think this is one of those issues where we have to come together and show farmers that we stand in their corner.

Standing Committee on Agriculture Meeting Request

Mr. Cliff Graydon (Emerson): I see that the minister has declared September 19th the Open Farm Day and I'm wondering if that is because he believes that farms are becoming extinct in Manitoba.

Madam Deputy Speaker, Manitoba producers have faced extraordinary challenges over the past number of years, ranging from excess moisture conditions to trade-related issues, such as COOL, BSE and the impact of H1N1, to high input costs.

Producers are worried about the responsiveness of business management programs. They're seeking ways to find new markets and to add value to their products. They want to succeed and they want a provincial government that will work with them in achieving success.

Madam Deputy Speaker, will the minister commit today to immediately calling a Standing Committee on Agriculture to hear producers' and stakeholders' feedback that will help shape short- and long-term strategies to ensure that Manitoba's agriculture is a success?

Hon. Stan Struthers (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives): I've always suspected that my friend from Emerson has been all hat and no cow, Madam Deputy Speaker, but to call for a committee at this time when we need to be working together with other levels of government to offer real, live programs, real, live support for the farm community, that's where my priorities are.

Our priorities are with the farmers—our priority in this side of the government, on this side of the House, is to make sure that we work with farmers to put those programs in place, to make sure we work as ministers in each province to make sure that those programs are what farmers need. And very key to this, and I'm very confident that we will get a good hearing from the federal minister, Gerry Ritz, as we work together to make sure we put a program together that works on behalf of farmers, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Agriculture Industry Supply Management Commodities Quota Tax

Mr. Hugh McFadyen (Leader of the Official Opposition): Madam Deputy Speaker, I know personally that the member for Emerson is both hat and cattle which is more than what can be said for the Minister of Agriculture who is all bull when it

comes to protecting farm families in the province of Manitoba.

And I want to ask the Premier today: As part of their budget, as part of this NDP government's budget in this spring session of regression, they did something that they had never done before, they introduced an unprecedented tax on food. They brought in a tax on milk, eggs and poultry that will hurt Manitoba families, will hurt our producers.

Will the Premier today, before the session is out, say that he's going to end the session on a good note, withdraw their tax on food and will they, at the same time, take away their protection for ministerial salaries which sends the wrong message of NDP ministers first, farm families last?

Madam Deputy Speaker: Just a—order. Prior to recognizing the honourable First Minister, I want to caution all members in their choice of words. So just—if we could take some caution in terms of our choice of words to all honourable members.

Hon. Greg Selinger (Premier): Yes, Madam Deputy Speaker, I'd like to table the outcomes of the Western Premiers' meeting this week, where all the premiers from western Canada took the issue of excess moisture very seriously, and we are now getting together with the federal minister to look at additional AgriRecovery programs.

This government was the first government to put an excess moisture insurance program in place permanently, a permanent program for farmers which will pay them enormous dividends in this very difficult year. And this was the government that in this budget put an additional \$4 million into the Food Development Centre to have value-added food products in this province, and, again, the members opposite voted against all these resources for farmers. And now they pretend to be supporting farmers when just a few short months ago they wanted to cut programs for them.

*(14:10)

Bill 31

Amendment on Ministerial Salary Reductions

Mr. Hugh McFadyen (Leader of the Official Opposition): Madam Deputy Speaker, after this session of one failure after another, a record debt, record deficits, a new tax on farm families, failures in the area of Child and Family Services and addiction services, a failure to be consistent on matters relating to public safety, the icing that they

are putting on this cake of incompetence today is a measure to protect their own salaries which we'll vote on later today.

How can they stand up today after this record of failure and reward themselves at the end of this session by protecting their own salaries? What happened to the NDP in Manitoba? Look how far they've come from their roots. Why is it now all about taking care of their own interests?

Hon. Greg Selinger (Premier): Madam Deputy Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition was the member that said that we'd never get an energy deal with Xcel. He said it was written on the back of a napkin. We have concluded a \$3-billion energy sale here in Manitoba, and the member doesn't even have the decency to apologize for that. He should apologize for that right now for saying it was done on the back of a napkin. It's a \$3-billion deal.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order. First of all, I'd like to remind all honourable members that their comments should be coming through the Chair and, second of all, if I could ask for some assistance from all members. I know this is our last day here in the Legislative Assembly for this session, but if we could just have some assistance in terms so that people don't have to yell at each other to answer the questions.

Mr. Selinger: Not only has he not apologized for that, he accused public servants in the health-care system of taking cash. The Auditor General has now said that that was wrong, and he hasn't apologized for that either. When it comes to public servants, when it comes to growing this economy, he's missed the boat every single time, and he doesn't even have the decency to apologize for it. We're moving Manitoba forward; he's taking it backwards.

Mr. McFadyen: Madam Deputy Speaker, there are 19 people in this House who are taking cash. It's the 19 members of the NDP Cabinet. They should be the ones apologizing. After 15 members of their caucus lined their pockets with federal tax credits arising from their two-for-one tax credit scheme, taking cash from federal taxpayers, today they have an opportunity—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order. I'm sorry, I am having a very challenging time here hearing the questions, hearing the answers. Could I please get the co-operation of all honourable members who are

in front of the viewing public here just to finish question period.

The honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, to finish his question.

Mr. McFadyen: Madam Deputy Speaker, 15 members of their caucus took federal tax credits in their two-for-one tax credit scheme. Nineteen members of their caucus today are going to vote to protect their own salaries. In five hours, all 57 members of this House will leave this place and go and speak to Manitobans. Manitobans will want to know what their government stands for, whose side they're on.

He's got an opportunity this afternoon in the next few hours to tell Manitobans whose side they're on. Which side will he be on? The 19 members of Cabinet or on the side of Manitobans? Which side is he going to pick? Manitobans or the 19 members of Cabinet? He's got three hours—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Selinger: Madam Deputy Speaker, I'll tell you whose side we're going to be on. We're going to be on the side of Manitobans, which why—which is why there will be 20—which is why there will be 29,000 extra jobs in this province, which is why there will be nurses at the bedside, which is why there will be police in the community, which is why there will be day-care workers in the day-care centres, and which is why there will be teachers in the classrooms. And the members opposite would have laid those people off. They would have cut those people out of the budget this year. They would have moved Manitoba forward—backwards every single day with the way they approach the economy.

We have improved the economy, we have invested in front-line services, we have created jobs, and the members opposite have dragged us back to the '90s with their every single approach, attack public servants every single day that they've been in this House. We know whose side we're on. We're on the side of Manitobans, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Inspyre Solutions Government Investment Recuperation

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Yeah, Madam Deputy Speaker, in the 1990s, the Conservative government provided tens of millions of dollars to the company Faneuil, mainly as a loan in what was described then as a sweetheart deal. In 1999-2001, the NDP jumped in to save the investment and

converted the loan into preferred shares, which the NDP said they expected to be worth \$16 million. The condition of the provincial investment were that Faneuil, now Inspyre, would maintain its executive and head office in Winnipeg and maintain operations in Manitoba at a level of not less than 400 jobs.

My question to the Premier: What is the current status of Inspyre? Is it fulfilling its commitments, and how much of the original investment will be recouped?

Hon. Greg Selinger (Premier): I thank the member for River Heights for the question. As he is aware, there have been many measures taken to generate and maintain employment in Manitoba. That's why we have the Manitoba Industrial Opportunities Program. We increased that program as the recession came along to preserve employment in Manitoba.

As to the specifics of the member's question, if he has some specific information he'd like me to bring forward to him, I'd be happy to do that.

Mr. Gerrard: Madam Deputy Speaker, the Premier doesn't seem to be on top of what's happening in this province. I table the latest annual report for Inspyre which shows that the provincial shares which the NDP expected to be worth \$16 million are now worth less than \$2 million, and I understand that the number of people who are working at Inspyre is now below 175, far below the commitment of 400 people.

Will the Premier admit that he doesn't know what's happening in the province? What action will the Premier and his government be taking with regard to this situation of Inspyre in Manitoba?

Hon. Peter Bjornson (Minister of Entrepreneurship, Training and Trade): And, of course, the Manitoba Industrial Opportunities Program is a very successful program and it has been under this government, and if we want to talk about how that has transpired over the last few years, the MIOP program is no longer in the business of providing forgivable loans. Nine percent of loaned funds before 1999 were in the form of forgivable loans, and all MIOP loans are now repayable loans.

Under the Conservatives, the MIOP program loans were generally provided at an interest rate below the government's cost of borrowing and under the current government the interest rate now charged on MIOP loans is generally at or above the government's cost of borrowing.

And details about MIOP portfolios are made public each year at the Public Accounts and the amount outstanding to each company is provided and additional details is protected by privacy, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

Mr. Gerrard: I ask leave to ask my remaining supplementary question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave for the honourable member for River Heights to ask his last remaining supplemental question?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Leave has been granted.

Mr. Gerrard: Madam Deputy Speaker, this is a very serious matter. Instead of loans, the government took shares. Those shares are worth a tiny fraction of what they told us they would be. It looks like the Conservative and the NDP governments, over the last 20 years, have together lost some \$28 million of taxpayers' money. The government cannot even provide assurances today that the company Inspyre is going to continue operations in Manitoba.

The question, Madam Deputy Speaker, is what on earth this government has been doing while taxpayers' money has literally been walking out the door. I ask the Premier: Why has he been caught flat-footed and out of touch with what's happening in our province when this company has not been fulfilling its commitments? This government has been totally fiscally irresponsible. Give us a clear answer on what's happening—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order.

* (14:20)

Mr. Bjornson: I can understand why the Tories wouldn't ask a question about MIOP loans, because 25 percent of MIOP loans were written off under the Tories at a cost of \$26 million to taxpayers. Major losses included 15 million to Isobord, 2.5 million to Akjuit Aerospace and 1.2 million on Daycon Mechanical Systems, and the practice of charging interest rates below the Province's cost of borrowing cost taxpayers over \$14 million. That was their record.

And, Madam Deputy Speaker, we worked with industry on the MIOP loans, we worked with industry on labour market demands and we're continuing to do so to grow Manitoba's economy,

and we'll continue to do so. In fact, recently there was a report that we broke a record for the number of Manitobans employed in the province of Manitoba. The next month, what did we do? We broke that record again. We're investing in Manitoba. We're supporting Manitoba industries.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Madam Deputy Speaker: Prior to recognizing the honourable member, I just wanted to ask the honourable members, as the House will be adjourning today, I encourage all honourable members to remove the contents of their desk here in the Chamber. I also encourage members to recycle as much of the material as possible. I would like to advise that the blue bins here in the Chamber are designated for recycling of *Hansards* only. Any other material you would like to recycle may be placed in the larger recycling containers in the message rooms located just outside the Chamber. I thank you very much for your co-operation.

The honourable member for Southdale, for members' statements.

Bois-des-Esprits Trails

Ms. Erin Selby (Southdale): Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise today to share with the House the official opening of a new trail in my constituency.

On June 5th, International Trails Day, I was honoured to cut the ribbon at the Bois-des-Esprits Trail in a ceremony attended by colleagues, friends and family. The Bois-des-Esprits Trail meanders through a pristine stretch of boreal forest, which, as the Save Our Seine organization puts it, is the heart and lungs of the 27-kilometre Seine River Greenway. Also unveiled were carvings made from trees in the forest by a talented local artist, Murray Watson.

Lunch was served, speeches were delivered and music was provided by Union Nationale, who were joined by a handful of their musician friends. Guided walks along the trail introduced newcomers to the forest. A rescued owl and hawk were there to represent the animals who live and share the forest with all of us.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the celebration of Bois-des-Esprits was realized by years of work by volunteers bolstered by the support of our provincial government. In 2003, the government partnered with Save Our Seine to achieve protected land status from

the City of Winnipeg. A year later the Province committed more than a half a million dollars towards the forest's further protection. I am proud that our government realizes the values of forests both within urban centres and beyond. Without question, our government has demonstrated a lasting commitment to environmental stewardship.

In closing, let me thank again the volunteers from Save Our Seine who, through their energy and skill, made the Bois-des-Esprits Trail a reality. The fruits of your labour are borne by the swaying trees and rich soil enjoyed by our children today and our grandchildren tomorrow. Thank you.

Chapman Family

Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden): I rise in the House today as the member of the Legislative Assembly for representing Arthur-Virden to recognize the Chapman family of Virden who have been selected the Red River Exhibition Association's 2010 Farm Family of the Year. The award was established in 1966 and acknowledges farm families like the Chapmans for their successful farm management as well as their contributions to improving agriculture in Manitoba.

In 1890, George Chapman, Sr., started the family homestead near Plumas and helped his son Robert begin farming at the age of 14 before subsequently moving to their current location four miles south of Virden in 1944.

In Chapman tradition, Robert assisted his sons, George and Russell, as they accepted more of the farming responsibilities, becoming R. Chapman and Sons in 1959, before incorporating as Chapman Bros. Farms in 1967 when Robert retired. Now, brothers George and Russell, with their wives Myrna and Betty, are proud that the next generation of Chapmans are carrying on this multigenerational farm with their own business sense. Today, George's sons, Darren and Parry, with wives Laura and Debbie, along with Russell's son, Robert, and wife, Colleen, his son-in-law, Jeff Elliott, married to their daughter Lauree, and grandson, Justin, and wife, Karen, currently operate the farm, each having their own responsibilities.

Having all attended university or college, the present Chapmans own, rent and manage a diverse enterprise. They were nominated by the Manitoba Forage Council where Robert-Russell, pardon me, has been a board member since its inception in 1973. This farm includes forages, grains and cattle, and

adopts modern technology early and self-inventions as required in their 17,000-acre operation. Their farm is based on the strong values of doing what needs to get done, helping in their community, and treating family, neighbours and staff with dignity that make the Chapmans a very deserving choice for the Red River Exhibition Award. They continue to mix business savvy with environmental conscience-conscious farming practices to make for a successful yet low-impact farm operation.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I, again, would like to congratulate all the members of the Chapman family on becoming the 2010 Red River Exhibition's Farm Family of the Year. Families such as the Chapmans are vital to Manitoba's agricultural industry, and I congratulate them for the hard work that they have put into their farm throughout the generations. Thank you.

Philippine Independence Ball

Mr. Mohinder Saran (The Maples): Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise in the House today to tell members about a memorable dinner that I recently had the pleasure of attending. Last Friday, the June-11th of June the Philippine Independence Ball was held at the Marlborough Hotel.

The dinner was organized and hosted by the Philippine Heritage Council of Manitoba in celebration of the 112th anniversary of Philippine independence. For members who may not know, on June 12th, 1898, revolutionary forces under Emilio Aguinaldo declared independence from Spanish colonial rule. The Philippines have since been a beacon of democratic values to other nation states near and far.

The ties between the Philippines and our country, and especially Manitoba, have steadily been strengthened by shared prosperity and flows of immigration between the two nations.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the evening was a remarkable success. The food was spectacular. Entertainment was provided by three phenomenally talented Manitobans. The honourable Minister for Culture, Heritage and Tourism (Ms. Marcelino) was the keynote speaker.

In closing, I would thank the Philippine Heritage Council of Manitoba for their work in planning and executing such a thoroughly enjoyable event. Their work to animate Filipino heritage for successive generations of Filipino-Manitobans enlivens our

local communities and enriches our collective culture. Thank you.

Heather Wilton

Mr. Blaine Pedersen (Carman): I am honoured to rise in the House today to recognize Heather Wilton, a Roland, Manitoba, constituent of mine who has been awarded for an outstanding accomplishment.

Ms. Wilton recently received third place in the North American undergraduate category of the Alltech Young Scientist annual competition. As part of the competition, participants were required to write a scientific paper on a topic related to animal feed technologies. Approximately 5,000 entries were submitted for the contest from six continents, and for Ms. Wilton to receive a third place award is quite an honour.

Heather Wilton, an animal science third-year undergraduate student at the University of Manitoba, based her paper on raising sheep on the family farm. Her topic was established from the work of fellow farmer, Randy Eros, who is the owner of Seine River Shepherds of Ste. Anne. Mr. Eros takes part in grazing management practices to reduce his farming cost.

Heather Wilton has spent many hours on her own farm caring for her 42 sheep and 60 lambs including rare breeds to Canada. Ms. Wilton has a deep passion for animal farming practices and is planning to attend the Western College of Veterinary Medicine in Saskatoon following her studies at the University of Manitoba.

Heather Wilton is a valuable community member who takes part in a number of organizations. Her interest in farming led Ms. Wilton to become a member of the 4-H Graysville Horse Club. She is also heavily involved in volunteering at her church through playing the piano and helping with the Sunday School where she occasionally brings her sheep for the kids to pet. At the University of Manitoba, Ms. Wilton spent a year as a don at St. John's College, tasked with being a dorm mother to students looking for advice and rural-rule enforcement.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would encourage all members of the Legislature to join me in congratulating Heather Wilton on receiving third prize in the Alltech Young Scientist competition. The work that she has done on raising sheep on her family farm is valuable research for the future of the industry, and we look forward to Ms. Wilton's

continued involvement in agriculture in Manitoba. Thank you.

* (14:30)

Ron Houston

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Madam Deputy Speaker, be it police officers, firefighters or EMS, these public services are crucial to public safety, and many times the people who perform these duties put themselves in harm's way to protect others.

Today we remember Ron Houston who gave his life in the line of duty as a police officer and his family's sacrifice.

Ronald Edward Houston was born and lived in Redditt, Ontario, with his family. Ron's father worked for the railway at the time but was transferred back to Transcona with his family.

As a young adult, Ron joined the Winnipeg Police department on June 3rd, 1957, but resigned on December 31, '64, to pursue another career with Investors. Ron later joined the Winnipeg—rejoined the Winnipeg Police department on October 11th, 1966, eventually moving to the Juvenile Division as acting detective on July 31st, 1968.

Ron loved to work with youth and would advocate for youth wherever—whenever possible. Since the Juvenile Division of the police force was fairly new, Ron made it his duty to go into schools and talk to youth of the day about the consequences of running into conflict with the law.

At 2 a.m. on June 26, 1970, detectives Ron Houston and John DeGroot were assigned to a night stakeout looking for a window peeper who was also a rapist. Detectives DeGroot and Houston encountered a 30-year-old male who attempted to flee the two police officers, when a struggle ensued. Detective DeGroot was stabbed first by the knife-wielding assailant, and then Detective Houston sustained a fatal wound.

The Winnipeg police officers who worked overtime on this investigation all donated their overtime pay to the Houston family trust fund which, I understand, helped immeasurably with the education of both Detective Houston's two sons.

In those days there was no widows' pension for those killed in the line of duty. But, as a result of this tragic event and the concerted efforts of many community folks, a widows' pension was established and made retroactive to include the Houston family.

Many friends of the Houston family tell me that Ron was always interested in sports. Ron was an avid hockey player having played for the Toronto Marlies as well as the Investors hockey team, and the Winnipeg Police hockey team. Ron also curled and played some baseball and coached little league hockey. Ron was involved in the Transcona Jaycees and was known as a great guy and a friend to everyone and would help anyone in need.

Ron and Mary Houston and their two sons, Ken and Darren, made Transcona home. Mrs. Houston and her family still call Transcona and Winnipeg home.

The tragic event of June 26, 1970, forever changed the Houston family lives. Very young sons never got to know their father. Family times with both parents, never to be. Sons never again could feel the strong hug of their father. Mrs. Houston lost her life partner but, by necessity, needed to be strong and subdue her own grief for the sake of her very young children, which included explaining to their sons how such a tragedy could occur. Mrs. Houston stated that her husband left work every day, but she never expected that he would never return, or would not return.

It seems fitting that since Ron Houston loved working with youth, a new children's playground and park in east Transcona was dedicated to his memory in the year 2000. The Houston family expressed their appreciation for the many days of work by the Transcona community residents who raised funds for the park.

June 26, 2010, will mark the 40th anniversary of Ron's passing, and I ask all members of the Manitoba Legislative Assembly to join me in thanking Ron Houston's family for the sacrifice they have borne all of these years and to demonstrate to that family that we have not forgotten.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Yes, Madam Deputy Speaker, I would move, seconded by the member from River Heights, that, under rule 36(1), that the ordinary business of the House be set aside to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the compromise to freedom of the press in Manitoba, which has resulted in Mr. Hussain Guisti, a journalist from Thompson, Manitoba, being banned

from attending board meetings of the Burntwood Regional Health Authority.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Before recognizing the honourable member for Inkster, I believe I should remind all honourable members that, under rule 36(2), the mover of a motion on a matter of urgent public importance, and one member from the other parties in the House is allowed not more than 10 minutes to explain the urgency of debating the matter immediately.

As stated in *Beauchesne* citation 390, urgency in this context means the urgency of immediate debate, not of the subject matter of the motion.

In their remarks, members should focus exclusively on whether or not there is urgency of debate and whether or not the ordinary opportunities for debate will enable the House to consider the matter early enough to ensure that the public interest will not suffer.

Mr. Lamoureux: I believe that this is a matter that has to be debated here today. If you take a look at the fact that we are adjourning later on today, the next time the House will be in session, likely in session, won't be until very late fall, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I believe that, ultimately, Manitobans recognize how critically important health care is to the province of Manitoba and over the last number of months, even longer, Madam Deputy Speaker, we've been trying to make it—the government aware of many of the things that are taking place that are not in the best interests of the province in terms of health-care reform, in the types of things that are actually happening where regional health-care authorities are making decisions.

Today I understand that Mr. Guisti and the representative of the *Grassroots* newspaper attended or attempted to attend a public meeting of the Burntwood Regional Health Authority and Mr. Guisti was asked to leave, and ultimately the meeting went in camera, came back out and he was told again that he had to leave the premise.

Madam Deputy Speaker, this is a very important issue. The Minister of Health (Ms. Oswald) herself stated on May the 31st, and I quote: "I believe in freedom of the press, absolutely." That is something in which the Minister of Health has stated.

The *Grassroots News*, which is a newspaper that's been around for many, many years, has chosen a reporter to report on what's happening in and

around that Thompson area, and the Burntwood Regional Health Authority is the organization that's ultimately making the decisions. The *Grassroots News* is only trying to convey through its newspaper the ongoings and the things that are happening that are having an impact on the people that live in northern Manitoba.

It's the *Grassroots News* that has chosen the reporter, Madam Deputy Speaker. Now we have a board that has made the decision, for whatever reasons. I know that there's been a request to provide a written detailed explanation as to why this has occurred, but that, to the best of my knowledge, has not been provided.

So one would ask, well, why is it so important for us to have to debate it today? Well, ultimately, Madam Deputy Speaker, it is all about freedom of the press. Does the press have the responsibility to be able to communicate a message to what they believe is accurate and try to demonstrate what's happening behind government, whether it's a regional health authority or the Manitoba government, and feel that they have the ability to be able to communicate whatever message that they feel is the right message according to the facts that have been put on the table.

If the government, for example, of the day, does not like what the *Free Press* is reporting in the newspaper, the government will not attempt to ban the *Free Press* from being in the press gallery, Madam Deputy Speaker. Well, I would suggest to you that the same arguments that would be used as to why the *Free Press* should be allowed to have complete access to reporting on this—activities inside this Chamber, those very same reasons should also apply to the *Grassroots News* in Thompson in reporting on the regional health authorities.

You see, Madam Deputy Speaker, I believe at the end of the day that the Burntwood Regional Health Authority is completely out of control and wasting tax dollars, and I question its ability to deliver the quality of health care in which Manitobans expect of regional health-care authorities.

And, Madam Deputy Speaker, I have called on the government to try to rectify the problem. One of the things that the government can do is, in fact, have regional health-care authorities report to the Manitoba Legislature. This is something that I have argued for a long time now—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order. I just want to remind all honourable members that under *Beauchesne* citation 390 we are to be discussing right now the urgency of having the immediate debate.

The honourable member for Inkster, to discuss the urgency.

Mr. Lamoureux: Yes, Madam Deputy Speaker, and if you take a look in terms of the urgency of the debate, there is no greater expense that the Province of Manitoba has than health care. We have regional health-care authorities that are administering health care to the province of Manitoba, and I would suggest to you that the way in which they are delivering that health-care services and the lack of accountability in health care today is the reason why that we have to have this debate today, because we are not going to be in session. I recognize the value of the urgency.

*(14:40)

My constituents—you know, I'd like to table, Madam Deputy Speaker, a letter that I circulated to a number of my constituents, and I had 250 people that responded to this and taking the time to put it into an envelope and mail it back to me, and I—and I'll read exactly what it says: Hundreds of millions of tax dollars are being spent on our health-care system and I believe that MLAs should be allowed to question health-care decisions being made by politically appointed health boards.

Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, I do that because I believe that it's not just Winnipeg, and the matter in which I am raising today in regards to the Burntwood regional health-care authority clearly demonstrates the need for more accountability in health. You have a Minister of Health (Ms. Oswald) who completely ignores this sense of urgency in regards to fixing the problem at the Burntwood Regional Health Authority. She completely ignores the issue. She says one thing inside the Chamber in terms of the freedom of press, but she continues to allow it to occur.

She continues to allow the Burntwood Regional Health Authority from banning *Grassroots News* from being able to have a reporter on site. And I believe that the Minister of Health has to take responsibility for her regional health-care authorities, including the Burntwood Regional Health Authority. And if she doesn't have the courage or the ability to do that, then it speaks even louder in terms of the

need to have these health-care authorities come before a standing committee of the Legislature.

So I bring to the attention of the government that what is happening today in Burntwood Regional Health Authority, in particular its board, and the banning of a reporter, by banning that reporter, they're saying to the *Grassroots News*, that you do not have the ability to have someone witness what's taking place in a public meeting in the delivery of health care in northern Manitoba.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I suspect that the *Grassroots News* is probably the most popular newspaper in that region. I likely think that that is—that could be the case. So you're denying a community-based newspaper—and when I say community-based, I know the *Grassroots News* is circulated even beyond northern Manitoba—and yours—and this Minister of Health (Ms. Oswald) and this Premier (Mr. Selinger) are doing nothing in terms of standing up for our freedom of the press.

It's not—you know, I understand that *Grassroots News* has even, at one point, said if you don't like what Mr. Guisti or a reporter is asking or writing on, then write an article to contradict him. State your opinion. And they chose not to do that previously. They chose not to do that. Instead, they're fixated on the fact that they do not like this reporter because this reporter maybe isn't telling it the way they want them to tell it.

And, I think that that is a very dangerous situation, and it's to the detriment of health-care delivery. There's 20,000 children, I—for example, that need pediatric care that don't have the type of pediatricians as we do here in the city of Winnipeg. There's other health-care needs that need to be reported on in the Thompson area, and the Burntwood regional health-care authority does not have the authority to start banning media from being able to report on the things that are taking place in Thompson.

And to go against this MUPI is to defend the actions of the Burntwood regional health-care authority. And I say shame to those that would defend freedom of the press. Do the right thing and send a powerful message to the Burntwood Regional Health Authority that their behaviour is unacceptable. In fact, and I would conclude by saying that the Minister of Health needs to write a letter today telling the Burntwood Regional Health Authority that the *Grassroots News* has the authority to have Mr. Guisti at those board meetings.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order. The honourable member's time has expired.

Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader): I would just rise briefly to argue that this is not—does not qualify under rule 36(1) as a matter of urgent public importance. And I think the honourable member has demonstrated that by his comments. I mean, he has said very little, if anything, about why this was—why this absolutely had to be debated today. I mean, he said he's been paying attention to this for a long time; it's a long, ongoing dispute between the Burntwood Regional Health Authority and the reporter in question.

But further to that, Madam Deputy Speaker, I understand as of today that *Grassroots News*, the newspaper that the honourable member referred to, that an agreement has been reached whereby they will actually be allowed to attend these meetings. It's only the specific reporter that is now the object of the board's actions, if you like.

So that all the argumentation—which wasn't really to the point anyway, because even if everything the honourable member said was true, it didn't have any bearing on whether or not it was a matter of urgent public necessity that we had to debate today. But I'm just saying that even when—even on the matter of whether or not freedom of the press is at stake and whether *Grassroots News* can attend the meetings, all of this, that I'm not sure that the honourable member is completely up-to-date on this.

But I was certainly—in the hands of the Chair on this, Madam Deputy Speaker. But this is an ongoing dispute, which is changing even as we speak, but certainly not something for which the business of the Legislature should be set aside today for the purposes of a debate.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I thank the honourable members for their advice to the Chair on whether the motion proposed by the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) should be debated today.

The notice required by rule 36(1) was provided. Under our rules and practices, the subject matter requiring urgent consideration must be so pressing that the public interest will suffer if the matter is not given immediate attention. There must also be no other reasonable opportunities to raise the matter.

I have listened very carefully to the arguments put forward; however, I was not persuaded that the ordinary business of the House should be set aside to

deal with this issue today. Although this is an issue that some members may have concerns about, I do not believe that the public interest will be harmed if the business of the House is not set aside to debate the motion today. Additionally, I would like to note that other avenues exist for members to raise this issue, including question period, members' statements and grievances.

Therefore, with the greatest of respect, I must rule that this matter does not meet the criteria set by our rules and precedents, and I rule the motion out of order as a matter of urgent public importance.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

(Continued)

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

House Business

Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader):

With respect to orders of the day, I would like to announce that the House will now proceed to third reading of the following bills: 203, 225, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 23, 24, 27, 32, 36, 39 and 29. And, of course, after that, Madam Deputy Speaker, pursuant to orders that have already been accepted, we will proceed then to report stage of Bill 31 and third reading of Bill 31.

Madam Deputy Speaker: You will need to have leave to call those bills. So is there leave from the members of the House to call the bills that were mentioned?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The Government House Leader has been given leave to call the following bills: 203, 225, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 23, 24, 27, 32, 36, 39, and then Bill 29.

*(14:50)

CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS

Bill 203—The Coat of Arms, Emblems and the Manitoba Tartan Amendment Act (Provincial Soil Designated)

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will now move on to bill—to third reading—concurrence and third reading of Bill 203, The Coat of Arms, Emblems and the Manitoba Tartan Amendment Act (Provincial Soil Designated).

Mr. Cliff Cullen (Turtle Mountain): I move, seconded by the member for Emerson (Mr. Graydon), that Bill 203, The Coat of Arms, Emblems and the Manitoba Tartan Amendment Act (Provincial Soil Designated), reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Cullen: This bill does amend The Coat of Arms, Emblems and the Manitoba Tartan Amendment Act. And what it does, it designates the Newdale soil as the official provincial soil.

First, the bill talks about the scientific name of Newdale soil is the Orthic Black Chernozem, but I'm sure the public at large will never remember that, so it is commonly referred to as the Newdale soil.

It is important to note that this particular legislation will come into force once it does receive royal assent, so that is very significant. And today is very significant in the Manitoba Legislature, just having a chance to review Manitoba's existing symbols and how significant they are. This is a fairly significant day in the Chamber.

Of course, the Manitoba flag, as we're all familiar with, we—that was approved by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth back in October of 1965 and officially proclaimed May in 1966. Our Manitoba emblem, the coat of arms, was revised in October 1992. The Manitoba tartan was received royal assent back May 1st, 1962. And, of course, our provincial flower, the crocus, received royal assent back March 16, 1906. And our provincial bird, the great grey owl, was officially adopted July 16th, 1987. And, of course, we all remember that we have a provincial tree, our white spruce. So the Newdale soil will be added to this very important list of Manitoba symbols.

And I just briefly wanted to explain the significance of having a designated soil here in the province of Manitoba. Obviously, agriculture has played a very critical role here in the development of the province of Manitoba, it plays a critical role today and it will play a critical role for many generations to come.

So I feel it's very important that we recognize the important contribution that our soils play here in the economy of Manitoba. Currently, we're looking at at least one out of nine jobs are directly associated with agriculture and food production here in the province

of Manitoba. We certainly hope there's more opportunity for value-added production here in the province as we move forward, but the soil is a very important resource that we have, and I do believe we have tremendous producers, agricultural producers, that do adequately and properly manage that resource.

I've also heard several comments about—this could provide us a very valuable tool in terms of public education about agriculture, and I think it's something that's really needed here in the province of Manitoba. You know, as we have fewer people directly associated with farming and with agriculture, we need that tool or that way to liaison food production with the general public. So I think this is an important tool that we can use, that the public will recognize that we have a provincial soil and the importance of agriculture here in the province of Manitoba.

And certainly the second reason is why the Newdale soil specifically. And we certainly have support from the Keystone Agricultural Producers in moving this legislation forward. They feel it's, and I will quote: It's always beneficial to highlight the unique characteristics of Manitoba. This distinguishes our province and confirms that we have an important resource that supports agriculture. And the point made here is that other provincial jurisdictions have designated provincial soils as well. So we are keeping pace with what some of the other provinces are doing.

The Manitoba Soil Science Society, back a couple of years ago actually, approached me on this very important issue, and I have a copy of a letter signed by the president at the time, Elaine Gauer, who, after consultation with their soil scientists, decided that the Newdale soil is the most representative soil of the black soil zone in Manitoba. And the letter goes on to say that the Newdale is a good representation of these productive soils both in terms of the area it occupies as well as the range of crops and agriculture it supports in rural Manitoba.

Of course, the Newdale soil is named after the town of Newdale which is located just west of Minnedosa on the west side of Manitoba. And the Newdale soil does carry—cover a fairly extensive area in Manitoba on the western side of the province. In fact, the soil itself continues on into Saskatchewan as well.

And I also want to mention that we have support from the University of Manitoba, the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences. They also support the notion of the Newdale soil as Manitoba does contain most of the black soil zone in Canada and, furthermore, that the Newdale soil is the most representative soil of the black soil zone in Manitoba. So, you know, as a result of that, it certainly makes sense that the Newdale soil be adapted and adopted as the—as our provincial soil here in the province of Manitoba.

I do want to thank our House leader, the member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Hawranik), for helping bring this bill—work its way through the system, and I do want to thank the members on the opposite side for supporting this legislation, acknowledging the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Struthers) also supports this particular legislation.

So, with that, I thank you very much for the opportunity to bring this bill forward, and I just want to thank you for that opportunity. I do believe that we will now have another tool to effectively recognize the important role that agriculture plays here in the province of Manitoba. Thank you very much.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Deputy Speaker, I just want to indicate from the Liberal Party perspective that we support this and welcome the addition of a provincial soil. Thank you.

Mr. Cliff Graydon (Emerson): Madam Deputy Speaker, I'd like to congratulate my colleague from Turtle Mountain for bringing such a bill forward. It's long overdue. As we've seen in other provinces, they have a designation for soils in New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, British Columbia, Alberta, Québec and Nova Scotia, and I'm sure that it won't be long, we'll see that in Saskatchewan.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the designation and proclamation of a provincial soil is one way to increase public awareness and create an appreciation for soils and, as my colleague pointed out, there has been such a disconnect from agriculture in the generations since agriculture first started in the province of Manitoba, and it was the backbone of our economy to begin with, but the disconnect is so great that—and I commend the Minister of Agriculture for declaring September 19th an Open Farm Day. But that's the point we've reached today in Manitoba, that a lot of people in Manitoba have no knowledge or no appreciation of the soil types or of

agriculture in the province, and this here will be a perfect tool for bringing that forward.

Madam Deputy Speaker, not many people understand that agriculture is the only essential industry on earth, and without soil you're not going to have agriculture. There's just no question about it. This Newdale soil, I'd like to point out, is one of the most fertile soils in our province. It has good drainage qualities or characteristics, and it also has a moisture-holding characteristic for growing your crop throughout the summer.

The Newdale soil covers 1.3 million acres in Manitoba. It covers one of the largest areas of any of the soil types, and it has no limitations on any of the crops that could possibly be grown, and so it gives it a higher profile than a lot of other soils that we do have in our province.

Mr. Rob Altemeyer, Acting Speaker, in the Chair

It also includes six different series of soil. It includes Newdale, Rufford, Varcoe, Penrith and Drokan soils. It has the biggest variety of any series of soils to make up the Newdale soil.

* (15:00)

So it gives me great pleasure, then, to stand today and speak to this. This is truly a milestone in the province of Manitoba to have such a designation, Mr. Acting Speaker.

And, with those few words, I'd like to—I'd like to vote on this one.

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 concurrence and third reading—*[interjection]*

Let's try that again. The House is ready for the question.

The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 203, The Coat of Arms, Emblems and The Manitoba Tartan Amendment Act (Provincial Soil designation).

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

**Bill 225—The Public Health Amendment Act
(Regulating Use of Tanning Equipment)**

Ms. Erna Braun (Rossmere): I move, seconded by the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale), that Bill 225, The Public Health Amendment Act (Regulating Use of Tanning Equipment); Loi modifiant la Loi sur la santé publique (réglementation de l'utilisation des appareils de bronzage, reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and now be read for third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Ms. Braun: I would just like to thank the honourable member from St. Norbert for having introduced this bill and look forward to speedy passage.

Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood): I'm pleased to have an opportunity to make a few comments about this legislation.

I was at committee last night to hear the people that came forward to make representation. And certainly there's a lot of merit to look at legislation like this, and we certainly hear from people in the—in-working in the cancer field that can certainly address the issue and talk about the seriousness of exposure to ultraviolet light as a cause for cancer.

And, you know, as more and more people are becoming aware of this, I think it's made all of us much more aware of protecting ourselves, and part of looking at protection from ultraviolet rays is certainly addressing the issue around tanning beds.

And I don't think the industry, itself, was arguing about the necessity for caution in this area, and I do note that the industry was represented there last evening. They did put some concerns on the record. I think a lot of their concerns weren't so much about whether or not this was a good or a bad idea, but I think there was some concern about how far the government was going to go in overregulating or overcontrolling the issue, and there was fear that without proper consultation and a voice on the working committee, that, in fact, the government might not be sensitive enough to the needs of the industry.

So, there's a line here where I think both sides make very good arguments. I think we have to be very, very aware from the medical community and from the research community about the dangers of ultraviolet radiation and what that does in terms of leading to skin cancer, and we also have to be aware

that there is a huge industry involved in this and their needs and concerns have to be raised.

It was interesting that it was the industry itself that was bringing the concerns forward about the various skin types and, in fact, in the one presentation last night, it was the industry that said, for those that are professionally involved in the association, they already, themselves, do not allow people with type 1 skin to tan in tanning beds. And they were urging that we do need to address that on a broader issue with all people out there that are involved in the industry, because not all services that are offered are done in a professional way, according to them.

So there is a need to look at this issue. And I think we have been seeing a significant number of cases of melanoma, and there is some concern that we have an ability to prevent it, but prevention does start at a very early age and it does start when people are younger. And the indication is that when skin is exposed to sunburn when we are all children, that we are much more prone as we get older to develop melanoma.

So there's a whole education component, I think, that has to be part and parcel of this, and that education component needs to start with our young people. And tanning beds are only a part of this. I think, you know, more public education around the dangers of sunlight need to be part of something that the government looks like in a broader way. And I would encourage the government, as they're moving forward this—with this legislation, to, indeed—and I was happy to see that they had a commitment last night to ensure that the people in the tanning industry are part of a working group, that it isn't just consultation that is going out there, that they are part of that working group. I think people involved in CancerCare also need to be part of that working group, so that we can have, you know, a good discussion at that level of discussion around the table.

And then it gives an opportunity, I think, for the government to take this issue and address it in a more fulsome way, too, and just—not just with the tanning beds, but to look more at the education that needs to happen. And then, I think, at the, you know, the end result, we will certainly, probably, have a better product around the whole issue of prevention.

We know that cancer statistics in Canada are going to go up. We certainly know that, you know,

there's a lot of people that work in the area of cancer care that the issue of melanoma is a huge concern.

And so I do commend the member from St. Norbert that did bring this forward. I think that this gives us a good opportunity, I think, to look more fully at the issue, and I just want to indicate that, with those comments in mind, we do support this legislation.

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

Some Honourable Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer): No.

Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden): And it's my privilege to be able to put a few words on the records in regards to Bill 225, as well, in support of this bill.

Mr. Acting Speaker, as well, last night I, as well as my colleague, had the opportunity to be at the committee and hear the presentations that came forward from the Cancer Society as well as the joint Canadian training association, and I was impressed by the presentations that came forward and the ability to look at the rules to analyse the skin texture of individuals that would be utilizing tanning beds.

I was also very—I thought it was very astute that the joint Canadian training association to, in their presentation, talked about how the government had, perhaps, could have included more opportunities to look at references to staff training to—and remote-control timers, and that would have been an opportunity to have looked at those.

There was also an opportunity to look at lowering the fiscal penalties to a maximum of \$10,000 for an infraction, and they made very good cases as to why that should be done, as well. It recognizes the need for a mechanism to ensure compliance, as well, in their discussion, and they are looking at mandatory staff training. They indicated that that could have been included, as well. Programs such as the Smart Tan certification and their JCTA standards program are available at a minimum cost to operators, as they indicated, and, you know, they felt that if they were to do that, there would be an offset to discounted insurance programs and no cost to government, that they were very supportive in their presentation. And so they, the training staff, could operate tanning equipment under their proposals, something that's not the case currently in Manitoba.

* (15:10)

So I think that their presentation was very clear. I was impressed by the presentation that they made in regards to being supportive of the class type 1's skin not being used in tanning, as well as being very cautious on the sensitive to sunlight level in type 2 as well.

With that, Mr. Acting Speaker, I would also be speaking in favour of this bill and look forward to its implementation.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Acting Speaker, just to indicate that we in the Liberal Party support this legislation.

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

An Honourable Member: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer): The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 225, The Public Health Amendment Act (Regulating Use of Tanning Equipment).

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

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Acting Speaker, I would ask if I may have leave just to add a few words to Bill 227, which I understand was actually debated a little bit earlier today.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer): Prior to asking for leave, I as Chair need to make a few points. First of all, I want to thank the honourable member for giving me, as Acting Speaker, a heads up that he would be seeking leave. This is an unusual situation. The legislation in question has already been dealt with this morning. It has passed third reading, and it is not on the order paper.

That said, I will ask the House for leave, and if leave is granted, then the honourable member will have an opportunity to speak. So is there leave of the House for this to occur?

Is there leave of the House for the honourable member for Inkster to speak to Bill 227?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

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

Bill 227—The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Education About Donating Organs)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Yes, Mr. Acting Speaker and members of the Legislature, I did want to just very quickly indicate that it was a pleasure of mine to have been the sponsor of Bill 227. It's always encouraging when we have private members' bills from all three political parties submitted to the Legislature, and at times we see them pass. And I understand it takes a great deal of co-operations and at times negotiations, to try to get some of these private members' bills to pass. I do believe that the employment standards code will be better as a direct result.

Organ donations is something that's very important for all Manitobans to recognize the value. And I trust that this bill will have an impact in different ways, as government makes it very clear that organ donors are very valuable to our province. And if there's things that we can do to better allow for organ transplants, that we're moving towards that, I appreciate the minister's amendments to the legislation.

And, with those few words, I just want to get on the record as having spoken to Bill 227 prior to it receiving royal assent. Thank you.

Bill 4—The Workplace Safety and Health Amendment Act

Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader): Mr. Acting Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Water Stewardship (Ms. Melnick), that Bill 4, The Workplace Safety and Health Amendment Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Peter Dyck (Pembina): Well, yes, Bill 4, The Workplace Safety and Health Amendment Act, amends the fines that are prescribed by The Workplace Safety and Health Act, and the fines have been increased in this specific act from \$150,000 to \$250,000 and that's for first time offenders, and for repeat offenders it's been raised from \$300,000 to \$500,000.

And while, yes, we will be supporting this bill, I would suggest to you, Mr. Acting Speaker—and I've said this numerous times here—I believe that it is a

deterrent to business, to the business community, because they certainly are being penalized if in any way they are caught—well, not caught—found to be in violation of any of the rules that are out there.

And the concern that I have on this is—and I combine this with Bill 4 which is the mobility of the electricians within the—across the provinces, and while we support that as well—and I've said this to the minister at numerous times and I indicated that as well in the House here—that while we do support that mobility, if those people who are in violation of any of the codes then are—by the—are hired by an employer and they don't know what the codes are, that this is a problem for them because they certainly would not want to be doing something that is contrary to the codes that are out there and yet, though, they would—could unknowingly do this.

And so it does penalize those out there and I would say that it would be something that they would not want to do but it could happen and, so, consequently, what the minister has done here, he has increased the fines, and I believe it's not necessary because, again, in my discussion with the minister this was not something that was taking place on an ongoing basis. So to me it just appears to be a tax grab that the minister has put in place.

But, seeing that it is under the Department of Labour and Immigration, it gives me an opportunity to also segue into some of the other concerns that I have which are specific to some of the issues that are involved in this department, and that is that on an ongoing basis—and I've also said this numerous times in the House—we continue to have the fast grow—the fastest growing area in rural Manitoba located in the constituency of Pembina.

And with this come—with this growth comes tremendous infrastructure needs and, so, consequently, when you have the growth taking place, you continue to hire extra people in order to be able to facilitate the growth that's out there, that, in turn, leads towards the hiring of new people and you've got the mobility taking place. People don't know the codes, and, so, consequently, unknowingly they could be in violation of some of the acts that are out there. And, again, as I've indicated, as the employers and the employees, they would not want to do this but they could be subjected to that.

And so coming back to the whole area of growth, the infrastructure needs that we have out there as a result of the immigration that's taking place, and as we're well aware we've—and I've been

out numerous times in question period asking for and lobbying for schools within my region that I represent, whether they are in Western School Division or in Garden Valley School Division, and, yes, the minister has indicated at the outset that there would be schools coming and the date lines were given, and yet we find that as a result of the overspending that has been taking place—and, yes, we find money for the football—the Blue Bomber football stadium. We're not opposed to this stadium itself. We're opposed to the way it is being funded but, certainly, we are taking those funds away from the schools that we need within the area and we are putting them into other infrastructure buildings here and projects.

So that is a problem for us. The other one is the area—and I've said this time and time again—we need personal care homes with the growth that we see in the region. We have the growth within that sector of the community as well, and yet there seems to be a stalling that is taking place. It's not only seems to be, there is a stalling.

* (15:20)

In fact, I've indicated to this minister numerous times that last August she was looking in order to do a study. That study was to be completed in two months. To date, we haven't heard anything as to what's taken place. And so the community is getting very frustrated, because we have numerous needs out there for our community.

In fact, as the member is aware, I've asked questions on this and indicated that people are being moved without—within the region but away from their homes, in fact, where they need—where family and friends need to drive anywhere from an hour to an hour and a half in order to meet and see their family members. But that's not the only problem: it's also the friends who, at that stage in life, many of them do not have their driver's licence anymore, and so consequently they are being isolated.

So, Mr. Acting Speaker, the concern that I have with all of this is that on the one hand, we—the government of the day is promoting in certain sectors, is looking at ways to continue to meet their budgetary needs, and they're doing that in this act here by increasing the fines that they're going to be levying on different businesses and also employees, individuals. I mean, these fines are huge and they could certainly shut down any business that's out there.

But, to add to that, we've also, within those infrastructure dollars that are out there, we continue to have the needs in highways. And I mentioned this as well numerous times, of Highway 32, the dollars that we need there in order to four-lane. It is a provincial highway. It's nothing new. It's been out—it's been in need of four-laning for many, many years. In fact, it was on the books, and even when the government changed in 1999 it was on the books and it was to be done within the next four to five years. Well, this is now 11 years later and still nothing has been done.

So, Mr. Acting Speaker, I have concerns about the way the dollars are spent within this province. I think that we need to continue to put dollars into areas where we see growth, where we see the largest growth in the communities, such as the area that I represent. And again, it's not something that is new or foreign to anyone here. These are—this is ongoing and we do have a responsibility. The government of the day has a responsibility to meet those needs, and I know that they continue to stall, to—continue to put resources in other areas rather than where they are needed.

So, coming back to the workplace health and safety and health amendment act, as I said at the outset, this act amends the fines that are prescribed by The Workplace Safety and Health Act. They are in addition to the existing fines that are out there. They've added from the \$150,000 to the \$250,000 maximum fine and, again, for repeat offenders, they've added it from \$300,000 to \$500,000.

So, Mr. Acting Speaker, with those few words, I know that I have a colleague of mine who wants to put a few words on the record as well, and I want to thank you for this opportunity.

Mr. Cliff Cullen (Turtle Mountain): And, Mr. Acting Speaker, I do appreciate the opportunity just to discuss briefly Bill 4, The Workplace Safety and Health Amendment Act.

I think maybe I'll just premise my comments by saying, you know, the government has a couple of options before it, and they can either take the carrot approach or they can take the heavy stick approach. And it's pretty clear the government, under Bill 4, have taken the heavy stick approach in terms of this legislation.

You know, I think there's an opportunity for government to work with the business community

and work with them in terms of education and make sure there's ways to deal with the employee safety that way. And I would hope they—I hope they're acting to do that in terms of the education and the safety aspect.

I believe the, you know, the heavy approach should probably be the last approach taken. If the education way and method doesn't work, well, then we could bring in the heavy stick. And that's clearly what's happening under Bill 4, when you look at the fairly significant increase in fines. You know, we're talking first-time offenders from 150,000 to 250,000 and then repeat offenders are up to the \$500,000 mark.

Clearly, we're all concerned about employee safety on the job site, and we hope that, you know, these sort of things don't happen, but unfortunately the statistics prove otherwise. You know, we have too many fatalities on our job sites here in the province or Manitoba.

I would wish that the government would have supplied us some kind of proof that the heavy stick, or the heavy fine approach, is effective and, you know, it'd be easier for us as opposition to buy into this legislation if the government could prove to us that the heavy fines have worked in other jurisdictions, but I, Mr. Acting Speaker, haven't seen that type of documentation.

Now we do know the government, though, on the same hand, has certainly increased a lot of the levies that are associated in different licence fees across the province and across all jurisdictions and various departments, and we know they're probably looking for money because the government has indicated we're in for a deficit budget this particular year and it looks like their plan, if you will, is to deficit budget for the next four or five years as well. So we're running up the provincial debt here over the next five years.

We keep hearing things are going to be good in the next few years but, at the same time, the government still maintains that they're going to be spending more money than they're taking in. So obviously, they're going to have to look for avenues to increase their revenue. So that's what they're up to in terms of this particular legislation. They're looking at all avenues to increase or pad their income.

And if you look at Bill 31, Bill 31 is a real example of what's happening there in terms of the increasing taxation levels. You know, not only does

Bill 31 make sure that the ministers maintain their salary; it also has a whole bunch of tax implications and increases in it. There's all kinds of changes in taxes in terms of gasoline, income tax, mining tax, property tax, retail sales tax, tobacco tax, and a whole bunch of other taxes that are impacted by Bill 31, as well as having a clause in Bill 31 that protects their salary and actually changes balanced budget legislation here in the Province of Manitoba. So we know the government is looking for any source of extra revenue they can get their hands on, and Bill 4 certainly looks like the same methodology's going to be used there.

I do want to just mention again, Mr. Acting Speaker, the Skanderberg family from Glenboro, Bill and Cindy's son, Michael, was killed in an accident. He was working on a ballast, electrical ballast, a few years ago on a school site and, unfortunately, was electrocuted and lost his life. A very tragic circumstances for that family, for the parents, Bill and Cindy, and of course, Michael's sisters.

But Bill and Cindy decided that would be a good opportunity for them to spread the message about educating our—primarily our youth in Manitoba about workplace health and safety issues, and they have taken a number of years and are taking a lot of time to travel throughout Manitoba, doing a lot of schools and other venues, to spread the word about public health and safety. I just wanted to mention them and commend them for their work in this regard. Obviously, it's a very important aspect to public education when we're dealing with workplace health and safety issues. So my hat's off to them for the work that they're doing in their very unfortunate circumstances that are before them, but they do take that work very seriously, and I know if more time away from business will allow them to do that, they're certainly prepared to spend more time there in educating Manitobans all across the province.

So with those few words, I just wanted to thank you very much for the opportunity to talk about Bill 4 today.

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 Bill 4, The Workplace Safety and Health Amendment Act.

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

* (15:30)

Bill 6—The Manitoba Association of School Trustees Amendment Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer): Up next is Bill 6, The Manitoba Association of School Trustees Amendment Act.

Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Advanced Education (Ms. McGifford), that The Manitoba Association of School Trustees Amendment Act, reported from Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer): It has been moved by the honourable Government House Leader, seconded by the honourable Minister for Advanced Education, that Bill 6, The Manitoba Association of School Trustees Amendment Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Mr. Cliff Cullen (Turtle Mountain): I welcome the opportunity to rise and discuss Bill 6 today. I do believe there is probably going to be unanimous support of the House to move this particular legislation forward. It is certainly a housekeeping bill as much as anything and the—with the committee last night we had representation coming from the Manitoba Association of School Trustees and we do appreciate Robert Rivard and Jacquie Field, who are the new vice-presidents of the association, and certainly they—in their presentation they were telling us why this particular bill was necessary, and basically this bill is before us because of the requests from the province's school boards.

And, in March 2009, the delegates to the annual general meeting of the Manitoba Association of School Trustees voted to change the name of their organization to the Manitoba School Boards Association. Now, they supported this change because they value the accuracy and transparency in the operation of their provincial organization just as they do in the operation of their own school boards at the local level. Now, Mr. Acting Speaker, it has always been school boards as corporate bodies rather than individual school trustees that are members of this organization. So the suggestion is that this name change would more adequately reflect the nature of this organization.

Mr. Acting Speaker, this bill also makes a few amendments in terms of legislation that would actually bring in line what the association is currently practising which is fairly important, and sometimes, you know, we fail to do that. As organizations change from time to time, some of the actions and the policies of the organization move forward and we don't always go back and change either the by-laws or the, in this case, the regulatory framework and legislation around it. So that's what this particular legislation is doing. And, in fact, Mr. Rivard and Ms. Field are the vice-presidents of the organization. Mr. Rivard represents school divisions in size of less than 6,000 students. Ms. Field represents school divisions which is greater than 6,000. So that is one of the changes that is made—incorporated in this particular amendment going forward and it's something that the school divisions themselves had decided would be a good thing to have both in practice, and now, of course, in legislation.

As we know, the composition of the association's governing body and the executive certainly has changed since the original Manitoba Association of School Trustees Act was first adopted and, of course, that change, just like their new name, reflects the decision made through the democratic process by their membership, and what we are doing is just reflecting in this legislation the democratic change that they have decided to make, as well, and I know it—they're certainly looking forward, as an association, having this legislation move forward quickly. We're certainly not going to be holding up this legislation and want to see it proclaimed today. They have, of course, in the last little while, they have been operating as the Manitoba School Boards Association, but, of course, technically, still must call themselves the Manitoba Association of School Trustees. So this will clean up some understanding and some issues relative to the technical name of it, and I think that's something that, you know, we as legislators owe that debt of gratitude to them.

And I do want to say, you know, as we're in an election year for school trustees this fall, I do want to acknowledge all the trustees over the past number of years who bring a lot to the table in terms of educating our youth, and I certainly want to thank them and acknowledge their contribution to society. And it's always a difficult time, whether you're going to allow your name to stand when an election rolls around. I think, from the municipal point of view in civic elections, we're probably going to see a

substantial change in terms of who is going to be running this year. I'm not sure what's going to happen on the school board side of things, as well, but we do see a turnover from election to election, and it is quite a commitment to serve on school boards. And it's one of those things, as elected officials, that there's not always a lot of thanks go into the job. There's a lot of—certainly a lot of time committed to those jobs that have to be done, and I just wanted to acknowledge those people that do put in the time in terms of trying to better our students' education here in the province of Manitoba.

And the job does come with challenges. You know, we are in a changing environment, and our students are asking more, our parents are asking more in terms of the education of their students and, as a result, they're asking trustees to provide more. But, at the end of the day, there's the financial aspect to it, as well, and there's only so much money to go around to address those issues. And those are the challenges that school trustees face and those are the challenges that the administration are facing and, in fact, now, this is the interesting time of the year when the administration, in conjunction with school trustees, are trying to make their plans for next year. So teachers are eagerly awaiting to see what their timetables are going to look like, what classes they're going to be teaching, how many students are going to be in those classes and those issues, and it's an interesting time for administration and teachers, both, to get those timetables finalized and to get all the t's crossed and the i's dotted in terms of who's going to be teaching what throughout the year. And it comes down to a number game in a lot of cases, because the school trustees recognize there's only so much money to go around in terms of financing the teachers, teachers' assistants and so forth, and the administration has to make some tough decisions in that regard, and, hopefully, they're making those decisions in conjunction with the school trustees and the school boards because they represent the people within a certain given jurisdiction.

We know there's a lot of pressure on school trustees, because the Province has been downloading a lot of programs into the schools and, as a result of the download of those programs, it puts a lot of pressure on the time and the resources within the school system. And when we talk about resources, it's not just money. It's bodies, it's teachers, teachers' assistants and, in some cases, it's the physical buildings. We don't always have enough buildings to provide the services and the education that we want.

And, certainly, my colleague from Pembina recognizes that there's situations out there dealing with a lack of quality space for teaching students. So those are the kinds of challenges that school trustees are facing.

And, as well, you know, we've got the assimilation of all children together now in terms of some of the—children with special needs are assimilated into the regular classroom, and the teachers' report that just came out, you know, we recognize there's a lot of extra work required to—when you're dealing with those diverse classrooms and those diverse education levels. It does put a lot of challenges on the program and, certainly, those are all factors that administration and school trustees have to bear in mind.

Certainly my wife, being a teacher, who's been shuffled around in elementary for years, she is eagerly awaiting to see what her timetable's going to look like for next year, and I certainly, you know, commend all teachers for the great work they do and all the challenges they face.

*(15:40)

But this particular legislation is talking about school trustees, so I will just close by saying we do appreciate the great work the school trustees around our province do and certainly wish them the best, those who decide they're going to put their name forward this fall for school board office.

Thank you very much.

Mr. David Faurshou (Portage la Prairie): I appreciate the opportunity to participate in third reading debate of Bill 6, The Manitoba Association of School Trustees Amendment Act.

I would like to begin by once again commending all of the men and women that take time out of their very, very busy schedules to pursue a commitment to the next generation of Manitobans through the public education system. It's certainly not because of the stipend that school board members receive. It is, indeed, the commitment and dedication to the young people and their education, which, ultimately, is the foundation to which each young Manitoban will base their future on and their aspirations of success pursuing careers.

I will also say that this particular bill, as mentioned by the honourable member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Cullen) is, again, perhaps, an example of this government being behind the times.

And they are presenting to the Legislative Assembly the Bill 6, which is a name change to the organization, which is a collective of all the school boards throughout the province of Manitoba. The Manitoba School Board Association has, in fact, been passed by the organization and has been in place since March the 20th, 2009.

The facilities which house the research staff and resources that support the 38 public school boards operating throughout the province of Manitoba redid their signage a long, long time ago. And it is a perfect example of we, as legislators, not being on the ball and updating the legislation, which we should have done last year when the resolution was passed and the organization changed its name to more adequately depict the organization and harmonize, through name, the activities conducted by the association here in Manitoba, similar to that of various jurisdictions throughout the—our nation of Canada, as well as abroad.

I will also like to take this opportunity to commend the leadership of the association in—through the director, Carolyn Duhamel, who has outstandingly shown leadership and futuristic thinking in support of all of the school boards throughout the province. And I might just mention that the school boards have shown that futuristic thinking by merging and coming together through organizational changes, boundary changes, so to more adequately deliver the services of education to young Manitobans.

It was just a short 12 years ago that I was a school board member with the Portage la Prairie School Division, and at that time we had 54 school divisions operating throughout the province, and today there is 38.

So I would like to commend the leadership and the direction that the school boards have taken over the past decade to effectively make certain that the dollars allocated by taxpayers of Manitoba are, indeed, delivered directly to the classroom, to the benefit of young Manitobans.

I would also like to mention that the school boards do do the best that they can with the limited resources that they receive from the Province of Manitoba. In the case of Portage la Prairie, we are, right now, receiving only approximately 54 percent of the needed dollars for programming from the Province of Manitoba.

It's indication by the level of support from this government that is increasingly stepping aside from the provincial obligations and letting the school boards have to raise the dollars locally instead of receiving the support from the Province, as has been the historic case.

The Portage la Prairie School Division, I would like to commend as showing their dedication to the environment as well. A recent announcement in the local newspaper stated that the school division board members had voted unanimously to go paperless at their school board meetings. And, now, all of the information discussed at the school board meetings comes by way of electronic delivery, and no more need for a shredder after the meeting, where all the paper that was formerly used for the conduct of the division's business will no longer be required.

So I appreciate, once again, the opportunity to rise and to state how very proud we are of the men and women who dedicate themselves to educating the next generation of Manitobans through the public school system. Thank you.

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): Mr. Acting Speaker, I do want to put a few things on the record in regards to Bill 6, The Manitoba Association of School Trustees Amendment Act, and I know that as a past administrator of the Interlake School Division from 1974 until 1982, I had an opportunity to work with a number of the school trustees and saw a number of changes take place during that time as the administrator of the school division.

Ms. Marilyn Brick, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

And I can certainly tell you that it's a challenge being a school trustee. And I encourage and support anything we can do in this Legislative Building to encourage more people to run and let their name stand as school trustees. I know, since my time there, it's been very difficult, in fact, to find people, good qualified people, to run as trustees. And I take my hat off and salute those that have done this in the past, and I know it's a steep learning curve. There's an awful lot of items that they try and deal with as school boards and as school divisions. They're becoming more and more reliant on staff for information.

It's an information highway that, as trustees, they have to make sure that they have the information at their fingertips, and I know that, as a past administrator, it was important that we see that all information was gotten to them in a timely manner

so as able to move forward on those decisions once the meeting was called. So I, in full support of this Bill 6, and I want to salute those members of the Interlake School Division and other divisions throughout the province for a job well done and looking forward to assist in these schools divisions in moving forward on this particular bill.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 6, The Manitoba Association of School Trustees Amendment Act.

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

Bill 9—The Electricians' Licence Amendment Act

Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Finance (Ms. Wowchuk), that Bill 9, The Electricians' Licence Amendment Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

* (15:50)

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): Madam Deputy Speaker, I want to put a few things on the records in regards to Bill 9, The Electricians' Licence Amendment Act, and it's my understanding the way the bill is written that the—presented by the minister in regards to the legislation, is that it allows the flow of electricians from province to province once they have their licence. And the key thing here in this legislation that I want to put on the record is regards to the New West Partnership agreement.

Now, if they would have signed on, if they would have been at the table when this first was brought forward, they wouldn't need this legislation. Unfortunately, this government is not at the table. They've messed the mark once again as a result of not being at the table. There's a number of issues in regards to Bill 9 that would have been taken care of by itself if they would have been at the table at the New West agreement.

Bill 9 is just a small sample. We talk about other tradespeople that will have the opportunity to go back and forth from one province to the other, and we want to attract some of those people back. There's no doubt about it. But there's more than just electricians; it's about all workers, all tradespeople and, unfortunately, this government has missed the boat once again when it comes to being at the table in regards to the New West agreement.

In fact, I just met with some individuals on Monday, as a matter of fact, in regards to the New West agreement and they're very concerned about the livestock industry, whether or not the cattle identification will be part of that agreement with those, also the processing of those livestock within Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. So I know that the government had an opportunity to get involved in that. Unfortunately, they did not and so they had to bring in a bill forward to try and clean up part of their misgovernment and opportunities that they could have taken advantage of in regards to the New West agreement.

So, what we're seeing now is the government doing maintenance. They're doing a defence instead of an offence. As a result of that, Manitobans will pay for that dearly and we hope that the electricians that are licensed in these other provinces and licensed here in Manitoba will have the opportunity to take advantage of this legislation once it's proclaimed.

The government's great at passing legislation but not very good at getting it proclaimed, so we would encourage the government to do so in a timely manner, so that these electricians will be able to take advantage of opportunities as they come forward, to provide for their families in a way that is going to be meaningful as a result of the change in this legislation.

So, thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Peter Dyck (Pembina): Madam Deputy Speaker, I, too, want to put a few comments on the record regarding The Electricians' Licence Amendment Act and, as the previous speaker indicated, this is something that we certainly endorse, of having the mobility between provinces. And this one is specific to the electricians.

However, as has also been said, and I've said this numerous times, it was an opportunity that was missed by the government of becoming a partner in the New West Partnership, or known as TILMA. It's

an opportunity that we missed out on and it's really, really unfortunate because as we met with—meet with businesses and people who are looking at expanding and moving into different provinces, they certainly do look at this in Manitoba as to where we stand regarding the partnerships that we could have had within the western jurisdiction.

And it's not only with electricians that we're looking for mobility. We're looking for the seamlessness that we need between provinces, whether that be in transportation, whether that be electricians, as we have here, other professions, that there is a standard that is reached throughout the provinces in western Canada. And, of course, we'd like to see that moved further east, as well, but we're talking specifically today of western Canada and the opportunities that we would have for businesses to be able to move, to know what the codes are. And it's not only the codes, and I've expressed this concern as well; that the codes that are in Alberta or Saskatchewan or B.C., that they be similar to the codes that we have here.

And in this bill, the minister has the opportunity to endorse whoever is looking at moving from another province into Manitoba, and if their credentials are the same and are right then they are given that status within the province of Manitoba.

And as I've said this and I've said a number of times, they don't necessarily know what the codes are out here. And as I said previously in speaking to Bill 4, the problem that we have here is if you don't know the code and then, through no fault of anyone, they come out here and are in violation and are subject to the safety and health standards as we have within the province here and then they are levied the fines as have been outlined here, we really feel that that is unfair. And so, consequently, it's not only whether that be electricians—in every area, we need to have that seamlessness take place so that employers and employees are aware of the codes or any of the other laws that we have within the province so that they can, in fact, meet those.

And so again, as indicated, we—it's unfortunate that we missed the opportunity to become partners within the New West agreement here with the other provinces so that we could work together with them in being able to allow business to—businesses to establish here. And, as I've said, they certainly do look at this province and then, when they see what's taking place here, that we're not connected with the other provinces, they move on. They move to some

place where they feel that they are welcome, that they would be able to expand and be able to grow their business, and that's certainly something that they look at and that they look forward to.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, again, I just want to thank you for the opportunity to put a few words on the record. And before I sit down I just want to indicate that, yes, we are in favour of this bill, but, again, with some of the—I guess, cautions that we're putting out regarding the intent of this bill as well. So, thank you very much.

Mr. David Faurshou (Portage la Prairie): I appreciate the comments that have been placed on the record during third reading debate of Bill 9, The Electricians' Licence Amendment Act.

The honourable member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck) outlined our concerns. However, I would like to look to the government members and state as very specific example of how we are disconnected with our western provinces.

The province of Saskatchewan is—economy is booming. They're looking for additional housing. They're looking to Manitoba and the ready-to-move home industry to provide for new dwellings. But what is happening is that because we don't have harmonized codes, as my honourable member for Pembina has made mention of, what takes place is that even though the electricians may be licensed and able to move from province to province to practise, the codes are slightly different, and therefore the ready-to-move homes, even though completed is the electrical installation by licensed electricians and inspected by licensed inspectors, they cannot enter Saskatchewan without a re-inspection of the electrical wiring of that particular new dwelling.

So, this government is not in tune or in step, with what effectively is an impediment to trade, but then again, maybe it's another example of a I-don't-care attitude of the current government and doesn't like business operating from province to province. And, yes, I know they're very envious of what's happening out in Saskatchewan and are maybe in very subtle manner trying to hold back Saskatchewan's progress by delaying deliveries of ready-to-move homes to persons wanting to move to Saskatchewan to take up careers in a very, very blossoming economy.

So thank you ever so much, Madam Deputy Speaker. It is a pleasure to rise this afternoon and participate on—

* (16:00)

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

In accordance with the sessional order adopted by the House on December 14th, 2009, by 4 o'clock p.m. today, the question on the concurrence motion to be moved in the House for concurrence in the Estimates must be achieved by 4 o'clock p.m. today.

The time is now 4 o'clock p.m.; therefore, I'm required to interrupt the proceedings and without seeing the clock put the question without further debate or amendment.

The current bill before the House must be set aside; therefore, I will now call upon the Government House Leader to move the concurrence motion.

Concurrence Motion

Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. Swan), that this House concur in the report of the Committee of Supply respecting concurrence in all Supply resolutions relating to the Estimates of Expenditure for the fiscal year ending March the 31st, 2010—[interjection]—Madam Deputy Speaker, I inadvertently said 2010 when I should've said 2011.

Madam Deputy Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Government House Leader, seconded by the honourable Minister of Justice, that this House concur in the report of the Committee of Supply respecting concurrence in all Supply resolutions relating to the Estimates of Expenditure for the fiscal year ending March the 31st, 2011.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Madam Deputy Speaker: No. Okay.

Voice Vote

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour, say aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Official Opposition House Leader): On division.

Madam Deputy Speaker: On division.

House Business

Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader): Yes, Madam Deputy Speaker, I understand that this—at this time it would be appropriate for you to canvass the House to see if there would be leave to resume third reading of bills and take up where we left off with Bill 9.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there agreement to continue with third reading of the bills we were previously doing prior to concurrence motion? *[Agreed]*

CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS

Bill 9—The Electricians' Licence Amendment Act (Continued)

Madam Deputy Speaker: The honourable member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Faurichou), who has 27 minutes remaining. No.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Yes, very briefly I just want to indicate that the principle of this particular bill is that—is positive in recognition of the importance of labour mobility. And what I just wanted to make reference to on this bill at this point, Madam Deputy Speaker, is just to try to bring, once again, to the attention of members—when we take a look at the many different professions that are out there that we get many people that come from other countries, not only the provinces in Canada.

And I think that at times we need to give greater—and a great deal more attention to the skill sets that are actually brought, not only from within Canada, but from many of those professionals that come from other countries that have many different types of skills, and we need to look and give more in terms of recognition for those types of credentials. In this particular bill when we talk about electricians it's encouraging to see that we are in fact moving forward in recognizing those skills that other electricians have in different provinces.

With those few words, Madam Deputy Speaker, we're prepared to see the bill pass.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 9, The Electricians' Licence Amendment Act.

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

Bill 10—The Proceedings Against the Crown Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will now move on to Bill 10, The Proceedings Against the Crown Amendment Act.

Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Swan) that Bill 10, The Proceedings Against the Crown Amendment Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon West): It's nice to be appreciated, on this side, particularly.

Madam Deputy Speaker, as was mentioned, Bill 10 is the Agreement on Internal Trade, which is very important, make no mistake about it. Manitoba cannot survive on consuming everything that it produces internally. We are a trading province. Actually, it's \$10 billion, I understand, is the number that we trade interprovincially, and there's \$10 billion that we trade internationally. So domestically, if you will, as consumers within the province of Manitoba, we depend on others for our economy here in Manitoba. That's a given. We recognize that. And Manitoba, in its wisdom, decided to enter into the Agreement on Internal Trade.

Now, Canada has been working towards a standardized agreement for internal trade—interprovincial trade—throughout the country for a number of years—many, many years, actually. And unfortunately, a number of trade barriers have been thrown up interprovincially, which didn't allow trade to go from province to province to province. This agreement, the AIT, is an attempt, and it's really only an attempt, it's not quite there yet, to open up those borders to internal or interprovincial trade. Now, when you're a signatory on the agreement, you

commit to certain requirements of that agreement, and what this bill is now saying and doing is that if you break the rules of that AIT agreement, if you don't comply to the rules and regulations of the agreement, then the party—the province that is not in compliance then gives the right to have the other partners in the agreement go to court in that province and put penalties in place for the province that is not going to comply, and there has been examples of this already with Ontario and Québec.

So this legislation is, at first blush, good legislation, no question about it. The AIT is a start, a good start, but unfortunately not everything that we should be looking at in order to encourage more trade for Manitoba into other provinces as well as encourage more manufacturing and more production of goods and services that we can trade. That's economics 101; that's what we're based on here in Manitoba.

So we now have a law here that will be passed that will say, if Manitoba doesn't comply to the AIT, then Manitoba will allow the other jurisdictions to take us to courts in Manitoba with a maximum penalty. The penalties are based on population and GDP, and they're on a sliding scale, and Manitoba's penalty right now is set at \$1.5 million, if we do not comply with what we've agreed to in the AIT.

Now, that in itself is or should be a stiff enough penalty, but we recognize that the Province of Manitoba really doesn't see \$1.5 million as being an awful lot of money, because we do recognize that they've wasted an awful lot more than \$1.5 million. They waste more than that before they have their first cup of coffee in the morning. They can come up with any number of ways to spending tax dollars in a rather frivolous fashion. I wouldn't even mention the \$1.75 billion that they plan on wasting on a west-side line or \$260 billion that they don't even know if they're going to get paid back—or \$260 million that they don't even know if they're going to get paid back on with an agreement that they have with a previously bankrupt company that's putting in a wind farm.

There's \$1.5 million if they wish to not comply with the agreement. It's really just a drop in the ocean to the Province of Manitoba, and they would probably let that run.

* (16:10)

But, Madam Deputy Speaker there's another issue here, not just simply the AIT, the Agreement

on Internal Trade. Interprovincial trade, which I just mentioned is so vital to the economy, so vital to the very positive economy here in Manitoba because we do have natural resources. We have mining, we have agriculture, we have manufacturing, albeit, the latest statistics are not all that positive with manufacturing, but I'll get on to that because there's a reason for it. You see the AIT is just—well, it's what the government of Manitoba hangs their hat on. It's that Pan-Canadian agreement that they want to enter into. It's the Pan-Canadian opportunities that we have here in Manitoba to extend from coast to coast to coast. But, unfortunately, others have shown some leadership when it comes to expanding their own economies and expanding the opportunities of trade between provinces.

I know they've heard of this agreement. I do know that for a fact. Whether they understand exactly what's embodied in the agreement remains yet to be seen. But there is a new agreement that other provinces have entered into and that's called the New West Partnership. It's an agreement of, again, internal trade between British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan. Now, the reason I mention the three partners in that particular agreement because there is one partner that is conspicuously absent in that agreement and that would be Manitoba.

Remember, Madam Deputy Speaker, we depend on trade interprovincially and internationally. A lot of our interprovincial trade goes west, goes into Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, which makes sense from a transportation perspective, which makes sense from the cultural opportunities that we have with our neighbours to the west. But we've kind of shunned that arrangement and that agreement. Well, whether we've shunned it or not, I don't know. Whether we've even been asked to enter into it is yet to be seen because we've asked the question of the minister on a number of occasions whether they—he or his staff actually had contact with the other three partners and his answer at that time was no, no, no, we don't even want to talk about it. We've never talked about it. Now, whether they've been asked to enter into that arrangement hasn't been answered or whether they have themselves asked to be a partner in it is highly unlikely because we seems to be—we seem to think—or Manitoba—the government of Manitoba seems to think that they're this island unto themselves, or this Pan-Canadian view, which isn't working all that well.

An Honourable Member: My money's on island.

Mr. Borotsik: So—my money's on island as well. So they don't really want to be a partner of anything else other than AIT. But now they've got this piece of legislation that's going to say that the other partners in AIT can sue Manitoba if they don't comply. But, you know, it seems that—whether the \$1.5 million is going to be a deterrent is a question. But if they don't like something it seems they just simply change the legislation, and I guess I'd have to refer to Bill 31 in that particular instance, because if they don't like something like a balanced budget legislation then let's just change the legislation to comply with what it is that they think is necessary for their own well-being. So Bill 31 deals with the remnants, the actual leftovers from balanced budget legislation because they've actually changed it twice previously. So if they can change Bill 31—if they can change the balanced budget legislation in Bill 31 they can probably change this legislation as well. If they didn't want to comply with it they could just simply change it or they could just simply pay a fine of \$1.5 million.

But what they can't do is they can't accomplish the trading arrangements that are necessary for Manitoba to grow its economy. They just can't do that because they shut off our partners to the west. They have slammed the door on our businesses who want to do that trade to the west. They have put into place roadblocks that have not allowed Manitoba businesses to grow their exports to the west because I think—I don't think I'm telling stories out at school, but if you have a block of three provinces to the west of us, and if a required service or good is needed in British Columbia, it would be my belief and thought—I could be wrong and maybe I will be proven wrong—but I would think that if you're trying to access a particular good, that you would access it from your partners, you'd access it from someplace in Saskatchewan or you'd access it from someplace in Alberta. You probably wouldn't go into Manitoba, who has not been a partner in that arrangement. That's just my thought, however, I—obviously, that thought isn't shared by members opposite.

And, I guess, that's even being reflected in some of the numbers that are coming out right now. We have the latest manufacturing numbers. And remember what I said; the three partners, B.C., Alberta, Saskatchewan, who have entered into this agreement, who not only want to trade interprovincially, but they also want to trade internationally. In fact, they have now set up a trading arm in China that is going to encourage not only goods that are manufactured in those three

provinces to be traded in China, but they're also going to encourage investment from China to come this way. So they've now got this rather large opportunity to sell their bloc of trade—their trade bloc to China.

Now Manitoba's left out of that. We know that. So we've got our own trading representative in China right now. But we think that our 50 billion GDP and million people are going to be able to compete with Saskatchewan, Manitoba and—or Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia.

But, it's reflected already in numbers, the latest numbers that came out the end of April, this year, on manufacturing sales. Now remember what I said about trade. We manufacture goods. We produce goods, agriculture. We produce goods from mining and energy. We produce goods but we also manufacture, and that's very important because manufacturing jobs are very highly prized jobs, highly valuable jobs, well-paid jobs. That's where the economy—it's called production. And I know from members opposite, they don't care whether there's actually productivity in the business sector, but it's really important that the business sector have productivity. As a matter of fact, that was mentioned just recently by Mark Carney. He wants productivity to be increased in all the provinces.

But that productivity is decreasing here in Manitoba and you ask yourself why: Is it because the government of the day is anti-business? Is it because of the regulations that they put into place, impeding business? Is it because of the high taxes that we have in place that impedes business? Is it because of a payroll tax that they have in place that impedes business? Why is it that our manufacturing sector, so vital to our economy, is, in fact, decreasing?

And, Madam Deputy Speaker, I'll give you the numbers. As of April 30th, 2010, Saskatchewan has increased its manufacturing sales, productivity, trade. Saskatchewan has increased productivity and sales by 12.7 percent. Alberta—now this is just recent, this is April of this year. Alberta has increased their manufacturing sales by 12.5 percent. British Columbia has increased its manufactured sales by 8.1 percent.

But, Manitoba, at that same—as at April 30th, 2010, has decreased in manufacturing sales by 8.2 percent. So our three partners to the west, who aren't our partners, have increased quite dramatically in their manufacturing sales and we've decreased. So that—that's scary. That's very scary, actually.

But we've got the AIT, don't forget. We got the Agreement on Internal Trade, which is Pan-Canadian. But, it doesn't matter whether we're going down in manufacturing sales of 8.2 percent.

Let me just read what StatsCan said: Manitoba is down from last year and down from last month, while the Canadian average is up over both time periods.

So if we're going to be Pan-Canadian, you would think that we would be able to maintain the average of the Canadian average of manufacturing sales, but no, we're down. Manitoba's down both from month to month and year to year.

It also says, Madam Deputy Speaker that—and this is very important: Manitoba is the only province, besides Prince Edward Island, which is a huge manufacturing entity.

Believe me, I mean, it's really good to have Manitoba competing with Prince Edward Island on manufacturing. Manitoba is the only province besides P.E.I. to have seen a reduction year over year. But that's okay, we've got the AIT. We can do interprovincial trade but we can't do trade with our three western partners: B.C., Alberta and Saskatchewan. We can't do that because either we weren't asked to join or we never asked them to join—to have us join.

* (16:20)

Okay, now, here, Manitoba has the—okay, this is really scary. Manitoba has the largest decline in sales of all provinces, both month to month and year to year. Manitoba has the largest decline of all provinces. Even P.E.I. beat us, and they are this master of manufacturing. So Manitoba has, in fact, fallen quite far behind every other province in the country, but that's okay, we have the AIT and we're going to pass a piece of legislation now that says, if we don't comply with those rules of internal trade, then they can sue us if they want.

Well, as I said earlier, the fine isn't all that great and I'm sure the Province would be able to find that in some slush fund somewhere, but even if they did pay the fine, it still doesn't make any sense to the fact that we don't have the productivity that we need in order to trade between the provinces.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, the bill is innocuous. It is, in fact, forced on the government. It's not something that they have put forward by leadership of the department. It's been forced on

them because all partners of the AIT were asked to pass this piece of legislation, so it's been forced on them. There's no great thought process that's gone into it from the department. Believe me, there's no thought process that's gone into it from the department. So we'll comply with the AIT. What we can't comply with is the competition to the west of us, the competition to the east of us and the fact that we're going to stand alone, our manufacturing is going to continue to decline and this government's going to continue to take us further and further behind every other province in the country.

So thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Deputy Speaker, just to say that we support this legislation. We support better internal trade. We also support the western economic partnership, the New West Partnership, which, sadly, the government does not seem to support. Thank you.

Mr. David Faurshou (Portage la Prairie): I do appreciate the opportunity to rise and participate in third reading debate of Bill 10, which involves, as the explanatory note states: to promote labour mobility within Canada.

But I want to cite a specific example that we're not that welcoming of professionals with career skills that we are wanting to attract to Manitoba and I speak, specifically, of an individual who—stellar accreditation received in the United Kingdom—wanted to come to Manitoba to teach and promote the skills that he'd acquired as a carpenter and was delighted to come to Manitoba because he'd heard so much about our province and, indeed, wanted to become a resident. This individual came to Manitoba and wanted to become a teacher in the vocational studies and to provide carpentry skills to young Manitobans. He was informed that he would have to be recognized as a journeyman carpenter in order to be able to provide instruction in the carpentry skills. He was very appreciative of being told that he had to prove himself within the province of Manitoba that he did, indeed, possess those skills, those carpentry skills, and it was required that he spend a minimum of six months applying those carpentry skills through the—working here in the province of Manitoba for six months.

After five months of working as a carpenter with the particular firm, this same firm, whom which he was being employed by, took on a contract to make the forms for a concrete elevator being constructed.

He continued to work for the same employer. He was working with wood, making the forms for the concrete elevator.

However, it was this Province that determined that he was no longer working with wood and employing his carpentry skills because he was engaged in construction of a concrete elevator. So, not only did this person end up not getting credit for working on the construction of the concrete elevator towards his apprenticeship and journeyman status, but this government saw fit to restart the clock.

The five months that he'd be employed as a carpenter meant nada, nothing, and he had to restart his employs as a carpenter so that they would not be considered as being interrupted, because the current law states that one has to be employed in the skilled trade for a continuous six-months period.

I don't know what we can say about this government and wanting to attract skilled labour to Manitoba with a example of which I've just described. I would suggest that this government doesn't really want skilled tradespersons to come to Manitoba, because they obviously are making the most of roadblocks to the fine, very fine print of the requirements to become a journeyman professional here, especially in the carpentry skills.

And this story was related to myself. And the determination of this individual, that wanted to take up residency in Manitoba and to become a proud Canadian and to share his skills acquired through the workplace with the next generation, were very much tarnished by this experience. But he did persevere and he is now proudly a Canadian. He's proudly teaching in the classroom and wants to be known as a true Manitoban. And so for that I say congratulations and express our very, very much support in your determination to become a resident of Manitoba. Thank you.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 10, The Proceedings Against the Crown Amendment Act.

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

Bill 12—The Pimachiowin Aki World Heritage Fund Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will now move on to Bill 12, The Pimachiowin Aki World Heritage Fund Act.

Hon. Dave Chomiak (Deputy Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Swan), that Bill 12, The Pimachiowin Aki World Heritage Fund Act; Loi sur le Fonds du patrimoine mondial Pimachiowin Aki, reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

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

Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden): Madam Deputy Speaker, it's my privilege to be able to speak to Bill 12, The Pimachiowin Aki World Heritage Fund Act.

* (16:30)

And I wanted to just say that we support this act—that we support this bill going forward. We support the development in—of the cultural and natural heritage areas in the area on the boreal forest on the east side of Lake Winnipeg, and we support the initiative of the fund being established to make sure that it's protecting and looking after the future development of cultural activities in those areas, and I think this is a very important issue. We'll be dealing with other areas in that later this afternoon as well, Madam Deputy Speaker.

This act affects the heritage project, and it's a joint initiative between Poplar River, Little Grand Rapids, Bloodvein, Pauingassi and Pikangikum First Nations, which make up the non-profit charity that forms this corporation and it has the support of the governments from Manitoba, and, hopefully, as the minister has pointed out, has the support of Ontario now, but, hopefully, the financial support down the road as well, as it covers some of the area that is in the eastern side of the Manitoba border in Ontario.

This area, Madam Deputy Speaker, we support, and I support as well, the recognizing Prime Minister Harper's initiatives around the cultural and heritage opportunity, the culture of First Nations people and some of the wrongs that were made. We're seeing the Truth and Reconciliation work going on as we speak,

at The Forks in regards to the situation. I know my Unity Riders from Canupawakpa the—Chief Gus High Eagle and the members of the reserve there are riding—have ridden, I guess. Today they were to be at The Forks at 3 o'clock, and because of debate in the House and other—and the weather, I wasn't able to be there this afternoon.

But it's a credit, I think, to the development and intensity of feeling in regards to the maintaining and wanting to make sure they maintain the culture of the First Nations communities, that Chief Gus High Eagle and some of the—or Mr. High Eagle and some of the members, I should say, of the reserve in Canupawakpa, have taken it upon themselves to ride from Pipestone, Manitoba, up through Virden, to Sioux Valley, to Brandon, to Carberry, on and through Portage la Prairie, and arrived here at The Forks today in a symbolic gesture of support. And I think that that is part of this bill.

It's the importance of maintaining the culture on the east side of—First Nations communities on the east side of Lake Winnipeg in that boreal forest area, and it also supports the funds, the \$10 million that the government has committed to put forward in this area. Of course, they were hoping that it would be matched by another \$10 million in private funds to be raised in that area and that the interest off of these funds would be used to expand cultural developments and maintain their heritage and put up sites in these reserves, at least one of them, to maintain that culture.

It's also to be hoped that once—that a further step involved in this area would be the UNESCO designation in the area on the east side of Lake Winnipeg as a World Heritage site and that some of the interest income from this fund would be used to support the operation of that site that I was referring to earlier. We would certainly support that. We supported it, as we did when I was transport critic, supported the building of the road up the east side of Lake Winnipeg to have more access into some of our First Nations communities. We would hope that, eventually, some of the winter road areas could be turned into more permanent roads to be used for access into some of our First Nations communities in those areas as well.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I just wanted to say that, you know, in '08, the International Institute of Sustainable Development published an ecosystems services valuation assessment regarding that Pimachiowin Aki World Heritage project area. And

in other words, they tried to assess the economic aspects of the proposed heritage site, and I quote: While some spiritual and cultural benefits could not be easily valued in economic terms, ecosystems services such as carbon sequestration, tourism, clean air and water reduces and—pardon me—and clean air and water resources do indeed have measurable economic value. The measurements are not exact, and some benefits cannot be measured in dollar amounts, but using a valuation approach, the overall ecosystem service value provided by Pimachiowin Aki was estimated to be approximately \$121 and—or 121.35 to 130.3 million per year. End quote.

Madam Deputy Speaker, they worked—their work lists some of the ecosystems services the region provides and their economic value. These included food harvested by hunting and fishing and the cultural—and the cultivation, rather, of wild rice.

And so these are some of the important areas of concerns to the development of this east-side area, and there's also a value for the fur harvested from trapping in the forest and value of the water supply needed to supply and produce electricity, Madam Deputy Speaker, and, of course, we've seen the discussion around that area. And I know that it wisely pointed out that in—it's been possible to have a hydro—a transmission line going down the east side of Lake Winnipeg along with the World Heritage site, and we've had that announced many times in the House. All members of the House are aware of that and acknowledge it, and I'd say that, you know, our views on Bipole III being in that area are very well known, and we, too, strongly believe that it's important to have a—to have both a transmission line and a heritage site on the east side, and that was also pointed out by the member from River Heights in earlier debates in this House as well.

So there's only one party that doesn't think that this is possible, Madam Deputy Speaker, but this bill can, of course, then allow for the preservation. And I believe that a road up the east side would allow us have access to more First Nations communities. It would allow them the opportunity to be less isolated than they presently are. It would allow for opportunities to have goods and supplies and services moved into those areas on a more regular basis, and it can make possible—with the use of very careful planning, this could very well come about to have both Bipole III and a road and access in that region. And with careful planning, it comes into designating a transmission route to ensure that at

least—that the least, the very least environmental impact possible to the forest takes place.

So in closing, Madam Deputy Speaker, I'd like to extend my thanks to all of the stakeholders who have invested hundreds and hundreds of hours in the development of the proposal related to the UNESCO designation, and I'd like to reiterate I and my colleague's support in moving forward on this bill. I know that there were concerns expressed around this bill in regards to what if UNESCO, for some reason, didn't provide us with a heritage site on the boreal forest, but it's very apparent that the funds would at least be used—at the very least be used to maintain culture and heritage opportunities in those areas, and only if and when a UNESCO designation is given, would funds from the interest of the 10 or—10 to \$20-million fund that's being set up be used to actually promote the site for the cultural and heritage.

And they refer to a site, but I believe that with the five First Nations involved, that there could be more than one site in this area set up because there are more cultures and more First Nations groups on the east side, bands in those areas, that have varying cultures amongst themselves—and I know that from the First Nations in my own area and the situation that they are dealing with there, and a good deal of cultural development being preserved, I think—and I think that's the key word here is the preservation of a number of these cultural activities and heritage activities are very important in our—as we continue to move forward in this being the 140th year of our culture in Manitoba, of becoming a Province, Madam Deputy Speaker, and becoming more and more aware of the heritage that we've seen.

We'll be dealing later on today with a bill, Bill 27, to—which is looking at the preservation of the Upper Fort Garry site that we have just down the street here at the corner of Main Street and Assiniboine Avenue, Madam Deputy Speaker. And I think that, with those words, I'd just like to say again that we do support the Pimachiowin Aki World Heritage project as the fund—act, Bill 12, has been presented, but we just feel strongly that the government needs to make sure that they stay on top of this to make sure that these developments of sites for cultural purposes actually are continued and that we work together, between the cultural development and the economic development, that will help preserve the industries and the way of life that we have in Manitoba through the development of

roadways and other hydro transmission projects as well.

And, with those words, I look forward to the passage of this bill.

* (16:40)

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise just to indicate that we in the Liberal Party support Bill 12, The Pimachiowin Aki World Heritage site—Fund Act, and that we are looking forward to the day when the World Heritage site will be there and that this support is one step in moving things forward. Thank you.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 12, The Pimachiowin Aki World Heritage Fund Act.

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

Bill 15—The Franchises Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will now move on to The Franchises Act, Bill 15.

Hon. Dave Chomiak (Deputy Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Swan), that Bill 15, The Franchises Act; Loi sur les franchises, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon West): Once again, Madam Deputy Speaker, this is another example, by the way, of a department that is absolutely bereft of any of their own innovative ideas. It's a piece of legislation, once again, that is insisted upon or brought forward by another organization or body, not something that's coming from the department itself to assist with entrepreneurship or trade or training, for that matter, but it's a piece of legislation that was actually suggested by the Manitoba Law Reform Commission because it's a bill modelled on the Uniform Franchises Act that was prepared by the Uniform Law Conference of Canada.

So, and don't get me wrong; the bill is good. It's got some merit, it's—and I'll explain in a little bit about the standardization of franchise requirements and disclosure of franchisors—but it's not a bill that was instituted by the department. It was actually forced on the department. It probably were forced kicking and screaming to get it here at this point in time. But it's really a very good piece of legislation because it talks about standardization. It talks about standardization of franchise requirements across the country.

So, if you're a franchisor, and you want to set up a franchise in Nova Scotia, and you want to take that franchise and put it into Manitoba or Alberta or British Columbia, then what you're going to be given is the same legislative requirements in all of those provinces. So, a franchisor, their job is made much easier because they have a packet that they put together. There's disclosure requirements with respect to financial disclosure, with respect to disclosure on what it is that they're going to provide for the franchisee for a franchise fee, they're going to disclose what the cost of that franchise fee is and any ongoing royalties that are attached to it, and that's very positive because there's some very expensive franchises out there and there's—it's nice to have protections, both side—protections for the franchisor and protections for the franchisee. But, again, it was legislation that was implemented by others and brought forward by a department, as I said, that really hasn't had any real innovative bills come forward in this session of the Legislature.

What it does, Madam Deputy Speaker, is speaks to a very important part of our economy, and I know members opposite probably don't even understand what franchises are, but it's a very important part of our economy. There are quite a number of franchises that we have already in the province of Manitoba and one would think—I know this—even mentioning think in the same concept of government is a little hard to understand, but one would think that the government, when they were trying to put together a model bill—now this isn't rocket science, okay—there's a model piece of legislation that they bring to the Province of Manitoba and say, okay, we want you to implement this so the standards are the same across the country—pretty simple—that you would probably, at that point in time, follow the model bill first of all, but secondly, you would probably talk to the people who are being affected by the legislation.

In fact, there's an organization, believe it or not, that deals specifically with franchisors. It's called the

Canadian Franchise Association and they made a wonderful presentation to committee last night.

An Honourable Member: Wonderful.

Mr. Borotsik: It was, it was great because they said, why didn't you talk to us? Why didn't you ask us what was wrong with the legislation that you put forward?

And I asked a simple question. I asked a simple question to the presenters. I said, did the government talk to you when they were drafting this legislation? The answer was pretty obvious when they said no. No—no, government didn't even talk to us when they were trying to take a model piece of legislation, put it forward in Manitoba and they even—they couldn't even accomplish that without having four amendments come forward last night. They had to amend their own legislation in committee, their own amendments, their own legislation, because they couldn't follow a model act.

And the franchise association said there are still other concerns we have with Manitoba's legislation but with the amendments, it makes it a little bit better.

But again, the question was: why not ask the people who are being affected for their input before you put a piece of legislation forward that can't even follow a simple template?

So here's the deal. The ministry, the Department of Entrepreneurship, Training and Trade—this isn't innovative. This isn't something that they came up with. This was something that was forced on them by the Manitoba review committee. So they bring it forward—they can't even bring it forward in a logical fashion so that they have to amend it three or four times in committee. And they don't even ask the people that are—they don't even ask the people that really understand what's going on.

As a matter of fact, I just want to read one paragraph from the presentation that was presented last night. This is from the Canadian Franchise Association: The CFA has a strong history of working with governments to help ensure that the needs of all stakeholders are represented and considered in the development of franchise legislation.

I guess, maybe, they didn't understand that. Okay, the CFA has a strong history of working with government to help ensure the needs of all stakeholders are represented and considered in the

development of franchise legislation. The CFA's Legal and Legislative Affairs Committee includes—are you ready for this Madam Deputy Speaker—Canada's leading franchise lawyers, whose breadth of experience with franchise legislation is substantial and worthy of serious consideration.

Well, let's put a piece of legislation forward, as the minister and his department says, let's not talk to the experts, let's not talk about putting together the template on the model piece of legislation, let's go ad hoc, throw it in there. And besides, we don't even have any ideas—anything else that we can put forward in this legislation with the department. So we're going to put it forward. And they did, and they, unfortunately, once again, failed again.

The legislation, as amended, will go forward and it's not a bad thing. As I said earlier, standardization is not bad so that franchisors and franchisees know the law when they're dealing with Manitoba. So we'll support the legislation. But, perhaps, there could be a lesson learned from the minister and the department. When they want to put legislation forward, perhaps, talk to the people that it's affecting, talk to the industry, and perhaps, talk to the experts, before they put their signature on a piece of legislation that really was deficient when it first came forward, a little bit better now, and certainly, is a step in the—a small step in the right direction.

But, again, maybe they'll change the legislation like they are wont to do. If they don't like it, perhaps they'll change it, like they did Bill 31. When they were probably more concerned with protecting their own salaries than they were about franchisors and franchisees. That takes a lot of time and a lot of energy, protecting your own salary, making sure that balanced budget legislation is also changed, so that they don't have to comply with balanced budget legislation.

So, maybe they were a little—they had more concerns in their mind, Madam Deputy Speaker, than franchise legislation. So they protect their salaries, put forward a piece of legislation that is, in fact, going to assist franchisors and franchisees, and we will see if, at any other time throughout the next part of the government, that the minister can actually put forward some legislation that he's not forced to put forward by somebody else's thinking.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

* (16:50)

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 15, The Franchises Act.

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

Bill 17—The Biofuels Amendment Act

Hon. Dave Chomiak (Deputy Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Swan), that Bill 17, The Biofuels Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les biocarburants, reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon West): I don't want to take up the time of the House, but I know that the Minister of Innovation, Energies and Mines would love to be able to hear some of the comments with respect to Bill 17, the biofuels act.

Actually, Madam Deputy Speaker, I will give the minister a compliment because in the title it does say innovation, and, actually, this is a bill that wasn't forced on the government, it actually came from his department to assist the development of biofuels here in the province of Manitoba.

So there was some thought put into this. It wasn't necessary to have somebody else go to the minister and say, okay, we think you should do this. He and his department actually put some thought into how they were going to assist the production of biofuels here in Manitoba. So I give him credit for that. I really do. I give him full marks for actually thinking outside the box and, perhaps, bringing something forward that was different than what had been in place previously. And it is different, because in this particular piece of legislation, the government is going away from a subsidy on biofuels and going towards a grant.

Now, you may think that that's fairly innocuous in itself—going away from a subsidy, but going towards a grant—but when you think about it, just simply paying a subsidy on the production of biofuels, it was a 20-cent, I believe—it was a

20-cent subsidy on every litre. And what that meant is that if there were just simply one process or a producer here in the province of Manitoba who was producing biofuels, then that full 20 cents per litre would go to that one corporation.

There is a cap, a cap of 20 million litres that has to be produced in order to comply with this legislation and it was up until not that long ago, we didn't have enough production here in the province of Manitoba—the 20 million litres—so we put into place a mandate—no, we didn't—the government put into place a mandate of 2 percent biofuels to be used in the province of Manitoba.

So all of the major gasoline suppliers, all the major fuel suppliers had to make sure that their diesel fuel had a 2 percent bio mix—biofuel mix. That, in itself—we're not going to talk about the mandate because that was set by the NDP government. But then they said, in order to do that 2 percent, we need 20 million litres, and we didn't have it here in the province of Manitoba. So we had to go outside into the U.S. to bring it in.

So that didn't make a lot of sense. We're basically subsidizing American processors. So now they've said, okay, we're going to do a grant in Manitoba, and it's not just simply going to be for the first processor to come up with 20 million litres, but we're going to be able, through the minister's office, decide who we're going to pay that grant to. And we do have one right now—it's called Speedway, here in Manitoba—who could produce the full 20 million litres.

But there's also a couple of other opportunities here in the province of Manitoba. As a matter of fact, one of them is in Beausejour in the constituency of one of my members—one of my colleagues, and another one is in Arborg. So the government, in its wisdom, and I do congratulate them for it, they said, well, no, rather than just throw all of our eggs in one basket, let's make sure we've got other people that are producing biofuels. And so that's what this is going to accomplish.

However—there's always a however, there's always a but—the final decision as to who's going to receive those grants lies with the minister. Now, any businessperson who's going to invest a substantial amount of capital would like to have commitments and confirmation of the grants that are going to be paid and at what levels and what limits that they can produce and what grants they're going to get. Now, the minister's going to have the final say. And what

we would like to see is some type of an appeal process, because if the minister doesn't like someone for whatever reason, then the grant, whether it be applied for or not, would not be given to that individual.

We think it's important that they develop new processors here in the province of Manitoba. We think it's important that there be an opportunity to encourage processors through a grant process or a subsidy, but we're getting rid of the subsidy.

So I do—I would like to very briefly say that we are going to support this legislation, with some reluctance because there still are not enough safeguards in there outside of the minister's office to ensure that it may well be done the way it should be done to encourage that growth in biodiesel.

So thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and I'm sure this legislation will pass. And I do hope that the minister is successful in getting 20 million litres of biodiesel here in the province of Manitoba.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 17, The Biofuels Amendment Act.

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

Bill 18—The Communities Economic Development Fund Amendment Act

Hon. Dave Chomiak (Deputy Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Swan) that Bill 18, The Communities Economic Development Fund Amendment Act, Loi modifiant la Loi sur le Fonds de développement économique local, reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and be now for the third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mrs. Leanne Rowat (Minnedosa): Madam Deputy Speaker, and I'd like to put a few words on the record with regard to Bill 18, The Communities Economic Development Fund Amendment Act. This bill will allow the Communities Economic Development Fund, or the CEDF, to manage the funds for others.

It will allow them to provide assistance to applicants, even though there may be, they may not

be able to find financial assistance elsewhere. And the bill is to clarify and allow the board of the CEDF to obtain necessary advice required to carry out its mandate. This is a fund, Madam Deputy Speaker, that I think is critical to rural or to northern communities. It's a fund that actually provides an economic stimulus to business owners who are looking at opportunities to provide jobs and economic opportunities for individuals living in northern communities.

We have seen over the past few years a number of issues with regard to this fund, and so we encourage the government to continue to ensure that this funds and the dollars that are being allocated through this fund, are actually going and being earmarked for projects that are important to communities. We have seen this fund provide dollars for Burnaby Bakery, and it wasn't really for a Burnaby Bakery, but it was for an individual who owned a Burnaby Bakery. But this individual didn't even have enough resources actually to even leave Burnaby and was looking at setting up a business in Churchill.

* (17:00)

So we do need government, or we do this fund to be able to determine, you know, businesses that are going to work within the communities.

We understand that there may not be huge resources available, but we have to understand that this, these companies or these businesses actually do as they say they're going to do and provide opportunities for communities.

Many northern communities face significant geographic isolation and individuals who seek to invest their capital or start business ventures face significant challenges they must overcome and a community economic development fund can play an important role in helping to surmount some of these hurdles.

Mr. Rob Altemeyer, Acting Speaker, in the Chair

When I've met with individuals from northern communities they have shared some very interesting stories with regard to challenges such as low graduation rates, the prevalence of substance abuse and crime. And as there's no real magic bullet to solve these problems, economic development can be instrumental in helping to remedy some of the causes which give root to these challenges.

In the north, many communities suffer staggering high unemployment rates and often resources cannot be—can be out of reach. So when economic development occurs in these communities it not only provides investors and business owners a benefit but it also provides the entire community with opportunities.

Economic development provides for employment and brings added resources and services. And programs like the CEDF, when properly implemented, can play an important role in ensuring that northern Manitobans have access to needed financial resources to invest in business opportunities throughout northern Manitoba.

This bill expands the scope and power of the Communities Economic Development Fund, giving it the ability to manage the fund of others. Any time this government expands the function or scope of its programs Manitobans must be careful. We are concerned that the current act does not have sufficient enough safeguards or oversight and this could lead to abuse without careful oversight, monitoring and limits.

This bill also indirectly expands the mandate of the CEDF by removing the requirement of it being a lender of last resort. With this expansion this side of the House will continue to monitor the operations of the Communities Economic Development Fund to ensure that they are loaning to sound individuals who will be able to make real contributions to the economy of the north.

As I had spoken earlier with regard to the Burnaby Bakery, we don't want to see situations like that occur again. We also understand that Flin Flon has one of those—one loan that is in question and I believe that this is something that the Communities Economic Development Fund should be looking at—are reviewing or auditing businesses that have received money several years ago and those businesses are not up and running. They are not providing a service to the community and remain vacant and empty buildings in the community.

So I encourage the Minister responsible for Communities Economic Development Fund to fulfil a promise that he made to me when I was the critic for Aboriginal and Northern Affairs, that he would set up a meeting with me with the fund so that I would have a better understanding of the role and of the CEDF, and the mandate of the CEDF because I do still have very serious concerns and questions with regard to this fund.

I believe it is something that the communities of the north rely on to build economic stability within their communities, is needed within those communities, and I believe that it would serve the entire Legislature if both sides of the House had a clear understanding of the mandate.

So I encourage the minister to set up a meeting with the now-critic for Aboriginal and Northern Affairs just to ensure that we understand the new rules and mandate of this amended act. And, as I said earlier, the communities of the north deserve as much opportunity as the communities in the south. So I look forward to seeing this bill providing those opportunities for the people in northern Manitoba.

Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

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 concurrence and third reading of Bill 18, The Communities Economic Development Fund Amendment Act.

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

Bill 23—The Public Schools Amendment Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer): Now calling Bill 23, The Public Schools Amendment Act.

Hon. Dave Chomiak (Deputy Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice—*[interjection]*

Well, you know, in fact, Mr. Acting Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Education (Ms. Allan), that Bill 23, The Public Schools Amendment Act, Loi modifiant la loi sur les écoles publiques, reported from the Standing Committee on Legislative Affairs, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed. So there.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer): It has been moved by the honourable acting Government House Leader, seconded by the Minister of Education, that Bill 23, The Public Schools Amendment Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Legislative Affairs, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Mr. Cliff Cullen (Turtle Mountain): It's a pleasure to rise today in third reading on Bill 23, an amendment to The Public Schools Act, and,

obviously, we on this side of the House recognize the important role that education plays in the province of Manitoba and the importance of education going forward and we firmly believe that, you know, a good public education system and a good education system is very, very important to the future of Manitoba and we certainly are supportive of this particular piece of legislation that is being discussed today. We look forward to having the bill pass and receiving royal assent later today.

There is certainly a few provisions in the bill which a number of parties are looking for, across the province, and we're certainly looking forward to having this legislation move forward. We do have letters of support from a number of organizations in support of this particular legislation, and I think it is important that both the government and opposition members take the opportunity to fully review the legislation and also have a discussion with stakeholders and, in this case, there's a number of stakeholders involved in education around the province here in Manitoba.

And I know one of the issues in this particular piece of legislation deals with the idea of having a certificate of completion for students, and the certificate of completion is a little different than a graduation certificate. It's not something new. A lot of school divisions are awarding certificates of completion and it's something different than a graduation certificate. So what the legislation is doing is basically bringing into legislation something that is already happening throughout Manitoba already.

And, you know, there is going to be some regulations associated with that and we look forward to seeing what those regulations are. We're certainly hopeful that the regulations the government is talking about will be similar to the guidelines that have been established already and just to review some of the guidelines that have been put forward in terms of the certificate of completion.

Obviously, it has to be approved by the principal, and the fact is that these certificates are going to be awarded to what I would call special needs children, those that wouldn't normally fit within the regular curriculum of the school. So it really goes to those with some kind of a cognitive disability so that they don't have the ability to complete the full workload, the full course load that would be associated with a normal high school curriculum.

You know, obviously, we know the—under The Public Schools Act, the regular student must complete four years in a seniors program and also have reached that criteria by the age of 21. So what this particular certificate would do would recognize those students that have a cognitive disability that maybe wouldn't be able to ascertain that full, regular graduation certificate. And it is something that is being carried out in school divisions across the province already.

Certainly, the Manitoba Teachers' Society support this initiative as well. We have heard from the Manitoba Association of Parent Councils, who are quite actively involved in our students' education across the province, and we have heard from them who also are in support of this particular certificate of completion.

*(17:10)

And, you know, we've also heard from the Manitoba Federation of Independent Schools, as well. You know, we have several thousand students going to independent schools across the province, and those independent schools also feel that the certificate of completion makes a lot of sense for those particular students. And again, it's a practice that they are carrying out. So this particular legislation will basically just codify what is happening there already.

And the Manitoba school boards—of course, we talked earlier about the Manitoba schools boards and their role in education here and across Manitoba; that was related to Bill 6. We certainly appreciate the good job they're doing, and they are also in support of—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer): Order.

I know we're all having a really good time. But I think our speaker is having trouble hearing himself speak. So, if we can keep it down a few decibels, that would be much appreciated.

Mr. Cullen: Well, Mr. Acting Speaker, it's good to see everybody engaged and having a discussion about education here in the province of Manitoba. You know, we look forward to continuing that discussion about education, and we do look forward on this side of the House working with the key stakeholders in education around the province.

We firmly believe that it's time for some innovation in a lot of areas around Manitoba, and, certainly, innovation in education is something that

we embrace here on this side. And we certainly want to embrace parents as well. We certainly believe that parents play an important role in the education of our children, and we firmly believe that we as legislators should be listening to what parents have to say.

You know, we as parents and we as legislators have a real important responsibility to the education of our youth here in the province. And we want to make sure that we are providing a education where our students can come out and they can be quite competitive with not just other provinces, but in this day and age we have to be competitive with other countries around the world. So it's really important that we are providing a quality product to our students. And I think maybe on that note, I think that's where we should leave it today.

We do support this particular legislation, but there's always room for improvement in, you know, whatever program we're talking about.

So I just thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker, for that opportunity to talk about this particular legislation. Thank you.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Acting Speaker, I just want to put a few words on the record with regards to Bill 23, as ultimately we see it as a bill that does provide a little bit more in terms of transparency and protocol and dealing with land and disposition of school division properties.

I know at times the way in which properties have been dealt with has been questioned, and I'm thinking in terms of a number of years ago, the Seven Oaks School Division. The bottom line is, Mr. Acting Speaker, is that school trustees and so forth, their focus at 99.9 percent of the time is on the—providing good quality education and a wonderful service to our students that are within the public system, and their efforts should be applauded in that area. Things of this nature are necessary type of legislation that we have before us, in order to ensure that there's other issues that are dealt with.

And all in all, I think that we're moving forward by passing of this particular legislation. But I also wanted just to take this opportunity to highlight something that was in committee the other night in regards to the whole issue of property taxes and the need to have the education portion of property tax shifted away and more into general revenues, something in which we've advocated for many, many years and, ultimately, would like to see the government take more action in that area.

Anyway, having said that, Mr. Acting Speaker, we're prepared to see the bill pass. Thank you.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer): Question before the House is concurrence and third reading on Bill 23, The Public Schools Amendment Act.

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

Bill 24—The Aboriginal Languages Recognition Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Altemeyer): Now calling Bill 24, The Aboriginal Languages Recognition Act.

Hon. Eric Robinson (Minister of Aboriginal and Northern Affairs): Yes, Mr. Acting Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Blaikie), that Bill 24, The Aboriginal Languages Recognition Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and now be read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Robinson: Well, I want to, first of all, thank the indication of support by all members of this Chamber. The First Minister (Mr. Selinger) and I just came back from a ceremony at The Forks as part of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's ongoing work in hearing testimony from survivors of the residential school system that was among us for over a century. And, truly, some of the stories that the people had to tell was inspiring and, to some degree, hurtful.

It was very difficult to hear from the women that I sat with yesterday, women now in their 60s and late 50s that experienced the abuse, sexual abuse, the rapes that they endured at the hands of people that worked in churches. I think the understanding that Aboriginal people have come to now is that it wasn't the institutions, the churches, and not so much the government, even though the government had the responsibility—the national government—of sending people like myself to these institutions, but it was, in fact, the people that worked in these institutions that were the perpetrators of hurt that has lasted for generations.

Ms. Marilyn Brick, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

And what was truly remarkable to hear yesterday when Minister Strahl, the Minister of Indian Affairs, and I sat in the circle along with National Chief Shawn Atleo was to hear first-hand about the experiences that these women experienced, because what they experienced was literal torture by the people that were supposed to take care of them and provide them with an education.

And hearing that was very hard, and the purpose of this national gathering here in Winnipeg this week is to hear from people like that whose voices are not often heard, and we want to reconcile, obviously, I believe that is the underlying tone in the gathering that is occurring this week in Winnipeg.

But, more so, I believe that it's an opportunity for people to get to know one another, whether you're Aboriginal or a non-Aboriginal, and it's also an opportunity for churches to be a part of that process, for many of these people that are now representatives of churches, who were not even born during the height of the residential school experienced by some of these Aboriginal people. And it gives us an opportunity to talk as human beings, whether we have brown skin or whether or not—whether we have lighter skin. It gives us an opportunity to come together and to learn to understand and to respect each other in a little greater detail.

We, the Premier and I, this afternoon took part in the Unity Ride that arrived in Winnipeg that started at Canupawakpa in the constituency of the honourable member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Maguire), and I know that the member for Arthur-Virden is a good friend of many of these people from that region of our province. They organized this ride as part of a traditional understanding of the Dakota people because the horse does not only represent a means of transportation, but the horses are sacred animals in the culture of Aboriginal people. And when they were brought into the Oodena circle, these horses, it was meant because they are, too, a creation of God or the Creator, came to hear the speeches that were made this afternoon by not only the Premier, but, indeed, by the elder Albert Taylor, who is a man who is in his 83rd year.

* (17:20)

And Mr. Taylor talked about his experiences about running away from residential school and winding up in Louisiana, and that was during the time of war. He also talked about his experiences and

the negative things that have happened to him as a result of rebelling on the hurt that he experienced as a little boy in residential school.

For many of us, we became alcoholics, drug addicts. It's not something that we're now very proud of talking about, and it takes a long time, and many people go to their graves without ever talking about the experience that they had. And for many of us, we are just slowly starting to express a little more as to what exactly it was we experienced. And I was grateful that we had the opportunity, the Premier (Mr. Selinger) and I, of meeting some elders, some people that are the faith and knowledge keepers of the traditional way of life of Aboriginal people.

And we hope with this first national gathering that's occurring in Winnipeg, and the speeches we heard yesterday and today, and since I've been down there, we have heard that one of the things that they attacked was the languages of our people. Not only did the children, like myself, at a very early age to get taken away and put in this institution that was going to civilize me and teach me, or give me an education, but they also talked about our children being taken away from their parents' embrace.

I heard yesterday from a pilot whose job it was to go round up these children in remote communities in northern Manitoba and northern Ontario, and I felt that pain that he had because he knew at the time, even though he was doing a job, that what he was doing was right. As his plane lifted off from that lake, and there was no airstrips in those days, obviously, in these remote communities, he talked about what he felt about this child leaving a place that loved him, a place where his parents and their—the little girls, I guess, and the little boys that he had in his plane, and he said he considered doing a flyover before going off to their destination, which was Kenora, Ontario. And he said, my better judgment taught me—told me not to do that because that would bring greater—because these children didn't know where they were going. They thought they were going for a little plane ride. He said he didn't know at the time, but these children would not see their families for several years, at the time.

And that hurt to hear it from a person like that, and that is why I'm saying that, as Canadians, and whether we're Aboriginal Canadians, new Canadians, several generation Canadians, we have something in common. And that is to make a better life for our children, a better life for our future. We want to provide opportunities, obviously, for our children

and our families, and we want to make things a lot better than it was for some of us, our parents.

My father—and it's well known in this Chamber; I said that a couple years ago—my father went to a residential school for eight years in Brandon, run by the United Church. He never learned anything when he went home. He hadn't learned anything. All he knew how to write was his name, Kenneth Robinson, and that's all he knew. He never learned anything else.

My biological mother, who many members here know and I spoke openly about that, died at the age of 31 on the streets of Winnipeg because of alcoholism. A dysfunctional person, like myself, I suppose, she had four children, two sons and two daughters, and I don't doubt for a moment that she loved each and every one of us.

We were raised in different situations, with different families. I went up north and lived with my father, where I always was, actually, but the other ones—my sister grew up in Norway House, and I'm very proud of her. She's a band councillor for the Norway House Cree Nation, one of the elected people there. And then I have a younger brother, who sometimes gets into mischief, and that's widely known, too; it was reported in the papers. I have a sister—and those two I don't know that well. Those two are almost strangers to me because we were not reconnected till the early 1980s. This is what the system of our residential school system had on many people like myself.

And I want my daughter—and my daughter is well known in her own right—I have a lot of pride in my daughter and I want to see her succeed. She is now 30 years old, and I'm sure in time I'll be blessed with grandchildren. I look forward to that as well, but even having her as a child, when she was a baby, it was very difficult for me to even hold her as a child because I did not receive that as a child. I was scared to hold her because of the abuse that many of us experienced in school.

We were embraced all right by some of these priests, but we were embraced in a way that was not proper. It was in a sexual way, and that is the hurt that I carry to this day and I'll probably continue to carry it till the day I'm buried. But I know that together we can make a better future for our people. And the one thing that we can do collectively here as elected people of the people of the province of Manitoba is pass a recognition bill knowing that the fundamental core of our communities and our

cultures and our nations is dependent on the use of our languages.

I know that Mr. Speaker, if he were here, would be very proud that we are recognizing his mother tongue, Inuktituk, Ojibway, Oji-Cree, Dakota, Dene, Cree and, of course, Michif, which is a culmination of a couple cultures, the French, the Ojibway and the Cree. And that's an indication of who we are as Canadians. But the distinct languages of our people must be sustained, and we have to, as legislators in this Assembly, agree to support this.

I asked some folks to come down here. If they wanted to come down by horse, I said you're welcome to do that. You can park in front. We got highly paid people that can take care of the poop. That's what I told them this afternoon.

So the Premier and I invited some people—I don't know if they're out there or not. I'm sure we'll find out. But I want to say, Madam Deputy Speaker, that I want to thank members opposite and my colleagues on this side for supporting this, and I want to thank particularly the kind words spoken by the member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Hawranik) in support of this bill.

I think we should all be proud of ourselves in this Legislature because we are the first government in this country, outside of Nunavut, to recognize the existence of Aboriginal languages. And I can't think of a better gift to bestow upon the conference and the gathering that's being held in Winnipeg at this time but for us to go proclaim that together as legislators in the Manitoba Legislative Assembly, we all agreed to pass this recognition bill.

With that I thank all members, colleagues, and you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and I commend you on a great job you're doing in your capacity. Thank you very much.

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

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): I—Madam Deputy Speaker, just a few comments on this bill.

First of all, I want to say that I personally and members of the Liberal Party appreciate the comments from the minister and the minister's willingness to share his story in terms of what's happened. I was at the Truth and Reconciliation meetings yesterday morning at The Forks and listened to some of the speeches, the process of bringing forward the truth and trying to move on

from that toward a reconciliation, the words of Judge Murray Sinclair and many others.

* (17:30)

I was there last night at the concert and had a chance to meet with many people and to hear about all the stories that were being shared, just as the minister has shared his own story with us just a few minutes ago.

It is a pretty historic occasion that we have the Truth and Reconciliation Commission here in Winnipeg starting on a major journey, a journey that will extend across the country and hopefully bring better understanding, more healing, after all the pain that has happened, and, as I said, a better understanding and a better future, not just for people in Manitoba but for people across Canada. And I would hope it's being well led, that it can serve as an example to people around the world of how we can talk about the pain that has happened and how we can move forward.

I want to congratulate the minister for bringing forward this legislation. And, certainly, in the Liberal Party, we support this very strongly and look forward to a Manitoba where people are comfortable in any of the languages that we recognize, and that we continue to support their use, knowing that one of the problems in the past was that there was some suppression, significant suppression, of their use from time to time.

But we have an important history in our province and that is a shared history. And that shared history belongs in all the many languages that have contributed to that and particularly to the languages that we are talking about today and recognizing.

So I congratulate and thank the minister for bringing this legislation forward and endorse this legislation on behalf of the Liberal Party very strongly. Thank you.

Mr. Hugh McFadyen (Leader of the Official Opposition): There are many issues where political parties will differ. This is certainly not one.

And I want to thank the member for Rupertsland (Mr. Robinson) for his comments. No other member of this House can possibly hope to be able to speak to this issue with the same amount of personal experience and authenticity as the member for Rupertsland with his comments.

And so I want to say, as somebody who is a Manitoban, who has many friends, who has, in fact,

family members and others who have—who are of Aboriginal descent and who have a much more acute understanding of the sort of pain that has been expressed today by the member for Rupertsland (Mr. Robinson), that it is right for all of us to stand up and support this bill. It is one more step toward reconciliation between people of different background and different cultures. One more step toward a better and more united province of Manitoba.

And so, without any further comments to make, knowing that the member for Rupertsland has absolutely perfectly captured all the reasons why we ought to support this bill, I would just conclude by saying, let us all stand together as Manitobans and support this bill on behalf of the Aboriginal people of Manitoba and with a view toward a more united province of Manitoba as we look toward the future.

Thank you.

Hon. Greg Selinger (Premier): Yes, by way of conclusion, I'd like to thank the Deputy Premier and the member from Rupertsland for bringing this bill forward.

There are many people in Manitoba that probably don't know that Cree, Dakota, Dene, or Inuktitut, Michif, Ojibway and Oji-Cree are languages spoken in Manitoba, languages that are at risk, Madam Deputy Speaker.

And as we start the Truth and Reconciliation Commission process here in Winnipeg today, with representatives from all across the country, including the Unity Ride led by Gus High Eagle from the Dakota people of Manitoba, we know that the journey of recovering language and culture and a sense of identity is a long journey, and an integral part of that journey is to have a sense of your own language, to have a sense of how you express your ideas and emotions and your feelings for the things that matter to you. Your values and your family have to be expressed in the language that you grew up in.

And so, by putting this bill in front of the Legislature today and having the support of all the members of the Legislature, I think we send a powerful message to our First Nations brothers and sisters in this province about how we value the contribution they've made to this province and the strength they bring to this province as we help them recognize and work with them to strengthen their language and culture and their economy and their institutions so that they can raise their children and

families in dignity and make a contribution to the overall well-being of all Manitobans. Thank you.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question.

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 24, The Aboriginal Languages Recognition Act.

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

I declare the motion carried—

An Honourable Member: No. Point of order before you declare the motion carried.

Point of Order

Madam Deputy Speaker: Honourable Government House Leader, on a point of order.

Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader): Yes, Madam Deputy Speaker, I think it would be appropriate pursuant to the comments of the Leader of the Opposition, and I know the wishes of the member for Rupertsland (Mr. Robinson) and others, that even though we all agree, that we have a recorded vote on this

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed we'll have a recorded vote? *[Agreed]*

Division

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

Yeas

Allan, Altemeyer, Ashton, Bjornson, Blady, Blaikie, Borotsik, Braun, Briese, Caldwell, Chomiak, Cullen, Derkach, Dewar, Driedger, Dyck, Eichler, Faurschou, Gerrard Goertzen, Graydon, Hawranik, Irvin-Ross, Jennissen, Jha, Korzeniowski, Lamoureux, Lemieux, Maguire, Marcelino, Martindale, McFadyen, McGifford, Melnick, Mitchelson, Nevakshonoff, Pedersen, Reid, Robinson, Rondeau, Rowat, Saran, Schuler, Selby, Selinger, Stefanson, Struthers, Swan, Taillieu, Wiebe, Wowchuk.

Madam Deputy Clerk (Bev Bosiak): Yeas 51.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried unanimously.

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

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will now move on to Bill 27, The Upper Fort Garry Heritage Provincial Park Act.

Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Struthers), that The Upper Fort Garry Heritage Provincial Park Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Justice, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Madam Deputy Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Government House Leader and seconded by the honourable Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Struthers), that Bill 27, The Upper Fort Garry Heritage Provincial Park Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Justice, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

* (17:40)

Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden): It's my privilege to stand in the House and support Bill 27, The Upper Fort Garry Heritage Provincial Park Act, as placed in this House by the member from Elmwood.

I just wanted to say as well, that I feel, as we spoke earlier in regards to some of the bills today, that this bill will be an opportunity to provide a provincial park, as I said earlier, down on the corner of Main Street and Assiniboine Avenue, here in the city of Winnipeg, and it will be in conjunction with The Forks and the Canadian Museum of Human Rights. Hopefully, it will be used as an attraction for more tourism to the province of Manitoba, but also a great educational opportunity for students and throughout Manitoba and Canada, and maybe in some of our American neighbours to come to Winnipeg to have a look at further the history of Manitoba's history. And this fort, being built in 1836, is certainly of great importance as a trading centre and a, not only cultural centre, but a trading centre for the first years of Manitoba's history.

And I believe that it's important to mention that the—this would not have been possible it hadn't—if it hadn't have been for the Friends of Upper Fort Garry, a group of citizens in Manitoba who have raised over \$10 million. The Province of Manitoba and the federal government have put about a million and a half in each, and their objective is to raise another 9 million to have a project begin construction next spring and spring of 2011. It's a—the heritage or the

archaeological digs are going on as we speak, maybe not in the rain this afternoon, Madam Deputy Speaker, but certainly there is great progress being made in that area, and they'll be all ready to go by next spring.

And I think it's important that we acknowledge this type of an enterprise because it is an enterprise that has been privately—taken a private initiative to get it to this point and move it forward. I know that the City of Winnipeg supports it, the Province supports it, the federal government supports it and so do the Friends of Upper Fort Garry, and, Madam Deputy Speaker, I just believe that it's important that we move this forward.

I know that there'll be an advisory committee as well, of—made up of from five to 10 people that will work with the development of this facility and that the fort may be expanded at other times, but it will be an educational opportunity, not the reconstruction of actual walls as we have in Lower Fort Garry, Madam Deputy Speaker, but a facility that will be a point of interest and a—you know, I could go into some more of the history of it, I guess, but the goal of this project is that in within the next five years it will be up and ready for citizens and—to view as well as educational opportunities for citizens, for our schoolchildren across the province of Manitoba.

And, with those words, Madam Deputy Speaker, I move that we support this bill and that we look forward to its passing.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Yes, Madam Deputy Speaker, Liberals have been, for a long time, strong advocates and supporters of having recognition of the Upper Fort Garry site. It's a prominent and very historical site, very important to the history of our province. And we're pleased and supportive of it becoming a provincial park and look forward to it being a location where people travelling down Main Street will everyday see and recognize this important fort and where future Manitobans will be able to go and stay in touch with the important history of our province as it's—as we celebrate it and continue to recognize the important role that the Upper Fort Garry played in the birth of our province and indeed for many years, both before and after that as a major centre in Manitoba.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third 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 32—The Protection for Persons in Care
Amendment Act**

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will now move on to Bill 32, The Protection for Persons in Care Amendment Act.

Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Advanced Education, that the Protection for Persons in Care Amendment Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Madam Deputy Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Government House Leader, and seconded by the honourable Minister of Advanced Education and Literacy (Ms. McGifford) that Bill 32, The Protection for Persons in Care Amendment Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood): In regards to this bill, we're certainly in support of the amendment to The Protection for Persons in Care Act.

We supported the bill when it first came forward in 2000. We did not necessarily feel very positive about the amendment that was brought forward in 2008 because what it did was take the investigators who were investigating abuse within personal care homes and hospitals and make them less independent. In fact, they became investigators that were under the control of the Minister of Health. They were people that worked within the department, and they were people that were appointed by the Minister of Health.

That raised a lot of red flags for us, and after that time we note that the founded reports in abuse dropped off significantly, and I do not find that to be a coincidence. We have over 8,000 cases of abuse reported within our hospitals and personal care homes since 2001. The types of abuse that are raised are physical, emotional, sexual, financial, neglect

and combination, and it's disconcerting to see that amount of abuse. It's also disconcerting to see that the government took away the independence of the investigators, and when they did that, the number of founded reports dropped, and, therefore, it looks like there's less abuse in the system than perhaps there might be.

We have a lot of concern about that, especially under this particular NDP government and this Minister of Health, where the system has become so invested in protecting itself, where the NDP are so worried about spin, and they are so worried about damage control, where the minister has spent a lot of extra money by doubling the political staff in her office. We've very concerned as to what is actually happening within the Protection for Persons in Care office, and what could be the results of taking away the independence of those investigators within that office.

I note now that under the amendment, that reports of abuse will now be taken from ERs and from urgent care centres and from geriatric day hospitals. I think this is going to have a certain amount of ramification related to the death of Brian Sinclair as well, in how this legislation may address situations like that.

So, with those few words, Madam Deputy Speaker, we do want to see this bill move forward. Thank you.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to indicate that we in the Liberal Party are supportive of this legislation. We continue to hear concerns about people who are in care, and believe that we must continue to do everything we can to make sure that people who are in care receive the best possible care.

And so we hope that this will be a step in that direction, but we're certainly supportive of that—of the legislation. Thank you.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 32, The Protection for Persons in Care Amendment Act.

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

**Bill 36—The Statutes Correction
and Minor Amendments Act, 2010**

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will now move on to Bill 36, The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2010.

Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Ms. Wowchuk), that The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2010, reported from the Standing Committee on Justice, be concurred in and be now read a third time and passed.

* (17:50)

Madam Deputy Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Government House Leader, and seconded by the honourable Minister of Finance that Bill 36, The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2010, reported from the Standing Committee on Justice, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): Madam Deputy Speaker, we're prepared to see this bill go to a vote on third reading.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 36, The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2010.

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

**Bill 39—The Child and Family Services
Amendment Act**

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will now move on to Bill 39, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act.

Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Child and Family Services, that the Child and Family Services—Bill 39, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act (Children's Advocate Reporting), reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Madam Deputy Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Government House Leader and seconded

by the honourable Minister of Family Services (Mr. Mackintosh), that Bill 39, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act (Children's Advocate Reporting), reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Mrs. Bonnie Mitchelson (River East): I want to say at the outset that we certainly do support this bill coming forward.

I guess it's very questionable about the timing of this legislation because it appears to me that this is the height of damage control by a government that has lost control of the Child and Family Services system. And the Advocate has said in a report that the system is in a state of chaos, that foster families within the system are leaving; they're worried that children that they have had in their care for a significant period of time, that they've bonded with, that they've loved, are being ripped out of those homes with no reasoning, nothing in writing that would indicate why it is in the best interest of those children to be moved.

And, Madam Deputy Speaker, we have significant concern with some of the things that the Child Advocate has said but we have more significant concern with the number of families that are coming to us as an opposition party, the number of social workers that are working within the system today that are coming to us and saying, we warned this government that they shouldn't rush ahead with devolution.

We warned them after devolution happened that it was wrong, that things were going amiss within the system, that the agencies that were taking over responsibility for children hadn't been prepared. They didn't have trained workers. They didn't have experienced workers and, as a result, we saw the results in the death of Gage Guimond as a direct result of the system, the process being rushed to a point where children were placed in unsafe circumstances.

And you only have to talk to the foster family of Gage Guimond that loved him and cared for him, and that family that went everywhere to try to ensure that Gage Guimond was not removed from their home and, Madam Deputy Speaker, their pleas fell on deaf ears from this government and, as a result, we saw a tragedy.

And we have seen review after review and the review of Gage Guimond—the section 4 review

was done by external reviewers and they made recommendations to this government and the minister stood up with major fanfare and said that he was going to implement all of those recommendations.

And one of the very important recommendations in that review was to ensure that no child was moved—like Gage Guimond—without a written reason. And those were the reviewers that the government hired and those were—that was the recommendation that was made to the government and, three years later, Madam Deputy Speaker, we don't see that recommendation implemented.

And we see members on the government side of the House stand up and wax eloquently about everything that they've done to protect children and everything they've done to put resources in place. Well, yes, some positive things have happened, but, Madam Deputy Speaker, one of the most important recommendations in that review hasn't been implemented. And we've heard many members of government stand up and speak on the record and indicate why that recommendation shouldn't be implemented.

Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, they will live to eat their words and their comments, because we know today children are still being moved in the same manner that Gage Guimond was, and it's not acceptable. And this government really should sit up, take note. The Minister of Family Services (Mr. Mackintosh), who has been there for four years, needs to show some leadership, take some action and ensure that we don't have more Gage Guimond deaths in this province, and he's not taking the initiative; he's not showing the leadership.

And, as a result, members of government will hear what is going on because foster families are really, really concerned, and they wouldn't take a child into their home and care for them and love them in the manner that they've been doing if they didn't care about those children.

But, obviously, this government and members of the government side of the House don't care because, if they did, they would take some action and put in place the recommendations that have been made to them by their own review process.

So we welcome this legislation. We will support it, but we won't support the government in the way

they dealt with children in their chaotic Child and Family Services system.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Yes, Madam Deputy Speaker, we support the legislation. Having said that, it's important to note that the government has been dragged kicking and screaming in terms of trying to ensure that they can come up with sort of damage control, and that's why we have this bill before us today.

Madam Deputy Speaker, it's because, in good part, the Manitoba Liberal Party took the position that the children of our province was more important than something that happened behind closed doors in LAMC that, ultimately, we have this report before us today.

And, in this report, it is very clear that the Province of Manitoba has failed the children of our province. The Province of Manitoba has the responsibility of providing care in excess of 8,000 children today, Madam Deputy Speaker, and this report makes it very clear that the government of Manitoba has not done its job.

So it's with sadness that we even have to pass a bill that we're passing today, but let it be very—and let me be very clear in the comments, in the sense that the children of our province have been put at risk because this government is more concerned about being politically correct and putting a spin that tries to make them look better. And I would suggest to you, Madam Deputy Speaker, it's been at a very great cost. It's been at the cost of the children of our province. And I would suggest to you when politicians stand and they talk about the future of our province, we talk about our children.

And, Madam Deputy Speaker, what I have witnessed through the Child Advocate's office, an independent office, which is give confirmation that the Province of Manitoba has sacrificed the lives of thousands of children, and that has meant that children have died; that has meant that we have more dysfunctional families as a direct result—as a direct result of poor government planning, poor government policy.

The government has been in office now since 1999. They've had the opportunity to make a difference and, when you don't take advantage of that opportunity, what ends up happening is you end up having more people within our jails, more drug addicts, more prostitution, more individuals or communities that are in a—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order.

* (18:00)

Point of Order

Madam Deputy Speaker: In accordance with the point of order, the honourable Government House Leader.

Mr. Blaikie (Government House Leader): Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. I think if you canvass the House, you would find that there would be unanimous consent to not commence the proceedings associated with the sessional order until such times that we have dealt with the bill now before us and Bill 29.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there a unanimous consent to set aside the sessional order until such time as we have completed Bills 39 and 29? Is there unanimous consent? *[Agreed]*

* * *

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will continue on Bill 29.

Mr. Lamoureux: Yes, Madam Deputy Speaker, that would, in essence, just conclude my remarks on that particular bill and just say that we do support the bill. Having said that, I did want to conclude my—just add a little bit more before I sit down, and that is just more so in recognition that I want to acknowledge a couple of things.

You know we are, indeed, very privileged to be here within the Chamber, and there never goes a day that goes by when I have been afforded the opportunity just to say a few words, that I've really considered it as a privilege. In fact, over the years I've had the opportunity to meet and have many discussions of individuals within the Chamber, beyond the Chamber, about the future of our province in many, many, many different ways, and I've truly appreciated it.

I've really appreciated some of the discussions amongst House leaders—the member from Kildonan, the member from Lac du Bonnet—in terms of me getting a better understanding of how our system works within the Chamber. I've appreciated the high level of speeches that have been delivered with an immense amount of integrity. The member from Rupertsland, prior to my standing, talked so eloquently in terms of—and shared with us his personal story and why it is that that bill was so

important, not only for him but for the entire province, Madam Deputy Speaker.

We have seen speeches from other members inside this Chamber where other members will stand up and give applause because they were touched by the words of those speakers. It is, indeed, a privilege to be standing inside this Legislature. I recognize the contributions that individuals make, and whether you're in government or you're in opposition, we all have a very important role inside the Legislature. And I acknowledge the fact that it takes more than one, quite often, in terms of being able to get some things done inside the Chamber. But I appreciate the patience and understanding of others when they—we try to facilitate the agendas that all members have inside the Chamber.

The Speaker of the House, who is not with us today, Madam Deputy Speaker, because of an issue in regards to his health, I wish him the very best. I have looked at our Speaker as an incredible individual that has truly done this Chamber well, and I think he's a success story in showing just how effective an elected Speaker of this Chamber can, in fact, be.

Members on both sides of the House have afforded me the opportunity to be able to express myself in many, many different ways, and I just wanted to say thank you for that opportunity, Madam Deputy Speaker. There is table officers, Hansard, Clerk's office, a whole group of individuals that make our system work, and they do a wonderful job. And I just wanted to give a bit of thanks and express some appreciation to the efforts that they also put in.

There is this possibility, Madam Deputy Speaker, that I might not be back when the session comes back. It is a possibility, and I wanted just to leave a of couple last thoughts. And that is, we are all here because individuals that are outside of this Chamber that enable us to be here. And, for me, personally, Madam Deputy Speaker, it is my best supporter, my No. 1 supporter, my wife, who's in the gallery. And, you know, we know the sacrifices that are made, but it is our spouses and our—and the people that we love and care so deeply about and the things that they are prepared to do, that allow us to do that, what we want to do in fulfilling our dreams. And it goes on to the hundreds or dozens, I should say, or hundreds, what everyone wants to say, of other people that make our democratic system work.

I am not the most articulate of all individuals. I would summarize it all in one word to them, whether

they're members inside this Chamber or individuals outside of this Legislature, and that is, thank you. It's been a real privilege, and I hope not to see, not to necessarily have to come back in the near future, Madam Deputy Speaker. And we'll just have to wait and see, and I wish each and everyone the very best in the years ahead.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

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

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 39, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act (Children's Advocate Reporting).

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

**Bill 29—The Advanced Education
Administration Act and
Amendments to The Council on
Post-Secondary Education Act and
The Education Administration Act**

Madam Deputy Speaker: By agreement of the House, Bill 29 was set aside yesterday at the conclusion of remarks, at concurrence and third reading. So I will now put the question on concurrence and third reading of Bill 29.

The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 29, The Advanced Education Administration Act and Amendments to The Council on Post-Secondary Education Act and The Education Administration Act.

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

Some Honourable Members: No.

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Voice Vote

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour, say aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Official Opposition House Leader): On division.

Madam Deputy Speaker: On division.

* * *

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will now go back to the sessional order.

In accordance with the sessional order adopted by the House on December 14th, 2010, all stages for the passage of the following—I'm sorry, excuse me. In accordance with the sessional orders adopted by the House on December 14th, 2009, all stages for the passage of the following bills, including all related motions, committee stage, and all three readings, but not including royal assent, must be completed.

These bills are The Appropriation Act, 2010; The Loan Act, 2010; and The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2010. If the House or a Committee of the House has not concluded any item, or the stage required by the above hour, the Speaker or Chairperson, as the case may be, must interrupt the proceedings at that time, and without seeing the clock, put all questions necessary to dispose of the required items without further debate or amendment.

For this purpose, if a recorded vote has been requested, the bells are to ring for five minutes only, not for one hour. As the hour is now after 6 p.m., therefore, the Chair must ensure that the following items are called and dealt with without further debate or amendment.

Report stage of Bill 31, six amendments in total; concurrence and third reading of Bill 31; the motion regarding the Capital Supply bill; the motion regarding the Main Supply bill; first reading and distribution of Bill 37; second reading of Bill 37; first reading and distribution of Bill 38; second reading of Bill 38; Committee of the Whole, consideration of Bills 37 and 38; presentation of the Committee of the Whole report on Bills 37 and 38; concurrence and third reading of Bills 37 and 38.

I will now call report stage of Bill 31.

* (18:10)

REPORT STAGE AMENDMENTS

Bill 31—The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2010

Madam Deputy Speaker: I will now call report stage of Bill 31.

Mrs. Heather Stefanson (Tuxedo): I move, seconded by the member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Hawranik),

THAT Bill 31 be amended in Clause 1(3) in clause (a) of the definition "economic recovery period" in the proposed section 16.2 by striking out "March 31, 2014" and substituting "March 31, 2011".

Madam Deputy Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Tuxedo and seconded by the honourable member for Lac du Bonnet, that Bill 31—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Dispense.

I will now put the question. The question before the House, is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Voice Vote

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order. All those in favour of the amendment, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the amendment, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Official Opposition House Leader): On division.

Madam Deputy Speaker: On division.

Formal Vote

Madam Deputy Speaker: The honourable Government House Leader, on a point of order?

Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader): Yes, I'd like a recorded vote on this.

Madam Deputy Speaker: A recorded vote has been called. Call in the members.

Order. The question before the House is adoption of the amendment put forward by the honourable member for Tuxedo (Mrs. Stefanson).

Division

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

Yeas

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

Nays

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

Madam Clerk (Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 20, Nays 31.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

* * *

Mrs. Stefanson: Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Hawranik),

THAT Bill 31 be amended in Clause 1(3) by replacing the proposed section 16.3 with the following:

Application of balanced budget requirements during economic recovery period

16.3 Subsection (2)(1) and sections 4 to 7 do not apply to any fiscal year within the economic recovery period.

Madam Deputy Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Tuxedo—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Dispense? Dispense.

We will now put the question on the amendment.

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

Some Honourable Members: No.

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Voice Vote

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the amendment, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Hawranik: On division.

Madam Deputy Speaker: On division.

* * *

Mrs. Stefanson: Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Lac du Bonnet,

THAT Bill 31 be amended in Clause 3-1(3) by adding the following after the proposed subsection 16.4(2):

Disclosure of net debt added

16.4(3) For each fiscal year in the economic recovery period, the comptroller under *The Financial Administration Act* must prepare a statement, to be included in the public accounts under section 65 of that Act, that clearly identifies the net debt added to the Province's general purpose debt for that year.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order. It has been moved by the honourable member for Tuxedo—

An Honourable Member: Dispense

Madam Deputy Speaker: Dispense? Dispense.

I will now put the question on the amendment.

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

(18:20)

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the amendment, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Hawranik: On division.

Madam Deputy Speaker: On division.

* * *

Mrs. Stefanson: I move, seconded by the member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Hawranik),

THAT Bill 31 be amended in Clause 2(2) in the proposed subsection 1(2.2)

(a) in the section heading, by striking out "20%" and substituting "40%"; and

(b) by striking out "80%" and substituting "60%".

Madam Deputy Speaker: It has been—order. It has been moved by the honourable member for Tuxedo—

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Dispense.

I will now put the question to the House. The question to the House, is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Voice Vote

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of adopting the amendment, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to adopting the amendment, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Formal Vote

Mr. Hawranik: Recorded vote.

Madam Deputy Speaker: A recorded vote has been requested, call in the members.

Division

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

Yeas

Borotsik, Briese, Cullen, Derkach, Driedger, Dyck, Eichler, Faurschou, Gerrard, Goertzen, Graydon,

Hawranik, Lamoureux, Maguire, McFadyen, Mitchelson, Pedersen, Rowat, Stefanson, Taillieu.

Nays

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

Madam Clerk (Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 20, Nays 31.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

* * *

Mrs. Stefanson: Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Hawranik),

THAT Bill 31 be amended by striking out Part 3.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order. It has been moved by the honourable member—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Dispense.

I will now put the question to the House. The question before the House is the amendment put forward by the honourable member for Tuxedo.

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

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to adopting the motion, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Hawranik: On division.

Madam Deputy Speaker: On division.

* * *

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the MLA for Inkster,

THAT Bill 31 be amended in Clause 76(10) by striking out "January 1, 1992" and substituting "April 29, 2010".

Madam Deputy Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for River Heights—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Dispense? Dispense.

We will now put the question to the House. The question before the House is the amendment put forward by the honourable member for River Heights.

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

Some Honourable Members: No.

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Voice Vote

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of adopting the amendment, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to adopting the amendment, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Hawranik: On division.

Madam Deputy Speaker: On division.

This concludes the report stage amendments that we have before us.

**CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS
(Continued)**

**Bill 31—The Budget Implementation and
Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2010**

Madam Deputy Speaker: We shall now proceed to concurrence and third reading of Bill 31.

Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. Swan), that Bill 31, The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2010, reported from the Standing Committee on Social and Economic

Development, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I will now put the question before the House. The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 31.

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

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to adopting the motion, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

* (18:30)

Formal Vote

Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Official Opposition House Leader): A recorded vote.

Madam Deputy Speaker: A recorded vote has been called. Call in the members.

Order. The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 31, The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2010.

Division

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

Yeas

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

Madam Deputy Speaker: Just prior to calling—the honourable Minister for Finance—

Some Honourable Members: No.

Point of Order

Mr. Hawranik: Yes, Madam Deputy Speaker, once the minister's passed over in the vote, the reality is she can't be counted. That's one of the rules of the Legislature, and I would submit that it is a point of order and she voted against her particular bill, Bill 31. Once you're passed over, you've—if you're in your seat—if you're in your seat—if you're in your seat, the reality is you voted against it if you didn't stand up.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order.

On the point of order raised by the honourable Opposition House Leader, I agree. You do have a point of order. The member did not stand up.

I agree with the honourable Opposition House Leader. The member did not stand up at the time that the vote was called, and, as such, she was passed over. And, as such, I would say that her vote would not be counted.

Some Honourable Members: Hear, hear.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order. All the—order.

I'm going to ask for co-operation from all honourable members, and I'm going to ask for the assistance for the page that we would allow the page to be able to say the names without having any interference and any noise from the members from the House.

Nays

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

An Honourable Member: Point of order.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The honourable government—the honourable Opposition House Leader, on a point of order.

Just a moment. I—prior to doing that, the Clerk has to read back the votes.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Deputy Speaker: She has to read them back.

Madam Clerk (Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 30, Nays 20.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I declare—

Some Honourable Members: No.

Point of Order

Madam Deputy Speaker: The honourable Opposition House Leader, on a point of order.

Mr. Hawranik: On a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The reality is that if you are in your chair in this House and a vote is called, you don't stand up in favour of a motion—unless you're paired—if you don't stand up, vote is not counted. And you correctly ruled on that point of order. But the reality is that if she's in her chair, if the member is in her chair at the time of the—of voting against the motion, her vote counts against the motion, Madam Deputy Speaker. And that's the rule.

She has to vote if she's in her chair. If she's not in her chair, she doesn't have to vote.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The honourable Government House Leader, on the same point of order.

Mr. Blaikie: Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, two things—[*interjection*] Two things: First of all, the honourable Minister of Finance (Ms. Wowchuk) did stand; she didn't stand exactly—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Blaikie: —she did stand later, and—

An Honourable Member: She didn't stand at the time.

Mr. Blaikie: She didn't stand at the time, I acknowledge that, Madam Deputy Speaker, but I've witnessed many other occasions, not here, I agree, where people have had the opportunity to rise after making an honest mistake and correct the record as to how they intended to vote. But I would say with respect to the point—with the point of order, that this, on the face of it, it's ridiculous; no one can be compelled to be recorded as voting contrary to their own intentions simply because they rose later or didn't rise at all in their seats.

So, either way, I was going to ask for leave for the Minister of Finance to have her vote recorded as she intended. If that's, you know, if that's—I sense the mood of the House is that that might not be forthcoming. That's too bad because that's the kind of courtesy we would want to extend to anyone in the Chamber who made an honest mistake. But—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

* (18:40)

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order. I want to be able to hear the honourable Government House Leader on the point of order, and I ask co-operation for all honourable members so that we can hear his comments.

Mr. Blaikie: Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, I say, I'm—both speaking to the point of order and giving notice that I intend to rise on a new point of order and ask for leave that some respect be shown for the honourable—the Minister of Finance, and she be allowed to record her vote, in spite of the fact that she inadvertently did not rise when the vote was taken.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The honourable member for Russell, on the same point of order.

Mr. Leonard Derkach (Russell): Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker, this is not an insincere matter. This is a very serious matter. A vote in the House is a very serious matter and, I think, by tradition of this House and traditions of Parliament that if a member chooses not to vote on an issue, that member has an option of not entering the Chamber. And that is why the bells are rung, to call the members into a vote. And, if a member chooses to dodge the vote, then that member doesn't come into the Chamber.

The second thing is that if you are in the Chamber and you are sitting in your place that is designated for you, then you either have to vote for or against a motion when it is called. You have no option. You can sit in another chair and not be counted, Madam Deputy Speaker, but you cannot sit in your chair and think that you cannot vote.

Now, the Minister of Finance did not vote for—in favour of her motion. Now, we can debate why she didn't vote on it, but the fact of the matter is she did not vote in favour of the motion. Her other alternative is to either leave her chair, which she did not do, or to vote against the motion. And she should have been called when the first row was called. She should have been called to order in either to stand or to be counted against the motion.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, those are alternatives that this House, I think, has practised. I have seen it happen in this Chamber before. It is not pleasant. I have seen members dash into the Chamber to try and vote and the door has been

locked and they have not been allowed in the Chamber to vote.

Now, we could have said, you know, let's give them courtesy; let's allow them in to vote. But that was not done because a vote is always considered to be a very serious matter. And, Madam Deputy Speaker, I don't think you have a lot of options in this matter, but the Minister of Finance will have to vote and her vote has to be negative.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The honourable—order. The honourable Minister of Finance, on the same point of order.

Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Finance): I would like to speak on the same point of order.

The fact of the matter is that I did stand. I inadvertently sat down too quickly before my name was called. I was standing, Madam Deputy Speaker, and just as in other occasions—and we can recall when we were in opposition, when Mr. Binx was the clerk and there was a mistake made; there was a recognition that there was a mistake made and we redid the vote because, in the spirit of the House, there was a recognition that there was a mistake made. I will say again that I did stand with the front row. I inadvertently sat down before the page had—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order. I would—order.

I'm going to ask the co-operation of all honourable members so I can hear the comments by the honourable minister.

Ms. Wowchuk: I inadvertently did sit down, Madam Deputy Speaker, because I—and I sat down before my name was called. I didn't realize I was sitting down, and I would ask—that I had sat down before my name was called and, just as in the past when there was a mistake made, I think that we should be all big enough to admit that we made a mistake. And I am saying to you I made a mistake and I sat down too quickly, but my intention is to, of course, vote for this bill.

Mr. Hawranik: On the same point of order and with new information, Madam Deputy Speaker—and it was very obvious in this Chamber as to what the Minister of Finance did. She did not stand up to vote for Bill 31. The reality is—that's the reality and anyone who sits in their chair, if they don't vote for a motion when the call comes to vote against that particular motion for Bill 31 and she's still sitting in her chair, her vote counts against Bill 31.

What she just said on the record, Madam Deputy Speaker, is that she's challenging a ruling, a ruling that you made, a ruling that you made previous to this point of order. You made that ruling. She had her chance to challenge that ruling and she did not challenge that ruling. If she didn't challenge that ruling, the reality is she agrees that she's—didn't vote for this motion.

So I would ask, Madam Deputy Speaker, that you rule in favour of this point of order.

Hon. Dave Chomiak (Deputy Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, I just want to clarify for a second through my experience in this House. This is not a challenge to the Speaker's ruling. And I recall quite vividly being in this House when members opposite were government and, when the clerk of the Chamber made a miscount, literally made a miscount, and, in fact, determined at that time that the opposition, which we were, had won the vote over the government, we, in the spirit of understanding the parliamentary system and in the spirit of being bigger than just worrying about political egos and partisanship, we allowed the vote to be retaken and the count to be retaken.

So I agree with your ruling, but I—sometimes in life, Madam Deputy Speaker, actions of people speak a lot louder than words. And I suggest that people who suggest who never make—that they never make mistakes—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order.

Just—I just would like to hear the comments put forward by the honourable minister.

Mr. Chomiak: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and I've often said in this House that people who suggest that they never make a mistake and are always perfect are wrong in that assumption.

So at the time when we were opposition, we simply allowed a revote because we recognized in the parliamentary system there was a mistake made by the clerk. In this instance, Madam Deputy Speaker, it's a reflection of—this is a reflection of the attitude of members of this Chamber to the dignity and the understanding of how we ought to deal in this Chamber. And I suggest that if we were in opposition, as we did in opposition, we would probably allow a revote; we would probably allow leave to have the vote taken in the spirit of the Legislature. But the opposition doesn't have to do that, and I suggest that their actions speak much louder than their words and their partisanship.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order.

I am going to, at this point, say that the honourable minister was trying to vote. She had made the—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Just a moment. Just a moment, please. At the end, she did try to stand up and vote, so she was trying to vote. So I am going to say that. I am going to ask, as well, if I could have this outcome of the division seem—there seems to be a dispute, and I'm wondering if it would be possible that we could put the question again before the House.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order.

At this point, what I am going to ask is, I am going to ask if there is leave from the House for the House leaders to gather together for a couple of minutes with me, so—

Some Honourable Members: No.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Okay. There is not leave. Leave has not been granted.

An Honourable Member: Madam Speaker, on a point of order.

Madam Deputy Speaker: On point of order.

Mr. Derkach: You cannot call another vote when a vote has been taken in this House.

Secondly, I watched very carefully while the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Robinson) stood in his place after his name was called, looked at the Minister of Finance (Ms. Wowchuk) who was sitting in her chair, and she did not make any motion to stand up at that point in time. And so, finally, the—

* (18:50)

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order.

I'm going to ask once again, just—is there—because there is obviously a dispute over this division, so I'm going to ask once again if there's a willingness from the House to allow this vote to go forward.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Once again.

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I hear "agreed"; I hear "no." Is there agreement?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Madam Deputy Speaker: No. All right. The members are saying, no. I'm going to tell you that the member—the minister did stand up to vote. It was—

Some Honourable Members: No.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Just a moment. Please let me finish. She did not stand up at the time. I did not—at the time she was to vote; she did stand up afterwards. So she did ask to have her vote recorded afterwards.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Deputy Speaker, on a point of order.

First of all, Madam Deputy Speaker, you have not ruled yet on a point of order that was raised by the Opposition House Leader, No. 1; No. 2, the vote was called and recognized. As a matter of fact, the Clerk insisted on reporting the vote. Now, an error was made. That is not our fault. The error was made by the Minister of Finance. I have no idea whether the Minister of Finance was—*[interjection]* Was it an error? Was she not prepared to vote on that? Did she have an ulterior motive? We don't know that; you don't know that. And it was obvious that the Minister of Northern Affairs stood in his place for several seconds before he sat down waiting for the Minister of Finance to stand up, and she did not.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, it's very obvious what has happened in this Chamber. The Minister of Finance does have to vote. She missed the Yea vote. She has to vote in the negative.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order.

I'm—at this point, I—*[interjection]* Order. I'm not going to—*[interjection]* Order.

I'm not going to entertain any more points of order at this point because we already were—we already had had the numbers read back to us. So I am going to say, first of all, that a member cannot be forced to vote against their wishes. So I am going to say that. And I am going to say that the Clerk had already—*[interjection]* Order.

Can I—[interjection] Order.

I please would like to be heard—I'm not going to say please. I would like to be heard.

So a member cannot be forced to vote against their conscience. The Clerk had already read the numbers back, and so I declare that the motion has passed.

Mr. Hawranik: I challenge that ruling.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The ruling of the Chair has been challenged. Please call in the members.

This—just hold on. Whoa. Before—close the doors.

Order. Before you leave—come back for a moment, please. I'm sorry.

Voice Vote

Madam Deputy Speaker: I have to say, all in favour of the ruling of the Chair being sustained, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the ruling of the Chair, say nay—being sustained, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The—please, come on—shh. This is—could you please come back? Sit in your seats for one moment so that I can do this properly, please?

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of sustaining the ruling of the Chair, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to sustaining the ruling of the Chair, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Formal Vote

Mr. Hawranik: Recorded vote.

Madam Deputy Speaker: A recorded vote has been requested. Call in the members.

Could the division bells please be turned off?

* (19:00)

The ruling of the Chair has been challenged. The question before the House is shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained.

All those in favour, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those—[interjection]

Division

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

Yeas

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

Nays

Borotsik, Briese, Cullen, Derkach, Driedger, Eichler, Fauschou, Goertzen, Graydon, Hawranik, Maguire, McFadyen, Mitchelson, Pedersen, Rowat, Stefanson, Taillieu.

Madam Clerk (Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 31, Nays 17.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I declare the ruling of the Chair has been sustained.

Point of Order

Mr. Hawranik: On a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker: On a point of order.

Mr. Hawranik: I refer to *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, and I note on page 5 of *Beauchesne* it indicates in section 11 that behind the written rules and filling in the gaps, lies the vast quantity of precedent. Secondly, there's more than a century of practice in Parliament and in this Legislature, and the reality is that custom and precedent are basic to the parliamentary system. Right from *Beauchesne*; I quote directly from *Beauchesne*. Tradition is extremely important in this House. And, while we very strongly disagree with your—the ruling that you made, the reality is that if you're not enforcing the tradition of this House, then what are you enforcing?

The reality is that it took the duty of the Speaker to enforce not only rules of this House, but the

tradition of this House. And I point even to Mr. Speaker's ruling a couple of months ago, where he ruled that when an individual, one of our MLA—one of the MLAs tried to table a report from the—from LAMC filed by the Children's Advocate, he ruled as a matter of tradition that, in fact, it was not able to be tabled in this House. And I witnessed Mr. Speaker even direct one of the pages who—he had noticed, first of all, that the Premier (Mr. Selinger) had the report on his desk. He noticed the Premier was leafing through that report, and he directed the page to take the report out of the hands of the Premier. That's how important it is to enforce the traditions of this House, extremely important. I believe that Mr. Speaker was correct when he did that. It's up to the Speaker to enforce every tradition of this House, including all the rules.

And I believe, Madam Deputy Speaker, that it is a tradition in this House and in Parliament—and you ruled correctly when you indicated that the Minister of Finance (Ms. Wowchuk), because she did not stand up in this House to vote, that her vote was not counted in favour of Bill 31. Where the problem lies is where a ruling was just made that her vote would not count against Bill 31.

It's a long-standing tradition in this House that if you are in your seat, you are voting. If you don't want to vote, the reality is you leave your seat. You can still be in the Chamber and not vote. You can switch seats with somebody else if you like. But, if you are in your seat, that vote has to count one way or the other. And if you don't stand up when there is a motion for a bill, in favour a bill, that vote isn't counted, and correctly so because the vote count reflected that. But, at the same time, when you're in your seat, you have to vote. And if you don't vote for, you vote against. You—there's no abstentions in voting when you're in your seat.

The reality is even though that the Minister of Finance did not stand up during the time that we voted against the bill, in fact she did vote against the bill, in spite of the fact that she didn't stand up. That's the reality. That's the tradition of Parliament. That's the tradition of this Legislature for over a hundred years.

Mr. Speaker had it right about a month and a half ago when he enforced the tradition of this House. And I would ask, Madam Deputy Speaker, that you do the same. The reality is that the Minister of Finance voted against Bill 31 and, in fact, voted against her budget in doing so. That's the reality.

She did the right thing—she did the right thing, I must say. The reason she did the right thing is, I believe that—she wants to take a 40 percent pay cut. That's the reality. Her conscience got to her, and the reality is she voted against Bill 31, which protected ministerial salaries.

So I'd ask, Madam Deputy Speaker, that you rule in favour of this point of order because it reflects the true traditions of this House for over a hundred years and Parliament for more than a hundred years as well, and to change that tradition is unprecedented. It's unprecedented.

So I would ask, Madam Deputy Speaker, that you rule in favour of this point of order.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The honourable Government House Leader, on the same point of order.

* (19:10)

Mr. Blaikie: Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, the honourable member, in his point of order, seems to be making two contradictory points. He wants the Minister of Finance to have voted, but he and his colleagues have done everything in their power to prevent the Minister of Finance from voting and from having her vote recorded. They've indicated on a number of occasions that they would not grant leave in order for the Minister of Finance to have her true intentions recorded.

I find this to be extremely unpalatable. There—the member refers to traditions of this House and traditions of Parliament. It is a tradition in Parliament that, if an honourable member says that they made a mistake, that they sat down before they should've, that they were standing but sat down before they should've, the tradition of Parliament is to accept a member's word. That's the tradition that supersedes all other traditions, and it's the tradition that's being ignored here today, Madam Deputy Speaker, I think, at great cost to the, you know, to the esteem in which this Legislature is held, although, thankfully, no one is watching. Perhaps some are listening and having a hard time figuring what—what's going on, that we should spend all this time trying to create a situation in which the Minister of Finance could be construed to vote against her own bill. Surely, we make a mockery of all of us and of this place and of democracy when we try to have points of order and points that try to create that kind of situation.

The grown-up thing to do, the parliamentary thing to do, would be to accept that the bill has gone

forward; the honourable member's vote is not counted, regrettably, for her sake. She indicated afterwards how she would have voted had her vote been counted. It wasn't counted. The bill is passed.

There's really no need anymore, Madam Deputy Speaker, to pursue this matter except for motives that can hardly be described as, you know, except, generously, as mysterious.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The honourable member for Portage la Prairie, on the same point of order.

Mr. David Faurchou (Portage la Prairie): I've had the privilege of being a member of this Manitoba Legislative Assembly for some 12 years. Upon my entry into this Legislative Assembly, I was brought into the Assembly on—in a by-election. I was—it was very important that I was schooled in the rules of this Chamber, the traditions of this Chamber. The previous clerk of the Assembly took great pains to make certain I understood the rules of the Assembly when it came to a vote. It was stated to me that if you are in your seat, you are compelled to vote. If you leave your seat, then you are not compelled to vote.

The honourable member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk), the honourable member that serves as the Minister of Finance did not make any effort to leave her seat. Therefore, by convention, by tradition, she is compelled to vote. She did not vote in the affirmative so, therefore, she voted against the motion before us, and that is the tradition of our House.

Any—the only exclusion: remaining in one's seat and not being compelled to vote is by pairing. It's called pairing between the government side of the House and the opposition, upon agreement. That is the only exclusion. Madam Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Finance is compelled to be counted in the—with a vote against the motion.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order.

At this point, I want to advise the House that I've been lenient about points of order because, accordingly, we are in the sessional order and, as such, points of order are not to be raised right now.

But the presiding officer does have the discretion to ask the—for—ask for a recess and to call for a recess so that I can have an opportunity to talk to the two House leaders.

So that is what I'm going to do at this point. I am going to call for a recess. I will ring the bells when the recess is over.

The House recessed at 7:15 p.m.

The House resumed at 9:43 p.m.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order.

As all honourable members are aware, the House has been at an impasse for the past several hours with numerous points of order raised, as well as an extended recess.

I would like to clarify for the House that part of the difficulty with the issue that has arisen is due to the fact that there is no explicit mention in the rules of what must be done if a member does not vote while seated in his or her seat and is not paired. Rule 14(7) obligates those members who are in their seat must vote, but does not state what should happen if a member is not in compliance with the rule.

The action that the Chair has taken this evening were based on comparable precedent from November 7, 2005, where the honourable member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard) was in his seat at the time of a division on the amendment to the Throne Speech, but did not vote. The honourable member for River Heights rose on a point of order, indicating that when the vote was being conducted he had been distracted, and that had he voted, he would have voted against the amendment.

Speaker Hickes ruled there was no point of order. The then honourable member for Ste. Rose rose on a point of order and apologized to the House for distracting the member for River Heights. Speaker Hickes ruled in response to the second point of order, that the member for River Heights had clearly indicated that, had the member for River Heights voted, it would have been a Nay, and that in order for the vote to count, unanimous consent of the House was requested.

A request for unanimous consent was put to the House and unanimous consent of the House was not given. So the vote of the honourable member for River Heights was not counted at all.

Some members have raised the issue of receiving advice from the former clerk of the House, that if a member is in his or her seat and misses the opportunity to vote during the division, then the vote must automatically be counted the opposite way.

I had the opportunity to consult the former clerk this evening, and he indicates that he does not recall

any conversation where he had given such advice to a member. His current opinion is that a member who is present and is in his or her seat must vote, but there is no basis to support or conclude that the vote must, in a situation like this, be automatically cast in the opposite direction.

He also advised that in a case such as we have seen tonight, the member has missed the opportunity to vote, the vote is over, and the business then proceeds. I can appreciate that this is an issue that members have serious concerns about, as we have seen from the points of order that have been raised.

I would also note for the House that the Chair has been lenient in allowing points of order on this issue. As according to the sessional order that is, in effect, points of order are not permitted to be raised at this time. I have allowed points of order given the seriousness of the issue for members. Tonight, we have seen various solutions tried, such as leave for the member to vote and leave for the entire vote to be held again. In both cases, leave was denied.

We have also had points of order raised in response to rulings of the Chair, which is also not procedurally correct because if the House disagrees with a ruling, it should challenge the ruling on the basis of a voice and a recorded vote and not continue to raise points of order after a vote has been held on whether or not to sustain the ruling.

Based on the November 7, 2005, precedent from Speaker Hickes regarding the member for River Heights, given that unanimous consent has been denied, the vote of the honourable Minister of Finance (Ms. Wowchuk) will not be counted at all because the House has denied leave for the vote to count.

I suggest we now deal with the business of the House in accordance with the provision of the sessional order. But I do make a strong recommendation that the House and the House leaders have discussions about possible rule changes regarding rule 14(7) so that it can clearly be identified in the rules what is to happen should a comparable situation arise in the future.

Mr. Hawranik: Challenge the ruling.

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

Voice Vote

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of sustaining the ruling of the Chair, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the sustaining of the ruling of the Chair, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Formal Vote

Mr. Hawranik: A recorded vote.

Madam Deputy Speaker: A recorded vote has been requested. Call in the members.

Order. The ruling of the Chair has been challenged. 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, Chomiak, Dewar, Irvin-Ross, Jennissen, Jha, Korzeniowski, Lemieux, Mackintosh, Marcelino, Martindale, McGifford, Melnick, Nevakshonoff, Reid, Robinson, Rondeau, Saran, Selby, Selinger, Struthers, Swan, Wiebe, Wowchuk.

Nays

Borotsik, Briese, Cullen, Derkach, Driedger, Eichler, Faurshou, Goertzen, Graydon, Hawranik, Maguire, McFadyen, Mitchelson, Pedersen, Rowat, Stefanson, Taillieu.

Nays

Madam Clerk (Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 31, Nays 17.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I declare the ruling of the Chair has been sustained.

*(21:50)

Madam Deputy Speaker: The honourable Opposition House Leader, on a point of order?

Mr. Hawranik: No, Madam Deputy Speaker, just on a clarification.

Madam Deputy Speaker: On a clarification.

Mr. Hawranik: I think it became rather obvious to a number of members here in the Chamber that Jamie,

one of our pages, appeared very distraught during these proceedings. And I just wanted to let her know that, obviously, it's—what happened here this evening certainly was not her fault and that she did her job very well. She called the roll completely, accurately, and I can tell you that if I did it I probably would not be able to do the same, after having been here for eight or nine years. And I think that probably goes for almost everyone. We appreciate all the work they do and we hope they have a very—she and all of our pages have a very good summer.

Mr. Blaikie: I just want to second the sentiments of the honourable Opposition House Leader, both in terms of what transpired and also in terms of wishing the pages, all of them, a great summer. They've all done a great job for this Chamber and for the political process here in Manitoba. We're very proud of all of them.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I really sincerely want to thank the members for that on behalf of the pages. I know they work very hard, and it's very much appreciated, your kind words, so thank you very much.

* * *

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will now move on to the motion regarding the Capital Supply bill.

Ms. Wowchuk: I move, seconded by the honourable Premier (Mr. Selinger),

THAT there be granted out of the Consolidated Fund for capital purposes the sum of \$1,587,768,000 for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2011.

Motion presented.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to adopting the motion, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Hawranik: On division.

Madam Deputy Speaker: On division.

* * *

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will now move on to the motion regarding the Main Supply bill.

Ms. Wowchuk: Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Aboriginal and Northern Affairs (Mr. Robinson),

THAT there be granted to Her Majesty for the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 2011, out of the Consolidated Fund, the sum of \$10,536,565,000, as set out in Part A of Operating Expenditure, and \$797,196,000 set out in Part B, Capital Investment, of the Estimates.

Motion presented.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Voice Vote

Some Honourable Members: All those in favour of the motion, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the motion, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Hawranik: On division.

Madam Deputy Speaker: On division.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 37—The Appropriation Act, 2010

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will now move on to first—[interjection] Order. We will now move on to first reading and distribution of Bill 37.

Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Finance): I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Swan), that Bill 37, The Appropriation Act, be now read a first time and be ordered for second reading immediately.

Madam Deputy Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Finance, and seconded by the

honourable Minister of Justice, that Bill 37, the appropriations act, be now read a first time and be ordered for second reading immediately.

Is it the pleasure of the House to—*[interjection]*—oh, I'm sorry—The Appropriation Act, 2010.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to adopting the motion, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Official Opposition House Leader): On division.

Madam Deputy Speaker: On division.

* (22:00)

SECOND READINGS

Bill 37—The Appropriation Act, 2010

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will now move on to second reading of Bill 37.

Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Finance): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Advanced Education (Ms. McGifford), that Bill 37, The Appropriation Act, 2010, be now read a second time and be referred to Committee of the Whole.

Madam Deputy Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Finance, and seconded by the honourable Minister of Advanced Education and Literacy, that Bill 37, the appropriations act, 2010, be now read a second time and be referred to a Committee of the Whole.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to adopting the motion, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Official Opposition House Leader): On division.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 38—The Loan Act, 2010

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will now move on to first reading and distribution of Bill 38.

Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Finance): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Family Services and Consumer Affairs (Mr. Mackintosh), that Bill 38, The Loan Act, 2010, be now read a first time and be ordered for second reading immediately.

Madam Deputy Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Finance and seconded by the honourable Minister of Family Services that Bill 38, The Loan Act, 2010, be now read a first time and ordered for second reading immediately.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to adopting the motion, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I declare that the Yeas have it.

Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Official Opposition House Leader): On division.

SECOND READINGS

Bill 38—The Loan Act, 2010

Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Finance): I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives (Mr. Struthers), that Bill 38, The Loan Act, 2010, be now read a second time and be referred to a Committee of the Whole.

Motion presented.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to adopting the motion, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Formal Vote

Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Official Opposition House Leader): A recorded vote.

Madam Deputy Speaker: A recorded vote has been requested. Call in the members.

The question before the House is second reading of Bill 38, The Loan Act, 2010.

* (22:10)

Division

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

Yeas

Allan, Altemeyer, Bjornson, Blady, Blaikie, Braun, Caldwell, Chomiak, Dewar, Irvin-Ross, Jennissen, Jha, Korzeniowski, Lemieux, Mackintosh, Marcelino, Martindale, McGifford, Melnick, Nevakshonoff, Reid, Robinson, Rondeau, Saran, Selby, Selinger, Struthers, Swan, Wiebe, Wowchuk.

Nays

Borotsik, Briese, Cullen, Derkach, Driedger, Eichler, Faurshou, Goertzen, Graydon, Hawranik,

Lamoureux, Maguire, McFadyen, Mitchelson, Pedersen, Rowat, Stefanson, Taillieu.

Madam Clerk (Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 30, Nays 18.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will now move on to Committee of the Whole, consideration of Bills 37 and 38.

Could I call the acting—*[interjection]*

The House will now resolve into Committee of the Whole to consider and report Bill 37, The Appropriations Act, 2010, and Bill 38, The Loan Act, 2010, for concurrence and third reading.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. Chairperson (Rob Altemeyer): Order. Committee of Whole—Committee of the Whole will come to order to consider the following bills: Bill 37, The Appropriation Act, 2010; Bill 38, The Loan Act, 2010.

And I will note for the committee that, as the 100 hours of Estimates time has expired, these two bills are not debatable in the Committee of the Whole.

During the consideration of these bills, the enacting clauses, the schedules and the titles are postponed until all of the clauses have been considered in their proper order. Also, if there is agreement from the committee, I will call clauses in blocks that conform to pages.

Is that amenable? *[Agreed]*

Bill 37—The Appropriation Act, 2010

Mr. Chairperson): We will begin with clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 37, The Appropriation Act, 2010.

Clause 1—pass; clauses 2 through 4—*[interjection]*

An Honourable Member: Hello? He said no.

Mr. Chairperson: Did I hear a no?—*[interjection]*

I did hear, so this—just to be clear, this was with regards to clauses 2 through 4. Okay?

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: So, on the issue of clauses 2 through 4, all those in favour of passing clauses 2 through 4, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my view, the Yeas have it.

Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Official Opposition House Leader): On division.

Mr. Chairperson: On division. Duly noted.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Now, continuing, shall clauses 5 through 7 pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Chairperson: I heard a no.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour of clauses 5 through 7 passing, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my view, the Yeas have it.

Mr. Hawranik: On division.

Mr. Chairperson: On division. Duly noted.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Schedule—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

Bill 38—The Loan Act, 2010

Mr. Chairperson: Moving on to Bill 38, The Loan Act, 2010.

Shall clauses 1 and 2 pass?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Chairperson: I heard a no.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour of passing clauses 1 and 2, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Moving on—[interjection]—oh, sorry.

Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Official Opposition House Leader): On division.

Mr. Chairperson: On division. Thank you.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Moving on, shall clauses 3 through 5 pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Chairperson: I heard a no.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour of passing clauses 3 through 5, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Mr. Hawranik: On division.

Mr. Chairperson: On division. Duly noted, thank you.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Shall clauses 6 and 7 pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Chairperson: I heard a no.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Chairperson: Opposed, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Mr. Hawranik: On division.

Mr. Chairperson: On division.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Shall the schedule be passed?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Chairperson: Is there a no? I'll ask again. Shall the schedule be passed? Please be clear.

Schedule—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

That concludes the business currently before us.

Committee rise and call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

Committee Report

Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Chairperson): Madam Deputy Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the following bills: Bill 37, The Appropriation Act, 2010; Bill 38, The Loan Act, 2010, and reports the same without amendment.

I therefore move, seconded by honourable member for Transcona (Mr. Reid), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion presented.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the report of the committee being received, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the report of the committee being received, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Official Opposition House Leader): On division.

Madam Deputy Speaker: On division.

CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS (Continued)

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will now move on to concurrence and third reading of Bills 37 and 38.

Bill 38—The Loan Act, 2010

Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Ms. Wowchuk), that Bill 38, The Loan Act, 2010, reported from the Committee of the Whole, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there agreement of the House to pass the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the motion, say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

* (22:20)

Formal Vote

Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Official Opposition House Leader): A recorded vote.

Madam Deputy Speaker: A recorded vote has been requested. Call in the members.

Order. The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 38, The Loan Act, 2010.

Division

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

Yeas

Allan, Altemeyer, Ashton, Bjornson, Blady, Blaikie, Braun, Caldwell, Chomiak, Dewar, Irvin-Ross, Jennissen, Jha, Korzeniowski, Lemieux, Mackintosh,

Marcelino, Martindale, McGifford, Melnick, Nevakshonoff, Reid, Robinson, Rondeau, Saran, Selby, Selinger, Struthers, Swan, Wiebe, Wowchuk.

Nays

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

Madam Clerk (Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 31, Nays 19.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Bill 37—The Appropriation Act, 2010

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will now move on to third reading of Bill 37.

Hon. Bill Blaikie (Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Ms. Wowchuk), that Bill 37, The Appropriation Act, 2010, reported from the Committee of the Whole, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to adopting the motion, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Gerald Hawranik (Official Opposition House Leader): Yes, on division.

Madam Deputy Speaker: On division.

* * *

Madam Deputy Speaker: I am advised that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor is about to arrive to grant royal assent to the bills. I am therefore

interrupting the proceedings of the House for royal assent.

* (22:30)

ROYAL ASSENT

Acting Sergeant-at-Arms (Mr. Ray Gislason): His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

His Honour Philip S. Lee, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the throne, Madam Deputy Speaker addressed His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in the following words:

Madam Deputy Speaker: Your Honour:

At this sitting, the Legislative Assembly has passed certain bills that I ask Your Honour to give assent to.

Clerk Assistant (Mr. Claude Michaud): 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)

Bill 4—The Workplace Safety and Health Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la sécurité et l'hygiène du travail

Bill 5—The Cottage Property Tax Increase Deferral Act (Property Tax and Insulation Assistance Act Amended); Loi sur le report des majorations de taxes foncières visant les chalets (modification de la Loi sur l'aide en matière de taxes foncières et d'isolation thermique des résidences)

Bill 6—The Manitoba Association of School Trustees Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Association des commissaires d'écoles du Manitoba

Bill 7—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Suspending Drivers' Licences of Drug Traffickers); Loi modifiant le Code de la route (suspension de permis de conduire en cas d'infractions se rapportant au trafic de drogues)

Bill 8—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Safety Precautions to Be Taken When Approaching Tow Trucks and Other Designated Vehicles); Loi modifiant le Code de la route (précautions que doivent prendre les conducteurs qui s'approchent de dépanneuses ou d'autres véhicules désignés)

Bill 9—The Electricians' Licence Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le permis d'électricien

Bill 10—The Proceedings Against the Crown Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les procédures contre la Couronne

Bill 12—The Pimachiowin Aki World Heritage Fund Act; Loi sur le Fonds du patrimoine mondial Pimachiowin Aki

Bill 13—The Civil Remedies Against Organized Crime Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les recours civils contre le crime organisé

Bill 14—The Body Armour and Fortified Vehicle Control Act; Loi sur le contrôle des gilets de protection balistique et des véhicules blindés

Bill 15—The Franchises Act; Loi sur les franchises

Bill 16—The Order of Manitoba Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Ordre du Manitoba

Bill 17—The Biofuels Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les biocarburants

Bill 18—The Communities Economic Development Fund Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le Fonds de développement économique local

Bill 19—The Protection from Domestic Violence and Best Interests of Children Act (Family Law Statutes Amended); Loi sur la protection contre la violence familiale et l'intérêt supérieur des enfants (modification de dispositions législatives concernant le droit de la famille)

Bill 20—The University College of the North Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le Collège universitaire du Nord

Bill 21—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Immobilizers and Air Bags); Loi modifiant le Code de la route (dispositifs d'immobilisation et sacs gonflables)

Bill 22—The Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les caisses populaires et les credit unions

Bill 23—The Public Schools Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les écoles publiques

Bill 24—The Aboriginal Languages Recognition Act; Loi sur la reconnaissance des langues autochtones

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

modifiant la Loi sur la preuve au Manitoba (établissement d'une liste d'organisations criminelles)

Bill 26—The Addictions Foundation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Fondation manitobaine de lutte contre les dépendances

Bill 27—The Upper Fort Garry Heritage Provincial Park Act; Loi sur le parc provincial du patrimoine d'Upper Fort Garry

Bill 28—The Drivers and Vehicles Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les conducteurs et les véhicules

Bill 29—The Advanced Education Administration Act and Amendments to The Council on Post-Secondary Education Act and The Education Administration Act; Loi sur l'administration de l'enseignement postsecondaire et modifications concernant la Loi sur le Conseil de l'enseignement postsecondaire et la Loi sur l'administration scolaire

Bill 30—The Strengthened Enforcement of Family Support Payments and Miscellaneous Amendments Act (Various Acts Amended); Loi sur le renforcement des mesures d'exécution relatives aux paiements de pension alimentaire familiale et modifications diverses (modification de diverses dispositions législatives)

Bill 31—The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2010; Loi d'exécution du budget de 2010 et modifiant diverses dispositions législatives en matière de fiscalité

Bill 32—The Protection for Persons in Care Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la protection des personnes recevant des soins

Bill 34—The Consumer Protection Amendment Act (Negative Option Marketing and Enhanced Remedies); Loi modifiant la Loi sur la protection du consommateur (commercialisation par abonnement par défaut et amélioration des recours)

Bill 35—The Condominium Amendment Act (Phased Condominium Development); Loi modifiant la Loi sur les condominiums (aménagement par phases)

Bill 36—The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2010; Loi corrective de 2010

Bill 39—The Child and Family Services Amendment Act (Children's Advocate Reporting); Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille (rapport du protecteur des enfants)

Bill 203—The Coat of Arms, Emblems and the Manitoba Tartan Amendment Act (Provincial Soil Designated); Loi modifiant la Loi sur les armoiries, les emblèmes et le tartan du Manitoba (désignation du sol provincial)

Bill 223—The Jon Sigurdsson Day Act; Loi sur le jour de Jon Sigurdsson

Bill 225—The Public Health Amendment Act (Regulating Use of Tanning Equipment); Loi modifiant la Loi sur la santé publique (réglementation de l'utilisation des appareils de bronzage)

Bill 227—The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Unpaid Leave Related to Donating an Organ); Loi modifiant le Code des normes d'emploi (congé sans solde pour donneurs d'organes)

Bill 300—An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Portage District General Hospital Foundation; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation la Fondation de l'Hôpital général du district Portage

Bill 301—The Salvation Army William and Catherine Booth College Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le Collège William et Catherine Booth de l'Armée du Salut

Bill 302—The Southwood Golf and Country Club Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le « Southwood Golf and Country Club »

Madam Clerk (Patricia Chaychuk): In Her Majesty's name, His Honour assents to these bills.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Your Honour:

The Legislative Assembly of Manitoba asks Your Honour to accept the following bills.

Clerk Assistant (Mr. Claude Michaud):

Bill 37—The Appropriation Act, 2010; Loi de 2010 portant affectation de crédits

Bill 38—The Loan Act, 2010; Loi d'emprunt de 2010

Madam Clerk: In Her Majesty's name, the Lieutenant-Governor thanks the Legislative Assembly and assents to these bills.

His Honour was then pleased to retire.

"God Save the Queen" was sung.

"O Canada" was sung.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Please be seated.

Prior to announcing adjournment of the House, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the table officers and the clerks. They've done an excellent job of guiding the House and on behalf of all members I thank you for your service to the House. It's been very, very much appreciated. Thank you.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank all honourable members. This was a difficult time for me, a challenging time for me, something I've never done before. I appreciate the support that I received from all members of the House. I very much appreciate the opportunity that you've given me to do this job, and I sincerely appreciate all your support in giving me this trust.

I wish you all the best for the summer, and I hope you enjoy a fabulous summer and I see all of you back here who wish to be back here in—well, whenever the House is called back.

The hour being after 5 o'clock p.m., the House is adjourned and stands adjourned to the call of the Speaker.

Bill 4–The Workplace Safety and Health Amendment Act		McFadyen	3207
		Selinger	3208
Dyck	3183		
Cullen	3185	Bill 27–The Upper Fort Garry Heritage Provincial Park Act	
Bill 6–The Manitoba Association of School Trustees Amendment Act		Maguire	3209
		Gerrard	3209
Cullen	3186		
Faurschou	3188	Bill 32–The Protection for Persons in Care Amendment Act	
Eichler	3189		
Bill 9–The Electricians' Licence Amendment Act		Driedger	3210
		Gerrard	3210
Eichler	3189		
Dyck	3190	Bill 36–The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2010	
Faurschou	3191		
Lamoureux	3192	Goertzen	3211
Bill 10–The Proceedings Against the Crown Amendment Act		Bill 39–The Child and Family Services Amendment Act	
		Mitchelson	3211
Borotsik	3192	Lamoureux	3212
Gerrard	3195		
Faurschou	3195	Bill 29–The Advanced Education Administration Act and Amendments to The Council on Post-Secondary Education Act and The Education Administration Act	3214
Bill 12–The Pimachiowin Aki World Heritage Fund Act			
		Bill 31–The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2010	3217
Maguire	3196		
Gerrard	3198	Bill 38–The Loan Act, 2010	3230
Bill 15–The Franchises Act			
		Bill 37–The Appropriation Act, 2010	3231
Borotsik	3198		
Bill 17–The Biofuels Amendment Act		Concurrence Motion	
		Blaikie	3191
Borotsik	3200		
Bill 18–The Communities Economic Development Fund Amendment Act		Report Stage Amendments	
		Bill 31–The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2010	
Rowat	3201		
Bill 23–The Public Schools Amendment Act		Stefanson	3215
		Gerrard	3217
Cullen	3203		
Lamoureux	3204	Introduction of Bills	
Bill 24–The Aboriginal Languages Recognition Act		Bill 37–The Appropriation Act, 2010	
		Wowchuk	3226
Robinson	3205		
Gerrard	3207		

Bill 38–The Loan Act, 2010 Wowchuk	3227	Bill 15–The Franchises Act	3232
Second Readings		Bill 16–The Order of Manitoba Amendment Act	3232
Bill 37–The Appropriation Act, 2010	3227	Bill 17–The Biofuels Amendment Act	3232
Bill 38–The Loan Act, 2010	3228	Bill 18–The Communities Economic Development Fund Amendment Act	3232
Committee of the Whole		Bill 19–The Protection from Domestic Violence and Best Interests of Children Act (Family Law Statutes Amended)	3232
Bill 37–The Appropriation Act, 2010	3228	Bill 20–The University College of the North Amendment Act	3232
Bill 38–The Loan Act, 2010	3229	Bill 21–The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Immobilizers and Air Bags)	3232
Royal Assent		Bill 22–The Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Amendment Act	3232
Bill 4–The Workplace Safety and Health Amendment Act	3231	Bill 23–The Public Schools Amendment Act	3232
Bill 5–The Cottage Property Tax Increase Deferral Act (Property Tax and Insulation Assistance Act Amended)	3231	Bill 24–The Aboriginal Languages Recognition Act	3232
Bill 6–The Manitoba Association of School Trustees Amendment Act	3231	Bill 25–The Manitoba Evidence Amendment Act (Scheduling of Criminal Organizations)	3232
Bill 7–The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Suspending Drivers' Licences of Drug Traffickers)	3231	Bill 26–The Addictions Foundation Amendment Act	3232
Bill 8–The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Safety Precautions to Be Taken When Approaching Tow Trucks and Other Designated Vehicles)	3231	Bill 27–The Upper Fort Garry Heritage Provincial Park Act	3232
Bill 9–The Electricians' Licence Amendment Act	3231	Bill 28–The Drivers and Vehicles Amendment Act	3232
Bill 10–The Proceedings Against the Crown Amendment Act	3232	Bill 29–The Advanced Education Administration Act and Amendments to The Council on Post-Secondary Education Act and The Education Administration Act	3232
Bill 12–The Pimachiowin Aki World Heritage Fund Act	3232	Bill 30–The Strengthened Enforcement of Family Support Payments and Miscellaneous Amendments Act (Various Acts Amended)	3232
Bill 13–The Civil Remedies Against Organized Crime Amendment Act	3232		
Bill 14–The Body Armour and Fortified Vehicle Control Act	3232		

Bill 31–The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2010	3232	Bill 223–The Jon Sigurdsson Day Act	3233
Bill 32–The Protection for Persons in Care Amendment Act	3232	Bill 225–The Public Health Amendment Act (Regulating Use of Tanning Equipment)	3233
Bill 34–The Consumer Protection Amendment Act (Negative Option Marketing and Enhanced Remedies)	3232	Bill 227–The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Unpaid Leave Related to Donating an Organ)	3233
Bill 35–The Condominium Amendment Act (Phased Condominium Development)	3232	Bill 300–An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Portage District General Hospital Foundation	3233
Bill 36–The Statutes Correction and Minor Amendments Act, 2010	3232	Bill 301–The Salvation Army William and Catherine Booth College Incorporation Amendment Act	3233
Bill 39–The Child and Family Services Amendment Act (Children's Advocate Reporting)	3232	Bill 302–The Southwood Golf and Country Club Incorporation Amendment Act	3233
Bill 203–The Coat of Arms, Emblems and the Manitoba Tartan Amendment Act (Provincial Soil Designated)	3233	Bill 37–The Appropriation Act, 2010	3233
		Bill 38–The Loan Act, 2010	3233

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>