

**Fifth Session - Thirty-Ninth Legislature**  
**of the**  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**  
**Standing Committee**  
**on**  
**Justice**

*Chairperson*  
*Mr. Tom Nevakshonoff*  
*Constituency of Interlake*

**Vol. LXIII No. 2 - 6 p.m., Monday, June 6, 2011**

ISSN 1708-6671

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

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

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE**

**Monday, June 6, 2011**

**TIME – 6 p.m.**

**LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba**

**CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Tom Nevakshonoff  
(Interlake)**

**VICE-CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Frank Whitehead  
(The Pas)**

**ATTENDANCE – 11 QUORUM – 6**

*Members of the Committee present:*

*Hon. Messrs. Struthers, Swan*

*Messrs. Goertzen, Jennissen, Maguire,  
Martindale, Nevakshonoff, Pedersen, Schuler,  
Whitehead*

*Substitutions:*

*Ms. Korzeniowski for Hon. Ms. Wowchuk*

**PUBLIC PRESENTERS:**

*Bill 37–The Highway Traffic Amendment Act  
(Accident Reporting Requirements)*

*Mr. Keith Atkinson, Chief of Police, City of  
Brandon*

*Bill 19–The Provincial Court Amendment Act  
(Senior Judges)*

*Mr. Ken Mandzuik, Manitoba Bar Association*

**MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION:**

*Bill 16–The Safer Communities and  
Neighbourhoods Amendment and Criminal  
Property Forfeiture Amendment Act*

*Bill 18–The Highway Traffic Amendment Act*

*Bill 19–The Provincial Court Amendment Act  
(Senior Judges)*

*Bill 25–The Inter-jurisdictional Support Orders  
Amendment Act*

*Bill 29–The Child Sexual Exploitation and  
Human Trafficking Act*

*Bill 31–The Manitoba Public Insurance  
Corporation Amendment Act*

*Bill 37–The Highway Traffic Amendment Act  
(Accident Reporting Requirements)*

\* \* \*

**Mr. Deputy Clerk (Rick Yarish):** Good evening. Will the Standing Committee on Justice please come to order.

Your first item of business is the election of a Chairperson. Are there nominations for this position?

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** I nominate Mr. Nevakshonoff.

**Mr. Deputy Clerk:** Mr. Nevakshonoff has been nominated. Are there any other nominations?

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

**Mr. Chairperson:** Our next item of business is the election of a Vice-Chairperson. Are there any nominations?

**Mr. Martindale:** I nominate Mr. Whitehead.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Whitehead has been nominated. Are there any other nominations?

Hearing no other nominations, Mr. Whitehead is the elected Vice-Chairperson.

**Committee Substitution**

**Mr. Chairperson:** For the information of the committee, Ms. Korzeniowski is sitting in for Ms. Wowchuk.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay. This meeting has been called to consider the following bills: No. 16, The Safer Communities and Neighbourhoods Amendment and Criminal Property Forfeiture Amendment Act; No. 18, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act; No. 19, The Provincial Court Amendment Act (Senior Judges); No. 25, the Inter-jurisdictional Support Orders Amendment Act; No. 29, The Child Sexual Exploitation and Human Trafficking Act; No. 31, The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Amendment Act; No. 37, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Accident Reporting Requirements).

How late does the committee wish to sit tonight?

**Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach):** Until the work of the committee is done, Mr. Chairperson.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Goertzen has spoken. Any other advice in that regard? *[Agreed]*

Okay. It's agreed we sit till the business of the community is completed.

As you will see from our presenters list, we have two presenters registered to speak this evening, one of whom is listed as an out-of-town presenter.

In what order does the committee wish to hear the presentations?

**Mr. Goertzen:** Can we hear the out-of-town presenter, esteemed as they are, come first.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Is that agreeable to the committee? *[Agreed]*

Before we proceed with presentations, if there is anyone else in the audience who would like to make a presentation this evening, please register with staff at the entrance of the room.

As well, I would like to inform presenters that in accordance with our rules, a time limit of 10 minutes has been allotted for presentations with another five minutes allowed for questions from committee members.

Finally, 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 have to say the person's name. This is the signal for the *Hansard* recorder to turn microphones on and off.

We will now proceed with public presentations.

**Bill 37—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act  
(Accident Reporting Requirements)**

**Mr. Chairperson:** I call on Mr. Keith Atkinson, Chief of Police, City of Brandon.

Good evening, Mr. Atkinson. Do you have any written materials for the committee?

**Mr. Keith Atkinson (Chief of Police, City of Brandon):** No, I do not.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Seeing none, you may proceed.

**Mr. Atkinson:** Mr. Swan, committee members, my name is Keith Atkinson. I'm the chief of police for the Brandon Police Service. I also serve as president for the Manitoba Association of Chiefs of Police.

For the past several years, the traffic committee of the Manitoba Association of Chiefs of Police have been working on changes to the accident reporting procedures within the province of Manitoba. We are pleased that these changes have now been proposed and would like to offer our support for Bill 37.

The particular points that we do support, that stand out mostly in the bill, it will reduce law enforcement's workload in the collection of traffic accident reports and provide opportunity for focusing on enforcement. It will make it simpler for most motorists who are involved in a minor traffic accident. And I stress minor because nowadays the— or the current law proposes a \$1,000 limit. Most minor traffic accidents are \$1,000 so virtually every accident is reported to police. And so they will have an opportunity just to report once to MPI as opposed to reporting twice, as is the current practice.

Serious accidents will still be investigated by the police. And right now an average of 42,000 accidents are reported annually to the police. We estimate that about half of those, or more, will no longer be required to be reported to police, freeing up valuable police resources for other important duties.

We are very impressed with the clear definition in section 155(7) as to what an accident is. It's removing the monetary value and basing it on a number of criteria such as injury and that injury is also spelled out; a person who is killed in a traffic accident; people who are involved with no valid driver's licence or from out of town or out of the province rather; no driver's insurance or vehicle insurance; as well as hit and runs or where there's a suspected criminal act that have taken place such as impaired driving.

The committee has worked very hard, our traffic committee, and I'd like to publicly recognize that committee. That was chaired by Inspector Ian Grant, of the Brandon Police Service, Inspector Mark LeMaistre to the RCMP and Sergeant Jeff Hodgson *[phonetic]* from the Winnipeg Police Service, who all worked diligently on this file.

So, in closing again, the MACP supports Bill 37 and I'm free to answer any questions if you have any.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Atkinson. The floor is open for questions.

**Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Thank you, Chief Atkinson, for coming to be here tonight. And you mentioned Ian

Grant. I know he's present here tonight so I'd like to thank him for his work.

Thanks for everything you do as the chief of the Brandon Police Service and for your work on behalf of the Manitoba Association of the Chiefs of Police and I'm glad we're able to put into effect the changes that you think will be helpful to police across Manitoba.

I just want to thank and put on the record, my appreciation for your coming with me when we met with Minister Nicholson just a couple of months ago to put forward some ideas for further changes to the federal laws, the Criminal Code, that we think will improve safety for all Manitobans and Canadians. So let me just thank you for coming out tonight.

**Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach):** I also echo some of the comments of the minister, chief, Mr. Grant. Thank you both for coming in, for making the trip in from Brandon. I know it's been some challenging days in Brandon lately with the flood water. We appreciate the work that you've been doing in that and, of course, keeping the community safe year round.

You've got some good initiatives out in Brandon. I've been pleased to be able to speak with you about those over time. I know you raised this with me more than a year ago and I appreciate the work you've done in getting it to this point and we look forward to its speedy passage.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay. Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Atkinson.

\* (18:10)

### **Bill 19—The Provincial Court Amendment Act (Senior Judges)**

**Mr. Chairperson:** I now call Mr. Ken Mandzuik of the Manitoba Bar Association to speak to Bill 19.

Mr. Mandziuk, do you have any written materials for the committee?

**Mr. Ken Mandzuik (Manitoba Bar Association):** No, I do not.

**Mr. Chairperson:** You may proceed, sir.

**Mr. Mandzuik:** Minister Swan, honourable members, I am Ken Mandzuik, the president of the Manitoba Bar Association, which is a branch of the Canadian Bar Association. We represent over

1,300 lawyers, judges, academics and students in the province of Manitoba.

On behalf of the MBA, I'll first want to thank the government for introducing this bill. The Provincial Court and the MBA have been asking for this kind of legislation for many years, and these changes will provide some flexibility the court needs to foster— increase timely access to justice for Manitobans.

There are couple of minor points that I wanted to raise for clarification about the bill. First, as regards section 6.5(4) in the budget for the program, it provides for the equivalent of one full-time salary, as the budget for the Senior Judges' Program. This makes for a modest program that we suggest could be improved by allowing the senior judges' budget to include any unused money in the annual budget for judges' salaries, should there be any. For example, if the full complement of judges isn't being used due to vacancies, we recommend to allow for maximum flexibility that those monies be available to fund the Senior Judges' Program.

In the—it's the—in the event that there's one—more than one judicial vacancy, that the Senior Judges' Program will be most important, and accessing the salaries budgeted for those vacant positions will ensure the program is able to properly address the problem it's intended to.

Second, as a point of clarification, and just to recognize the importance of judicial independence is protected, we recommend that an additional paragraph, sub (e), be added to subsection 6.5(6) to include a reference to section 11.1(3), a review by the compensation committee. This ensures that the compensation and benefits of the senior judges is also considered by the independent Judicial Compensation Committee. This is probably something that's already contemplated, but we recommend this just for clarity's sake.

Third, we wanted to ensure that the per diem compensation is properly and fairly calculated. Annual sitting days needs to be clearly defined in the regulations. We submit that there are 218 sitting days in the year, as calculated at 52 weeks a year, plus 104 weekend days, plus 30 vacation days, less 12 statutory holidays. That leaves 218 sitting days. This can be defined in the regs, and the MBA would be happy to provide any further comments at that time.

Again, we wanted to thank you for the introduction of this legislation, and I'm happy to address any questions you have.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Mandzuik.

Open for questions.

**Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Well, thank you, Mr. Mandzuik, for coming down today. I know you've had an interesting year, I'm sure, as the president of the MBA, and I congratulate you on everything you've accomplished.

Just a couple of questions on the suggestions you've made, or comments. I mean, on the changes to 6.5(4), there is the ability of government to increase the amount of money available for senior judges, as prescribed in regulations. And I can assure you that we'll be carefully looking at how well the senior judge program works, hopefully getting some better outcomes and quicker ability to deal with certain things. I can tell you we would certainly be open to expanding the way the program works from one judge year, if it works as well as I think the chief judge and my department believes it would.

I just wanted, maybe, test you a little bit on the next point you'd made about referring the remuneration of the Provincial Court judges to the compensation committee. Because it's already defined as being a—the per diem would be a certain proportion of the Provincial Court judges' salary that's already set by that JCC, maybe you can just, when I'm finished, give us a little bit more detail on that reason.

And, on the third piece, the per diem, I think our general sense right now is it would be the sitting days of the court recalculated as all of the regular business days, Mondays to Friday, less statutory holidays and, of course, not including Saturdays, which we hope will become part of the court routine in Manitoba. But we can certainly have some further discussions about that as we move to get the regulations in place.

But, again, thank you, on behalf of 1,300 Bar Association members, of which I'm proud to be one, on coming down and talking to us tonight.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Any response, Mr. Mandzuik?

**Mr. Mandzuik:** Thank you, Mr. Minister. Just on the addition, or the inclusion of senior judges in the JCC, section 11.3 does list the chief judge, the associate judges—or the associate chiefs and judges

separately. We just want to avoid any potential for confusion by referring the senior judges or, you know, separately, in that section.

**Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach):** Thank you, Ken, for coming in this evening. It's been a pleasure to speak to you and your association about this and other matters and your predecessors going back, oh, about four or five years, I think, the first discussions about the senior judge program coming forward. We were all a little mystified in terms of why it wasn't happening in Manitoba when it was happening in most other jurisdictions in Canada. I wish it would have happened a little sooner, but I will quibble about that another time. I'm glad too that it's happening now, and thanks for your support on getting this to this point.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Seeing no further questions, I thank you for your presentation, sir.

That concludes our list of presenters. Is there anyone in attendance who wishes to make a presentation on these bills?

Seeing none, in what order does the committee wish to proceed with clause-by-clause consideration of these bills?

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** Seriatim or as printed.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Proposed as printed. Is that agreed? *[Agreed]*

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, for the longer bills, I 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]*

We will now proceed to clause-by-clause consideration of the bills.

#### **Bill 16—The Safer Communities and Neighbourhoods Amendment and Criminal Property Forfeiture Amendment Act**

**Mr. Chairperson:** Bill 16: Does the minister responsible for Bill 16 have an opening statement?

**Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Very briefly, Bill 16 will amend The Safer Communities and Neighbourhoods Act, which has been amended a couple of times now since

it came into force in 2002. It is a bill which—that act has given greater community safety and security. It uses civil remedies to allow residents to use a confidential process to move ahead and use provincial resources to get people who are causing grief and stress in their neighbourhood out of their neighbourhood.

This will move forward by allowing applications to be made for homes and apartments which are being used to commit a criminal organization offence. It will also clean up a couple of things on the safer communities front by clarifying the role of investigators who conduct investigations, and, when there has been an order granted, it will allow the registration of that order against the real property.

The second part of the bill will amend The Criminal Property Forfeiture Act, which is another very successful piece of legislation using civil remedies to deal with the public safety issues, and it creates a rebuttable presumption that a property has been used to engage in unlawful activity if an order has been issued. That presumption would then make it easier for our Criminal Property Forfeiture Unit to seize property that represents the proceeds of crime or has been used for the commission of crimes. So, again, it's a civil remedy that's being used for criminal problems in a way that we think has been very good for safety in this province and we look forward to continuing to expand.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Minister Swan.

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

**Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach):** Mr. Chairperson, we do support the legislation. It's worth noting that The Safer Communities and Neighbourhoods Act was a piece of legislation, although it's come under a different name and with some minor variations, that was introduced by the now-current, I think, Minister of Public Safety, Vic Toews, when he was the Attorney General here in the Province of Manitoba. It didn't meet with resounding support by the members of the then-opposition New Democratic Party.

\* (18:20)

They had some questions about it, whether or not it would be successful, and we never want to say, I told you so, that's really not a place here in the Legislature. We wouldn't want to get into that sort of level of political debate. But it is worth giving credit to Minister Toews, who was pushing the envelope a

bit, and led the country in this kind of legislation. And they say that imitation is the most sincere form of flattery, and we're glad that the government has sort of latched on to this and then claims it as their own. I think Manitobans know where the impetus of the bill came from. But it doesn't matter because we don't want to sort of get into that sort of thing and I wouldn't want to bring the level of debate down in this committee or others.

So we're looking forward to this bill passing and just wanted to ensure that Minister Toews has the credit that he wouldn't ask for but I certainly think he deserves.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Goertzen.

Seeing no further comments, move to line by line.

Shall clauses 1 and 2 pass?

**An Honourable Member:** Pass.

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** Mr. Chairperson, I have a question for the minister. Since I'm not a lawyer, and since, as a legislator, I think I should try to understand legislation that's before the committee, and since it's a very good act, can the minister briefly explain what a rebuttable presumption is?

**Mr. Swan:** What it means is that, I mean, if no evidence is led in opposition to what the investigators were saying, then it would be presumed that it is criminal property. It would be rebuttable if there was a reasonable explanation that's put forward by somebody for why something is not being used for the purposes.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay.

Clauses 1 and 2—pass; clauses 3 through 5—pass; clauses 6 through 8—pass; clauses 9 and 10—pass; clause 11—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

### **Bill 18—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act**

**Mr. Chairperson:** Move on to Bill 18.

Does the minister responsible for Bill 18 have an opening statement?

**Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Well, thank you very much.

We look forward to Bill 18 passing through this process and to becoming law in Manitoba. This bill will allow us to keep pace with some recent amendments that have been made through Bill S-9,

which is a federal piece of legislation. We are very pleased that the federal government moved to make car theft a stand-alone offence, something that had been—that the government of Manitoba had called upon them to do for several years. We're glad they finally listened to Manitoba and moved ahead. I was pleased to stand with Minister Toews and Chief McCaskill a couple of months ago at the Public Safety Building as we talked about this coming into effect.

What will happen under Bill S-9 is there will be, for the first time in Canadian history, a specific offence of motor vehicle theft as well as some related offences. We are changing The Highway Traffic Act to provide that if an individual is convicted of those new provisions, there will continue to be sanctions, including licence suspensions that will apply to those individuals.

So we're pleased in this case the federal government listened to Manitoba. We think it's another piece in combating auto theft and related offences, and we think it's good for public safety in Manitoba.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Minister.

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

**Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach):** Yes, Mr. Chairperson, this actually segues into my last comments on the last bill, unintended of course, but we do see a great number of changes happening on the federal side when it comes to justice legislation. Some of them were led by the former federal minister of Justice and Attorney General, the same Mr. Toews we talked about the work that he did on the provincial level. And there seems to be a clear pattern here that when you have a Conservative Attorney General a lot of things get done. And there's a lot of changes and, sure enough, Mr. Toews took some of those same principles. So Ottawa, lots of things are happening.

Of course, Mr. Nicholson as well, now is the Attorney General, and we see a great number of changes on the federal side. There used to be, I think, in the NDP caucus some—*[interjection]* You never know when another one coming. There used to be in the NDP caucus a lot of feeling that, you know, well all—the changes that had to happen federally for us to get things going here. Of course, those excuses are all gone now because there's been so many things that have happened federally in terms of changes to

legislation that the excuses are gone and now the NDP had to simply run on their own record. And we look forward to them running on that record in the fall, and we'll see what the results are.

But we certainly know that when there's a Conservative government, particularly in Ottawa right now, there's a lot of things that happened, and I can only presume that a lot of other changes would happen if there was a Conservative government provincially as well.

So with that we want to get speedy passage of this because there might be more changes coming federally. They're not done yet. There's more work to do, and we look forward to seeing what changes happen there and hope that this Minister of Justice will be inspired by the legislative changes and reforms that he's seeing in Ottawa. We are doubtful that he will be, but, you know, I want to be an optimist. I consider myself an optimist, and we want to hope that he'll be inspired in the next few weeks. It's never too late.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Clauses 1 and 2—pass.

Shall clause 3 pass?

**Mr. Swan:** Yes, actually, I have a motion to move, and I'll read it in and then I can explain the happy reasons why we'll want to bring this in.

I would move

*THAT clause 3 of the Bill be replaced with following:*

***Coming into force***

*3 This act comes into force on the day it receives royal assent.*

**Mr. Chairperson:** It has been moved by Mr.—the Honourable Mr. Swan,

*THAT clause 3 of the Bill be replaced with the following—*

**An Honourable Member:** Dispense.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Dispense.

The amendment is in order. The floor is open for questions.

**Mr. Swan:** Yes, just in terms of clarification, the original drafting of the act had provided that this bill would take effect on proclamation. We're actually quite pleased that MPI has been able to move quickly to make sure their systems are in place. Bill S-9 has now become law, so those new federal provisions are



in place. So we're quite pleased that we're in a position as soon as this bill clears third reading and becomes law that this will take effect.

And I want to thank everybody at MPI for their hard work in making sure that this could happen as quickly as possible.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Is the committee ready for the question?

Amendment—pass.

Clause 3 as amended—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill as amended be reported.

**Bill 19—The Provincial Court Amendment Act  
(Senior Judges)**

**Mr. Chairperson:** Now move on to Bill 19.

Does the minister responsible for Bill 19 have an opening statement?

**Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Yes, I do. I'm almost inclined to let the member for Steinbach go first. I know as we are talking about why the Senate needs to be abolished, we found out that there was a senator who decided to read in his entire work of fiction into the record to get it—to translate it for free. So, if the member for Steinbach is working on his book of fiction for after he finishes, I am very happy to let him do that.

So I will instead stick to Bill 19, which is The Provincial Court Amendment Act. Of course, this will allow the chief judge to designate retired judges as senior judges. I'm very pleased that the work we've done with the chief judge—we're very hopeful that the passage of this bill will allow us to have senior judges appointed and, perhaps, in the courts as early as this fall helping with the business of the court.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Does the critic for the official opposition have an opening statement?

**Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach):** I was going to resist, but now I feel I have to. If I ever do write a book, I might reserve a chapter—and not that anybody would read it—but I might reserve a chapter for the senior judges. And then, quite an odyssey this has been.

You know, I remember speaking to the bar association a long time ago. I don't even want to venture exactly the date of it, and they were raising this issue about supernumerary judges, senior judges, retired judges, whatever terminology you want to

use, and we brought it to the then-attorney general, the member for St. Johns (Mr. Mackintosh).

And he said, and, you know, one of his colleagues says he was a good minister, and, you know, that's open for debate. I wouldn't want to dispute it here, but it certainly—he said, you know, it's a good idea. You know, we should look at this. There's no reason why we shouldn't have senior judges. It's something we should do. And I left—I think it was Estimates—I mean I left very encouraged and thought, well, this is something that's going to happen.

\* (18:30)

And a couple of years passed and suddenly the minister for Justice, the member for St. Johns, was on to a different job, and we had a new minister, the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak). And so I figured, well, you know, I'll try my luck again, and now the bar association they were still interested in the issue of senior judges, and we brought it to Mr. Chomiak's and Mr.—sorry, the member for Kildonan—and the member for Kildonan indicated that, yes, this was absolutely something they wanted to do and they were going to move forward on it; it was high time and all sorts of proclamations. And a couple of years went by and nothing happened.

Then the new Minister of Justice came in, and we brought it to him and he said, absolutely, it was going to happen. And it took a couple of years, but here we are. And I'm sure the fact there's an election coming and—had nothing to do with it or anything like that. It just—now was it's time, and you wonder why it took that—well, 10 years or 12 years, I guess, since the government was elected and eight years since I've been Justice critic, longer than I care to actually recall.

But it's been quite an odyssey to try to get it to this point, and it's been a bit of a tepid government in terms of getting this legislation before us. I don't understand why. I think that the point that was made by the president of the Bar Association is correct in terms of why we're capping it at the equivalency of one provincial court judge. You know, it's a tepid—took a long time to get to this point, and now we're being very cautious in terms of implementing the bill. And I don't understand why the concern was ever there and why it took so long to get here. But, again, no need to quibble on this fine Manitoba summer night, so here we are and we'll get the bill passed. And, hopefully, there'll be an increase in the number of equivalency for provincial judges that can

be ascribed to the bill for those who are under the senior judge program.

**Mr. Swan:** There's a question. Oh. I'm sorry we're—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order. All right, thank you, Mr. Goertzen.

Clauses 1 and 2—pass; clauses 3 and 4—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

#### **Bill 25—The Inter-jurisdictional Support Orders Amendment Act**

**Mr. Chairperson:** Move on to Bill 25. Does the minister responsible for Bill 25 have an opening statement?

**Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** This is a highly technical bill which amends The Inter-jurisdictional Support Orders Act, which deals with support orders which are made in other provinces, other territories, other jurisdictions, enforced in Manitoba. Manitoba has reciprocal agreements with many jurisdictions, every other Canadian province, every American state now, I believe, and a number of other countries, and this bill, which is a part of a national effort to continue to streamline, enhance, and improve the way that provinces and different jurisdictions deal with each other.

This will enhance the process by which family support orders are obtained, varied, and recognized for enforcement in cases between Manitobans and parties elsewhere. The bill confirms that recalculated child support orders, through the Child Support Recalculation Service, which is a new initiative brought in several years ago by our government, can be recognized and enforced in interjurisdictional cases. It also clarifies various provisions about how notice is to be given to assist with enforcement, to assist with variations of those orders.

In addition, the bill clarifies factors which will be considered when registration of a foreign order should happen to be challenged.

Again, it's a very technical bill. I want to thank the people within my own department as well as their counterparts across the country for continuing to work together to improve the way that these inter-jurisdictional support orders are treated.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Swan.

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

**Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach):** We support the legislation and look forward to its quick passage.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Goertzen.

Clauses 1 and 2—pass; clauses 3 through 5—pass; clauses 6 through 8—pass; clauses 9 through 11—pass; clauses 12 and 13—pass; clauses 14 through 17—pass; clauses 18 through 20—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

#### **Bill 29—The Child Sexual Exploitation and Human Trafficking Act**

**Mr. Chairperson:** Move on to Bill 29.

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

**Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Bill 29, The Child Sexual Exploitation and Human Trafficking Act is the first bill of its kind in Canada. We're very proud to be bringing it forward to deal with, really, you know, a vexing problem and a terrible crime, which is being—you know, in our province and other provinces—being perpetrated against vulnerable people.

There's two major ways in which this bill, we think, will improve protections for people who are subject to—with the horrors of human trafficking, of sexual exploitation.

The first is that this bill will enable a protection order to be made when a justice of the peace has determined that a person has engaged in child sexual exploitation or human trafficking. The protection order will prevent that person from contacting or approaching his or her victim. It will follow, in many ways, the types of orders that are available for domestic violence and intimate relationships. If somebody comes forward and presents their case in front of a justice of the peace and that person is convinced, there's an order that will then protect that person and police can become involved very quickly if there's any further contact.

The second major part of the bill is to create a new tort or cause of action in Manitoba courts for human trafficking. It will allow a victim of human trafficking to actually sue the perpetrator, the trafficker, the person who has put them in that terrible situation. And what's important to note is that it will not be necessary to prove to a financial loss, that the simple fact that there has been trafficking will be enough for a person to recover from, well, their abuser, I think we can all say.

So it's part of an overall strategy on protecting vulnerable Manitobans. We think that these additional protections, both in terms of protection orders and also in terms of giving a new cause of action, those are both things that we think will make the province just a little bit safer.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Does the critic from the official opposition have an opening statement?

**Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach):** Just that I want to put on the record that we appreciate the work that Member of Parliament in Winnipeg, the—for the riding of Kildonan-St. Paul, Joy Smith, has done in terms of the whole issue around human trafficking.

And I think it probably wasn't on many Canadians' radar five years ago, and I know she started to champion the cause not only in Manitoba and in Canada, but, really, within her own caucus about how important it was, and that it wasn't just an issue that happened in far away countries, in places that we'll never see or visit, that, in fact, well, that is important to shine a light on that. It is also important to know that it can happen and it does happen here in Manitoba and Canada. And, since that time, I know Joy's been a tremendous advocate across the country, has organized events. I've had the opportunity to attend a few of those, the minister probably has as well, and learned a great deal about human trafficking and the—not only the impact of it, but the fact that it's a very real situation here in Manitoba.

I know she's also been able to bring it to the top of the agenda for caucus colleagues. There, I think, is a national strategy and discussion about a legislation coming forward federally as a result of her work.

So we're glad that this minister has also picked up on her work from a Conservative MP, Joy Smith. We think it's good that he's seen the work she's done and has decided to be part of that as a result of her initiative.

So we're pleased to see that and look forward to the bill passing.

\*(18:40)

**Mr. Chairperson:** Due to the size and structure of Bill 36, is it the will of the committee to consider the bill in blocks of clauses corresponding to its five 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]*

Part 1, pages 1, 2, 3. Shall clause 1 pass?

**Mr. Goertzen:** Mr. Chairperson, just—I know that it was raised by, I think it was Beyond Borders who raised the issue of having a—and I know it's unusual, but having another party sort of bring forward the application for somebody who might have been the victim of human trafficking or exploitation and wanted to have a protection order that they as a third party might bring forward that application, and I wonder if the minister could just comment about that. I know it's not unprecedented but it's also not a normal course, but can you respond to Beyond Borders and the suggestions that they had that they might in fact be part of bringing forward the application for somebody?

**Mr. Swan:** I'd refer the member for Steinbach to section 3(1) of the bill which maybe gives a bit more clarification. If somebody's over 18 years of age, they have the full right to make applications on their own. Of course, for domestic violence cases, we do have protection order designates who assist individuals in preparing for their applications.

You'll note in section 3(1)(b), if a subject is under 18 years of age, the application can actually be commenced by the parent or guardian. If they happen to be a child in care, it can be brought by that agency. There's also subsection 3 which provides for a person designated in writing by the minister for this purpose. So the act is drafted to leave open the possibility of someone other than a parent, guardian, or a child agency to come forward, and we can certainly discuss in future whether there should be others designated to be able to bring those applications.

Generally, of course, to bring on an application, it would either be the person themselves or their legal guardian but I agree with the member that there may be situations in future that perhaps require a slightly different approach and the act is drafted to allow that to happen if we deem it advisable in future.

**Mr. Goertzen:** Well, I appreciate that clarification and I read the part and obviously, if somebody's a minor, then having others bring forward the application—I think that the point of Beyond Borders, and it's probably the point of others too—I just used them because I know that they were cited, is that perhaps people who are victims of this kind of a crime would be in such a state that they themselves might not be able to bring forward the application, might be particularly traumatized, might be scared of the court process.

I know that the provision is there where the individual who is the accused, to use that terminology, isn't in the proceeding and so there's separation there. I think that was wise to have that separation and how the orders can be done ex parte. That's important. I think their point was that in this particular case, it might be helpful to be—have an organization like Beyond Borders be able to do it, even for those who are over 18 just because of the nature of the crime. The minister is saying there's flexibility for that in the future. I'm satisfied with that and we can certainly move forward on that basis.

**Mr. Swan:** Just to point out as well that in subsection 3(3)(b), it also provides that there's many ways the application for the 'protection order' can be submitted. Of course, many times it's the person going down to a courthouse, but as you'll see in subsection (b), it can also be by telecommunications, or by telephone. It can be made by a lawyer on a person's behalf. It can be made by a police officer or somebody else designated in writing by the minister for this purpose, as long as the applicant agrees to that person going ahead and doing that on their behalf.

So I agree, there's many factors out there for victims of human trafficking and sexual exploitation. We've got some experience already on the domestic violence side, and those protection orders—we've drafted the act to make sure that those—if there are a range of possibilities out there to make sure if somebody needs protection, there's various ways for them to put that before a justice of the peace and, if they satisfy the justice of the peace, to have the order in hand.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Seeing no further questions: Clause 1—pass; clauses 2 through 17—pass.

Shall clauses 18 through 20 pass?

**Mr. Goertzen:** Mr. Chairperson, a question regarding the issue of torts and damages. Was there any thought given to writing in the specific level of damage or minimum damages that could be awarded to an individual?

I mean, are the questions about whether or not this might be difficult to prove damages in these kind of offences and that it would be—you might have people going through the process and having a difficult time proving the damages that they might get.

**Mr. Swan:** Yes. Just to clarify, section 19(1) of the bill provides: An action for human trafficking may

be brought without proof of damage. It's then up to the court, based on all the evidence that's presented, to make that determination. The idea of sort of a minimum damage award—it's not something that exists in many other areas, including torts for domestic violence, including torts for breaches of privacy under provincial legislation. You know, we are going to allow courts to hear all the evidence, sometimes what's going to be very difficult and painful evidence in determining what the appropriate level of damages should be.

**Mr. Goertzen:** Right, and that was sort of my point, I think, is that there might be people becoming quite disappointed with what the damages that are awarded, because, you know, proving that level of damage and what the award might be, but we'll wait and see. I mean, I might have taken a different approach, but I think it's fair to see what the end result of the legislation is, and perhaps changes can come in the future to it.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Clauses 18 through 20—pass; clauses 21 through 24—pass; table of contents—pass.

Shall the enacting clause pass?

**Mr. Ron Schuler (Springfield):** I'll wait for the title.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Enacting clause—pass.

Shall the title pass?

**Mr. Schuler:** Yes, and I just want to take a moment of the committee's time and just pause and reflect on this issue. From time to time, as we pass legislation through committee and through the House, one or the other politician wants to try and take some credit for it having been introduced or previously introduced, and we've seen that kind of thing.

Today, I would like to just pay a little bit of homage to one of our federal colleagues, and that would be Joy Smith, Member of Parliament from Kildonan-St. Paul, who was at the time when this became a very important issue, and that has to do with human smuggling, when she was a member of this Legislature.

In fact, it was her son, a member of the Brandon—City of Winnipeg police department was a member of the ICE division. And she noticed that her son was going prematurely grey very quickly and asked him what was so troubling. And he started to relate to her one evening what his life was all about.

\* (18:50)

And since then, over the years, she has made human trafficking her passion. And, I think, for most people, and if you were to survey, most Canadians would think that human trafficking was something that the Civil War in the United States had been—or the—yes, the Civil War in the United States had been fought about. It had been settled, it had come to an end, and that's furthest from the truth.

Human smuggling continues to take place in our very modern and very liberal pluralistic society that we have. It is there. In fact, for those of us who have been to some of the meetings that Joy's held—the breakfasts, and she has brought internationally renowned speakers. They will point out to us that it can be the home next door that has individuals who are trafficked and are pushed into the sex trade. It can be in the nicest of neighbourhoods, in the worst of neighbourhoods. There—it respects no gender, no age, no ethnicity. It is real and it is a big problem.

And I think Joy Smith, who stood probably against her own party when they were in opposition. The feeling was that that bill may not be as popular as perhaps she thought it would be and that it wouldn't be taken up the way she thought it would be, and she still pressed on. And she's one of the few individuals in the history of this nation who got a private members bill passed. She is probably one of very few women who ever got a private members bill passed, and I think it is probably one of the few bills that was ever passed unanimously by the House of Commons.

And this is an important issue. I know that I took the opportunity to send this announcement to her when the minister announced it, and I know she put a press release out, and she complimented the government of the day here for having put this legislation out there. It's important. We have to protect our young people. We have to protect our citizens, whether those are being trafficked from abroad or here from our own communities. And we know that First Nations are often targeted. A lot of the young girls do come into the city and are viewed as easy and prime targets.

This is important legislation. It is very sobering for anybody who was at the Manitoba Prayer Breakfast and heard the guest speaker talk about the kind of horrific details. You actually feel like you want to put your hands over your ears and you just don't want to hear any more. For those of us who have children and go home and put them safely to

bed at night it's not a story you want to hear, but it's an important one.

This legislation is just another step to deal with a terrible blight on our modern society, and I appreciate the minister and his department having brought this forward. It's important to pass this legislation and probably as we go through the years it'll have to be amended again and again to make it stronger, to make it better, because this is clearly an issue that's not going to go away and it's not going to go away easy.

So, with those few comments, I do want to pay respects to Joy Smith and the work that she has done with great credibility and with great respect on this.

I thank the minister and his department for having brought this bill at a provincial level to back up what's now being done at a federal level.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Schuler.

Title—pass. Bill be reported.

#### **Bill 31—The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Amendment Act**

**Mr. Chairperson:** Move on to Bill 31. Does the minister responsible for Bill 31 have an opening statement?

**Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister charged with the administration of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act):** Mr. Chairperson, this bill will amend the Manitoba Public Insurance Act. It will cancel compensation to an accident victim if that victim is convicted of certain criminal offences related to the accident and MPI will then, if that happens, be entitled to reimbursement of the amount paid to the victim before the conviction.

Now we thought it was very important that this new legislation should include the new provisions setting up a separate stand-alone offence of motor vehicle theft. We also thought it very important that this new legislation include those who are injured in the course of taking flight from a police officer. We also thought it very useful that this new bill include denying benefits to those who are injured while street racing. We think those are all very dangerous activities and a message needs to be sent. So I certainly look forward to quick passage of this bill which will then allow MPI to move forward with those changes.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Does the critic from the official opposition have an opening statement?

**Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach):** This bill has a long history, actually, before the Legislature, even though the current government bill isn't as long in terms of its time, but this debate goes back some years. And I remember just during the last provincial election there was discussion about eliminating benefits for auto thieves. And, at that time, the NDP said, well, it's all been done. You don't have to worry about it. It's all taken care of. They tried to convince the media that there were no benefits going to auto thieves. And media, to their credit, did a little bit more digging and realized, in fact, there were still some benefits going to auto thieves.

And the year after the election, I believe it was my colleague, my former colleague from Lac du Bonnet, Mr. Hawranik, who then brought in a private member's bill that would have done away with and eliminated benefits for auto thieves.

And that was an interesting debate that we had in the Legislature. I remember it, not as though it was yesterday, but it was—feels as though it was fairly recently because I remember the member for Kildonan, the attorney general at the time, standing up in the House and telling us that we were—my colleagues will correct me if I get the words wrong—but I think it was mean, that we were mean-spirited Tories for bringing in this legislation to take away MPI benefits from auto thieves. It might be the cleansed version. Probably off the record there were things said that would have been less complimentary than that uncomplimentary statement, but he said that we were mean Tories for taking away benefits from auto thieves. And then every member of the NDP caucus, including all of those except for the new member for The Pas, voted against the bill that we brought forward, and continued on, continued on benefits for auto thieves over these last number of years. *[interjection]*

And now the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) says that they had something better coming. I don't know why it would have taken three years for him to convince his caucus, because those were three years—because this bill is not retroactive. I don't believe he's going to claw back benefits from those who've been convicted and who are getting it. So, for those three years, though, conceivably been people—in fact, I know that there have been some who've been convicted of auto thieves who are getting benefits, and they'll get it because people like—I won't point to that member, but the member for Dauphin, for example, who let it sit for three years when he could have acted on it sooner.

And now, lo and behold, who would have thought the member for Morris (Mrs. Taillieu)—and I'm speaking to this bill tonight for her. I won't do her justice, but I'll do my best. The member for Morris brings forward this bill to eliminate the benefits for auto thieves, and here comes the government on the eve of an election.

I'm sure it had nothing to do with the fact that there was some media around this issue and that they were getting phone calls and letters and emails. And I think the public opinion of polls on the CTV site and the *Free Press* site that had opinion polls were like 99 to one in favour of the bill, and the one probably was either an auto thief or had accidentally clicked on the wrong button when they were voting on the online site.

And so we were able to do it, I guess—the member for Morris and the member for Lac du Bonnet—I won't take credit for this even though I had some input on it at earlier time—brought forward the bill and were able to shame the government into this, but the sad thing is it took that. And we know from the comments—and we'll repeat them in other contexts. We'll repeat them to others in the public that there's many members, not just the member for Kildonan. I don't want to pick on him. He's a friend of mine. But there are certainly other members in that NDP caucus who also spoke to this bill, who spoke to this bill and said that it shouldn't happen, that we should continue to allow auto thieves to get benefits.

And it was so off the mark, so completely away from what Manitobans were thinking. And now, of course, over the last three years, I think that, not for any reasons of conviction but convenience, for political reasons, now that we're staring down the barrel of an election, these members don't want to go out and try to explain why they would have done what they did.

\* (19:00)

But the fact is the record's there. For the last number of years, since the legislation was brought forward in late 2007, early 2008, its members have allowed auto thieves to get benefits, and they will continue in perpetuity to get those benefits because you didn't act in 2008, because this is not retroactive legislation, because it will not claw back benefits.

They will continue to get those benefits and we'll remind Manitobans. We'll remind Manitobans we're glad this has finally got here today, but we'll remind

Manitobans where you've been for the last number of years on this bill and why it is that car thieves are going to get those benefits for the rest of their lives because you didn't act when you had that chance to act, when you said it was mean—mean to take away taxpayers' money, MPI ratepayers' benefits for car thieves who go out there and cause injuries to other people. We'll remind them of that—and with those non-partisan words, Mr. Chairperson, I think we're ready to proceed with debate.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Clauses 1 through 3—pass; clause 4—pass; clause 5—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

**Bill 37—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act  
(Accident Reporting Requirements)**

**Mr. Chairperson:** Bill 37. Does the minister responsible for Bill 37 have an opening statement?

**Hon. Andrew Swan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Yes, thank you. I think actually Chief Atkinson's comments pretty much said everything needs to be said. We think this bill is good because it will allow police officers to be out on the streets investigating crime, preventing crime, doing the things that we know they're trained to do and not staying back at the police station taking accident reports.

The bill will eliminate the requirement to make a police report about an accident if the only consequence of that accident is property damage and despite that change, drivers will still be required to make police reports about accidents only in certain limited circumstances: first, if the accident causes serious bodily injury or death; secondly, if it involves an unlicensed driver or unregistered vehicle; thirdly, if another driver does not exchange the required information or stop at the place of the accident; or, fourthly, if the driver is informed or has reason to believe that the consumption of alcohol or another intoxicating substance by another driver was a cause or contributing factor.

As you heard Chief Atkinson say, some reworking has been done to clarify exactly what information a driver is required to exchange with other drivers, exchanging particulars as we call it. We think it was a good thing to use this opportunity to make that just a little bit clearer and also to define what constitutes an accident for the purpose of police reporting and exchanging that information.

So we think this is a good thing. We'd rather have our police officers doing the things for which

they are most trained to do, and it will free them up from having to take, as Chief Atkinson said, some 40,000 accident reports in the police station every year.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Minister Swan.

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

**Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach):** Just briefly, Mr. Chairperson, we support the legislation, and I want to applaud the police for the work that they've done in putting this together. I've—as I mentioned I've had the opportunity to talk to them over the last year or two regarding this particular request. I knew that they were working on it—glad to see it here. We support our police in all of the endeavours that they do. We appreciate the hard work they put in.

They're asked to do a lot of difference things, and I've learned that in my experience going out in ride-alongs with the police. As I've said that's voluntary ride-alongs that I've had with the police officers in different parts of Manitoba, and they—and I've learned a lot about the kind of things that they do. And it's not just the traditional kind of police work we'd associate with the policing activities. They're asked to do just a multitude of different sorts of things. And, if this relieves one thing that maybe doesn't relate specifically to keeping the community safer, then we certainly support and appreciate the fact that Mr. Atkinson and others of the police force in Manitoba have helped to bring it forward.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Clauses 1 and 2—pass; clause 3—pass; enacting clause—pass.

**An Honourable Member:** Whoa. No, no, no.

**Mr. Chairperson:** I retract the passage.

**Mr. Goertzen:** It will just be a temporary retraction. I just have a couple of questions for the minister that's going back to a couple of sections of the act. And the issue of section 155(15) Police report by passenger. Can he just talk a bit about that and is there any—I'm just sort of contemplating a passenger who maybe isn't that familiar with the driver of the vehicle, for whatever reason. I mean, sometimes people get rides with individuals that they sort of tangentially know, and if there's an accident and they don't know if the driver has made a report, how strong is the onus upon the passenger to file a report or to do that sort of follow up to figure out if a report's been made by the driver?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, I'm going to ask leave of the committee to revert back to clause 2, which is where the essence of the member's question lies. Is that agreeable? *[Agreed]*

**Mr. Swan:** Just to clarify, it's a decent question. Currently, in the act, section 155(5) currently requires a passenger to make a police report if the driver, owner, or other person in charge of the vehicle involved in an accident is unable to do so by reason of injury, illness, or other emergency. The intent of this section, I can clearly state on the record, is to provide for really the same obligation as already exists, and that is generally subsection 6 to 10 when the driver of the vehicle, in most cases, has been so severely injured that it's obvious they're not going to be able to make a report to police or to anybody else.

So the way this is going to be enforced is that it'll have to be quite clear to the passenger, based on the condition of the driver, that the driver won't be able to make a statement.

**Mr. Goertzen:** Okay, now, if there were multiple passengers in the vehicle, how would the decision be made in terms of, you know, one passenger might think the other passenger made the report, and you just don't want to get somebody snared into a situation where they didn't—they weren't trying to avert their responsibilities, but they just didn't realize that somebody else didn't make the report. Maybe one of them—well, they had to get together and make a decision about who was going to make the report or how that works.

**Mr. Swan:** Now, again, it's important to remember that even though this—the general intent of this bill is to force the police to do less work on the reports. When there has been a serious accident involving bodily injury, the police will still be involved, and the police will make it clear to the passengers in the vehicle there has to be at least one report, so one of the passengers needs to make the report. If all of them want to, I suppose that's fine, but the obligation will be for someone who was riding in the vehicle to make a report. But we expect that the police will be the ones communicating that when there's been a situation where a driver is obviously too injured to be able to make a report in a timely way.

**Mr. Goertzen:** I thank the minister for that. I just wanted to make sure that nobody is sort of done in or ensnared in a piece of legislation that when they weren't trying to do anything that was against the legislation.

I might—Mr. Clerk, indulge. I want to ask the question regarding the provisions on domestic animals being injured or killed. Do I need to seek leave of the committee to do that as well? 155. *[interjection]* Okay, so I'll proceed, then, on—thank you for your steady hand, Mr. Clerk—Deputy Clerk.

I—question regarding the sections on action when domestic animal injured or killed. Are those now—you know, forgive me. I didn't go back to look at the original provisions. Are those essentially the same requirements that exist today in Manitoba in terms of what you have to do if you hit an animal?

**Mr. Swan:** Yes, it actually, again, narrows the requirement for police to be involved. The idea is if it's a domestic animal, small animal that's injured or killed, there's going to be an obligation on the driver to do the best they can; if it's safe to do so, to remove the animal, and only if the animal can't be removed or isn't removed from the roadway is it necessary to tell law enforcement. So, again, it's narrowing the involvement of our police.

**Mr. Goertzen:** And the obligation to either seek out the animal's owner—I guess, if they have a tag or something like that, or advise a clerk of the municipality, is that already an existing obligation?

\* (19:10)

**Mr. Swan:** I understand, actually, this new provision is just the same as the existing provisions in the act.

**Mr. Goertzen:** I'll ask from my own ignorance, which won't surprise members of the committee, I'm sure, but is that something that's stated somewhere's on your registration or licence? I'm just wondering how many Manitobans would know their obligations and, I'll be frank, I don't think I would have known my specific obligations until I read the act.

But how many Manitobans would know—you won't know how many Manitobans would know, but is there something within the context of a person's registration or driver's that gives some sort of advice to them what to do if they hit an animal?

**Mr. Swan:** You know, we were—I was just asking my staff if it's information that would be contained, for example, in the driver's handbook. And tonight I can't tell you whether or not that's the case. So we will, of course, be going out and educating Manitobans about the new provisions in this bill. I take it no one around this table would be upset if, perhaps, talking about this issue could be something that's part of that communication strategy.



**Mr. Goertzen:** And that's probably a good idea, because I again, I admit I don't think I would have had the specific understanding of what I had to do if I hit an animal while driving. And, if there's any way to get that message out, I see a member of our media here tonight, the intrepid Anne Cote. Perhaps she'll be able to get some of the message out through her reporting. But there might be a need to have more broad-based knowledge of what your responsibilities actually are if you hit an animal on our roadways in Manitoba.

With that, Mr. Chairperson, I thank the minister for his comments, and we look forward to passing this bill back to the House.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Goertzen.

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

\* \* \*

**Mr. Chairperson:** That concludes the business of our committee this evening. What is the will of the committee?

**Some Honourable Members:** Committee rise.

**Mr. Chairperson:** The hour being 7:12 p.m., committee rise.

**COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 7:12 p.m.**

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

**<http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/index.html>**