

Fifth Session – Forty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
Official Report
(Hansard)

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Myrna Driedger
Speaker*

Vol. LXXVII No. 41A - 10 a.m., Thursday, April 13, 2023

ISSN 0542-5492

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
FONTAINE, Nahanni	St. Johns	NDP
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	Brandon West	PC
ISLEIFSON, Len	Brandon East	PC
JOHNSON, Derek, Hon.	Interlake-Gimli	PC
JOHNSTON, Scott, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
KHAN, Obby, Hon.	Fort Whyte	PC
KINEW, Wab	Fort Rouge	NDP
KLEIN, Kevin E., Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
LAGASSÉ, Bob	Dawson Trail	PC
LAGIMODIERE, Alan	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, Hon.	Seine River	PC
MOSES, Jamie	St. Vital	NDP
NAYLOR, Lisa	Wolseley	NDP
NESBITT, Greg, Hon.	Riding Mountain	PC
PEDERSEN, Blaine	Midland	PC
PIWNIUK, Doyle, Hon.	Turtle Mountain	PC
REDHEAD, Eric	Thompson	NDP
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, Hon.	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>	Morden-Winkler	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, April 13, 2023

The House met at 10 a.m.

Madam Speaker: O Eternal and Almighty God, from Whom all power and wisdom come, we are assembled here before Thee to frame such laws as may tend to the welfare and prosperity of our province. Grant, O merciful God, we pray Thee, that we may desire only that which is in accordance with Thy will, that we may seek it with wisdom and know it with certainty and accomplish it perfectly for the glory and honour of Thy name and for the welfare of all our people. Amen.

We acknowledge we are gathered on Treaty 1 territory and that Manitoba is located on the treaty territories and ancestral lands of the Anishinaabeg, Anishinewuk, Dakota Oyate, Denesuline and Nehethowuk nations. We acknowledge Manitoba is located on the Homeland of the Red River Métis. We acknowledge northern Manitoba includes lands that were and are the ancestral lands of the Inuit. We respect the spirit and intent of treaties and treaty making and remain committed to working in partnership with First Nations, Inuit and Métis people in the spirit of truth, reconciliation and collaboration.

Good morning, everybody. Please be seated.

House business, and I have a statement for the House.

Orders of the day. Private members' business. House business.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Speaker's Statement

Madam Speaker: I'm advising the House that I have received a letter from the Official Opposition House Leader regarding her caucus's second selected bill for this session.

As a reminder to the House, rule 25 permits each recognized party to select up to three private members' bills per session to proceed to a second reading vote.

The Official Opposition House Leader has advised that her caucus has selected Bill 210, The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Leave for Miscarriage or Stillbirth), as the second of their

three selected bills from the official opposition caucus for this session.

In accordance with the Official Opposition House Leader's letter, the process on this bill will proceed as follows: second reading will begin at 10 a.m. immediately followed—following this statement. The question shall be put on the second reading motion this morning at 10:28 a.m.

* * *

MLA Nahanni Fontaine (Official Opposition House Leader): In addition to Bill 210, would you call, from 10:30 to 11 a.m., Bill 218 for second reading debate?

Madam Speaker: It has been announced that the House will consider second reading of Bill 210 from 10 to 10:28, and at 10:30 to 11, we will call second reading of Bill 218.

SECOND READINGS—PUBLIC BILLS

Bill 210—The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Leave for Miscarriage or Stillbirth)

Madam Speaker: So, I will therefore call second reading Bill 210, The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Leave for Miscarriage or Stillbirth).

Ms. Amanda Lathlin (The Pas-Kameesak): I move, seconded by the member for St. Johns (MLA Fontaine), that Bill 210, The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Leave for Miscarriage or Stillbirth), be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

Motion presented.

Ms. Lathlin: It's always an honour to be standing here as the elected—[interjection]—it's always an honour to stand here as the elected member for The Pas-Kameesak. It's really important, too, to be here to be speaking on this very important bill proposed by this side of the House.

Bill 210 will provide Manitobans with three days' paid leave, which is very important, especially when people don't have paid leave—like I shared with you the other day, Madam Speaker, when I suffered my second miscarriage, I was medevac'd out.

And so, imagine, you know, the amount of time I had to spend away from The Pas. And imagine if I didn't have an employer who wasn't understanding, or didn't have that, you know, in my leave.

So, pretty much, I was away for three days and I had to get back on my own, okay, with basically the clothes on my back. So, that kind of leave is much needed and very appreciated when you're put into that situation, which many of us are in northern Manitoba.

And again, which I shared with you, too, the other day, Madam Speaker, was a time when I was first sworn in as the MLA. I was sitting right in the back bench where the member there is sitting right there, the very seat, where I started having very familiar pain in my mid area. And I knew right away, you know, as a woman, something's going on. This was very familiar. And I'm, like, I'm in the Chamber. It's my first day, being sworn in.

So, I told a female staff member what was going on with me, and I was lucky enough to have my oldest daughter with me to assist me. And I drove myself, with her, to the Health Sciences Centre, and, like I shared, the health staff had to come and get me, and my daughter still didn't know what was going on. I just said, mommy has something, you know, she has to get taken care of, and she had no idea, this poor girl.

So, when we finally enter the ER, like I shared, everything happened in the washroom there. And when I was taken out, I was, like, bare down below, and it was very sad, because I should have been at home celebrating with my young family that—because I was sworn in and being able to serve with you wonderful folks here. But instead I was at the emergency room dealing with this matter of mine.

And I had just—when I was talking about this, I was just having a bit more memories about that evening. I remember when the doctor came in, basically told me what was going on, and I remember that's when my daughter had figured things out; she's a very bright girl. And I had to get a friend of mine, who is like a sister of mine, to come and gather up my daughter and go meet with my caregiver of my children, who were waiting for me to celebrate at the hotel, to let them know what was going on.

And, yes, I just remember the look on my daughter's face, you know, when she realized the reality. And so, I'm very lucky I was able to have her, and blessed with my three nieces. So altogether I have four girls.

So, with this kind of matter in this House, I think it's very important to provide that respect for families. Obviously, even though it's been, like, since 2015, I'm still very affected by it.

And I propose, and I strongly recommend the other side of the House, that this one is a much more caring bill. A much more stronger bill for our families.

* (10:10)

And, again, for those who have lost children, their dreams, I—my condolences go to you and your family and I pray for strength as your journey continues, as is mine.

Ekosi.

Questions

Madam Speaker: A question period of up to 10 minutes will be held. Questions may be addressed to the sponsoring member by any member in the following sequence: first question to be asked by a member from another party; this is to be followed by a rotation between the parties; each independent member may ask one question. And no question or answer shall exceed 45 seconds.

Mr. Len Isleifson (Brandon East): Before I ask a question, I do want to give my best wishes to the member opposite. I know how difficult that is, and I certainly understand.

My question that I want to ask, my first question is, if the member opposite can tell the House the approximate cost on small business that this will have if it passes.

Ms. Amanda Lathlin (The Pas-Kameesak): I think what we should be talking about is the higher cost of what a family takes when a loss like this happens.

Ekosi.

MLA Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): I just want to, on behalf of our NDP caucus, certainly say miigwech to the member for The Pas-Kameesak for bringing forward this bill. And again, to put on the record that this is the third time the member has introduced this bill.

So, it's an important bill. And it's an important discussion here this morning.

And I would ask the member why she thinks it's important to extend paid leave to people who have experienced a miscarriage or a stillbirth.

Ms. Lathlin: Thank you for that question for the member for St. Johns (MLA Fontaine). As you can still see, that I'm still emotionally impacted since 2015 when I realized that I can't carry any more babies. That's why I'm very thankful that I have my Elyse. And it's a no-brainer.

I'm still affected by it and I'm sure many, many families are still.

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Tyndall Park): I'd like to thank the member for bringing forward this legislation. The member knows how much I admire her and her courage and sharing so much of her own personal story. We've had many talks about this over the years and I really want to commend her on her persistence and hard work with this specific legislation.

She has worked hard for it over the years. She has pushed it here in the Manitoba Chambers.

I'm hoping that the member can just share a little bit more with us about how this will be so effective and helpful for Manitobans.

Ms. Lathlin: Thank you for that question. Especially—this would be very effective, too, for those folks that have to travel just to get a procedure, you know, or get treated once that happens, because when you're living in northern Manitoba, you're going to be medevac'd out immediately—or I have as well, and other family members of mine as well.

Three days' paid leave would just ease that loss, whether it's—you know, you're going to be away for a while. And three days' paid leave is better than thinking that you're—you have to go back into—go back to work whether you have this major trauma on your body—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Isleifson: So, I know this bill—I believe the member opposite has brought this bill on the floor before. And we just had a bill pass second reading recently on five days' leave.

And I'm just wondering if the member opposite could tell the House why this bill is being brought forward at this point.

Ms. Lathlin: Well, this bill is being brought forward at this point because it's a great bill. We introduced it a few times already.

And I was surprised that they showed no interest in this, only to make it their own; Bill 235, I believe, which is a less caring bill.

You know, as woman to woman, you know, would you rather have, you know, unpaid leave or paid leave? You know, Manitobans' decision. I think paid leave is much more respectful.

Ekosi.

MLA Fontaine: Miigwech to, again, the member. What are the current barriers Manitobans face—and their partners—when trying to take leave from a miscarriage or a stillbirth when there is no such provisions for paid leave?

Ms. Lathlin: Well, when I look at this bill, when you compare them, pretty much only high-income earners would be able to afford this five days' paid leave, versus low-income earners. And especially if they have a second income earner in that household, it's much easier.

But as a single parent, you know, as parents, they cannot afford to do that whatsoever.

Ekosi.

Mr. Isleifson: Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if the member opposite could give us an outline of the number of small businesses that were consulted during the process prior to bringing this to the floor in the House today.

Ms. Lathlin: I would like to ask the member a question too: How many pregnant people are—you know, pregnant women he has talked to, whether they want: Hmm? Do you want five days' unpaid leave or three days' paid leave?

You know, as a woman who has went through that agonizing process, I think I would presume three days' paid leave so I can continue to feed my children.

Ekosi.

MLA Fontaine: I know that members opposite are fixated on small business, and we actually just saw that yesterday, as well, in respect of Orange Shirt Day. And members opposite supporting small business and overriding that for, I don't know, reconciliation and paid leave for miscarriage.

But I would ask the member for The Pas-Kameesak (Ms. Lathlin), you know, if—how many folks, how many Manitobans she spoke to in respect of supporting this bill?

Ms. Lathlin: Well, I thank you for that question. And from woman to woman, I've experienced this agonizing part of my life three times, and to—

An Honourable Member: Experience of your constituents.

Ms. Lathlin: Yes, and experience of my constituents too. I share my story with my constituents once I hear what they talk about, and when I go home we talk about this bill. When I go to community gatherings, I have the opportunity to talk about this bill to let them know the upcoming great work that this side of the House is working on.

Ekosi.

Mr. Isleifson: Madam Speaker, my next question is just straightforward: we introduced a Bill 235, which passed second reading, which came up with five days. This bill has three days.

And I'm wondering if the member opposite prefers the three days or the five days.

Ms. Lathlin: I'll be very straightforward too. As somebody on this side of the House who has personally experienced this tragedy, like I said before, I would prefer three days' paid leave so I can continue with my life with—at home and continue to—

An Honourable Member: Pay the bills.

Ms. Lathlin: Yes, pay the bills and feed my children.

Ekosi.

MLA Fontaine: The questions that the member has asked across the way I think are so 'disingenuous'—just disingenuous and really kind of highlight the priorities and the focus of members opposite in dealing with reproductive health here in Manitoba.

And we know that reproductive health has suffered under each and every one of those members opposite. So, it's really disheartening to hear the questions that the member is asking our colleague here.

I would just ask our colleague for one more final question in respect of, you know, how important this bill is for Manitobans.

Ms. Lathlin: This bill is very—thank you for the question. This bill is very important for all Manitobans because, like, seriously, when you compare the two, paid leave is much more respectful to folks and families who've suffered a loss and tragedy in their family versus five days' unpaid leave, saying, good luck, yes, if you need to get a loan after that, after you missed a whole week work with no pay, good luck.

* (10:20)

This bill is much more caring, much more respectful for all Manitobans. Not that one.

Ekosi.

Mr. Isleifson: So, Madam Speaker, I understand the member is talking about three days' paid leave. I understand that there is a concern about being able to pay bills when someone is on a—grieving on this type of leave.

I also know that small businesses, though, have to pay that fee to ensure that that processes.

So, I'm wondering if the member truly believes that a broader consultation with small business is needed or not?

Madam Speaker: The honourable member—*[interjection]* Order. The honourable member for The Pas-Kameesak, to respond.

Ms. Lathlin: I don't know how many times I have to say that, you know, what is right out there, is that this bill is a much better bill. I don't understand how they don't understand how paid leave—it's much more respectful than unpaid leave.

I don't know what else to say to this side—hide of the House—to the other side of the House that the difference is right there, and it's quite disturbing they don't see that.

Thank you.

Madam Speaker: The time for this question period has expired.

Debate

Madam Speaker: Debate is open.

Mr. Len Isleifson (Brandon East): You know, it's a tough debate. It really is. And I'm not here to—

An Honourable Member: You're telling me.

Mr. Isleifson: I understand that, and it's—and if I could speak, please; it's my turn to speak in the House. And I appreciate what you—what members go through.

I am very fortunate that, in my family, we have not experienced a loss that this bill is addressing. However—and I know we get ridiculed in my questions earlier because I'm concerned about small business. The opposition doesn't seem to be concerned about small business. *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Oh, order. Order.

Mr. Isleifson: So, Madam Speaker, I understand the need and the desire to get paid when on leave, I really

do. But that pay needs to come from somewhere. That pay needs to come from an employer.

I was an employer; I had my own small business and I took care of my employees. And at the same time, they understood that if I didn't have that small business running, there would be no business for me to pay them.

So, all I'm saying today, Madam Speaker, is while they have a feeling for this bill, which I truly understand, I also know that we have passed second reading on Bill 235, which increases the time off which is needed by families to five days.

Our government recognizes the issues that not just the person going through a miscarriage or loss but the entire family, what they go through. I understand that, although I've never, as I said, experienced it. So, my heart is there for them, but I want to ensure that we as legislatures do what is good for the entire province.

And it is easy, it is easy to stand back and pick one side over the other. I try not to do that; I try not to do that. I have numerous friends in small business. I have not talked to them about this issue in the last week when we—or, the last couple of days when this was coming up.

But I have talked to a few of them—and I say a few of them; less than five. But I have talked to some small businesses when the bill was on the floor originally. And they do struggle, they struggle with the fact of having to pay more, although they're all dedicated to doing whatever they can to help their employees. So, that's not the issue, Madam Speaker.

The issue is, how do we recognize the pain and suffering that families are going through? Do we have the right to legislate businesses to pay someone? That should be a choice of the business. So, I'm not saying it shouldn't happen, but I don't believe it should be legislated.

So again, our government works to advance gender equity throughout the province. We envision a safe community; we want 'equidity' for Manitoban people of all genders. We want to ensure that people live in Manitoba, have the ability to enjoy Manitoba.

And again, we all go through personal things in our lives, and I truly understand and—what the member went through. I don't want to politicize that. I just simply want to say, we have a bill on the floor, Bill 235, that addresses the need and provides longer

time for families to come together in—a lost one in their family.

I believe Bill 35 even extends beyond what this bill does today, when looking at, you know, people who have passed away within a family, and in other areas as well.

So, Madam Speaker, I just—I truly believe that at this time, you know, we look at further consultations when we talk about forcing small businesses to pay more out of their bottom line. We all know right now the cost of living is going up; it's getting harder for families.

And now we're talking to, you know, maybe even making it harder on them if employers have to pay out more money. Obviously, they got to get it from somewhere, so they're going to raise the cost of goods and services. So, I don't know if that really helps.

But again, Madam Speaker, we understand that, you know, the loss of a pregnancy at any stage is devastating for the individual and for their entire family. And we really need to have a really good look at processes. And again, when we compare Bill 210, I believe it is, with Bill 235, Bill 235 has just a little bit more in it for families so they can take the time that they need to grieve, they can take the time they need to make arrangements.

Life—and I've always said this, even about our own government—life is not all about money. Life is about people. It's about looking after Manitobans. It's about giving them the time and the opportunity they need to grieve. It's about the time and opportunity they need to understand, to move beyond.

And again, we—you never ever forget, you never want to forget. I lost a brother a number of years ago and while we—I miss him dearly. It's certainly something that we never want to forget, right?

And that's the same here, when people go through this grieving process, let's give them the time to grieve. It shouldn't be about money. It should be about the ability to bring families together. It should be about the ability to take the time needed.

Money aside, you cannot throw money at every single problem and hope it goes away. It's a situation that families need to take.

So, Madam Speaker, I know others want to speak to this, but again, our bill is taking the current three-day leave that's in legislation, and expanding that to five. You know, that is certainly something that needs to happen. I believe it's more important.

The legislation brought forward today is very broad and I believe would place a large undue burden on—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. Order. In accordance with rule 25 and as previously announced, I am interrupting this debate to put the question on the second official opposition's selected bill for this session.

The question before the House, then, is second reading of Bill 210, The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Leave for Miscarriage or Stillbirth).

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Madam Speaker: Sorry. Am I hearing this right? Okay.

In my opinion, the Ayes—the motion is accordingly carried.

MLA Nahanni Fontaine (Official Opposition House Leader): A recorded vote, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: A recorded vote having been called, in accordance with our rule 24(7), this vote will be deferred to 11:55 a.m. today.

**Bill 218—An Act Respecting
the Title "Associate Judge"
(Various Acts Amended)**

Madam Speaker: Moving now to—as previously announced, we will now move to second reading of Bill 218, An Act Respecting the Title "Associate Judge" (Various Acts Amended).

* (10:30)

MLA Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): I move, seconded by the member for Union Station (MLA Asagwara), that Bill 218, An Act Respecting the Title "Associate Judge" (Various Acts Amended), be now read a second time and referred to a committee of this House.

Motion presented.

MLA Fontaine: I'm really pleased this morning to get up to put a couple of words on the record in respect of Bill 218, An Act Respecting the Title "Associate Judge"—various acts amendment—amended. I'm not going to speak too long on this bill, just to put a couple of words on the record.

First, let me begin by saying miigwech and acknowledging one of our Manitoba lawyers, who I

know would not want me to say his name and give him that official recognition. But I do have a lot of respect for this particular lawyer on a variety of different issues.

And him and I were chatting quite a while back, and he had mentioned this move from the Ontario courts, back in September of 2021, who—they had also changed the title of masters to associate judge. And so, I want to just acknowledge this particular lawyer and say miigwech to him for bringing this to my attention.

I think it's an important bill, and I think it's a common sense bill. And the bill is this, Madam Speaker: it is that—this bill would amend The Court of Queen's Bench Act to change the designation of judicial officials appointed under division 2 of part 4 of the act from master to associate judge.

And I think that most of us can agree that language matters, right? And language, decolonizing language, 'unpacting' language, is something that's been taking place for many years now.

And I'm not going to go into great detail or depth at why calling someone master within our judiciary could be harmful, is certainly not in keeping with the times and needs to be changed. We need to do better in the language that we use, and this is a very, very simple step that we can all undertake here this morning and support.

And so, you know, terms such as master which have a connotation to the very dark, dark, grotesque history of slavery, can be very harmful and very damaging. And I know that folks in this Chamber would understand that if you are a Black lawyer, or a Black person working within the judiciary, to hear that term in the context of you doing your job, is not good. And as I said earlier, we need to do better and we need to get with the times that we are operating within.

And so, certainly reducing or changing this term from master to associate judge would help reduce this harm, and in a very tangible way, but certainly a small way, work to create more equity and safety within the judiciary here in Manitoba.

And for those folks that perhaps are not well aware of the term, masters are judicial officers that are appointed pursuant to The Court of Queen's Bench Act with jurisdiction proscribed by legislation. Masters have extensive jurisdiction with respect to court motions and references, which may be directed by judges of the courts of queen's 'brench'. They deal with a variety of law, including family law matters,

Family Property Act references, striking out improper evidence from affidavits, presiding over family law motions, maintenance enforcement court, child protection screening. So, a whole variety of issues that masters deal with in the court system.

So, I think that this bill is important. I think it's something that we can all get behind and we can certainly all work in this Chamber together to create a more safe space within our 'judiciaries'—in—within our judiciary.

And let me just say this, I want to put on the record, when Ontario changed over, there was a note that had gone out from their chief justice and I just want to put in the record. And I quote: I commend the Attorney General for supporting this change. Ontario is now one of several commonwealth jurisdictions that have retired the title of master, which was seen as out of step with modern justice systems and a multicultural society. The new title also better reflects the important role of associate judges in Ontario's judges—justice system. End quote.

So, I'm hoping that folks will support this bill today and that we can get in line of creating a more safe and equitable and modern justice system here in Manitoba.

Miigwech.

Questions

Madam Speaker: A question period of up to 10 minutes will be held. Questions may be addressed to the sponsoring member by any member in the following sequence: first question to be asked by a member from another party; this is to be followed by a rotation between the parties; each independent member may ask one question. And no question or answer shall exceed 45 seconds.

Mr. Len Isleifson (Brandon East): A simple question just to start off: When would the changes take place if this legislation is passed?

MLA Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): Well, I would imagine immediately upon royal assent. I'm sure that there's some logistical work that needs to be done, but it is a relatively simple change or easy change and could be changed almost immediately.

MLA Uzoma Asagwara (Union Station): I thank our colleague, the MLA for St. Johns, for bringing this bill forward. The member has already stated how important it is that when we know better we do better and we take steps to decolonize language that is potentially harmful to communities.

And I'm just wondering if the member can advise who she consulted in the development of this bill.

MLA Fontaine: And certainly I paid my respect to the initial gentleman—lawyer who we spoke about this and had brought this to my attention. But I did speak with Manitoba Bar Association and, certainly, other lawyers as well.

And then, again, I think it's really important to recognize that, you know, often as legislators, when we see good legislation in other jurisdictions, that provides us a frame of reference in which we can make those changes here. And so, certainly I took a lot of note of and research of what happened in Ontario—[interjection]

Madam Speaker: Order.

MLA Fontaine: —which again, by all accounts has been welcomed and is a welcome change within the Ontario court system.

Mr. Isleifson: Just wondering if any other provinces use this term and if not, what terms do they use?

MLA Fontaine: Certainly, there are other jurisdictions in Canada that do, but also there are other jurisdictions within the Commonwealth, so certainly, those are—that term is something that is within the commonwealth and reflective of our colonial history with England.

Miigwech.

MLA Asagwara: I thank the member for St. Johns for her last response. It actually answered a question I was going to ask. I'm wondering if the member can advise—she talked about slavery as part of the reason why, you know, the court system should be advancing and progressing language.

Can the member talk a bit more about why it's so important to make these changes and advance language in general in terms of the court system because of the impacts it can have on folks who are involved in the legal system?

* (10:40)

MLA Fontaine: I say miigwech to my colleague for that question. I mean, I would imagine that in 2023, we don't have to get into great detail on why, or the history—I would hope that we wouldn't have to get into great deal of history on why that term master is so grotesque and offensive.

We have—we are part of a world that at one point had slavery, in which millions and millions and

millions of human beings lost their lives, or were oppressed for generations and generations. And it was built on white supremacy. And there is no greater word than the word master—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Isleifson: I wonder if the member can enlighten the House on how many people would this affect within the Department of Justice at the courthouses throughout Manitoba.

MLA Fontaine: That's actually a really good question. And I actually don't know. So, I can certainly get back to the member and provide that, but I don't actually have those numbers on me. I would suspect that his colleague, the Minister for Justice, would probably have those numbers better than myself.

But unfortunately, I'm not able to answer that, but I will get back to him once I speak with the Minister of Justice.

MLA Asagwara: With the member bringing this bill forward, it strikes up an interesting and important dialogue around the history of slavery as it pertains to Canada. Many folks still do not know that Canada has a history of slavery that is hundreds and hundreds of years long.

And I'm wondering if the member can share a bit about her thoughts on what bringing this bill forward does to also inform people in Canada and in Manitoba about the history of slavery within our own country.

MLA Fontaine: Yes, that's a really good question. And I would suggest and actually agree with the member for Union Station (MLA Asagwara) that a lot of folks don't realize that Canada has its own history of slavery.

And I think that we immediately go to the American experience, right? Or—and England and Spain and France and all of that slavery and colonizing history, that we immediately just go to the US. And I think that that is indicative of how for generations, our education system didn't provide that education in respect of Canada's own history on slavery.

Madam Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Debate

Madam Speaker: If not, debate is open.

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I appreciate the member bringing forward this bill. I know it's been discussed across Canada. Alberta has recently—relatively recently made

changes, as well, to do away with the name masters because it is not culturally appropriate; it's not historically appropriate anymore.

There's some debate about what the name should be. And I've had some discussions with the judiciary about that. And I'm not sure that that's an entirely settled matter, but I do think that what is a settled matter is that the name should be changed.

And we look forward to passing this bill to second reading and calling it to committee.

Madam Speaker: No further speakers on this bill?

If not, is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is second reading of Bill 218, An Act Respecting the Title "Associate Judge" (Various Acts Amended).

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

I declare the motion carried.

* * *

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Government House Leader): The will of the House to call it 11 a.m.?

Madam Speaker: Is it the will of the House to call it 11 a.m.?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

An Honourable Member: No.

Madam Speaker: Leave has been denied.

MLA Nahanni Fontaine (Official Opposition House Leader): I apologize for that. Is there will of the House to take a 10-minute recess?

Madam Speaker: Is it the will of the House to take a 10-minute recess? [*Agreed*]

We will then—as it's been accepted, we will have 10-minute recess with a one-minute bell.

And the House is now recessed.

The House recessed at 10:45 a.m.

The House resumed at 10:55 a.m.

Madam Speaker: The House is now back in session.

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Acting Official Opposition House Leader): Madam Speaker, can you canvass the House to see if there is will to call it 11 a.m.?

Madam Speaker: Is it the will of the House to call in 11 a.m.? [Agreed]

RESOLUTIONS

Res. 10—Condemning the Provincial Government for Breaking its Promises to Seniors on Personal Care Home Beds

Madam Speaker: The hour being 11 a.m., it is time for private members' resolutions.

Before I call that, I would indicate now that the noon recess will be at 11:55 and the deferred vote from this morning will be at 11:50.

Introduction of Guests

Madam Speaker: And also, we have some guests in the gallery. We have 36 students that are grade 4s and 5s from Ecole Van Walleghem, and they are from the constituency of the honourable Minister of Sport, Culture and Heritage (Mr. Khan), from Fort Whyte.

We welcome all of you to the Manitoba Legislature.

* * *

Madam Speaker: The resolution before us this morning is a resolution on Condemning the Provincial Government for Breaking its Promises to Seniors on Personal Care Home Beds, being brought forward by the honourable member for Elmwood.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): I move, seconded by the member for The Pas-Kameesak (Ms. Lathlin),

WHEREAS Manitoba seniors deserve to age with dignity and respect that should include access to high quality, long-term-care services when they need them in their local community; and

WHEREAS the need for personal-care-home beds in the province is a critical issue, particularly in light of the aging population and the increasing demand for long-term-care services; and

WHEREAS families are struggling to find appropriate care for their loved ones and many seniors are forced to live in substandard conditions, waiting months or even years for a spot in a facility; and

WHEREAS a lack of personal-care-home beds has had detrimental impacts on the health of many seniors who have had to be transferred far from their home communities and families, particularly in northern Manitoba; and

WHEREAS the current Provincial Government pledged in the 2016 campaign that it would build 1,200 new personal-care-home beds; and

WHEREAS since that time it has closed personal-care-home beds and cancelled projects for additional beds in Lac du Bonnet and Winnipeg such that there are now 216 fewer personal-care-home beds in Manitoba than in 2016; and

WHEREAS this situation is unacceptable, and this Provincial Government must take responsibility for its failure to deliver on its promises.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba condemn the provincial government for breaking its promise to build 1,200 new personal-care-home beds, and its refusal to invest in the long-term-care needs of Manitoba's seniors and their families.

Motion presented.

Mr. Maloway: I am very pleased to bring this resolution forward because it points to a very important failure of this government. And I think what—you know, we have to start at the beginning, and the beginning was in the election campaign in 2016, the government promised to build 1,200 new personal-care-home beds.

Here we are seven years later, and how many beds have they built? Of the 1,200 promised, how many beds have they actually built? Does anybody know?

The truth of the matter is, they've actually dropped, they're minus. How does that happen? How can you go seven and a half years promising 1,200 new beds, and seven and a half years later, you end up with 193 fewer beds?

And, you know, you can blame it on the pandemic. That's, you know, that's—we have to accept there was a pandemic and a lot of new realities came forward out of that. But the truth of the matter is that Manitoba really wasn't touched by the first wave of the pandemic. We had ample opportunity—it's past three years now—to see this virus moving across the globe, and we saw it move through the United States, on the cruise ships. We saw it move through the seniors homes.

Mr. Andrew Micklefield, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

So, we knew what to expect. And what did we do? Well, not very much, evidently, because I remember following the first wave, and we were lucky to—you know, some days, we only had single-digit number of cases. I presume the government, the premier, was sitting huddled in his office there by himself, and thinking that this was all going to pass.

I can—that's the only conclusion I can come up with because they had lots of opportunity to do an inventory of the homes, of the beds, since they knew who was getting the virus. And they could have gone through a checklist. What's so difficult about that?

Oh, they're moving through an election checklist right now. You know, I asked the minister questions for a couple of hours last week, and, you know, clearly they're talking about announcements. They're going to be announcing a number of new homes. But they're waiting for the election. Because it's all part of the election planning process. And when the election's called, they're going to make another announcement.

* (11:00)

Well, that announcement is going to be very similar to the one they made seven and a half years ago. So the question is: Why should the public believe them?

An Honourable Member: They shouldn't.

Mr. Maloway: No. Seven and a half years ago, they promised 1,200 new personal-care-home beds. Seven and a half years, they've got a minus figure here, minus 193. And they think that they're going to walk out and make a big announcement, during the election in a few weeks from now, that they're going to make—I don't know how many homes they're planning to build. But who is going to believe them? Who should believe them with a record like that?

Now, I have to say that I heard some positive things come from previous Finance minister during the pandemic, when he had suggested that the very next building that was going to be built was going to be based on the—I think the Holland example or the Nordic countries have a different approach to long-term care. And where they—you know, they don't have these huge, tall buildings that present lots of problems.

I mean, even in my own area during the pandemic, we had a situation where we had all the seniors on the top floor and the elevator broke down, and the parts come from Germany. You know, that's—that is a nightmare situation. Those poor people were stuck, you know, walking up and down the stairs for the months that it took to get parts from Germany for the elevator.

So, we have to learn from—you know, you can't really call them mistakes of the past because, I mean, that was what we did. In the 1960s, we built 14-storey buildings, we put seniors at the top, we had modern elevators from Germany that didn't need any repairs

and, you know, we built one, then we built another one. And we ended up with the system we have now. And nothing wrong with that, it's just that nobody foresaw that a pandemic was going to come, and another one may come around as well.

We have to quickly change our approach. And I don't think we should be building any more of these tall buildings that, you know, that lead—that lend themselves to a very poor approach to a pandemic. We should be thinking, before we build another one, what should this building look like? What should the operation look like?

And the Dutch example sounded pretty good to me, anyway: low-profile buildings, not just seniors in the development, mixture of people. And we should get on this file, you know, right away.

We shouldn't just use it as a, you know, sort of promise to get past an election—which is the way it sounds to me—and then go back to dealing with the past assuming that, oh, we got another 99 years before we're going to get another pandemic, so we can just keep building the same old buildings that we were in the past.

Also—[interjection]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Maloway: —we had a situation where, unbeknownst to a lot of people in the province, the seniors were in these long-term-care homes, multiple people in a room. Well, that doesn't work very well when you're trying to fight a pandemic. So we have to learn. I—it's fine to blame people for things, but the reality is, going forward, we have to treat this a priority area and we have to build these new-style homes and we have to do it as quickly as possible.

And we have to do it in—with a view to making certain that we're not essentially abusing our seniors, that we're not piling people four to a room. We saw what happened in The Maples and how many people died in there. That is absolutely unbelievable that that should be allowed—should have happened in the first place. But certainly with what we know right now, we have to move forward and we have to develop a new approach.

And I'm not really seeing that from this government. I'm just seeing the approach of, you know, let's just get ourselves past the next election and promise whatever we have to, to win, and then we're just going to roll back into our—into relaxation mode and wait for the next election to come around.

So, I'd be very interested to hear what the Conservatives have to say on this issue, and I look forward to answering some questions.

Thank you very much.

Questions

Mr. Deputy Speaker: A question period of up to 10 minutes will be held, and questions may be addressed in the following sequence: the first question may be asked by a member from another party; any subsequent questions must follow a rotation between parties; each independent member may ask one question. And no question or answer shall exceed 45 seconds.

The floor is open for questions.

Mr. Reg Helwer (Brandon West): Well, I'm interested to hear from the member opposite that we should learn from the past. So, in 17 years of NDP rule in Manitoba—and the member opposite was a member of that government. They decreased PCH beds in Manitoba by 100 in 17 years, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

What can we learn from that mistake, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when people were calling for PCH construction in Manitoba and it was denied—announced, announced, announced and denied by the previous government?

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): But the member is, you know, talking about the past. The fact of the matter is that they've been the government for seven and a half years. They promised 1,200 beds. We've dealt with a pandemic.

They had—they have had time now to consider the effects of the pandemic and to look forward to a future. And, you know, he can complain all he wants about the past. He's saying, well, we didn't—we promised a certain number of beds and we under-produced by 100.

Well, they not only promised 1,200, but they have 193 fewer. I mean, it's pointless to sit here and argue—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): My question to the MLA for Elmwood deals with not just numbers, but the quality of care is important. I wonder if the member would comment on the number of hours of care per person that the type of care that we've seen under the last number of years.

Mr. Maloway: I have to compliment the member. I have to say that I have, you know, watched him for quite a few years in this House now, and he's all—he seems to be ahead of the curve on a lot of issues and one of them, our long-term-care situation.

You know, he has been involved in there and knows how, you know, mistreated people are sometimes in those homes. And he's taken up the case, I know, more than once now. But we do have to increase the amount of hours each resident gets, and the care has to be quality care.

I mean, I'm just increasing the amount of hours, and that is, really, is one metric, but—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The member's time has expired.

The honourable member for Midland (Mr. Pedersen)—my mistake. The honourable member for Thompson, according to the rotation set out in the rules.

Mr. Eric Redhead (Thompson): You know, I want to thank my colleague for bringing this PMR forward. You know, we have to take care of seniors in Manitoba. And, obviously, this government doesn't do that.

So, in 2016, the PCs had promised to build 1,200 care-home beds in Manitoba. They failed to make any progress. We've actually lost approximately 216 personal-care-home beds.

Can you explain how this failure is negatively impacting seniors in our province?

Mr. Maloway: The fact of the matter is that we have an increasing demand for these long-term-care beds. And like I said, we can dwell on the past all we want, but this government made a promise seven and a half years ago. It's underperformed.

We've had a pandemic, which was not anticipated, and it shows how serious this issue is and how it has to be dealt with right now. And I don't want to see us lunging forward, basically doing what we did or didn't do in the past. But let's look forward, to the way things should go in the future.

* (11:10)

And I think we should be looking at models and the—like Holland. The former—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Blaine Pedersen (Midland): I'm glad to see the member from Elmwood's admitting that nothing was done in the past.

So, I have to ask—*[interjection]*—I just have to ask: Was the construction on the Louise Bridge the reason for this Assembly having to take a 10-minute break?

Mr. Maloway: Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm very thrilled that the government member would actually want to talk about the Louise Bridge and I'm very looking forward to that.

This bridge has to be built and, you know, nowhere in Winnipeg would—you know, other parts of Winnipeg—no bridges are this old—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Maloway: This bridge is going to fall into the water.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Order. The question was irrelevant; the answer was irrelevant. Let's stick to what we're debating in this hour.

The floor remains open for questions on this resolution.

Mr. Redhead: I'll keep my question to the topic. Why is it important that all seniors in Manitoba have access to high-quality long-term care in their communities?

Mr. Maloway: The fact of the matter is that we are getting complaints now, many, many complaints, from rural Manitoba, where people are being moved out of their—moved into homes, long-term-care beds, far away from where they live. And it's even worse in the North.

So, I mean, the fact of the matter is that the system is getting worse—is getting worse—under this government; worse than it ever was before.

So, the members, you know, can ask me about the Louise Bridge all they want and I'm happy to respond—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Brad Michaleski (Dauphin): I want to acknowledge and thank the new and dedicated Minister of Seniors and Long-Term Care (Mr. Johnston) for introducing a comprehensive seniors strategy that includes investments in facility staffing and supports for better long-term care.

I find this resolution to condemn us a bit rich, given the NDP record. And I want to thank the government for its sincere and steadfast efforts to ensure

the safety and protection of seniors over the past seven years, and especially during COVID, which was a large disruptor that changed a lot of plans for a lot of government.

So, can the member ask why—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I—you know, I don't know why the member is complimenting the government. We had a record number of deaths in The Maples. Like, how is that, you know—I—what—why would he be complimenting the government for that?

He should be critical of the government for not doing something about the situation to prevent the deaths in The Maples. I mean, that's pretty clear.

Mr. Redhead: I'd like to ask my colleague, what steps could the government take to fix the crisis it has created in long-term care that their cuts have created? So, what can they do to help the situation?

Mr. Maloway: Well, I mean, for starters, they can honour their promises. And so, I'm looking forward to the announcements that the minister is suggesting is going to be made—make in the future—well, in the future election—to build some new buildings and deal with this backlog, you know, the promise of Brian Pallister to build 1,200 new personal-care beds seven and a half years ago.

So, they got a lot of time to make up and, you know, I'm going to be very interested to see them attempt that.

Mr. Helwer: Well, over 17 years of NDP rule, we would see the premier of the day come out to the community, take the shovel, dig some dirt, throw some dirt and announce a personal-care-home-bed construction in that community.

And then the election would happen and nothing would happen again, until the next election, that the premier of the day would come out and throw some dirt and announce that personal-care-home bed again.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, how many times did the NDP announce PCH construction and deny those to Manitobans?

Mr. Maloway: I seem to recall a certain PC government announcing—I think it was the hospital buildings to be built in Brandon, and it was announced over and over and over again. And the member knows about that and how long it's taken, right?

So, we don't need any lessons on, you know, promises made and promises not kept. We just have to look at Conservative government's current—*[interjection]* Yes, we don't have to go any further than the current government to see all the promises that have not been followed up on, especially on this file.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The time for questions is over.

Debate

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The floor is open for debate.

Mr. Reg Helwer (Brandon West): Pleased to rise to speak to this resolution today. And many things that can be said about the resolution, especially that the member opposite was part of a government that for 17 years ignored the needs of seniors in Manitoba, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I'm a child of the '60s; I was born in 1960, part of the baby boom generation. And right at the end of it, depending on where the years are, we were told that the baby boom generation would have a massive impact on service requirements on health care, on personal-care homes.

Yet, in 17 years of government, the NDP ignored all those projections. They did not add personal-care homes, they did not add staff, they did not educate nurses, they did not hire nurses, they did not hire doctors. They did not look for health-care productivity in Manitoba; they denied it to Manitobans.

They ignored what all of the experts were telling them: build personal-care homes, open personal-care-home beds. Instead, over 17 years, what we saw from that government, that failed government, was a decrease in personal-care-home beds in Manitoba, an 'ilabil'—an inability for Manitobans to stay in their homes safely and no supports for seniors in Manitoba, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

They're trying to teach the truth, they're trying to teach some history; look at their failed history on building personal-care-home beds in Manitoba. It's there for everyone to see.

As I said, the premier of the day would come out to the community, they would take the golden shovel, they would throw some dirt. They would make an announcement that they're going to build a personal-care-home bed just before an election. Election happens and they're back in, and the community's going, let's build that personal-care home.

And what happens? Nothing for another four years until the premier comes out again, throws some more dirt with the golden shovel, makes another announcement they're going to build a personal-care home. Another election; what happens? Nothing.

Failure after failure after failure is what we saw from that government not fulfilling the needs of Manitobans.

Also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we saw with the previous NDP government, they introduced hallway medicine to Manitoba. This had an impact on PCHs; this had an impact on seniors.

I can recall visiting my very delicate aunt in the hallway of St. Boniface as she was covering—recovering from open-heart surgery under their watch—in the hallway. But she was not counted in the hallway 'mediskine' numbers. Do you know why? Because every hour, someone would come out and they would move her stretcher half an inch, so she's not technically in the same area of the hallway that she was before. Not counted in their hallway numbers, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

* (11:20)

How despicable is that? People recovering in hallways, under their watch, being denied care in a personal-care home because they didn't build any. And we know that that is the truth, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They're trying to hide and run from their record and pretend that they did something different, but we know the truth. We know they did not.

Instead, now we have a government that is helping seniors. We have a Minister of Seniors that has been doing great work on behalf of seniors in Manitoba, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

And I think the thing that is very important here is the ability to stay in your home longer. We all know that you're safest in your familiar surroundings, where you know how far everything is, where you know how long it takes to walk to the kitchen, where you know you can reach out for supports when you need to get out of your chair, to rise off the toilet. Those are the types of things that we know we can put in place, and have put in place, to keep Manitobans safe in their own homes.

There's many more announcements that the Minister of Seniors is making, even one this morning, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's happening as we speak in this Chamber: more supports for seniors that our government is bringing into reality, as opposed to the

denials that were made by the previous NDP government.

We know this is their record that they want to run from, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We know that they can't run from their record because it's there for Manitobans to see. The failure, time after time, to build personal-care homes, to provide for seniors, to work on hallway medicine, to hire health-care staff, all of those are their failures.

And Manitobans won't forget; they know that this member was part of that government. They know all those members over there voted against health-care funding from our government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that would provide for personal-care-home beds, that would provide for aid into—in seniors and staying in their residences safely, that would provide in home care.

You know, the other thing that strikes home with me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is we all have loved ones that needed help. And during the time of NDP rule, my mother-in-law moved from an assisted-living facility where we paid for somebody to help her, because there wasn't enough home care available. We had to pay for more on her own because she needed more, and there were no government supports available.

And we were able to do that, it was able—we were able to keep her in her home, where she knew where everything was, where she was safer, where she had friends, until the point where she needed more care that couldn't be provided.

And then, under the NDP rule, we tried to find a personal-care home for her, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We knew the time was coming. We had been preparing this—for this, but it took months to find a spot for my mother-in-law in a personal-care home that could help her and could help her maintain her ability to move around.

And that was something that was absent under the previous NDP rule. They didn't build personal-care homes, they don't—didn't open personal-care-home beds, and that had a detriment that pay—that is still there to this day.

So, what happens when you form government and you come out of the doldrums, the dead part that we saw under the NDP? We find that they didn't have any plans for personal-care-home beds; they didn't buy the land for personal-care homes. If you don't buy the land, then you can't specify what the structure's going to be. If you can't specify what the structure's going to

be, you can't design it, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You can't go to tender for that facility.

These were announcements that the NDP made that they had no intention of fulfilling. They had no intention, no plans. There were no plans to build personal-care homes under their watch. And we know this is true, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because they didn't buy the land, they didn't design the facilities.

And that's what we were left to deal with when we formed government. Looking—maybe they had some plans that we can put into building new personal-care homes. They must have had something on the books that we can just take and say, hey, they had the land, you know, we can now build a personal-care home in this area.

That's where they announced it. But nothing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, nothing that we were left with to work with as a government that could build a personal-care home rapidly for the demand that Manitobans have. So we had to start from scratch.

And I'm sure the member opposite may or may not know, because he's never been in Cabinet and doesn't know how these things are done, it takes time to assemble that land. It takes time to get the services into that land. It takes time to specify the building, to design the building, to go out for tender. But they left us with nothing, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

This is not the only file that happened in. We all remember what happened when the emergency radio system, a \$385-million program that keeps Manitobans safe—they didn't even put in the briefing books. That's how—lack of importance they placed on it. We were buying parts and they were buying parts on eBay to keep our emergency responders safe. Those that respond to seniors in need, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we were trying to run the radio system from eBay.

What a disaster they left for all future governments. And those disasters are still—we're still paying the price for NDP rule of 17 years, trying to find a path out of the wilderness that they left for Manitobans. No personal-bed-home construction. Closing personal-care-home beds. And making sure that Manitobans weren't able to go to personal-care homes when they needed so, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

That is their legacy. Nothing to learn from there.

Mr. Nello Altomare (Transcona): As you know, all of us in this House take our role as advocates for our constituencies very seriously. It's something that

we've been entrusted with as elected officials here in the Legislative Chamber, and one that, I'm sure everyone takes very seriously.

I can say that this PMR is certainly a cautionary tale. And I do want to redo some—give a bit of a history of how this is a cautionary tale for the 'constits' of Transcona and for the people of northeast Winnipeg, Deputy Speaker.

Because this hits home particularly hard to us in Transcona. Because, Deputy Speaker, I recall in 2016, a certain PC leader made his way all the way out into northeast Winnipeg and to Transcona and the corner of Kildare and Redonda. On that very day—I don't recall it because it's actually kind of blacking out in my mind because it was actually so, I think, politically opportunist that it was almost insulting, certainly to the residents and constituents at Transcona.

PC leader is sitting there in front of Park Manor Personal Care Home heralding the fact that they will build 1,200 new personal-care-home beds. And that one of the very first places would be Park Manor Personal Care Home.

And the reason—was chosen as one of the first places is because the previous MLA, the MLA for Transcona by the name of Daryl Reid had put together a community committee that had created a plan. A plan to the point where it was shovel ready, Deputy Speaker. Shovel ready to the point where the land was already apportioned.

And how deeply did they plan this? Not only did they have a spot close to the actual—where Park Manor is right now. There was also a spot on another street called Ravenhurst that was set aside to build a home along the lines of what the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) described as a Dutch model. One that had a hub design where they would share a kitchen. They would have their own personal space for their own personal items. And also share the services of PCH staff, a nurse and other medically trained professionals. It's a great model. One that was on two levels.

So, not only did they have that ready to go, they also had another plan that was going to expand the actual personal-care home. The first thing that happened once this government was elected in 2016: they cancelled the expansion of Park Manor Personal Care Home.

But there was still hope. Because the people, the developers of all things, kept the land for an extra year on Ravenhurst in the hopes—because the plan was shovel-ready and ready to go in Transcona—that there

would be an announcement. But they were left disappointed.

* (11:30)

And so, to this day, Deputy Speaker, it's—it leaves a sour taste in the mouth of constituents of Transcona and residents of northeast Winnipeg. It is well documented that in northeast Winnipeg—and I can speak to Transcona specifically—7,900 residents that are 75 and over, yet we only have 100 beds available at Park Manor. That is a ratio that is below the 120 that is established by the Department of Health.

We know that this exists, so when my colleague, the member for Elmwood, brings this PMR forward, he brings it forward seriously. And when he has to answer questions that are not pertaining at all to this very serious topic, it does a disservice to the people that elect us here to talk about these very important issues.

And I can tell you, they remain very important in northeast Winnipeg. I recall in 2019 that there was a sign still up there at Park Manor Personal Care Home that was talking about—that itemized the expansion. Just before the election was called, they took down the plywood. But, you know what? They left up the pressure-treated sticks, the lumber that had that sign. How disrespectful to the community, having to look at that sign every time they went by there and then have the sticks remaining because of a broken promise from this government.

That was one of the main reasons why I ran in 2019, because this government has not been a friend to the residents of northeast Winnipeg at all. And one of the things that sticks in our craw was this Park Manor decision that was made right away in 2016, as soon as they were elected, despite the fact that we had shovel-ready plans, not only on the original location but at another location ready to go.

The time and effort put in by the community committee was set aside, Deputy Speaker. And that speaks volumes as to the lack of respect that was shown when this decision was made.

And like I said before, Deputy Speaker, we know that the area of northeast Winnipeg requires more PCH space. As a matter of fact, it's been identified as the one area of the city that has the least amount per capita. That needs to be dealt with.

So when members opposite bring up a past history piece, it's just meant to distract and deflect,

because they can't run on their record, right? They can't run on minus 193 beds. Not at all.

And I'll tell you, not only is that disrespectful; what it says to people in northeast Winnipeg is that we don't value your input. Can you imagine that community committee? They're still feeling the scars of being ignored, of being devalued.

These are people that care about their community, that had a commitment from a certain PC leader who had the temerity, Deputy Speaker, to have his picture taken in front of Park Manor along with a particular candidate—I don't remember their name—and ran on some campaign literature that was distributed throughout the constituency. And yet, what was the first thing that was done? It was cancelled. Absolutely disrespectful.

That facility, Deputy Speaker, was built in 1967. It was a centennial project. When first built in 1967, there were 65 beds. It was meant to service the area because it was growing. Transcona has a very unique history because people that are born and raised in Transcona tend to stay in Transcona. They don't leave. They raise their families there.

As a matter of fact, many of us also have extended family that remain in the area, and they want to age in place, but they want to age in place where they know that facilities are in place.

Because I can tell you, when you have a lack of personal-care-home space, that has a cascading effect on many other services. You have people that are backed up in hospitals right now, waiting for PCH space. You have loved ones that are tasked with the added responsibility to ensure that their older parents, older family members are being looked after properly.

These are the impacts of not fulfilling a promise that was made in 2016. And it's one that's left our community—like I said earlier in this particular debate, Deputy Speaker—with a very sour taste in our mouths.

And like I said earlier, they've been no friend to northeast Winnipeg. We've had a reduction of lab services, IV clinic, all of these very important things that allow people to age in place. We need to take these matters very seriously, Deputy Speaker, because I can tell you this: people value where they grow up, people want to age in place.

And people want to have a government that's their partner, that is walking with them down this very, very difficult path for people as they care for their aged

loved ones. They need to know that they have a government that's with them and that'll work to create these very necessary spaces, Deputy Speaker.

So, right now, I want to commend my colleague, the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), for bringing this PMR forward, so we can have this debate.

And I would like to hear from the other side, Deputy Speaker, how they plan to address these—

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

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Okay. This is, of course, a curious debate in that the NDP members are slamming the Tories, and the Tories are slamming the NDP. *[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Gerrard: You know, I want to say first of all, thanks to my colleague from Elmwood and his kind words.

And I think that he brings attention to this resolution which is an important need to draw attention to personal-care homes and situation in the province; both the number of beds that are available, the type of units, which needs to change from what we've done historically to more home-like units, which have been shown to work better in terms of quality and to work also efficiently.

So, I'm prepared to support this resolution.

There has been, sadly, not the attention to personal-care homes that we would have hoped, both in terms of building, but also in terms of what we saw during the pandemic and both before and after in the last seven years.

It is sad that the government, as one of the first things that they did, cancelled the 'pairk'—expansion of Park Manor, including the space which had been carefully designed and new, more modern model that was certainly, you know, unfortunate and I think spoke, right from the beginning, of the PCs' approach to both their commitments and to personal-care homes.

In the pandemic, we spoke up early on—I think it was March the 2nd—to say that the government needed to watch out what was happening in personal-care homes, because they were, as we saw not just here but elsewhere, a big and important concern in a place where you had a lot of vulnerable people together and where you had a lot of problems with personal-care homes, and with residents of personal-care homes

getting sick and dying in very high numbers, which was very sad and very unfortunate.

* (11:40)

In April of 2020, we spoke up and said that the government needed to be on top of this situation and that they—as soon as there was a single case in a personal-care home, you should be testing all the staff and all the residents. Because that was a way of keeping track of what was happening, and it was already evident at that time that there was asymptomatic transmission.

This was known from what was known in China, and it was known from what was known in studies in a community in Italy and in other places, that asymptomatic transmission was a very real concern. And so that if you're going to look after people in personal-care homes who are vulnerable, that you need to test all the residents and staff in an epidemic as quickly as you can, and—to determine who needs to be quarantined and who not.

And we recognize that one of the problems with personal-care homes was that as soon as you had a case, you would have a lot of people, staff in particular, who were in contact. And so that all of a sudden you'd be laying off staff, or actually putting them in a situation where they couldn't come in and work at the very time when it was a crisis and you needed more staff.

And so, we said in May of 2020, well, the thing to do is to put in place a rapid response team with the capability to address at least three personal-care homes, and that you need to be not only putting the teams in place, but you need to be training people so that they're ready. And there was a time to do that over the summer.

But of course, the PCs decided in their own wisdom to not do that, and it wasn't until there were major disasters in several personal-care homes that they decided that that was the approach that they needed to take. And having not done the preparation and not done the training, it was kind of a slapdash effort.

Of course, you had people who pitched in and did a very credible job, but because it was so late in the game, we had a lot of people who were in personal-care homes who died, who I think, in retrospect, we could have done far, far better than we did.

So, once again we're seeing that the PCs were not paying the attention that they should have paid to

personal-care homes. And now, with an election looming, all of a sudden they're getting very excited about personal-care homes, and making all sorts of promises.

And we're just wondering now if, you know, if they were to be elected—we hope not—then all of a sudden they would walk around and say, no, no, we made that promise but we're not following through. Just like they did with Park Manor.

And it's a, you know, it's a sad situation when you don't know, when people are making commitments, whether they're going to keep them. That's pretty sad.

So we'll support this resolution. I hope it will pass and there will be enough support for it, and I thank the member for bringing it forward.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Blaine Pedersen (Midland): It certainly must be awkward for the member from Elmwood to bring forward a resolution like this when he sat in the NDP government for 17 years, and we ended up with a net loss of personal-care beds.

That wasn't bad enough: the NDP also closed 20 rural hospitals, which were—many of those were being used as waiting placement, which then increased the need on personal-care homes when those hospitals were closed.

If that wasn't bad enough, then they went and doubled, tripled ambulance fees. We had seniors who wouldn't call an ambulance because they couldn't—they felt they couldn't afford to call an ambulance.

So, over 17 years and everybody knew the baby boomer generation was getting older and that they would be in need. There was no plan for it. The only plan they ever had was—and I can remember back prior to the 2011 election, Greg Selinger going to Lac du Bonnet with his silver shovel and throwing the dirt aside, saying, we're going to build a new personal-care home in Lac du Bonnet. They didn't have the land. There was no plan on it and they never did build it.

And I remember my colleague from—well, first it was Pembina and then Morden-Winkler, Peter George Dyck spent pretty well his entire political career in this assembly lobbying to have the Tabor Home build in Morden. I can remember my grandmother living in Tabor Home in the 1960s, and it was an old building then. And Morden was growing rapidly. The Pembina Valley was growing rapidly. There was a need, so they finally began to build it. We finished it. We got it done, got it open. Beautiful facility.

One that I'm very familiar with is the Boyne Lodge in Carman, built in the early 1960s, about the same time as many of these personal-care homes were built. Community-owned, community-built. It was a—65 beds and as that building became out of date and not servicing—and you have to remember, too, that over the years, the needs on the personal-care homes have changed greatly.

When Boyne Lodge was built in the early 1960s, the residents in that personal-care home, most of them were driving, most of them were parking their vehicle at the lodge.

And we know now that that has changed. There's aging in place. Our Minister of Seniors is working very hard on the seniors strategy to accommodate this. People want to stay in their home much longer.

Many of them are in good health to be able to stay in their home, but needing some assistance to stay there. So, it's changed now. The—when residents move into a personal-care home, the need—their care requirements are much higher than what they used to be. And that has changed.

Now, in Carman, the Boyne Lodge, as I said, was aging. When that building was built by the community in the—when our regional health authorities were created, the Boyne Lodge—owned—community-owned Boyne Lodge actually sold the facility to the regional health authority. But they also put a clause in that sale, saying that if the community ever wanted to buy back that facility, they could do it for \$1.

Very smart of them to do that because fast forward here to a few years ago, Boyne Care Holdings was created by the community to build a new personal-care home together with this government. We now have a brand-new facility. It's got eight pods in it. Just a—very nice living conditions for those residents. I've been in there, visited some of the residents and it's really nice in there.

But it's community-owned and the community raised the—Carman and district, there was five municipalities involved—raised over \$3 million. At last count, it was over \$3 million. I know there's more since then to put towards this facility. And it's just a tremendous opportunity now for the citizens, not only in Carman but of those five municipalities around there that are living in that facility.

Our government also created the Minister of Seniors, our member from Assiniboia, doing a tremendous job in that department. There's been a real need with—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please.

* (11:50)

When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member for Midland (Mr. Pedersen) will have five minutes remaining.

SECOND READINGS—PUBLIC BILLS

(Continued)

Bill 210—The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Leave for Miscarriage or Stillbirth)

Recorded Vote

Mr. Deputy Speaker: As previously announced, I'm interrupting this debate to conduct a recorded vote deferred from earlier this morning. Accordingly, a recorded vote having been requested, call in the members.

The question before the House is the second reading motion for Bill 210, The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Leave for Miscarriage or Stillbirth).

Division

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

Yeas

Altomare, Asagwara, Brar, Bushie, Clarke, Cox, Cullen, Eichler, Fontaine, Gerrard, Goertzen, Gordon, Guillemard, Helwer, Isleifson, Johnson, Khan, Kinew, Klein, Lagassé, Lagimodiere, Lamont, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino, Martin, Michaleski, Morley-Lecomte, Moses, Naylor, Nesbitt, Pedersen, Redhead, Reyes, Sala, Sandhu, Smith (Lagimodière), Smook, Teitsma, Wasyliv, Wiebe, Wishart, Wowchuk.

Nays

Deputy Clerk (Mr. Rick Yarish): Yeas 45, Nays 0.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hour being 12 noon, this House is recessed and stands recessed until 1:30 p.m.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, April 13, 2023

CONTENTS

ORDERS OF THE DAY		Resolutions	
PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS		Res. 10—Condemning the Provincial Government for Breaking its Promises to Seniors on Personal Care Home Beds	
Speaker's Statement			
Driedger	1457	Maloway	1465
Second Readings—Public Bills		Questions	
Bill 210—The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Leave for Miscarriage or Stillbirth)		Helwer	1467
Lathlin	1457	Maloway	1467
Questions		Gerrard	1467
Isleifson	1458	Redhead	1467
Lathlin	1458	Pedersen	1468
Fontaine	1458	Michaleski	1468
Lamoureux	1459		
Debate		Debate	
Isleifson	1460	Helwer	1469
Bill 218—An Act Respecting the Title "Associate Judge" (Various Acts Amended)		Altomare	1470
Fontaine	1462	Gerrard	1472
Questions		Pedersen	1473
Isleifson	1463	Second Readings—Public Bills	
Fontaine	1463	<i>(Continued)</i>	
Asagwara	1463	Bill 210—The Employment Standards Code Amendment Act (Leave for Miscarriage or Stillbirth)	
Debate			1474
Goertzen	1464		

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>