

Fourth Session – Forty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
Standing Committee
on
Social and Economic Development

Chairperson
Mr. Len Isleifson
Constituency of Brandon East

Vol. LXXVI No. 5 - 6 p.m., Tuesday, May 24, 2022

ISSN 1708-6698

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Forty-Second Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
AL TOMARE, Nello	Transcona	NDP
ASAGWARA, Uzoma	Union Station	NDP
BRAR, Diljeet	Burrows	NDP
BUSHIE, Ian	Keewatinook	NDP
CLARKE, Eileen, Hon.	Agassiz	PC
COX, Cathy	Kildonan-River East	PC
CULLEN, Cliff, Hon.	Spruce Woods	PC
DRIEDGER, Myrna, Hon.	Roblin	PC
EICHLER, Ralph	Lakeside	PC
EWASKO, Wayne, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	PC
FIELDING, Scott, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
FONTAINE, Nahanni	St. Johns	NDP
FRIESEN, Cameron, Hon.	Morden-Winkler	PC
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Lib.
GOERTZEN, Kelvin, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
GORDON, Audrey, Hon.	Southdale	PC
GUENTER, Josh	Borderland	PC
GUILLEMARD, Sarah, Hon.	Fort Richmond	PC
HELWER, Reg, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
ISLEIFSON, Len	Brandon East	PC
JOHNSON, Derek, Hon.	Interlake-Gimli	PC
JOHNSTON, Scott, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
KHAN, Obby	Fort Whyte	PC
KINEW, Wab	Fort Rouge	NDP
LAGASSÉ, Bob	Dawson Trail	PC
LAGIMODIERE, Alan, Hon.	Selkirk	PC
LAMONT, Dougald	St. Boniface	Lib.
LAMOUREUX, Cindy	Tyndall Park	Lib.
LATHLIN, Amanda	The Pas-Kameesak	NDP
LINDSEY, Tom	Flin Flon	NDP
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MARCELINO, Malaya	Notre Dame	NDP
MARTIN, Shannon	McPhillips	PC
MICHALESKI, Brad	Dauphin	PC
MICKLEFIELD, Andrew	Rossmere	PC
MORLEY-LECOMTE, Janice	Seine River	PC
MOSES, Jamie	St. Vital	NDP
NAYLOR, Lisa	Wolseley	NDP
NESBITT, Greg	Riding Mountain	PC
PEDERSEN, Blaine	Midland	PC
PIWNIUK, Doyle, Hon.	Turtle Mountain	PC
REYES, Jon, Hon.	Waverley	PC
SALA, Adrien	St. James	NDP
SANDHU, Mintu	The Maples	NDP
SCHULER, Ron	Springfield-Ritchot	PC
SMITH, Andrew, Hon.	Lagimodière	PC
SMITH, Bernadette	Point Douglas	NDP
SMOOK, Dennis	La Vérendrye	PC
SQUIRES, Rochelle, Hon.	Riel	PC
STEFANSON, Heather, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
TEITSMA, James	Radisson	PC
WASYLIW, Mark	Fort Garry	NDP
WHARTON, Jeff, Hon.	Red River North	PC
WIEBE, Matt	Concordia	NDP
WISHART, Ian	Portage la Prairie	PC
WOWCHUK, Rick	Swan River	PC
<i>Vacant</i>	Thompson	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Tuesday, May 24, 2022

TIME – 6. p.m.

LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba

**CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Len Isleifson
(Brandon East)**

**VICE-CHAIRPERSON – Ms. Janice
Morley-Lecomte (Seine River)**

ATTENDANCE – 6 QUORUM – 4

Members of the committee present:

Hon. Ms. Clarke, Hon. Mr. Friesen

*Mr. Isleifson, Mses. Morley-Lecomte, Naylor,
Mr. Wasyliw*

APPEARING:

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux, MLA for Tyndall Park

*Hon. Jon Reyes, Minister of Advanced Education,
Skills and Immigration*

*Hon. Kelvin Goertzen, Minister of Justice and
Attorney General*

PUBLIC PRESENTERS:

*Bill 29–The Mennonite College Federation
Amendment Act*

Cheryl Pauls, Canadian Mennonite University

*Bill 33–The Municipal Assessment Amendment
and Municipal Board Amendment Act*

*Kam Blight, Association of Manitoba Muni-
cipalities*

*Bill 34–The City of Winnipeg Charter Amend-
ment and Planning Amendment Act*

*Marc Pittet, City of Winnipeg Planning, Property
and Development Department*

James Platt, private citizen

*Bill 228–The Eating Disorders Awareness Week
Act*

*Elaine Stevenson, Alyssa Stevenson Eating
Disorder Memorial Trust*

Lea Neufeld La Rue, Women's Health Clinic

Kristen Bauman, private citizen

MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

*Bill 16 – The Financial Administration
Amendment Act*

*Bill 29 – The Mennonite College Federation
Amendment Act*

*Bill 33 – The Municipal Assessment Amendment
and Municipal Board Amendment Act*

*Bill 34 – The City of Winnipeg Charter
Amendment and Planning Amendment Act*

*Bill 37 – The International Child Support and
Family Maintenance (Hague Convention) Act*

*Bill 228–The Eating Disorders Awareness Week
Act*

* * *

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Will the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development please come to order.

Before the committee can proceed with the business before it, it must elect a new Chairperson. Are there any nominations for this position?

Hon. Eileen Clarke (Minister of Municipal Relations): I'll nominate Len Isleifson, MLA for Brandon East.

Madam Vice-Chairperson: Len Isleifson has been nominated.

Are there any other nominations? No?

Hearing no other nominations, Len, will you please take the Chair.

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

Mr. Chairperson: Good evening.

This meeting has been called to consider the following bills: Bill 16, The Financial Administration Amendment Act; Bill 29, The Mennonite College Federation Amendment Act; Bill 33, The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Municipal Board Amendment Act; Bill 34, The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Planning Amendment Act; Bill 37, the international child support and family maintenance, the Hogue [*phonetic*] convention act; and Bill 228, The Eating Disorders Awareness Week Act.

So, to start, I would like to inform all in attendance of the provisions in our rules regarding the hours of adjournment. A standing committee meeting to consider a bill must not sit past midnight to hear public presentations or to consider clause by clause of a bill, except by unanimous consent of the committee.

Also, because today is the specified bill committee stage deadline day, our rule 2, subsection (16), applies and states: At 11 p.m. any member of the committee who wishes to move an amendment to a bill must file 20 copies of the amendment with the clerk of the committee, and the clerk must distribute the amendment to members of the committee. After that time, an amendment may be moved only if copies of it were filed with the clerk and distributed as required by this rule.

At midnight, the Chair of the committee must interrupt the proceedings and, without further debate or amendment other than an amendment distributed as required by paragraph (b), put every question necessary to complete clause-by-clause consideration of bills under consideration.

Prior to proceeding with public presentations, I would like to advise members of the public regarding the process of speaking in committee. In accordance with our rules, a time limit of 10 minutes must be allocated for presentations, with another five minutes allowed for questions from committee members.

If a presenter is not in attendance when their name is called, they will be dropped to the bottom of the list. If the presenter is not in attendance when their name is called a second time, they will be removed from the presenters list.

The proceedings of our meetings are recorded in order to provide a verbatim 'transcript'. Each time someone wishes to speak, whether it be an MLA or a presenter, I first have to say the person's name. This is the signal for the Hansard recorder to turn the mics on and off.

Also, because the day is the specified bill committee stage deadline day, our rule 2(16) applies and states: If a committee considering bills has not completed public presentations, it must close public presentations by 9 p.m. By unanimous consent, the deadline can be extended to 10 p.m. The public has the ability to provide written submissions for an additional 24 hours.

Thank you for your patience, and we will now proceed with public presentations.

Bill 29—The Mennonite College Federation Amendment Act

Mr. Chairperson: So I will now call on Cheryl Pauls from the Canadian Mennonite University.

Cheryl, I would ask that you please come to the podium, and if you have anything to hand out, should be—Ms. Pauls, the floor is yours.

Cheryl Pauls (Canadian Mennonite University): Thank you. Good evening.

Dear Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development, it's my pleasure to be here, and I am here to speak in favour of Bill 29, The Mennonite College Federation Amendment Act. In fact, I do so with gratitude and with honour.

I am grateful for two things that I will name. One is the work of the government in pursuing these amendments, and secondly, the quality of the legislative drafting. I myself came to administration from music, and there are places where the best of poetry and music and legal proceedings meet, and that is to bring an elegance—to bring an elegance to the clarity of what the work can do and to bring an elegance to the possibilities for facing conditions that cannot be imagined at the time of writing. And so, I'm very grateful for the quality of the legislative drafters who have prepared these amendments.

This amendment—or this bill brings to date and takes forward the original Mennonite College Federation Act of 1998, which in itself is a—excuse me—a fine piece of legislation. It was a way of what became Canadian Mennonite University, CMU, getting started to become a university that would include and be more than the sum of its originating parts; that is, the programs and the purviews of the three colleges that we—that—through which it began.

Now, CMU began with the dubious honour of being one of the smallest universities in the country and the most top-heavy administration structure, with three presidents, three boards, three personnel polities and so on. Very quickly, we moved to a single structure, and the act was very good in being something through which we could become a single university with one board, one president, one financial set, one set of programs and so on, even as we retained the structures lined out in the original Mennonite College Federation Act that allowed us to bring our constituencies of the three founding colleges together.

At this time, though, I'm very pleased that this amendment moves from a federation of colleges to a

university that has been established in its own right, and this gives us a room to move beyond being just a simple coming together of those three originating colleges.

What does this allow for CMU? Well, first of all, it just brings together some work that was—that felt like extra time, red tape, one might say: filing audited financial statements for colleges that no longer had any activities, so nil financial sets, and also maintaining boards of these shell structures.

Also, with this, though, we're able to move in a way that our bylaws have been able to keep pace and yet have brought us to a point that CMU, being a centred entity that no longer has the structure of things in its act, such as the initial board and that kind of language, that allows us to move forward at this time.

You will notice in this amendment that there also is a reference to repealing the—sorry—the Menno Simons College act. This in itself was a private member's bill, and it in itself was a way of getting started for CMU.

It was far inferior as a piece of legislation to the public act of The Mennonite College Federation Act, and so its properties became really inconsequential at the time of CMU being founded.

* (18:10)

In terms of repealing this at the—at this time, it does not mean that we will cease to operate the activities that currently are seen as being Mennonite—or sorry, Menno Simons College, in conjunction with University of Winnipeg.

Rather, just like the faculty of Health Sciences has colleges that fit within its purview, college is not the name of an institution and how we use it for Menno Simons College, but rather akin to a department within Canadian Mennonite University.

So I want to thank you. Overall, The Mennonite College Federation Act speaks of the betterment of society through furthering the intellectual, spiritual, moral, physical, social and community development of its students and we're grateful to have been a place that has been able to fulfill that mandate and grateful that the provisions in this amendment allow us to take that mandate forward.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation. The floor is now open for questions.

Do any committee members have questions?

Hon. Cameron Friesen (Minister of Finance): President Cheryl Pauls, I want to welcome you to committee this evening and I just—I really don't have a question for you. I wanted to simply thank you for being here this evening.

I thought it was an interesting point that I happen to be a graduate from one of these colleges. Now this legislation sees into a new cycle in its evolution.

Thank you for your leadership at the college—or at the university, I should say. I thank you for being here this evening. And I just wanted to also acknowledge that you have a—have cited the good work of Legislative Counsel this evening and I think that's appropriate. It's a group within the Legislature that we legislators rely on heavily. Most of their work is done quietly and out of the limelight, but I think it's very appropriate to acknowledge.

I know, from time to time I have put inordinate demands on this unit on—in respect of timelines and other things, but the quality of the work and the way in which their work is done is really worthy of acknowledging. So that you for doing that this evening and thank you for being involved in the process that has led to this Bill 29 here this evening.

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Pauls, any comments?

C. Pauls: Thank you.

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Tyndall Park): I, too, just want to thank you for coming out and joining us for committee tonight in person, as well, and all the work that you've put in and to providing some of the background.

Just in your presentation, I learned more from you, in addition to what we learned in second reading in the House, so I want to thank you for that. And, just in your own words, I want to thank you for the elegance that you brought to the committee today, that you have to see in you as well.

C. Pauls: Most grateful for your comments. Thank you.

Ms. Lisa Naylor (Wolseley): Thank you, President Pauls, I just wanted to also just speak on behalf of this—this is certainly a bill that we've been happy to support and it was really helpful to hear your enthusiasm and remarks on the origin and development of this bill. So thank you very much.

C. Pauls: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Any other questions?

We thank you very much for your presentation this evening.

Bill 33—The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Municipal Board Amendment Act

Mr. Chairperson: Our next presenter this evening is Kam Blight, president of the Association of Manitoba Municipalities.

Mr. Blight, whenever you're ready, if you want to turn your camera on and—good evening, Mr. Blight. The floor is yours for your presentation.

Kam Blight (Association of Manitoba Municipalities): Good evening, everyone. My name is Kam Blight and I'm the reeve of the RM of Portage la Prairie, and I'm speaking today as president of the Association of Manitoba Municipalities.

On behalf of the AMM, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to present municipal priorities related to Bill 33. My presentation tonight will focus on three key areas: first, I want to talk about the appeals issue that Bill 33 is partly meant to solve; secondly, I would like to express our gratitude for the changes proposed; and lastly, I want to urge the Province to keep acting on opportunities to address municipal concerns.

The more we tighten up the bill 37 model into a true appeal system, the better it is for local democracy. The better it is for the province's economy and the better it is for the government's own development objectives.

First, let's start with the challenge. In 2020, Premier Pallister's government tabled bill 48, which later became bill 37. The original bill was written on the recommendation of a task force that rarely met, consulted a few, and did too much to extrapolate Winnipeg's challenges as if they applied equally across the province.

We were told a stronger land-use appeal system was needed to make sure we said yes to more developments. It's not clear how that claim was fair, since the 2021 census reconfirms that several Manitoba municipalities are growing more rapidly than we've seen in decades. In fact, some Manitoba municipalities are among the fastest growing in Canada.

The AMM responded with constructive suggestions to try to limit the high risk of appeals, backlogs, and unaccounted—accountable decisions within the proposed model. As AMM president, it's important for me to remind MLAs that we are an association of governments. Our members have hundreds of years of

combined experience in land-use policy and regulation between us. We know from first-hand experience that, for developers or development critics, paying a fee for an appeal is a small price to pay for a second shot at their desired outcome. The easier it is for anyone to appeal, the more likely it is that government approvals would turn into a practice round for final adjudication in front of the unelected Municipal Board.

Ontario's appeals model is closer to bill 37 than any other, and Ontario is already on their second round of millions of dollars in new hiring and spending to try to clear their backlogs. In the Ontario Land Tribunal's last annual report, they reported a caseload of 1,858 active land-use appeals, and they had only managed to resolve 560 by year's end. This leaves billions in development projects trapped in limbo, waiting to get to the hearing stage. That's the biggest problem Bill 33 is meant to solve.

Which brings me to my second, more positive point: We always give credit where credit is due. Bill 33 confirms that the new government is listening. So let me be clear: this bill does respond to our key recommendations to varying degrees. The bill also seeks to manage appeal volumes by allowing for dispute resolution before a hearing.

When we first saw bill 37, we encouraged the government to consider six specific challenges. Each one drew on a safeguard already in place in at least one other province's appeals legislation. To recap, we proposed that the system should (1) require anyone filing an appeal to state their reason for appealing in the filing; (2) limit permissible grounds for appeal; (3) limit appeals to those already engaged in the process; (4) limit the scope of appeal decisions so they couldn't clash with municipal or provincial plans; (5) further reduce appeal timelines to match other provincial standards; and (6) impose accountability measures on the Municipal Board just as you have on municipalities. Acting on all these six recommendations would turn the bill 37 model into a true appeals system that respects the decisions of local councils who know their communities best.

As noted, Manitoba Municipal Relations has responded to all of our recommendations to varying degrees, and we appreciate our ongoing dialogue with the department. We agree that the government has taken positive steps on recommendations Nos. 1, 2, and 5, both in this bill and in Bill 34.

Although the department notes that recommendations Nos. 3, 4, and 6 may be potentially addressed

under other statutes, this leaves the scope of appeal decisions potentially somewhat still up for interpretation. Some of these recommendations may also be further clarified under other processes at an unspecified point in the future. While we appreciate the government's response and clear action that has been taken to address our concerns, we believe greater clarity can still be provided to all stakeholders, particularly as legislation is being opened up now and amendments are being proposed.

Therefore, I would like to restate, our goals here are the same: to better manage the speed, scope and accountability of the new appeals system so that it works smoothly and quickly for all Manitobans.

In closing, the AMM wishes to once again thank Minister Clarke, Deputy Minister Gray, and departmental staff for working collaboratively to get us much further ahead on this challenge.

Thank you very much for your attention.

* (18:20)

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have any questions for the presenter?

Hon. Eileen Clarke (Minister of Municipal Relations): Thank you, President Blight, for taking the time to join us tonight, and I just want to clarify for the record. I believe you were speaking to Bill 34, which is the planning. Bill 33 is the assessment, digital assessment. So I think I just want to clarify the record. I believe your comments were directed to Bill 34. But I thank you for that.

We have had some good discussions, and I have to acknowledge previous ministers that have worked on getting us this far, as well as the collaboration table that is working with many stakeholders to ensure that we're moving forward in a positive direction and that we are addressing the needs and the concerns brought forth by the Association of Manitoba Municipalities, from the industry itself, and this is a continuation of work that we are looking forward to.

And we appreciate the information that you have brought forward, and, yes, there is much to do yet in regards to the regulations, et cetera, but we certainly look forward to that, and we look forward to discussing this in the future as well as with the rest of your committee.

K. Blight: Thank you very much for that, Minister Clarke, and I apologize for the confusion. I have down Bill 33, The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Municipal Board Amendment Act. So I apologize for that. But thank you very much. I look forward to the ongoing dialogue that we'll have together in the future.

Mr. Mark Wasyliv (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Blight, for being here today and sharing your thoughts.

If I hear from you correctly, there is obviously some concerns about managing frivolous appeals, and I'm wondering what recommendations would you give to the Legislature of how we could tighten this legislation up, how it could go further, in your mind, to be sort of fair to local governance.

K. Blight: Well, thank you very much for that—the question.

And I know we provided—or the AMM staff have provided multiple different recommendations in regards to this to the provincial government.

And, ultimately, we're just trying to limit the amount of frivolous appeals and the scope of appeals that is there and make sure that it's limited to those that are involved in the process already, so that outsiders cannot become involved in the process and delay the appeals and the project itself going forward.

So we're once—we're just trying to limit the scope of appeals and make sure that it's legislated, it's in the legislation to exactly what can and cannot be appealed, and also just make sure and limit it to those that are already a part of the process.

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Tyndall Park): I'd like to thank you, Mr. Blight, for your presentation this evening.

You spoke a little bit about the need for greater clarification. I was wondering if, provided the opportunity right now, you could elaborate on that a little bit more. What specifically could be clarified further?

K. Blight: Well, thank you very much as well for that question.

And just, you know, I guess I'll go back to more clarification is required when it comes to limiting the appeals to those that are already engaged in the process. So, right now, the response we got from the Province of Manitoba states that, under The Planning Act and City of Winnipeg Charter, an appeal to the Municipal Board can only be triggered by those

already engaged in the process, including—and then it names the individuals, the applicant, et cetera. But at the very bottom of this response it says: The Municipal Board is also addressing this item through, in quotes, interested person requirements in the draft planning appeal rules that will be adopted under The Municipal Act.

So, for us, then, that—it just leaves it subject to interpretation where there's got to be greater clarity as to exactly who these interested persons are, et cetera. And so we're just asking for it to all be laid out in this legislation. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you.

Any further questions?

Hearing none, Mr. Blight, thank you very much for your joining us this evening with your presentation.

**Bill 34—The City of Winnipeg Charter
Amendment and Planning Amendment Act**

Mr. Chairperson: Our next presenter this evening is Marc Pittet, the City of Winnipeg Planning, Property and Development Department.

Mr. Pittet, if you're on camera, I ask that you turn your camera on, when you're ready.

Thank you very much for joining us this evening. The floor is open for your presentation.

Marc Pittet (City of Winnipeg Planning, Property and Development Department): Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Through you, I'd like to thank yourself and the members of the standing committee for hearing my presentation this evening.

As you've heard, I'm Marc Pittet, and I'm the manager of real estate and land development—the City of Winnipeg. This is the second time in just over a year that I've appeared before the standing committee.

The last time was to speak to bill 37, and when I had tried to limit my comments to our most important concerns, I still ran out of time. So tonight I will ensure I address our most significant concerns, and I'll start immediately by speaking to the new charter provisions pertaining to ordinary mail.

Under new sections 246(1.1)(a) and 275(1.1), the City must provide notice by ordinary mail within 20 days of receiving a complete application for a development permit or development/zoning

application. For your information, I'm the City's representative on the bill 37 working group, and in my role I meet regularly with staff from the Province.

This is not a change that was raised with me prior to the tabling of this bill. Had it been raised, I would have advised that providing notice through ordinary mail would be incredibly costly, time consuming and unnecessarily damaging to the environment. The City issues almost 40,000 permits per year, and this requirement would be counterintuitive to our recent efforts to digitize this process.

I'd like to request this provision be deleted to allow the City of Winnipeg to continue to issue this notice electronically, as provided for in the original clause that was included in bill 37. There is nothing wrong with the existing process, so if it's not broken, why make the change?

I'll also point out that this change was only to The City of Winnipeg Charter and not The Planning Act, which is contrary to the basic premise of bill 37 and its predecessor, bill 48, which was to ensure consistency, predictability and alignment throughout the province of Manitoba.

Similarly, another change that would—was not made to The Planning Act and included in Bill 34 without any prior notice or consultation is outlined under sections 234.2(1) and 234.2(2), which require the City of Winnipeg to pass a bylaw to establish criteria for determining when a secondary plan is required.

Our city-wide bylaw, Complete Communities, covers much of what is being required under section 234.2(2), but not all. After this bill was tabled, the City of Winnipeg did take the time to consult with industry on this clause, and I'm pleased to advise that they are willing to work collaboratively with us on drafting a bylaw for council to consider, but this will take time. We, along with industry, respectfully request that these two sections not be proclaimed until at least June 1st, 2023.

My last major concern with this bill is with section 234.4(1). This clause affords the City of Winnipeg 20 days—that's 20 calendar days, not 20 business days—to determine if a secondary plan meets the requirements of the bylaw that we hope you are going to give us time—the time to write.

Twenty calendar days is not long enough for City staff to make this determination. A comprehensive secondary plan application could include hundreds of pages of information, including traffic and

engineering studies, that would inform the final form of the plan. We would respectfully request this timeline be extended to at least 60 days.

James Platt, the senior planner with the City and former regional manager of planning at the Province, is up next, and he'll be speaking at length about secondary plans and other related planning changes.

In closing, it's evident that Bill 34 was rushed. This bill is making additional major changes to the charter while the City is still adjusting, both operationally and legislatively, to address bill 37. The City has only recently been provided with a draft version of the planning handbook. The handbook is currently being updated to address bill 37, which has yet to be proclaimed in its entirety. We're also still waiting on the promised the Municipal Board guide.

In the FAQs that were published after Bill 34 was tabled, it is stated that the City of Winnipeg was consulted. I want to be clear: once again, the City of Winnipeg was not consulted on many of the proposed changes in advance of this bill being tabled.

In truth, I've enjoyed getting to know many of the provincial planning staff, who I've met with on many occasions the last two months. It's been beneficial to help them understand planning processes as at the City, as we explain how the changes they are being told to make impact our approval processes.

We're always ready to continue to consult and collaborate, and *[inaudible]* fine-tune legislation to ensure it meets the—with the intent driving it. But that intent, it would seem, is often lost when it goes from policy makers to planning staff to the lawyers who ultimately draft.

* (18:30)

The Province clearly needs time to address some of the inconsistencies in Bill 34, as well as properly consult with the City of Winnipeg and development industry.

And, in just over five minutes, I'm going to close, and I'll thank you for your time and attention.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Pittet, thank you very much for your presentation.

The floor is open for questions.

Hon. Eileen Clarke (Minister of Municipal Relations): Thank you, Mr. Pittet, for joining us tonight.

And since coming into this department in January, I have paid special attention to these two bills that are before us tonight. And I took the time to meet with other stakeholders to have discussions, and I just want to assure you that that will continue. I'm going to be watching this very carefully. I indicated to the task force, the working group, that communication and 'transparenty'—transparency is ultimately imperative as we move forward on this.

And I thank you for bringing your concerns forward to—for me to hear it personally, and I also thank the committee that's working on this with other members of staff, like James Platt, and other professionals in the City.

So, thank you once again for being here tonight.

M. Pittet: Thank you, Minister Clarke. We appreciate your appointment to this portfolio and your diligence.

Mr. Mark Wasyliw (Fort Garry): Thank you very much for being here. Certainly, your comments are, I think, striking a note of caution that this government needs to hear.

I'm wondering, in relation to your concerns about the notice being required to be produced through the mail. That's obviously an extra layer of red tape that is going to be 'fosted' on you.

Has there been any numbers run by the City of how much this is going to cost city taxpayers a year to comply with that section?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Pittet?

M. Pittet: Sorry, Mr. Chair. It is estimated that that would between—be between four to six hundred thousand dollars in hard costs and staff costs.

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Tyndall Park): Thank you, Mr. Pittet, for your presentation this evening. I appreciated how you came forward with three very specific points, and you not only brought forward the points, but potential solutions that we can debate as well.

I was wondering—you spoke about the 20 days not being long enough and threw out the number of 60 days. And you talked a little bit about as to why, but I'm curious—like, that—those extra 40 days, what would take place within those 40 days?

M. Pittet: Within those extra 40 days, the public service would be afforded the opportunity—I'll give you one example: a traffic impact study is submitted that needs to be reviewed by our Public Works Department. This would typically take them up to six weeks to review on its own. And then when you

take that traffic study, which would inform the shape—the form and shape of the actual secondary planning area, that leads to the next conversation in terms of the look and feel and layout of the entire subdivision.

So, 20 days is certainly not long enough; 60 days I threw out just to offer something to the committee to consider.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you. Any—Mr. Wasyliw.

Mr. Wasyliw: I was wondering—you came up with a 60-day timeline. What are the averages currently? Like, what would be sort of the average time that you would have to sort of comply right now? And, you know, is 60 days going to cover it, or even there, you're being ambitious?

M. Pittet: So, I don't believe there is any existing requirement—timeline requirement for us to evaluate a secondary plan application, but I'm not a hundred per cent sure. That question could certainly be directed to James Platt.

Mr. Chairperson: Are there any further questions?

Mr. Wasyliw: The four hundred to six hundred thousand in extra costs that the government would be imposing on city taxpayers—can you tell us what would be cut, what services or what programs would have to be cut, to sort of satisfy this additional red tape?

M. Pittet: Sorry, sir, I couldn't speculate on what decisions council would make.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further questions?

Hearing none, thank you very much for your presentation this evening.

Our next presenter, I'd like to call on Mr. James Platt.

Mr. Platt, if you—when you're ready, just turn your

Welcome, Mr. Platt. The floor is open for your presentation.

James Platt (Private Citizen): Thank you.

My name is James Platt, and I'm a registered professional planner. I've been employed with the City of Winnipeg for nine years. Prior to working at the City, I was employed by the Province as the manager of the regional planning office in Portage la Prairie. I have a very strong working knowledge of both The Planning Act and the City of Winnipeg Charter.

I have spent a significant amount of time reviewing Bill 34 and have some concerns. Bill 34

creates confusion by introducing a lack of clarity in a number of places, and in other instances, it creates rules which could hamper the City of Winnipeg's land-use-planning efforts. I propose that the City of Winnipeg and the development community be given time to work with the Province to make alterations necessary for Bill 34 to function clearly and efficiently.

My concerns are as follows: in the past, the City permitted developers to submit non-statutory secondary plans, which are secondary plans not adopted as bylaws. Endorsement of these non-statutory secondary plans did not require public hearings and, as such, do not have the same force and effect as secondary plan bylaws. The charter currently requires that a development proposal be refused if it does not conform with a secondary plan bylaw. However, a development proposal cannot be refused for not conforming with a non-statutory plan.

Bill 34 indicates that non-statutory plans are not invalid solely because they were adopted by resolution of council. Bill 34 does not state that non-statutory plans have the same force and effect of a secondary plan bylaw.

As a result, it is not clear whether development proposals must be refused when not conforming with a non-statutory secondary plan. This lack of clarity will be a little bit confusing for developers and the City and potentially the Municipal Board.

Next, Bill 34 contains definitions for both secondary plan and secondary plan bylaw, which appear to be used interchangeably at times. In some cases, it's unclear if a section inserted into Bill 34 also applies to secondary plan amendments or even non-statutory secondary plans.

This lack of clarity is certain to be a future cause of confusion for all those involved in the development industry. We propose that the Province be given time to consult with the City and the development community to provide clarity on this portion of the legislation.

Next, the secondary plan: secondary plans serve to ensure the orderly development of large areas of the city. They ensure that infrastructure, including collector roads, water and sewer pipes, and drainage ponds have the capacity to efficiently and effectively service the intended future development of a large area, often involving many landowners.

Bill 34 introduces a mechanism that allows the City to require a secondary plan in support of a proposal for a zoning bylaw amendment or a subdivision proposal. Bill 34 goes on to say that if the City does not inform an applicant within 20 days that a secondary plan is required prior to the subject land developing, the City can no longer require a secondary plan.

This means that a small misstep in an administrative service standard will undermine the City's ability to apply land-use-planning principles. In an extreme case, this could result in unintended development which threatens the orderly development of large areas of the city. We propose that the Province be given time to consult with the City and the development community to provide clarity to this legislation.

Bill 34 introduces a new feature into the charter that allows the City to adopt a bylaw that establishes criteria for determining when a property owner must submit a secondary plan. The bylaw must include a description of the subject area, along with the objectives and issues to be addressed, as well as the format of the required secondary plan. The City of Winnipeg needs time to ensure that such a bylaw is adopted by council before Bill 34 is proclaimed.

Proposed section 236(1.1) of the charter states that a zoning bylaw must be consistent with the development–development bylaw–development plan bylaw and any applicable secondary plan bylaw. While this wording may be consistent with the planning area, it is redundant, confusing and potentially harmful to the City of Winnipeg.

* (18:40)

First, this section is redundant considering section 235 already provides that public works undertakings and development in the city must be consistent with the development plan or any secondary plan. Second, section 275(2) requires that all applications for zoning bylaw amendments, among other applications, must conform with the development plan and any applicable secondary plans, or be refused. Again, existing sections of the charter make proposed section 236(1.1) redundant.

Section–second–this new section is confusing. Secondary plans present a future vision for an area. The intention of a secondary plan is not–is to not require that all existing uses immediately change to reflect this future vision. However, as per section 275(2) that I just mentioned, when the land

use does change, it must conform to the vision of any applicable secondary plans.

Proposed section 236(1.1) does not mention zoning bylaw amendments, but rather the zoning bylaw. So, adhering to the wording of proposed section 236(1.1) would require that all existing zoning be made consistent immediately with a secondary plan for that area.

Parcels that are zoned agricultural would need to be immediately up-zoned or rezoned to match the urban land use provided in the policy areas of the secondary plan. If the intention of the proposed new section 236(1.1) is not to require up-zoning, we're not sure what its intention is. As before, we already have sections of the charter which provide for conformity with secondary plans.

Third, this new section is potentially harmful. The City of Winnipeg is soon to begin on–work on replacing the City of Winnipeg's zoning bylaw. Adhering to new section 236(1.1) would require that the new zoning bylaw conform with all the existing secondary planned policy areas. Again, this would require that all parcels in the new zoning bylaw for the entire city be up-zoned to conform with the various existing secondary planned policy areas. This up-zoning would forgo the city's ability to require development agreements which would normally be attached to zoning bylaw amendments.

New section 236(1.1) should be removed from section–from Bill 34, as it speaks to zoning bylaws not to propose zoning bylaw amendments, and it's redundant given the existing sections of the charter.

In conclusion, I'm proposing that Bill 34 be amended to provide the clarity necessary for both the City of Winnipeg and the development community to officially operate within the new rules.

Alternatively, I propose that the City of Winnipeg and the development community be given the time to work with provincial planning staff to make any necessary alterations for Bill 34 to function clearly and efficiently.

Thank you for your time and thoughts.

Mr. Chairperson: And thank you for your presentation, Mr. Platt.

The floor is open for questions.

Ms. Clarke: Hi, James. Thanks for your presentation.

I was sitting here and thinking, kind of with a smile on my face, thinking back to 2007-2008, and

I'm not sure which it was when I first met you and we were talking about Ag and PLUP, and you know what? That sounds really simple now compared to what we're facing ahead of us.

But I take great comfort in knowing you and your expertise in this field. I knew back in the day that you did a lot of explanations to us as rural municipal officials and I'm really appreciative for having your expertise now as the minister, and I've taken a few notes here. But I'll definitely be looking back in Hansard to review the information that you've brought forward here tonight. And I look forward to the work that we're going to be doing in the future as well.

Thank you.

J. Platt: Thank you, Minister Clarke. Much appreciated.

Thank you for your kind words, and I really believe we work very well with the provincial planning staff. We always have, and I think discussions are only a—are only going to be helpful.

Mr. Wasyliw: Thank you, Mr. Platt, for coming here today and providing your comments.

And, obviously, there is a great deal of analysis that have gone into your position, and I certainly—I take your comments that this feels rushed and that the government hasn't properly consulted with municipalities, and I certainly hope that they hear your warnings today.

For somebody like myself, who doesn't have a strong planning background, I'm wondering if you can give some real-life, tangible examples about how these changes are going to play out in the real world, and what it's going to mean to the public interest and how communities aren't going to be served by these changes.

These, sort of—apologize, but to dumb it down for me with some examples.

J. Platt: Thank you, Mr. Wasyliw.

So, aside from some of the parts that are more confusing, one of—the one requirement that I'm particularly concerned of is when we receive an application for a zoning bylaw amendment, an amendment to a zoning bylaw or a subdivision of land in an area that's greenfield.

So, consider areas that you know of the city that will one day be urban. What Bill 34 does to the letter of the wording right now, if somebody in that area applies for a rezoning—so they own some agricultural

land and they say, well, I'm going to go just ahead; I'm not going to wait for the secondary plan. I'm just going to do a residential subdivision in this area, under the existing rules. We would say, I'm sorry, that doesn't conform with our Complete Communities bylaw and we have to do a secondary plan for the area; then we can go ahead with doing subdivision rezoning. So, it would be a recuse.

In this case, we're saying that we're not—if we miss that 20-day window—and now, this is calendar days, not working days—if we miss that window, that person can go ahead and we can't then require a secondary plan for that whole section of the—or, from the City. It's a punitive rule that's unnecessarily—it's a misstep in administration all of a sudden results in hundreds of acres of land potentially being cut off by this subdivision that we can't now recuse.

Mr. Chairperson: Any further questions?

Mr. Wasyliw: So, if I hear you correctly, then, this arbitrary 20 days could end up resulting in municipalities having to build communities or neighbourhoods or developments that are not in the public interest, and the public interest won't be safeguarded?

J. Platt: Potentially, just because—and I would say potentially because depending on how—where things go with a file. It could go to Municipal Board; it might not actually get to our council. Decisions on what's being approved might get on the—be on the purview of City oversight. And we do spend a lot of time figuring out where we need secondary plans and developing secondary plans for new areas to make sure that there's orderly development capacity.

This could potentially result in a situation where the—one of the only connections into a new area is shut off by a development because we missed a 20-day window due to Christmas, maybe.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Platt, thank you very much for your presentation and for joining us this evening.

Bill 228—The Eating Disorders Awareness Week Act

Mr. Chairperson: So, our next presenter will be on Bill 228, the eating disorder awareness week.

Ms. Elaine Stevenson, I would ask you to come up to the podium.

And, for the committee, we have received a request. I would ask for leave so that Ms. Stevenson could sit at the table rather than standing at the podium. Is that—is there leave? *[Agreed]*

Ms. Stevenson, please join us at the table.

We're just handing out your presentation.

Excellent, Ms. Stevenson, welcome this evening. The floor is yours.

Elaine Stevenson (Alyssa Stevenson Eating Disorder Memorial Trust): May I start, sir? *[interjection]* Yes. Okay.

I am honoured and very pleased to present before the standing committee members in strong support of Bill 228, The Eating Disorders Awareness Week Act. I would like to express my sincere thank-you to all members who voted to unanimously pass second reading of Bill 228. In particular, I want to thank Lisa Naylor for her passion and efforts in bringing this essential bill forward.

As an advocate for eating disorder services who has been helping families in Manitoba and across Canada for over 32 years, I personally am aware of the carnage, pain and nightmare that many families and those with eating disorders go through.

* (18:50)

Most importantly, we lost our daughter Alyssa after a 12-year battle with anorexia, at only 24 years of age. Alyssa had the misfortune of becoming ill when there was no child and adolescent eating disorder program and she was never, ever referred or received in-depth PTSD or trauma counselling, a critical mistake that still happens today for some.

Eating disorders have the highest mortality rate of any mental illness after opiates. Eating disorders are complex mental illnesses with physical manifestations. A number of factors can contribute to the development of an eating disorder, including genetics and mental health, as well as culture. Many elements can be—influence the development of an eating disorder. They can be biological, genetic and biochemical, psychological, personality and mental health, and social, including cultural norms about food and appearance.

In Canada, research indicates that the prevalence rate of eating disorders is between 2 and 3 per cent. Based on Statistics Canada's population data, there is an estimated—just over 1 million Canadians meet the diagnostic criteria for an eating disorder. Sadly, 70 per cent of doctors only receive five hours or less of eating-disorder-specific training while in medical school.

For me, this bill is about finally putting an annual and public focus on a very serious illness—eating disorders—that are often cloaked in secrecy, shame and silence, in addition to myths, stigma, lack of knowledge on the many physical complications and dangerous social media messaging.

This is an illness that requires early intervention, treatment by experienced eating disorder health providers, significant government funding, unbiased research, tracking of data, ongoing training of doctors and entire health-care teams, programming support, both before- and aftercare for those with eating disorders, supports for families and separate programs for siblings who are often so forgotten.

I believe that Bill 228 is an incredible opportunity to educate Manitobans, demystify stigmas, encourage those who are reach—suffering to reach out for help and provide valuable, reliable and safe information on prevention and treatment to Manitobans, families and our elected officials.

Today, Eating Disorders Awareness Week has been proclaimed in six provinces and the Yukon Territory. British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland and Labrador, and most recently Ontario, have all proclaimed Eating Disorders Awareness Week. It is always held the first week in February.

This past year's Eating Disorders Awareness Week campaign focused on the theme Everyone Has a Role To Play. It was aimed to raise awareness, to highlight that we all in society have a role to play in eating disorder prevention and recovery and to gaining an understanding that an eating disorder is not simply about weight and is not simply a choice.

This is a very complex illness that affects everyone in one way or another: eating disorder sufferers, caregivers, friends and colleagues, mental health and medical providers, educators and athletics and fitness professionals.

In my 32 years as an advocate, I have never seen eating disorder services in our province so stretched to the max and so unattainable for so many. A recent Canadian study of nine- to 18-year-olds published in the Journal of the American Medical Association showed an increase of 60 per cent in newly diagnosed anorexia cases over pre-pandemic levels.

It is important to understand that eating disorder programs have been underfunded in Manitoba for far too long and that long waiting lists for treatment of over a year have occurred for many years at the

Women's Health Clinic Provincial Eating Disorder Prevention and Recovery Program prior to the pandemic. Now, the waiting list has increased to 18 to 24 months. Urgent pleas for help to multiple health and mental health ministers resulted in minimal action with no short-term or long-term vision plans for eating disorders in Manitoba. In addition, funding decision advice does not include all eating disorder program staff representatives. Sadly, our only adult tertiary care eating disorder program with beds does not treat binge-eating disorder clients.

Why has this been allowed to happen? I have asked on numerous occasions: Where do binge-eating disorder clients go if they need to be hospitalized? No official answer received to date.

This has resulted in adult ED clients with binge-eating disorder finding the only publicly funded programming for them is at the provincial eating disorder program at the Women's Health Clinic; 50 per cent of the Women's Health Clinic clients are binge-eating disorder, but this program has no beds. We encourage people to come forward to seek treatment and support, but we must ensure we have adequate resources to be able to meet this urgent need.

Time is not on the side of someone with an eating disorder. Early intervention and treatment must become a priority for successful treatment. We must always be cognizant of the high suicide rates and multiple mental, emotional and physical complications of patients with eating disorders.

The VIRGO report on mental health and addictions indicated that eating disorders and addictions should be first priorities for action by the Manitoba government. In my opinion, this has not occurred and has resulted in the crisis in eating disorder service delivery that many Manitobans face today.

We must improve our services and listen to the people with eating disorders, their families, health-care providers and advocates. I am strongly recommending that a forum be arranged for this critical dialogue to happen. Such a forum would be well suited for 'including'-inclusion in eating disorders awareness week programming.

People can and do recover from eating disorders if there is timely access to treatment, early intervention and adequate program resources including sufficient funding and staff. These are the key components to a successful recovery.

I wish to thank the National Eating Disorder Information Centre and the national initiative on eating disorders for their research, data and information.

Proclaiming eating disorders awareness week in Manitoba would be an important first step in a long journey to shine a light on an illness that has been hidden in the darkness for far too long. Manitobans can no longer afford to wait. Too many lives are at risk.

I want to thank you for your time, and I look forward to the positive results of this process. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Stevenson, we thank you very much for your presentation this evening.

The floor is open for questions.

Ms. Lisa Naylor (Wolseley): I just want to thank you very much for your words tonight. You and I have been—we've sat around a lot of different tables together over the last 20 years, but this is new. So I just want to thank you for being here and addressing this committee as you have.

And I'm just wondering if you can maybe share a couple of ways that, you know, eating—having a recognized eating disorders awareness week in the province might help families like—families going through what your family went through. How might that make a difference? *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Stevenson.

E. Stevenson: I'm so sorry. I'm supposed to wait. Sorry. Just wipe that off the books. Okay.

The first thing I get from families is that—why? How could this happen? What can I do? Where can I go for help? There's so much garbage out there on social media and on the Internet which is potentially dangerous, and that's where people need to know, what's the starting point? And what they really need to know when the families come and talk is, we love to blame families for everything, but this is not the family's fault. This is society in general needs to make some major changes.

And, you know, I'm just thinking right now of—it was all over the media, all over the TVs, all over every—I can't believe, you know, newspaper and whatever. A major social media star recently wore a gown by Marilyn Monroe to the Met Gala. And she very proudly stated as she walked through the thing and talked to different reporters that she starved

herself for three weeks to fit into a gown by Marilyn Monroe. This is someone who has a lot of potential—not potential, power—at her hands. To give that kind of message to impressionable, young, naive young women and men is appalling and disgusting to me and shows a lack of respect for fellow people and for—especially for children and adolescents.

* (19:00)

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you.

Hon. Cameron Friesen (Minister of Finance): Elaine, thank you for being here this evening.

You and I go way back, from my time in opposition when I was the Health critic, and we used to meet around tables in much smaller rooms. You used to teach me why this was important—I mean, we knew it, but you would teach me about the importance of advocacy.

And I was humbled to be in your presence as a person who had personal experience, you know, and you told me of the loss of Alyssa for you and Rick and how it drove you to be a voice. I remember, at the time, my son was at the building for take your kid to work day; and he was in the room, and you turned to him as if he was a full participant in the meeting. And you may remember, you said, Evan, do you understand why this important in the lives of young people? He's like, I understand, Mrs. Stevenson—because you sold the point home.

But what I want to just say tonight—I don't really have a question for you, but I wanted to say that when it comes to advocacy for eating disorders and awareness in the province of Manitoba, I cannot think of a better, more plain-spoken, honest and hard-working advocate.

So, I thank you for your continuing work to be a voice in this area. Thank you for being present at committee this evening. Thank you for continuing to teach us all how important this is.

And I know I had the honour to stand with you at the microphone in 2020 and announce some expansion of HSC's program for eating disorders, for more beds and a nutrition clinic, and it's not enough. But it was something at the time, and we need to build and build and build.

And I think one thing that you really left us with tonight is the knowledge that the pandemic has been terribly unkind to all of us, but it's been exceptionally unkind to those who are suffering. And we are seeing

this explosive growth of people who are in need of services, and we must respond.

Thank you.

E. Stevenson: Yes. I just want to say that the long waitings that exist at the Women's Health Clinic have been in existence for many, many years prior to the pandemic. And it's about time that we work 'collaboratively' and collectively together to get action because we need to save lives.

And asking people to wait two years for treatment is absolutely a disgrace by any government, a terrible disgrace.

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Tyndall Park): I'd like to thank you, Ms. Stevenson, for coming out to committee this evening and sharing so much of your story with us, and just personally to be able to extend my condolences, as well, to your daughter, Alyssa.

I was wondering if you could paint a little bit of a picture for us. So, you talk about it being 18 to 24 months right now as the wait time, which is completely unacceptable. So, explain to us: when a person is dealing with an eating disorder of any kind, why is it so critical they get their resources immediately? *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Stevenson. Sorry, I need to acknowledge you first.

But as we have run out of time, I will seek leave from the committee to allow Ms. Stevenson to provide an answer.

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, leave has been granted. Go ahead, Ms. Stevenson.

E. Stevenson: Okay, so one of the major things when I get a call or if I've heard of someone and they ask me, what should I do first, and I said, get in as quick as you can to have an examination by a medical doctor of the person you love and are concerned about. I'm no doctor and I'm not a counsellor, and I am not going to fill those roles when I talk to them.

But so many physical complications: cardiac issues are very, very common; the early onset of osteoporosis; kidney failure and shutdown; imbalances in the electrolytes which even is—the potassium. And I can't tell you how many pills Alyssa was on. But that's absolutely critical.

But at the same time, they need therapy. Once an eating disorder gets a hold of you, it is really, really

hard for a therapist and counsellor to get—they can, but it's a lot of work. It's so much earlier—easier for the client and their families if we get to them early on in the process. But that's really hard to do.

You finally have the courage to come forward and say—and it's really hard to convince some people that they need to get treatment and they need to see—come forward and reach out for help. So, when they finally do and we have to say to them, in Manitoba right now, oh, gee, sorry, it's going to take you two years to get in. Well, they may be dead by then. We can't do that anymore, and the situation keeps getting worse and worst and worst. And somebody has to act and do something.

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Stevenson, thank you very much for your presentation this evening.

We'll now move on to our next presenter, Michelle D'Amico, from the national institution of eating disorders.

So, I may have brutalized the last name and for that I apologize, but, Michelle D'Amico?

Okay, hearing—not seeing Michelle, we will move her to the bottom of the list.

So our next presenter is Lea Neufeld La Rue from the Women's Health Clinic. She's online.

So just, Lea, whenever you're ready, just turn your camera on. Thank you very much for joining us this evening. Ten minutes, the floor is yours.

Lea Neufeld La Rue (Women's Health Clinic): Thank you very much. So, good evening, standing committee members. My English name is Lea Neufeld La Rue, my spirit name is Standing White Bear and I'm from the Eagle Clan. I'm a settler on this land and I want to acknowledge my privilege to live, work and play here.

I'm also a counsellor at the Provincial Eating Disorder Prevention and Recovery Program at Women's Health Clinic, and I'm honoured and excited to speak in support of Bill 228 and I'm grateful of—for the work that's already been done around this bill.

I also wanted to acknowledge the work that Elaine has done in support of eating disorder awareness and recovery. I'm so grateful.

And, as you can imagine, for our program, Bill 228 is very important. I'm going to tell you a little bit about our work and then I'll speak to the potential impacts of this bill.

So our program offers community-based care for folks experiencing eating disorders. Our program is open to all medically stable residents of Manitoba over the age of 18. We aim to provide a holistic treatment through a harm-reduction lens, acknowledging that eating disorders exist on a continuum.

We strive to compassionately meet clients where they're at without judgments and work to welcome folks from all races, genders, sexualities, abilities, class, religion and body sizes. We aim to facilitate and support long-term changes for folks around their relationship with food and body and, ultimately, their relationships with themselves.

We work to address the underlying and inextricably linked factors that contribute to eating disorders: things such as trauma, intergenerational trauma, systemic oppression and diet culture. We recognize that eating disorders are more than just the desire to be thin, but rather often develop as a coping strategy that can offer a sense of control or safety in people's lives.

Our program was created in 2009 in response to the growing demand for a weight-neutral, community-based comprehensive and accessible outpatient eating disorder treatment alternative in Manitoba. Prior to our program, there was no community-based treatment options and no services for people experiencing binge-eating disorder in Manitoba.

We continue to work hard to meet these growing needs—the growing needs of our program—with a relatively small program, with about the equivalent of about eight full-time staff. We currently support 116 clients in our program and have around 25 people who access our post-treatment support group—monthly support group.

We offer workshops to the community around topics around body image, perfectionism, communication and relationship to food, as well as our always well-attended family and friends workshop, which offers support for folks whose loved one is experiencing an eating disorder. Our workshops are open to anyone in the community over the age of 16 who wants to improve their relationship with food and body. People don't have to have an eating disorder to attend these workshops.

We also offer consultation and support to families, to health-care providers and other professionals around eating disorders and system navigation.

* (19:10)

The need for our services—and Elaine spoke to this—have always been greater than what we can provide. Unfortunately, this has led to the long wait times. Through the pandemic, we've seen a 30 per cent increase in calls for our service, and our wait times, which has historically been around 12 months, has grown closer to 24 months. We currently have 193 people who are waiting for our services.

We did receive additional funding last fall and are grateful for that to help some of these growing needs, and while this funding has been helpful, people to—do continue to experience these long wait times and can feel discouraged, and they ultimately cause that increased distress.

We know that treating eating disorders, it's complex. It often touches many, if not all, aspects of a person's life. And we also know that eating disorders often happen alongside other mental health conditions as well as substance use concerns.

A recent program—our recent program evaluation found that our program contributed to improving clients' overall quality of life and decreased symptoms of depression and anxiety. Our clients also reported experiencing positive and calm relationships with food in their body, as well as increased self-compassion, as well as more coping skills that can help serve them not just with recovery, but also in their lives in general.

So, given our work, what would this bill mean to us?

For us, it would mean the potential for great aware—greater awareness in the public around what is an eating disorder: a mental health 'diagnostic'—diagnosis that is drastically under-reported while continuing to be one of the most fatal.

It would mean building a greater understanding of the fact that eating disorders impact people of every gender, race, age, ability and socio-economic class, not just the smaller-bodied white cis women and girls that we once did. In fact, we know that eating disorders disproportionately impact trans, non-binary, two-spirit, queer, Black, Indigenous and racialized folks. This growing awareness would potentially help parents, doctors, teachers, coaches, friends and even individuals themselves that are—be better able to identify eating disorders when they start, knowing, again, that that early intervention is key.

It would mean expanding the conversation around prevention, starting with children who are in elementary school, which is a time when many of my clients have talked about first learning that their bodies were wrong.

It would bring awareness to all iterations of eating disorders, including binge-eating disorder, a behaviour that's tied to restriction and the body's natural defence against starvation rather than the lack of willpower which is as it's often seen.

It would bring forth the urgent need for increased funding to support education prevention and recovery, something that's so necessary as our wait-lists grow exponentially. We are grateful, again, for the funding we have received, but the need continues to grow. Growing awareness around eating disorders might ensure that people can receive access—accessible, timely, culturally safe care.

It would help to support the extension of—expansion of eating disorder supports, as the vast majority of eating disorder treatment programs are centred in Winnipeg. This growing awareness would bring eating disorder education, prevention and recovery knowledge to folks who live in the North and in rural parts of Manitoba.

It would potentially bring a growing awareness to the dangers of diet culture, a culture that teaches us that some bodies are deemed worthy and some are not.

It would provide space for communities and service providers to talk about the relationship between anti-Black and Indigenous racism and the experience of eating disorders, as well as the experience of poverty. White supremacy and colonization has on—has caused folks to experience this—a disconnection from their mind and body and spirit, interrupting their relationship with the land, with food and with community.

This bill, if passed, has the ability to open the doors for great things, not the least of which is saving lives. I thank you for your time in considering this bill. By passing Bill 228, you, too, can play a part in bringing awareness to eating disorders, improving the lives of countless Manitobans.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: And thank you very much for your presentation, Lea.

Floor is open for questions.

Ms. Naylor: Hi, Lea. Thank you for being here tonight and for addressing the committee and sharing some of the work at Women's Health Clinic, and some of the concerns. And mostly, I just—I don't really have a question, so much as to appreciate you for taking the time to enlighten members of this committee with your knowledge and to speak in support of the bill.

So thank you.

L. Neufeld La Rue: Yes, thank you so much.

Mr. Chairperson: Are there any other questions? No other questions?

Again, thank you very much for joining us and for your presentation this evening.

The next presenter is Kristen Bauman.

Kristen Bauman, we'd just ask you to turn your camera on when you're ready, Kristen.

Good evening, and welcome to committee. You have 10 minutes; the floor is yours.

Kristen Bauman (Private Citizen): Thank you. I apologize—I'm just going to bring it up here.

Good evening. My name is Kristen Bauman. I'm a wife, a mother of four kids under the age of eight, and I'm beyond grateful to be here today to speak on this topic.

A little over 12 years ago, I hit yet another all-time low with my 15-year battle with an eating disorder. It was shortly after the best day of my life; my wedding day. Getting married, moving in together and a few months later admitting that I wasn't okay was one of the hardest things I ever had to do. Up until the moment, I thought I was in control of it. I thought it was a choice I was making to be thin and I believed that I could keep it from my loved ones.

I didn't realize until that moment that I wasn't in control, my eating disorder was, and I was scared. A few months later it was my husband that found out about the program at the Women's Health Clinic. He signed us up for a Saturday workshop to check it out and ease me into the idea of attending the two-year program.

I was scared, ashamed, embarrassed and desperate for help and freedom from it. At that time, I was on the wait-list but, thankfully, I only had to wait a few months. In the meantime, I had a very supportive husband and family to lean on. Unfortunately, not everyone has that type of support—sorry—has that type

of support and feels that safety when they're deep in the trenches.

I often wonder if it would have been different for me if I didn't have that support in the meantime. Every rock bottom was worse than the last and you never really know how many chances you'll get before it's gone too far. I also sometimes wonder: If the wait-list was longer, would I be here today?

That question makes me even more driven to work in this field and bring more awareness to this mental illness. I want to be that person that can offer support and give hope that there is such thing as free—as being free from this illness. I want to help those suffering feel seen and know that their lives are worth the fight.

The program at Women's Health Clinic gave me hope, tools, resources and a lot of support to beat what I once believed was impossible. It saved my life. People like the incredible MLA Naylor and Lori Peters saved my life.

My counsellor met with me weekly, along with a dietitian, followed by a weekly class that ran for two hours once per week for two years. The space made me feel safe; the people made me feel seen, supported and heard; the environment made me feel hopeful.

I was 10 when I first began feeling uncomfortable in my body and I was 12 when I started hating my body.

As a mother of four, two of them are only a few years away from being 10, and it saddens me to think how many young, impressionable youth are currently suffering in silence, like I once did. It saddens me even more, after this pandemic, to think how many individuals are on a wait-list to seek the help that I once got and so desperately needed.

How many have relapsed throughout the pandemic in isolation? How many men are suffering but don't know where to go for help? The Women's Health Clinic has had men in their program and are inclusive of all individuals, but I believe there needs to be more programming for all people to feel welcome and safe to seek the help that they need for their recovery journey.

I personally would not have felt as comfortable sharing my story with a group of men as I did women at my lowest, most vulnerable place in my life. I would imagine men would feel more comfortable sharing their stories in a group with other men as well.

* (19:20)

More awareness brings about these important discussions. It helps those that are unsure of what to do with loved ones that are suffering get the answers that they are seeking. It helps those suffering to feel seen, less alone and more likely to seek help. Bringing these topics to the forefront will, hopefully, bring about opportunities for more funding and an increase in programming so there aren't so—such lengthy wait-lists. It will also, hopefully, provide more resources for those in need and opportunities for professionals to help in this field.

To break down the barriers that are keeping those we love suffering in silence, we need to bring more awareness and be more compassionate, educated on this topic and loving towards one another. From experience, I can tell you that no one can win this battle on their own. To recover from this mental illness, we must seek help. My concern is that with the growing wait-list numbers, people won't get the help that they need. People won't be as fortunate as I was to get into the program shortly after they reach out, which could lead to a devastating loss of a life.

During my childhood, no one really talked about eating disorders. They weren't a lot of—there weren't a lot of resources available at that time other than the program at the hospital. Being thin and discussing perfect bodies was normal. Dieting was normal, and talking about it was normal. As a young girl, I knew a lot of individuals like myself that were suffering, but I knew no one that had recovered. I only heard about the tragedies of those that lost their lives to this illness.

We as humans are born to help, share and connect with others, but somewhere along the way we are taught to keep our problems private, act like we have it all together and play victim to our struggles. When we finally have the courage to open up and share our stories with others, vulnerability connects us and gives permission to others to share their stories too. Sharing releases and lifts the weight from us and allows us to no longer feel alone.

We desperately need more programming for this illness. We desperately need more funding and professionals to help in this field. As I mentioned above, it took me 15 years of absolute hell to finally seek help. Then it took two years in an eating disorder program to break free from my negative relationship with food and my mind and another seven years of painful healing and growth to heal my body.

My journey is my own, and not everyone's will look this way, but we need to speak up, drop the shame and have these conversations. I am here today, 10 years since completing the program at the Women's Health Clinic, recovered, healthy, happy and working towards becoming a counsellor in this field to give back and be that support for others. I owe so much of this to the staff at the Women's Health Clinic that provided me the support and resources that I needed to beat it once and for all.

Passing this bill and bringing more awareness to it gives me hope for those currently suffering in silence and for future generations.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: We thank you very much for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions?

Ms. Naylor: Thank you so much, Kristen.

Not so much a question, but I want to thank you for being here. It is lovely to see you again and how well you are doing in your life and to—and it's exciting to hear that you're pursuing a career in counselling in this field.

I'm wondering—I guess I do have a question—is that if there's anything more you want to say about how an eating disorder awareness week might make a difference, like, in the lives of your own children and in other folks that you know. How could this help increase awareness or how might it make a difference?

K. Bauman: I believe by being talked about more regularly and individuals such as kids as young as my kids are—because I was only 10 when I started to be affected by things I was seeing more often on—than not on the TV, I'm seeing across social media. Kids are seeing these things so young now. Social media is something that is, as Elaine mentioned earlier, just—it is so terrifying. And I think this messaging needs to be addressed so that my kids can be able to know that if they are at all suffering in their own ways that they aren't alone and that these messages are not correct and this is not right.

I do believe that the awareness will bring about the safety and that feeling that they can seek help, even if they're scared.

I didn't feel like the help was there. So I feel like it wouldn't make a big difference just—even just having more spaces to go, more groups to be had,

which is, I believe, makes such a difference in our—in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you.

Do other committee members have any questions?

Seeing none, thank you very much for joining us this evening with your presentation.

Okay, so our presenter that we had moved to the bottom, Michelle D'Amico, is not with us this evening, so we will be removing that presenter from our list.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: So, for the committee, in what order does the committee wish to proceed with clause-by-clause consideration of these bills?

Mr. Friesen: I would suggest we proceed on the same sequence as the bills are listed on our agenda.

Mr. Chairperson: So, it's been suggested that we do the numerical order as listed on the agenda.

Is all in favour? *[Agreed]*

We will now proceed with clause by clause in order.

Bill 16—The Financial Administration Amendment Act

Mr. Chairperson: Clause by clause—Bill 16. Does the minister responsible for Bill 16 have an opening statement?

Hon. Cameron Friesen (Minister of Finance): Mr. Chair, I will make a few opening comments.

I'm pleased to have Bill 16, The Financial Administration Amendment Act, here at the committee for consideration.

I want to begin by saying that in the province of Manitoba, we have, in the past, provided funding for loans through a loan act that we bring ever year in the Legislature. It's authority for a single year in which that loan act is passed.

However, it's not the same as what other provinces do and it has shortcomings. One shortcoming, of course, is that a loan act does not make it clear what the total amount of borrowing authority is that the Province has, and year after year, as you add successive years of loan authority, it makes it further unclear what the total authority is. It is that uncertainty and lack of clarity about how much authority the

Province has that prompted our government to introduce this bill. Not only that, but there is an ongoing lack of reconciliation between debt level and the authority to borrow.

I would want to point out that in 14 years between—or, I should say, in just 11 years—between the year 2000 and—no, 2000 and 2021, so, 21 years—\$14 billion worth of built-up authority on the government's book, but no place annually where the public or legislators or other groups have access easily to that information.

So, we would suggest that incremental borrowing authority provisions have not served the people of Manitoba well. They have not served legislators well. I can recall being a critic for Finance and at the time not clearly understanding how to even form the query to understand what the total borrowing capacity would be looking at loan act authority utilization and that amount not utilized.

So, we believe that we can do better. We have looked to other jurisdictions who have sought to—done better. I would indicate to all members of this committee and the public that this work does nest well inside the greater area of financial control improvements that we have brought to the province of Manitoba since 2016.

And being elected at that time, I would also want to make clear that for the purposes of this bill, we have delineated between government debt and Manitoba Hydro debt; the former being taxpayer 'supported', the latter being ratepayer supported.

Why Manitoba Hydro debt presented at all? Because it's material with the amount of debt that Hydro now holds at more than \$20 billion—actually, indeed, more than \$23 billion. It is only appropriate that a government that has ultimate authority for the debt and a responsibility for that Crown corporation to identify limits there as well.

* (19:30)

Just a few more things: this bill does propose in legislation to set at borrowing authority for government at \$44.4 billion. It is a big number, but it is less as—of a number than that total borrowing authority that I indicated that would be stacked upon the current debt. So that's good to keep in mind. It also sets a separate number for Manitoba Hydro's debt.

I would want to clearly say, though, that it doesn't create some kind of false cliff for the Province of Manitoba. It is not intended to invite some kind of

fiscal cliff has—which has been the terminology that's been used in the United States, whereby you can see in certain years the processes held up and there's a need to enact emergency authority. Instead, this is meant to create visibility to set an appropriate manoeuvrability for a government in respect of its need for authority not just in one year but also in respect of the next year's authority prior to the passage of a budget.

So there's some need to create an additional capacity and, indeed, additional capacity as well for emerging or exigent circumstances. The government needs the ability to respond to things like pandemics and forest fires and floods and Ukrainians when they need to come to Manitoba to resettle because of global conflict and a war that no one wanted. And so these are the kind of circumstances that face governments and face legislatures and we must be willing and ready to be able to respond.

I do want to say, because I mentioned before, that Manitoba is quite unique in the way we do some of this work. We would basically be reforming the way government-reporting organizations receive loans from the government. The amendments will allow for the loans to be issued on the basis of appropriations that are approved by the Assembly.

Manitoba is the only province in Canada that provides authority for these loans through reporting organizations through the loan act. As I said, \$44.4 billion is the amount that has been indicated in the legislation at that level and, as I mentioned, it is a bit over \$9 billion more than the current debt level of the Province of Manitoba, which seems like a lot of money, but it is less than nearly \$14 billion in borrowing authority built up under these loan acts over time. And I would just finally mention that that amount in legislation that is set to be that limit for Hydro is \$29.3 billion.

There are other things that this legislation does. We've had good conversation in second reading in the question-and-answer period that's allowed during that phase of the Legislature. But I did want to just, at this time, end by providing an explanation, because the critic did ask some questions specifically in regard to universities when we had gone through the bill at second reading. And so my officials and I prepared just that small response on that question.

I wanted to emphasize that in Manitoba there is a complex mixture of legislative authorities for reporting organizations to borrow funds for temporary purposes for working capital or borrowing for a term that is under a year in length. And that means that each

organization has different provisions in their own legislation. There are inconsistencies. Some acts have set limits on temporal-temporary borrowing that haven't been adjusted for many, many years.

And the majority of government-reporting entities, or government-reporting organizations, require Cabinet approval for temporary borrowing. And those are taxpayer-supported organizations; they're included in the financial statements of the government. Government has, for a long time, required Cabinet approval of their borrowing, with a few exceptions.

Bill 16 makes amendments that will, over time, facilitate moving toward a more centralized regulation under The Financial Administration Act that specifies the amount and types of temporary borrowing that each organization can undertake.

And just to emphasize that point, just consider post-secondary universities. University of Manitoba, University of Winnipeg, Brandon University and St. Boniface university can borrow an unlimited amount for short-term borrowing within a fiscal year, but they require Cabinet approval for long-term borrowing; whereas Red River College can only borrow \$20 million for temporary, but can only borrow long term if authorized by The Financial Administration Act or an act of the Legislature, while other universities, including one that was represented tonight by a president of a small university in Manitoba, can borrow for long-term purposes with the approval of Cabinet.

This all emphasizes the need to have a regulation that would be better poised than—to handle the challenges than the hodgepodge approach that I just described. It would avoid bottlenecks that happen for executive government at Cabinet when all of these things come streaming in at the same time, and it also, we believe, provides a more appropriate way for the Legislature to deal with these types of things.

So, I wanted to provide that information to the critic, who had asked for the information, and commend this bill to this committee this evening for consideration.

Mr. Chairperson: And we thank the minister for those comments.

Does the critic of the official opposition have an opening statement?

Mr. Mark Wasyliw (Fort Garry): When it comes to financial administration and transparency, the

PC government has shown time and time again that they can't be trusted. They've received qualified audit opinions from the Auditor General for years because they refuse to follow the rules. While it's good that this legislation requires Estimates of expenditure to be tabled, it's embarrassing that they've had to set rules for themselves after failing to do so in the past.

Tabling of Estimates was a long-standing practice that shouldn't have required legislation. As well, Bill 16 doesn't specify which subappropriations have to be included in the Estimates books, and we can't trust that our government will provide them. Over the past several years, the Estimates books have been gutted so that they provide less information, reducing transparency.

We certainly have concerns. It seems to be a theme with this government that they engage in performative politics. They bring in pieces of legislation which are meant to virtue signal to their various bases, but don't really add anything to the public. And we only have to look at the balanced budget legislation as an example of farcical legislation that we've had to endure in Manitoba.

It seems that this government is adding to that canon with this bill. The minister, quite reasonably and fairly, says this is not a debt-ceiling bill, and I think, you know, on every fair reading of the bill, that's true. However, it's our concern that that's exactly what it's being used for and it's going to lead a misleading signal to the community that somehow this is a debt ceiling.

If it is not a debt-ceiling bill, then why have a debt ceiling in it? It places no useful purpose for the government and essentially is purely cynical and political.

We're certainly concerned about this—is a continuing attack on post-secondary education. This is the centralization of financial authority in Cabinet. Universities are losing autonomy in this bill. They are losing authority over their finances, and this is a pattern of defunding post-secondary education that we've seen with this government for the past six years. And this is another step in removing that autonomy that ultimately will be harmful to our post-secondary institutions.

So, thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: And we thank the member.

So, during the consideration of a bill, the enacting clause and the title are postponed until all other clauses have been considered in their proper order.

Also, if there is agreement from the committee, the Chair will call clauses in blocks that conform to pages, with the understanding that we will stop at any particular clause or clauses where members may have comments, questions or amendments to propose.

Is that agreed? [*Agreed*]

Clauses 1 and 2—pass; clauses 3 and 4—pass; clause 5—pass; clauses 6 through 8—pass; clauses 9 and 10—pass; clauses 11 through 15—pass; clause 16—pass; clauses 17 and 18—pass; clauses 19 and 20—pass; clauses 21 through 25—pass; clauses 26 through 28—pass; clause 29—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

* (19:40)

**Bill 29—The Mennonite College
Federation Amendment Act**
(*Continued*)

Mr. Chairperson: We will now move on to Bill 29, The Mennonite College Federation Amendment Act.

Does the minister responsible for Bill 29 have an opening statement?

Hon. Jon Reyes (Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Immigration): Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairperson: Minister Reyes.

Mr. Reyes: Mr. Chair—good evening, everyone, and thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm pleased to be joined by my deputy minister, Eric Charron, along with my special assistant, Madhur Sharma.

I'm happy to hear all committee members are supporting Bill 29, The Mennonite College Federation Amendment Act.

As you heard from President Cheryl Pauls, this bill will modernize the legislative framework out of the Canadian Mennonite University and support its effective governance.

The Canadian Mennonite University has requested these changes be made to reflect the evolution of the Mennonite College Federation into the Canadian Mennonite University and support the operational needs of the institution.

The current governance structure of Canadian Mennonite University consists of a Canadian Mennonite University council and board of governors. This structure is outlined in the bill and the act is retitled the Canadian university act to reflect the shift to a single university.

Our government is committed to ensuring high-quality post-secondary for all Manitobans and is pleased to support Canadian Mennonite University in these necessary updates to the institution's legislative framework.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chairperson: And we thank the minister.

Does the critic of the official opposition have an opening statement?

Ms. Lisa Naylor (Wolseley): Could I? Thank you.

This bill formally merges the Canadian Mennonite Bible College, Concord College and Menno Simons College with the Canadian Mennonite University. These three colleges began co-ordinating their activities to become a federation in the late 1990s, and in 2000 the Canadian Mennonite Bible College and Concord College located together on a common campus at 500 and 600 Shaftesbury Blvd.

All of the partners amalgamated into a single university known as CMU in 2003, and CMU began a member of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada in 2008. During this transition, the partners to this arrangement maintained their own separate governance and oversight.

The legislation proposes to bring the partners of this arrangement together under one governing structure, as the Canadian Mennonite University. Allowances are included to ensure things like estate donations to the old institutions carried forward to Canadian Mennonite University.

We've spoken with leadership at the Canadian Mennonite University to get a better sense of their needs and to understand this legislation. It's our understanding that the colleges have been co-ordinating with their-co-ordinating their governance activities already for some time, and so the proposed legislation formalizes this process.

We're proud of Manitoba's Mennonite heritage. It has been nearly 150 years since Mennonites first came to Manitoba, and since then they've become an integral part of our province.

I wish the Canadian Mennonite University success and I thank them for their contribution to provide stellar post-secondary education in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairperson: We thank the member.

So, again, during the consideration of a bill, the enacting clause and the title are postponed until all

other clauses have been considered in their proper order.

Also, if there is agreement from the committee, the Chair will call clauses in blocks that conform to pages, with the understanding that we will stop at any particular clause or clauses where members may have comments, questions or amendments to propose.

Is that agreed? [*Agreed*]

Clause 1 through 3—pass; clauses 4 and 5—pass; clauses 6 through 9—pass; clauses 10 and 11—pass; clauses 12 through 14—pass; clauses 15 through 18—pass; clauses 19 through 23—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

Bill 33—The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Municipal Board Amendment Act

(Continued)

Mr. Chairperson: Moving on to Bill 33, The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Municipal Board Amendment Act.

Does the minister responsible for Bill 33 have an opening statement?

Hon. Eileen Clarke (Minister of Municipal Relations): I'd really like to thank everybody that came out tonight to present on Bill 33, and also thank those who provided input and analysis to the department as they've been working on this legislation.

Bill 33 modernizes how Manitobans are able to access their property assessment notices. It also allows municipalities to improve access to assessment roll information, and it supports the Municipal Board in managing planning appeals.

I'll first speak to the legislative amendments to The Municipal Assessment Act. Currently, in Manitoba, all property owners receive their notice of assessment via mail, with no option to receive it electronically. The Province, on behalf of municipalities, prints and mails assessment notices for property owners outside of the city of Winnipeg.

Bill 33 will enable to—Province to send electronic assessment notices to property owners outside the city of Winnipeg. It will also enable the City of Winnipeg to do the same should they choose to in the future. An electronic assessment notice will replace paper 'noticens' if Manitobans opt in to receive an electric notice—electronic. Property owners will be able to access and save an electronic 'vergon' of their notice in places convenient for them.

Migrating property owners to electronic services, along with a reduction in the print services offered, represents a significant opportunity to improve client service and information accessibility for property owners. It also presents an opportunity for cost savings and reducing the Province's environmental footprint.

I encourage all Manitobans outside of Winnipeg to sign up at manitoba.ca/myproperty to receive assessment notices electronically and for Winnipeggers to watch for changes that Winnipeg may choose to make.

Legislation currently requires the assessment roll to be available in municipal offices during business hours, implying that citizens are required to visit municipal offices to view assessment rolls. Bill 33 will enable municipalities to pass a bylaw to provide online access to their assessment rolls, so citizens can view them at a place and a time that is convenient to them. Certain identifying information of property owners will be removed from roll information before it is shared online.

I will now briefly comment on amendments to The Municipal Board Act. I'll take a moment to share that the input we received from the Association of Manitoba Municipalities, the public and other stakeholders has helped shape this legislation.

Bill 33 will support the successful implementation of planning appeals. Bill 33 gives clear authority to the Municipal Board to work with parties to use effective and mutually beneficial alternatives to more costly and time-consuming public hearings.

To streamline the planning appeals process further, we are introducing statutory requirements for grounds and dismissal of appeals. Appellants will be required to state grounds for appeal in their initial filing with the board. This will improve transparency and accountability while helping to narrow and limit the scope and extent of future appeals to the board.

The Municipal Board will have the authority to dismiss appeals for reasons written in legislation. The board may dismiss an appeal at any point prior to a hearing with written notification for reasons such as subject matter that is frivolous and not within the board's jurisdiction. Appellants, in turn, must be provided an opportunity to be heard by the board as to the dismissal.

I'm pleased to highlight these legislative changes that, once enacted, will enable the Municipal Board to manage planning appeals effectively and efficiently.

I would like to thank our stakeholders such as the Association of Manitoba Municipalities and Manitoba municipal administrators for their important ongoing 'contributions' and dialogue with the department. We're proud to introduce this legislation which responds directly to the feedback on Manitobans.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chairperson: And we thank the minister.

Does the critic from the official opposition have an opening statement?

Mr. Mark Wasyliv (Fort Garry): This bill makes amendments to The Municipal Assessment Act and The Municipal Board Act.

Bill 33 enables a municipality to post assessment information online and allow permits and documents to be sent electronically. We understand that the move to online platforms can mean more convenience for many, but we need to ensure that these changes are widely accessible as possible, for example, for those with limited technology.

This bill extends the statutory time limits for up to 60 days for 'municipal' boards to hear and determine a matter. We understand that it also gives the Municipal Board the power to dismiss a matter without a hearing. We're worried about how this power will be used.

It's clear that these changes were brought in as a result of previous legislation passed last year in the form of bill 37, The Planning Amendment and City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment Act. We remain concerned about the changes to bill 37 ushered in, as it took away decision making from communities and placed it in the hands of a provincially appointed Municipal Board.

* (19:50)

We're also concerned that it will result in far too many matters being taken to Municipal Board and that developers will be favoured over local governments since they have the ability to appeal municipalities' land-use decisions.

Bill 33 does not change the real problem, and that problem is last year's bill 37, a bill met with universal opposition from effected municipalities.

Like to—all right. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: And we thank the member. Pardon me.

So, during the consideration of a bill, the enacting clause and the title are postponed until all other clauses have been considered in their proper order.

Also, if there is agreement from the committee, the Chair will call clauses in blocks that conform to pages, with the understanding that we will stop at any particular clause or clauses where members may have comments, questions or amendments to propose.

Is that agreed? *[Agreed]*

Clauses 1 and 2—pass; clauses 3 through 7—pass.

Shall clauses 8 through 10 pass?

An Honourable Member: Not 10.

Mr. Chairperson: No? I hear a no.

Clause 8—pass; clause 9—pass.

Shall clause 10 pass?

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Chairperson: I hear a no.

Ms. Clarke: Yes, I have a proposed 'mendment' to Bill 33 for clause 10, and that's:

THAT Clause 10(2) of the Bill be amended in the proposed clause 64.1(1)(b) by striking out "third day" and substituting "fifth day".

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, it has been moved by Minister Clarke that The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Municipal Board Amendment Act

THAT Clause 10(2) of the Bill be amended in the proposed clause 64.1(1)(b) by striking out "third day" and substituting "fifth day".

The amendment is in order.

The floor is open for questions.

Seeing no questions, is the committee ready for the question?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Question before the committee is as follows:

THAT Clause 10(2) of the Bill be amended in the proposed clause 64.1(1)(b) by striking out "third day" and submitting "fifth day".

Shall the amendment pass?

An Honourable Member: Pass.

Mr. Chairperson: The amendment is accordingly passed.

Shall clause 11 pass?

An Honourable Member: Pass.

Mr. Chairperson: Clause 11 is accordingly passed. *[interjection]*

Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, pardon me—a rookie error. I've only done 30 meetings.

Clause 10 as amended—pass.

Shall clauses 12 and 13 pass? *[interjection]*
We're—do it again? Just to do it in order?

Okay, we're going to do this—it was so much fun, we're going to do this one again.

Clause 11—pass; clauses 12 through 13—pass; clause 14—pass; clauses 15 and 16—pass, clause 17—pass, clause 18—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill, as amended, be reported.

Bill 34—The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Planning Amendment Act *(Continued)*

Mr. Chairperson: We'll now move on to Bill 34, The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Planning Amendment Act.

Does the minister responsible have an opening statement?

Hon. Eileen Clarke (Minister of Municipal Relations): Bill 34 will amend the City of Winnipeg Charter and The Planning Act to streamline land-use planning, reduce red tape and modernize building inspection processes.

This bill is a priority for the govern—Manitoba and supports key recommendations of the 2019 Treasury Board review of Planning, Zoning and Permitting in Manitoba and builds on previous legislation changes under The Planning Amendment and City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment Act that was passed on May 20th, 2021, previously known as bill 37.

Over the past year, department officials and I have had the opportunity to meet with municipal and industry stakeholders to receive their input on streamlining land-use planning and modernizing processes. We have been listening to the stakeholders. The input we have received from the Association of Manitoba Municipalities, the public and other stakeholders, such as professional planners and development industry, has helped shape this legislation. I'd like to

take this opportunity to thank the numerous stakeholders for their feedback and working with our government to improve and modernize the processes in Manitoba.

Ensuring municipal governments make timely decisions on planning applications provides greater certainty needed for development and investment. Now, more than ever, this is critical to support recovery efforts from the challenges created by the pandemic.

Bill 34 complements and clarifies existing timelines in The City of Winnipeg Charter and The Planning Act, including requiring planning authorities to determine whether a planning application is complete or not within 20 days; reducing the timeline to file an appeal to the Municipal Board on subdivisions, aggregate quarries and large-scale livestock operations from 30 days to 14 days, under The Planning Act, to align with other appeal timelines.

In response to stakeholder feedback, the bill also allows statutory timelines on planning applications to be extended with the agreement of the applicant. This will allow the applicant and the municipality to agree if extenuating circumstances require the timelines to be adjusted in any way. The bill also gives planning authorities an additional 30 days on the longest applicable timeline when holding compliant hearings on two or more planning applications.

Another important feature of Bill 34 is that it provides legal framework for the City of Winnipeg's existing practice and requirements around secondary plans while also providing greater clarity and transparency around secondary plan processes in the City of Winnipeg. The City can only require an applicant to prepare a secondary plan if it has adopted a bylaw that sets consistent rules on when a secondary plan is required and what those requirements are. Bill 34 ensures timely decision making on secondary plans by establishing timelines and giving applicants the right to appeal missed timelines and council decisions on applicant-prepared secondary plans to the Municipal Board.

This legislation strikes an important balance by recognizing the secondary plan as an important planning tool while also ensuring development is not unnecessarily delayed by the City's requirement for secondary plans.

Bill 34 also alleviates unnecessary administrative burdens on the City of Winnipeg, property owners and the court system, which align with key government

mandates to reduce red tape. Amendments will remove an outdated and duplicative need to annually audit Winnipeg's Sinking Fund Trustees related to the previous sale of Winnipeg Hydro.

They will also reduce red tape around property removal and demolition on land and tax arrears by removing the requirement for one step of a duplicative approval process.

Amendments will also improve—remove red tape around substitutional service provisions for compliance and demolition orders.

These changes align with the work of the City of Winnipeg, government of Manitoba collaboration table subcommittee on the City of Winnipeg Charter.

Bill 34 also amends The City of Winnipeg Charter Act to create a new definition of designated officials to enable the City of Winnipeg to choose either a designated employee or designated official to conduct building and fire inspections. This means the City of Winnipeg will have the same alternative service delivery mechanism as provided for in all other municipalities within Manitoba. The legislative change enables municipalities to engage other officials only if they choose to. This change delivers on Manitoba's commitment to modernize processes by establishing a co-ordinated approach to conducting building and fire inspections.

The Province of Manitoba has taken responsibility to ensure that the regulatory processes in our province operate in an efficient, transparent and consistent manner and achieve the desired outcomes. These changes to The City of Winnipeg Charter and The Planning Act deliver on our government's commitment to modernize and streamline planning processes and reduce red tape and unnecessary administrative burden on Manitobans and key stakeholders.

* (20:00)

I'm confident that Bill 34 will support economic growth and ensure Manitoba remains competitive and attractive for business and job growth. I look forward to consideration of this important legislation by this committee, and welcome and thank everyone participating this evening.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chairperson: And we thank the minister.

Does the critic of the official opposition have an opening statement?

Mr. Mark Wasyliv (Fort Garry): I'd like to thank all the presenters for speaking to Bill 34, the City of Winnipeg amendment and planning amendment act, and contributing to the democratic process.

Again, like Bill 33, it's clear that Bill 34 was introduced as a direct result of last year's bill 37, The Planning Amendment and City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment Act.

Bill 37 ushered in changes that took away land-use decision making from communities, placed it in the hands of provincially appointed Municipal Board. Bill 37 allows developers to appeal municipalities' land-use decisions to the Municipal Board, which we're worried will skew land-use decisions in favour of developers.

We're also worried that far too many matters will be taken to the Municipal Board, which we raised in the initial debate of bill 37. Clearly, this government is worried about the number of appeals as well, as Bill 34 halves the deadline to appeal to the board from 30 to 14 days.

Bill 34 also gives the City the authority to appoint non-employees as inspectors, which is a clear move towards privatizing inspection services rather than investing in City employees.

Unfortunately, Bill 34 does not address the core deficiencies of bill 37, a bill that was universally opposed by affected municipalities. Bill 34 would not be necessary if bill 37 had not passed last year. Thankfully, it's not too late to 'repill'—repeal bill 37, and I'd urge the government to do so.

I also urge the minister to have listened to our stakeholders tonight. I think, universally, they expressed concerns about this bill. They—some of the words they used: that it was rushed; that there hasn't been any proper consultation in relation to it; there's a number of concerns with the bill that will create unintended consequences.

I think we see from this bill this government is creating new levels of red tape for municipalities. City of Winnipeg is estimating that the red tape in this bill is going to cost taxpayers 400 to 600 thousand dollars a year which, with the cuts this government has made to municipalities for six years in a row, means that services will get cut even further at the City of Winnipeg. And this is an extra burden to taxpayers for something that is completely unnecessary, and the government should consider amending this bill to remove that requirement.

The other concern, of course, in this bill is the arbitrary 20-day requirement for municipalities to get back to developers. There's absolutely no policy justification for a 20-day period which is that low. There was a recommendation that at least 60 days should be contemplated, and that there are some real and devastating consequences to this; that failure of the City to meet the 20-day deadline could result in some very skewed and very harmful development decisions, the consequences of which will be foisted on unwitting communities for generations to come.

We're moving towards—well, at least the opposition is concerned about the climate crisis. And one of the issues we need to address with the climate crisis is how we build our cities and our towns. And creating a development system that favours developers, as opposed to local community interests, is a recipe to continue to build unsustainable communities.

So, I hope the minister was listening today. I hope she pauses and withdraws this bill, and does the proper consultation to get it right. This bill could have far-reaching consequences, and it would be a shame if those consequences were ignored here tonight.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: And we thank the member.

During the consideration of a bill, the enacting clause and the title are postponed until all other clauses have been considered in their proper order.

Also, if there is agreement from the committee, the Chair will call clauses in blocks that conform to parts, with the understanding that we will stop at any particular clause or clauses where members may have comments, questions or amendments to propose.

Is that agreed? [*Agreed*]

Clauses 1 through 33, pertaining to part 1—pass; clauses 34 through 52, pertaining to part 2—pass; clauses 53 through 57, pertaining to part 3—pass; clauses 58 and 59, pertaining to part 4—pass; schedule—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

Bill 37—The International Child Support and Family Maintenance (Hague Convention) Act

Mr. Chairperson: We'll now move on to Bill 37, The International Child Support and Family Maintenance (Hague Convention) Act.

Does the minister responsible for Bill 37 have an opening statement?

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I do, Mr. Chairperson.

So, spoke to this bill at second reading this afternoon. I won't repeat those comments. There was one question that I wanted to respond to.

Tonight at committee it was asked by, I believe it was the member for St. Johns (Ms. Fontaine), the number of countries that Manitoba currently has a reciprocal agreement with when it comes to the enforcement of support payments. The answer to that question is 23, which would include the United Kingdom—so, Scotland, Northern Ireland, Wales and England. So, if you counted those as separate jurisdictions, it would be a total of 26 agreements that are currently in place, and this will expand it by those that are under the 2007 Hague Convention.

So, with those few comments, I thank the committee for the opportunity to respond to that question.

Mr. Chairperson: And we thank the minister.

Does the critic from the official opposition have an opening statement?

Ms. Lisa Naylor (Wolseley): This bill implements the Convention on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance in Manitoba to facilitate the international recovery of child support and other forms of family maintenance. It also applies procedures under The Inter-jurisdictional Support Orders Act to applications made under the convention.

Bill 37 helps brings Manitoba in line with other jurisdictions both in Canada and around the world so that parents are better able to navigate these complex jurisdictional issues.

It is vital that provincial and federal laws align and keep up with current family law issues. Like everything else, society continually evolves, and our legislation must adequately support Manitoba families.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: And we thank the member.

So, during the consideration of a bill, the enacting clause and the title are postponed until all other clauses have been considered in their proper order.

Also, if there is agreement from the committee, the Chair will call clauses in blocks that conform to pages, with the understanding that we will stop at any

particular clause or clauses where members may have comments, questions or amendments to propose.

Is that agreed? [*Agreed*]

Clause 1—pass; clauses 2 and 3—pass; clauses 4 and 5—pass; clauses 6 and 7—pass; clause 8—pass; clauses 9 and 10—pass; clauses 11 through 13—pass; clauses 14 through 17—pass; clauses 18 through 20—pass; clauses 21 through 24—pass; clause 25—pass; clause 26—pass; clauses 27 through 30—pass; schedule—pass; annex 1—pass; annex 2—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

* (20:10)

Bill 228—The Eating Disorders Awareness Week Act (Continued)

Mr. Chairperson: Now, move on to Bill 228, The Eating Disorders Awareness Week Act.

Does the bill sponsor, the honourable member from Wolseley, have an opening statement?

Ms. Lisa Naylor (Wolseley): I do.

I would like to thank all of the presenters for speaking on this important issue and providing their support for Bill 228, The Eating Disorders Awareness Week Act. Whether you have lived with experience with an eating disorder, or as the loved one of someone with an eating disorder, or speaking as a therapist or activist, I thank you sincerely for your time tonight and your advice to me through the bill development process.

For almost 30 years prior to being elected to the Legislature, I worked in mental health services and the last 10 years as a counsellor in an eating disorder treatment program. I was driven in part to run for office because of the gaps I saw in mental health funding and policy. And as a member of the opposition, I've continued to advocate for better supports for those affected by all mental health issues and, specifically, eating disorders.

I introduced Bill 228, The Eating Disorders Awareness Week Act, to help awareness and break down misconceptions and stereotypes on this important issue. I'm also hoping that Bill 228 will validate the experience of those affected by eating disorders.

Within society at large, eating disorders are often misunderstood, and that can also be true in the medical community. There remains stereotypes and stigma about who is affected and why. Eating disorders affects people of all genders and all sizes.

Eating disorders are so much more than just food restriction, as we've already heard from our speakers tonight. There's a range of behaviours, thoughts and feelings that lead to a diagnosis of an eating disorder. There are many different causes for why eating disorders arise, including societal expectations, weight prejudice, socio-economic factors, trauma history and more. It's important we address these issues to help those who are affected by eating disorders.

Eating disorders currently have one of the highest mortality rates of any mental illness, and medical diagnoses may miss people who don't fall into the category of white, thin and female. Even when diagnoses are administered, medical professionals may not have the tools they need to help people, especially in northern and rural areas, and an awareness bill like this can help.

I'm very thankful that Bill 228 has received support from colleagues on both sides of the House, and I hope that EDA will help bring about awareness on eating disorders so that we can help address this important issue.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: And we thank the member.

Do any other members wish to make an opening statement on Bill 228?

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Tyndall Park): It's nice to be given the opportunity here to share a few words as an opening statement.

I, too, just want to thank our presenters for their presentations this evening at committee and the different perspectives that they brought into the committee room.

I think that the bill has actually already begun doing the job and doing the purpose of what's set out in the legislation by creating that dialogue. I know amongst my MLA colleagues, we've already created the dialogue and a discussion around how eating disorders is not just about physical health, there's the mental health component to it and an emotional health component to it as well.

And, like my colleague from Wolseley, I actually just finished receiving my master's in marriage and family therapy, and I've been doing a lot of research over the last seven years, in part on eating disorders, and we see it growing here in Manitoba. And one of our presenters spoke so elegantly to it. It's not just cis-female women, white women, Mr. Chairperson. It's, in fact, it is wide. It is diverse. It's across the entire province, and so we do need to be investing more into it, whether that be money, resources, legislation, building awareness.

And whenever I'm given the opportunity, I like to try to get on the record too, Mr. Chairperson, that this is a perfect example of why we need to regulate therapy here in the province of Manitoba. By regulating therapy, it will actually ensure that those who are providing therapeutic services, counselling services, they are well trained and well equipped to be providing these services. And it also makes it so it will become more affordable for people in this scenario seeking out therapeutic services for eating disorders have access and can afford to receive those services.

So, I think that this is great legislation. I'm very happy that it's passing through committee here tonight, and let's continue to push for more.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, and we thank the member.

Are there any other members wishing to make a statement?

Hearing none—so during the consideration of a bill, the preamble, enacting clause and title are postponed until all other clauses have been considered in their proper order.

Clause 1—pass; clause 2—pass; clause 3—pass; preamble—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

The hour being 8:15, what is the will of the committee?

Some Honourable Members: Rise.

Mr. Chairperson: The committee rise.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 8:15 p.m.

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

<http://www.manitoba.ca/legislature/hansard/hansard.html>