

**Fourth Session – Forty-Second Legislature**  
**of the**  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**  
**Standing Committee**  
**on**  
**Justice**

*Chairperson*  
*Mr. Dennis Smook*  
*Constituency of La Vérendrye*

**Vol. LXXVI No. 3 - 6 p.m., Wednesday, May 11, 2022**

ISSN 1708-6671

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Forty-Second Legislature**

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

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

**Wednesday, May 11, 2022**

**TIME – 6 p.m.**

**LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba**

**CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Dennis Smook  
(La Vérendrye)**

**VICE-CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Brad Michaleski  
(Dauphin)**

**ATTENDANCE – 6 QUORUM – 4**

*Members of the committee present:*

*Hon Messrs. Goertzen, Johnson*

*Ms. Fontaine, Messrs. Michaleski, Sandhu,  
Smook*

**APPEARING:**

*Hon. Jon Gerrard, MLA for River Heights*

**PUBLIC PRESENTERS:**

*Bill 7–The Police Services Amendment Act  
(Enhancing Independent Investigation Unit  
Operations)*

*Louise Simbandumwe, Immigration Matters in  
Canada Coalition*

*Damhat Zagros, Aurora Family Therapy Centre  
Shereen Denetto, Immigrant and Refugee Com-  
munity Organization of Manitoba*

*Jennifer Montebruno, Police Accountability  
Coalition*

*Rachael Howgate, Supporting Employment and  
Economic Development Winnipeg*

*Kate Kehler, Social Planning Council of  
Winnipeg*

*Bill 27–The Highway Traffic Amendment Act  
(Alternative Measures for Driving Offences)*

*Diane Redsky, Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata Centre  
Hennes Doltze, private citizen*

*Bill 30–The Police Services Amendment and Law  
Enforcement Review Amendment Act*

*Louise Simbandumwe, Immigration Matters in  
Canada Coalition*

*Damhat Zagros, Aurora Family Therapy Centre  
Shereen Denetto, Immigrant and Refugee  
Community Organization of Manitoba*

*Jennifer Montebruno, Police Accountability  
Coalition*

*Kate Kehler, Social Planning Council of  
Winnipeg*

*Lisa Forbes, Stop Violence Against Aboriginal  
Women Action Group*

*Catherine Biaya, private citizen*

**MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION:**

*Bill 7–The Police Services Amendment Act  
(Enhancing Independent Investigation Unit  
Operations)*

*Bill 27–The Highway Traffic Amendment Act  
(Alternative Measures for Driving Offences)*

*Bill 30–The Police Services Amendment and Law  
Enforcement Review Amendment Act*

\* \* \*

**Clerk Assistant (Mr. Tim Abbott):** Good evening, everyone. Will the Standing Committee on Justice please come to order.

The first item of business is the election of a Chairperson. Are there any nominations?

**Hon. Derek Johnson (Minister of Agriculture):** I would like to nominate Dennis Smook as a Chair, please.

**Clerk Assistant:** Mr. Smook has been nominated.

Are there any other nominations?

Hearing none, Mr. Smook, please take the Chair.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Our next item of business is the election of a Vice-Chairperson.

Are there any nominations?

**Mr. Johnson:** I nominate Brad Michaleski for Vice-Chair.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Brad Michaleski has been nominated.

Are there any other nominations?

Hearing no other nominations, Brad Michaleski is elected Vice-Chairperson.

This bill—or, sorry, this meeting has been called to consider the following bills: Bill 7, The Police Services Amendment Act (Enhancing Independent Investigation Unit Operations); Bill 27, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Alternative Measures for Driving Offences); Bill 30, The Police Services Amendment and Law Enforcement Review Amendment Act.

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

Public presentation guidelines: prior to proceeding with public presentations, I would like to advise members of the public regarding the process for speaking in a committee. 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.

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

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

Also, if any presenter has any written materials for distribution to the committee, please send the file by email to the moderator, who will distribute to all committee members.

Thank you for your patience.

**Bill 7—The Police Services Amendment Act  
(Enhancing Independent Investigation  
Unit Operations)**

**Mr. Chairperson:** We will now proceed with public presentations.

I will now call on Louise Simbandumwe, Immigration Matters in Canada Coalition, to speak to Bill 7, and ask the moderator to invite them into the meeting.

Please unmute yourself and turn your video on.

**Floor Comment:** Thank you very much for—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Louise, you may proceed with your presentation.

**Louise Simbandumwe (Immigration Matters in Canada Coalition):** Okay. I'm just organizing my notes.

So, just wanted to start by thanking you for inviting me to speak at this committee hearing.

I came to Canada as a refugee when I was actually very young, but I still remember growing up as a refugee in India and in Kenya and being really frightened of police officers, and with good reason.

And in coming to Canada, I truly believed that, in this new context, we no longer needed to be afraid of the police and that they were here to protect us. And over the years, this is the advice that I've provided to other immigrants and newcomers, and I've really urged them to say, hey, things are different than they were back home and you can have faith in our police service.

However, over the past two decades, that faith has been eroded, both because of what I've personally witnessed and experienced, as well as hearing story after story from racialized newcomers and Indigenous peoples—my neighbours, my friends—about their treatment by the police.

And I realized that I couldn't dismiss these experiences as isolated incidents or a few bad apples, that there were and are deep-seated systemic issues that need to be addressed, and that there is an urgent need for a more robust civilian oversight to ensure police accountability and equal protection under the law for everyone.

So that's why the Immigration Matters in Canada Coalition signed on to the Police Accountability Coalition's policy brief and joined the Police Accountability Coalition, and why I agreed to be co-chair of the Police Accountability Coalition as well as my role on the Immigration Matters in Canada Coalition.

I think civilian oversight is a really critical piece to starting to repair some of the damage and restore some of the faith and trust that community members need to have in our police.

I was really surprised when I learned that the review of the police act had been undertaken, because I hadn't heard anything about that process. And when I reviewed the report and looked at who had been consulted, even more shocked when I realized that there wasn't a single Black-led organization that had been consulted as part of that process.

Since then, we've been able to have a couple of meetings with staff at the Department of Justice that have been very positive and productive. However, I'm really concerned that that ability to provide input through that avenue is a level of engagement that is too little and it's too late, because the legislation in Bill 7 falls far short of what is needed and what community members told us, in our consultations with them, that they wanted to see in terms of reforming the IIU.

The Public Interest Law Centre undertook some initial research for the Police Accountability Coalition, which included a cross-jurisdictional analysis of independent investigation units across the country. And this research told us what community members already knew and had been telling us: that the recommendations included in the police act review were not strong enough and they lacked meaningful consultation; that the current legislation that was in place for the IIU in Manitoba was very weak when evaluated against best practices—so, it scored nine out of a potential 53; and that Manitoba's legislation was weak when compared to other provinces.

\* (18:10)

So, they compared it to Manitoba, Ontario, BC, Alberta, Quebec, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland. The legislation in other provinces like Ontario scored 22 out of 35, and they set the minimum standard for Manitoba. So even with the amendments—and some of the provisions are positive—our legislation in Manitoba will still 'faharf'—fall far short of what is required.

And I assisted in conducting some consultations with communities. So, consulted with the members of the Immigration Matters in Canada Coalition. We also had a town hall, which was co-sponsored by the African Communities of Manitoba Inc., as well as a really interesting and impromptu listening session with Indigenous youth.

I'll highlight a few key areas of concern, which aren't addressed in this legislation, that community members felt very strongly about.

And I would say that they had the strongest and most visceral response around the composition of the IIU and who—and the investigators, and so felt really strongly about discontinuing the seconding of serving police officers in the IIU. And so we were pleased to see that, and that is an important step, but they want it to go further, we—in terms of also not wanting to see former police officers as investigators either. That

really undermines the perception in the community that this is a civilian-led oversight and that the IIU is independent and free of any police influence.

So we strongly support the recommendation put forward by PAC to discontinue the use of serving police officers and former police officers in the IIU investigations and to develop a plan that ensures that the IIU functions in a way that is fully independent of police influence or the perception of police influence.

There—they also felt really strongly about needing to ensure that the IIU investigation team reflected the communities that are served, particularly communities that tend to have higher levels of engagement with the police. And so it is imperative that a plan be created to diversify the IIU, which includes timelines and targets, and that this plan be public and that we get reporting of progress towards achieving those results.

The last piece that I'll speak to is—that community members felt really strongly about was—and—was the failure of police officers to comply and co-operate with investigations. And they were really struck by the double standard in terms of their encounters with the police and what's demanded of them when they are being questioned by the police, and hearing in the [*inaudible*] report that less than a third of police officers were fully—that fully complied with investigations was really shocking, and so felt really strongly that there needs to be meaningful penalties for officers who failed to comply with legislation, and they must be large enough to be a deterrent, so suspension without pay as well as limiting the potential for a future promotion.

So, in closing, while we think that there are—there—that this legislation is long overdue, in terms of reforming the IIU, a lot more needs to be done to address community concerns.

And so our key recommendation is that this bill should be withdrawn and that a full consultation—meaningful consultation—with impacted communities is conducted, and that includes priority communities, includes Black, Indigenous, communities of colour, disabled communities, LGBTQ2S+ communities, sex workers, people who use drugs, individuals living on low incomes and community-based organizations working with affected communities. We think that that's an important first step that was missed the first time around from the very beginning when the review was done of The Police Services Act, and that needs to be rectified.

Thank you very much.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

**Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Thank you, Louise, for your presentation this evening.

I am, you know, really sorry to hear about your own feelings and experiences with the police, both previous to coming to Canada and to Manitoba and since then, but I do appreciate you sharing them with us because they are instructive and they're helpful.

I want to assure you—and I'm glad that you had a good interaction with the Department of Justice, and I'm sure that, you know, those opportunities will continue. I do want to assure you this is, you know, a legislated and regulated review of the police act. It's a regular thing, I think, by statute, and there's more reforms that are coming; it's not the end of the process.

But I do think you highlighted some good things that are in this bill, and I'm reticent and worried about, you know, sort of the good being the enemy of the perfect, and I think it is important that we proceed on things that are important. But I do take your comments to heart, and they will help inform future changes that would come forward with other reviews.

Thank you very much.

**L. Simbandumwe:** Thanks for that, and it's interesting that you quoted that to me, because I was just quoting that to a co-worker just last week in terms of trying not to be a perfectionist.

I think part of what I'd really like to impress on you is just how far the current legislation falls short of what would be required to restore faith and trust in the civilian oversight of the police when it comes to serious incidents. And so I think while we are supportive of some of the steps that have been taken, so much more needs to be done that I'm just worried that a process of very slow incrementalism will not do anything to restore the kind of faith that I had in the police when I first arrived in Canada.

**Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns):** Miigwech, Louise, for your presentation, and I appreciate all of the critique and concerns that you have brought forward and put forward as part of our official record here for the Manitoba Legislature.

You know, quite obviously, a lot of the concerns that you've shared are concerns that I've brought up in

the House and that I've actually shared with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Goertzen).

I would—you know, one of the things that I am also concerned about in this bill that—the Minister of Justice is well aware that, as you know, this bill establishes a director of Indigenous and community relations. And this position is supposed to be engaging with Indigenous communities, Indigenous citizens and community organizations or community in general.

And yet, in the bill, there's nothing that says this person has to be an Indigenous person or has to be, you know, a Black person or POC. And so what I fear is that we're going to have another non-BIPOC person hired in this position.

And so I'd like to hear some of your thoughts on that.

**L. Simbandumwe:** I didn't realize that that person didn't have to be Indigenous. I think I just made the assumption that they would be. And I also think that, while I have no objection to having that kind of a role, it's very easy for that role to devolve into just a public relations role, which would be my other concern.

And part of what our recommendations are geared towards is really robust civilian oversight, and so we also made some observations around the Civilian Monitor Program and just ensuring that there is a—that there is that level of oversight and that connection back to the community throughout the whole process of investigation and not just as someone that would just meet with community and where it might just devolve to just being sort of public relations as opposed to being able to substantively impact what is actively happening within the IIU. *[interjection]*

**Mr. Chairperson:** Sorry. Ms. Fontaine.

**Ms. Fontaine:** And also, I do—also, I really appreciate you bringing up the fact that investigators should reflect the community that they come most in contact with. And certainly that's been a criticism of myself of the IIU, and we don't see any of that in here.

What would you like to see in respect of folks working in—

\* (18:20)

**Mr. Chairperson:** Excuse me. We have run out of time, so if you would like to, we'll need leave to allow you to finish your question and to have the presenter answer.

Is there leave for Ms. Fontaine to conclude her—  
[interjection]

Oh, is there leave for Ms. Fontaine to conclude her question and for Louise to give us an answer?  
[Agreed]

Ms. Fontaine, you may continue.

**Ms. Fontaine:** Miigwech for that.

So just very quickly, Louise, in respect of reflecting on those that are representative, what would you like to see in that regard?

**L. Simbandumwe:** Yes. So it's exactly as you described. That is not just in direct proportion to the number—the percentage of people that belong to different demographic groups in the population, that there is—that we do look at the communities that are most likely to come in contact with the police and ensure that they are being—that the IIU reflects that. And so—and I will also—the other piece that we didn't really talk about in our policy brief is also ensuring that that is reflected at all different levels of the unit.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

I will now call on Damhat Zagros from the Aurora Family Therapy Centre. Mr. Zagros? Is Damhat Zagros online? [interjection]

Mr. Zagros, could you just give me the opportunity to acknowledge you. Please proceed with your presentation, Mr. Zagros.

**Damhat Zagros (Aurora Family Therapy Centre):** Thank you.

So, my name is Damhat Zagros and I came to Canada in 2017 as a refugee coming from Lebanon. I'm originally from Syria, and one of the reasons of seeking refuge was because of policing. And I really appreciate the opportunity to be here to share our concern.

I work in an organization the—called Aurora Family Therapy Centre, and we work with the youth that deal with policing on a daily basis to a point that they would even hesitate to call police when they are at risk.

And so our trust—as a youth, as a person who went through many experiences with policing, we really lost our trust with anything that's coming from policing and background and—because we tried a lot, in the past, that—trust policing and everything would end up just creating more tools that clear and—trying

to make the image of police look good, rather than effective mechanisms that change the system.

So, what we want to—and really the concern here is to see, like, people who look like us, organizations that we really trust and leaders from community that we really trust are being involved. We cannot trust police anymore. It's [inaudible] and misrepresentation in Winnipeg is still huge issue.

So when this kind of law and rules are being made, that they are really being made by people who are not being affected by. So if this can affect our life, it's—this is going to affect our communities. Let us be involved as well. Let people that look like us to be involved.

So I'm here just to share this concern because I see, I work with youth on a daily basis. I see how they feel, and anything that has seeing a former police officer as being involved as a solution will not help because we don't trust them. So there is really need of effective consultation with community members. Here there is really need of an independent agency to be involved—has no police background.

And also, like, diversity is—will be really important too—for some was—like, there was mention earlier, like, if someone has no lived experience, background, if someone is coming from a totally different environment, if—will never recognize and understand what's happening on the streets, what's happening in our communities and what we are facing.

So, I'm really, really concerned about certain points and we need to address them. We need to be considered, and I hope that this is, like—could be the tool that's led to change, like—and to let the change we need to balance the power. We are—we know—we have—we are dealing with a lot of misrepresentation, so we need a kind of balance in power dynamics. We need community members who are getting involved, and not just a box to check, and they have to be involved effectively. They have to have some power to make some changes.

Thank you for allowing me to share today, and this is all from me.

Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

**Mr. Goertzen:** Thank you for your presentation and for sharing your experience coming from, I guess,

originally Syria and then coming to Canada from Lebanon. And it's great that you can participate in this process. It is, I think, unique—or, almost unique in Canada; there may be one other province that has hearings like this that allows citizens, residents to come and speak about legislation that's being proposed.

If I understood your comments correctly, I think you are maybe specifically talking about ensuring that the police force is and looks more diverse, and I think that those are fair comments.

I know that the Winnipeg Police Service, as an example, when Devon Clunis was the chief police—first Black police chief, I believe, in Canada, and so I think that there is an understanding that that's important for confidence and it needs to continue to grow.

This is particularly about the IIU, and I know it does have specific provisions for diversity and ensuring that there are individuals, directors who specifically have Indigenous or diverse responsibilities and, hopefully, backgrounds, but I get your point about ensuring that police forces are diverse and representative of the communities that they are policing.

So, thank you for making that with your unique experiences.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Zagros, did you have any comments for Mr. Goertzen?

**D. Zagros:** Yes.

So, like, I just wanted to ensure, like, that what we are asking for is, like, the people of diverse backgrounds, in terms of, like, organizations being involved. If someone has—if someone is a former police officer or has a policing background, that will not solve the problem, because we don't trust them. They're coming from the same system, from the same background.

So diversity, in terms of, like, different organizations that deal with people with lived experiences. So just to make sure, like, they understand our environment, they understand our perspective.

Thank you.

**Ms. Fontaine:** Miigwech for your presentation this evening and for being here this evening.

So, I understood what you were saying in respect of diversity, and I also understand what the minister is saying. There is obviously—quite obviously merit in

having a policing institution that also reflects the public that they come into contact with.

But right here, we're talking about the IIU, and we're talking about a civilian oversight that must look like the folks that they come into contact with, but also that relationship with community.

So, I want to assure you that I understand and really appreciate what you shared here tonight and that I also just want to take a couple of minutes—I know that you do a lot of good work with youth in the community. And that's such important work, to work with the youth and to develop those relationships, and so I just want to say miigwech to you for that work.

**D. Zagros:** Thank you.

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** Just to clear up one of the issues: I think when you're talking about the need for diversity, you're talking specifically about the IIU and the investigative team, although it's important to have the police force diverse that, in this case and this bill there should be some clause which says that the IIU itself must be diverse.

Is that what you're saying?

**D. Zagros:** Yes. So, like, the diversity should be at all levels.

**Mr. Chairperson:** We thank you for your presentation, Mr. Zagros, and we will be now moving on to the next presenter.

I will now call on Shereen Denetto from IRCOM.

\* (18:30)

Shereen, please unmute yourself and turn your video on.

Ms. Denetto, are you ready for your—you may proceed with your presentation, Ms. Denetto.

**Shereen Denetto (Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization of Manitoba):** My name is Shereen Denetto, and I'm the executive director at IRCOM, the Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization of Manitoba, and thank you very much for providing this opportunity.

IRCOM is home to 110 newcomer—primarily refugee—families; 110 families translates to 500 individuals, two thirds of whom are children and youth. So, we have a lot—a huge investment in the success of our families, our adults and our youth. The vast majority of our families are also racialized people, people of colour.



And so I wanted to say—and I also want to say that we're also speaking in solidarity with our Indigenous friends and neighbours who are living in and around us. We're right in the heart of the inner city.

So, what do we want for the newest members of our society? You know, what do they want? They want to live in peace, you know, and to set goals and to achieve them, to thrive in their new home, to be Canadians, you know, to be accepted as Canadians.

And what holds them back? Well, I'm sure you're no strangers to what holds people back when you're newcomers. There are a lot of barriers. People start their lives here in low-income housing and poverty. Lot of, you know, systemic barriers, language barriers, educational barriers and so on.

But racism—racism is another factor that deeply affects our ability to have families integrate successfully into Canada. And it's a huge problem, and in policing—I hate to say it, but we have ample evidence and many, many experiences, as Louise and Damhat talked about.

You know, we do—at IRCOM, we work well with the police. We have had them recently come in to talk about gang awareness with our families. So, I appreciate the work that especially community relations does, but we also, unfortunately, have real—a real problem with policing, as well. I have met with police and have been told that, you know, racial profiling is a useful investigative tool. We've met with police and we've been told that it's a few bad apples.

I've had a youth in program—he actually wanted to be a police officer, and he was mistakenly accused of saying something in a 7-Eleven to a police—he wasn't even talking to the police officer, and he was handcuffed and taken into a station, separated from our staff who were with him and held for many hours. So, there are some real problems, and these are recent examples. Young, racialized men and some women, too, are harassed, profiled and falsely accused. These are life-altering events.

So, speaking for IRCOM, we're part of the Police Accountability Coalition; we're really glad that these bills are coming forward—bills 30 and 7 are coming forward—because we really, as Louise said, we really want to advocate for robust civilian oversight, a robust civilian voice in how the amendments move forward.

Bill 30, the law enforcement review agency amendment, we're—we are asking for further consultation, meaningful community consultation. Looking at the high rates of complaints to LERA and—that are,

you know, dismissed out of hand. Or the members—or the complaints that are withdrawn or abandoned by the public. The rates are shocking.

So, to me, incremental—as Louise was commenting on, incremental change will only get us so far, and we have a really—we have real pressing problems and we need to work with the police on this. We have a serious rising gang issue. It ebbs and flows, but it's not going in the right direction, let's just say, and we are—we're getting increasingly worried.

And here we are, holding special sessions with our parents, we're holding another session tomorrow night, because we do not want them to lose their kids to gangs. They are being preyed upon by gangs. And so, we need to work with the police, but as Damhat and Louise said, our families are also—and our youth, in particular—are extremely reluctant to connect with the police and to work together. So, yes, stronger and more robust community consultation around Bill 30 is—would be really, really something that we advocate for.

And just, you know, to speak a little to the IIU. There are many points that Louise raised; I would support them all. I'll just focus on one of them, which is our recommendation that the IIU be allowed to launch investigations when notified, you know, by the public or through public resources. We know—and create a system of tracking complaints against specific officers.

You know, we want to highlight patterns of behaviour, and if you can't look at it holistically and include community perspectives, it's not going to meet the threshold for IIU investigation and there's—it's a huge piece of what is missing that is known to community. And I'm not saying we want this to be a witch hunt. There is factual, evidential, reliable information that, when put together, would fully inform an IIU investigation.

So, again, I would strongly encourage the committee to look at these bills, some of the police accountability recommendations and really help us. As Louise said, you know, incremental changes, sure, and not wanting to be perfectionists, but as she also said, we're very far from that point.

As Damhat said, our families won't come forward. They won't call the police. I mean, this is a real problem. You know, I've got a son, he's 20 years old and he gets pulled over—in the last four years of his high school, you know, experience—were being profiled and pulled over as well. And, you know, we're a

middle class family, so I'm not going to make a big thing about it, but it's endemic.

So I really want to, you know, to make that point that a robust civilian oversight process is needed.

Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Denetto.

**Mr. Goertzen:** Thank you, Ms. Denetto, for your presentation and sharing personally about the experience of your son, which I know is challenging for all of us to hear and, obviously, more challenging for you and your son to experience.

I—you know, I appreciate the nature of your presentation because you spoke about the good things that you believed that the police are doing in terms of interacting with 110 newcomer families that you're dealing with in terms of gang awareness, and that's important.

But you also spoke about the challenges. And I think that that's one of the things about Canada that attracts newcomers to Canada is that—not that it's perfect, but that it's always striving to be better.

And in this, as well, in the Legislature, I can assure you that this is not, you know, sort of the end of consultation. We go through an annual process of legislation and consultation, and trying to improve bills isn't something that happens, you know, once and then it doesn't happen again for 15 years. It is an annual process and there's always looking for input.

So, I appreciate you coming tonight, virtually, and sharing your unique perspective on behalf of the 110 newcomer families of which you are representing tonight.

So thank you, again.

**S. Denetto:** Thank you for your comments, Minister, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak and I would also welcome any further consultations, and also revisiting progress. Let's see what the acts and the amendments look like, what the changes in—are effected, and community, I think, would be really interested with providing feedback on changes and improvements as we see them happening, and areas for improvement.

**Ms. Fontaine:** Miiigwech for your presentation this evening.

You know, back before I was a public servant here, I did, obviously, many, many, many years

working on Indigenous police relations. And years back, there was—I can't remember what it was, but often the WPS would talk about how they had unbiased policing, and that they didn't racially profile. I cannot tell you how many meetings I was in that WPS members would say, well, we don't racially profile—which we all know that that's not true.

So, I am curious, though—this is actually the first time I've heard racial profiling as a useful investigative tool.

In the limited time that we have, can you, kind of, share where that came from, what was the context of the conversation and how that was, kind of, said to you?

\* (18:40)

**S. Denetto:** Sure. Thank you so much for the question and the comment.

Yes, I will, in brief, say that we had, you know, a number of cases of what we would consider racial profiling. It was happening to our paid staff employees, young, Black men. So we called a meeting with the police. It was really getting bad, and they were harassed and profiled. So we called a meeting with the police and we met with a leadership team of four to five people, and in that discussion that's where the a few bad apples was shared. We also heard that phrase that, actually, you know, it's a useful investigative tool—and it was appalling to hear that, but it was probably the truth.

So I think there's a lot to be uncovered, and maybe we can get to these kinds of frank discussions and then we have to deconstruct that, you know, yes.

Thanks.

**Mr. Gerrard:** Thank you for your presentation, Shereen.

One of the strong 'perds'—points that I heard from you was the need to lower the threshold for an investigation or look at what's happening by the IIU. Could you expand on that a little bit?

**S. Denetto:** Yes, I—we do have examples from our experience—I'll try to be brief—where we've had knowledge of harassment happening in a coaching context. So not a policing context, a totally different—sports related, but there's one individual. Then we've seen it on the streets as well, where that one person—in their role as a police officer.

And, you know, when you put these pieces together, community has knowledge. Community—

unfortunately, some officers have reputations. And if you can find credible information from communities, it can really provide well-rounded information for the IIU. And, again, it's credible; it's not a witch hunt; and it needs to be heard and brought to the table.

**Mr. Chairperson:** We thank you for your presentation, Ms. Denetto.

We will now move on to the next presenter for Bill 7.

I will now call on Jennifer Montebruno from the Police Accountability Coalition and ask the moderator to invite them into the meeting.

Please unmute yourself and turn your video on.

Ms. Montebruno, you may proceed with your presentation.

**Jennifer Montebruno (Police Accountability Coalition):** I—my name is Jennifer Montebruno, and I am here representing the Police Accountability Coalition, which is made up of over 100 community-based organizations that have come together to work for immediate changes to resolve long-standing concerns regarding police accountability and the allocation of resources in our communities.

I'm here tonight to speak to our analysis as PAC, or the Police Accountability Coalition, about the recommendations in Bill 7, specifically pointing out that Winnipeg residents have the lowest confidence in police out of every major city in Canada. And 36—sorry, 36 per cent of Winnipeggers believe there's a serious problem with the police—the way that police interact with Black, Indigenous and other non-white people, meaning that there are serious, legitimate concerns that have been expressed for many years over police accountability.

And while we appreciate the recommendations and the position that is taken and some of the changes recommended in Bill 7 to look for us to ensure that Manitoba has the most effective independent police oversight agency in Canada, it's truly our position that the proposed changes to the IIU are inadequate and have not involved enough community consultation to provide true oversight, transparency and accountability that our communities are asking for, deserve and need.

Our analysis draws upon the expertise of the many and diverse organizations in our coalition and as well as the—in—with consultation, as mentioned, with the communities that we represent, including

research conducted by Legal Aid Manitoba's the Public Interest Law Centre.

So there are many concerns and recommendations that we have regarding the proposed IIU changes, and in the time I have, just to speak to a few.

Regarding the Civilian Monitor Program, we would propose that—Bill 7 currently proposes replacing this program with a community liaison program, and although this program may provide important connection and outreach, it seems to lack the meaningful voice and input that an effective Civilian Monitor Program would provide. We have concerns that this will result in less public transparency and civilian oversight over investigations. So, our recommendation is to keep that program alongside the community liaison program and invest the Civilian Monitor Program with greater oversight.

In regards to other issues or other presentations to changes involving things from—everywhere from seconding 'slevring' police officers to having us discontinue that use, and also the discontinuance of former police officers in IIU investigations, which would speak to some of the concerns expressed by the previous speakers tonight regarding trust and true partnership with police and the IIU.

There are lots of recommendations that we would suggest regarding officers who again, as mentioned, refuse to comply with legislation, which brings concerns for civilians, like myself, as to what we can expect when these investigations occur, if this is already known and not being addressed further. We feel that there's much more room for opportunity for accountability in the bill.

Bill 7 does not specify the mandate for the IIU regarding on- and off-duty domestic and sexual violence by police officers. Because the rate of domestic and sexual violence by police officers is high relative to the general population and because the police and the IIU have had a difficult and poor record of identifying and investigating domestic and sexual violence, particular attention to this issue is needed. So our recommendation is to expand that mandate to address the issue of domestic and sexual violence by on- and off-duty police officers to address the accountability and lack thereof that exists with police and IIU investigations in this area.

My colleagues and friends have already spoken to the need for additional diversity of investigators and an increase of the receiving and responding of complaints, so I'll just summarize at this point by

saying that our recommendation as the Police Accountability Coalition is that you do not pass Bill 7 until meaningful consultation is done with the priority communities that have been mentioned.

To reiterate who they are: Black, Indigenous and communities of colour; disabled communities; 2SLGBTQIA+ communities; sex workers; police—or sorry, people who use drugs; individuals living on low incomes; and the community-based organizations that work with these affected communities.

We would welcome additional consultation. We would welcome additional dialogue. And we hope to see that true partnership in this regard can be recognized that we all want, as we've stated, to move towards a recognition of the outdated system that is currently in place. We agree that we want to foster a culture of excellence to ensure police accountability, and we believe that by doing so, by delaying this bill, you will begin to provide some accountability and steps towards the trust that you say you want us as your civilians and the people you serve to feel from you.

So we respectfully offer these positions and offer the opportunity for increased dialogue to both increase our robust civilian oversight mechanism, but also to be representative of the people that are primarily affected and are entirely the society we serve in regards to this particular issue. So I thank you for this opportunity to speak to you tonight.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for that presentation, Ms. Montebruno.

**Mr. Goertzen:** Yes, thank you, Ms. Montebruno. And thank you on behalf of PAC, the coalition that you're representing today.

You raise a number of issues and I'll certainly take them back. I don't want to try to address all of them, because I would take away time from my colleagues who I knew—know also want to speak.

\* (18:50)

You and others have raised the issue of current serving police officers being investigated as—on the IIU. And I know this was a significant issue when the former NDP government originally brought forward this legislation and were quite insistent that there should be allowed to be current officers involved as investigators.

I think this is the right step to move away from that. I'm reluctant to delay that step. Again, I know,

you know, previous government thought it was important to have that. I do think it's important to move away from that, both from perception and potential realities.

So, I can commit that, you know, we want to continue to have dialogue and continue to hear concerns because this won't be, I'm sure, the only change that ever happens to the IIU. But I know that there are legacy provisions from previous government that people are quite concerned on, and I think we need to make changes on and not delay it again for a year or two. But I do appreciate very much your concerns.

**J. Montebruno:** Thank you. I appreciate that we see commonality in that there are many outdated parts of the system to look at. And, as has been mentioned, no one is expecting any sort of perfection from any bill, only that there would be increased consultation prior to its signing. I think we can all agree that the points that we've mentioned tonight are important and real and provide us a real opportunity for some steps to right some of the wrongs of the past.

So I—again, I thank you for those comments and welcome additional dialogue at any time with Justice and with others involved in the situation.

**Ms. Fontaine:** Miigwech for your presentation this evening, alongside your colleagues in the community and on the Police Accountability Coalition who are doing really, really good work. And I want to lift up everybody that's on the call—or on the Zoom right now who do that work on behalf of all of us.

You know, everybody so far—thus far has talked about the lack of consultation that was undertaken in this police act review, and I suspect that the minister has heard that and appreciates that concern.

And, you know, what type of consultation would you like to see at this point? Because as the minister has said, the—Bill 7 will pass. It's going to pass on, I think, June 1st, I believe it is—June 1st, June 2nd, I can't remember—but what kind of consultation would you like to see for the community?

**J. Montebruno:** Thank you. Thank [*inaudible*] that question.

I think that there could be some opportunity for some increased promotion of opportunities to speak with community. I know that, at times, it has been difficult to get meetings with the key—with key folks, recognizing, of course, the challenge that our coalition—representing community members who are

working at their day jobs during this time. So a lot of this community consultation, an opportunity could be to have more consultation on evenings and weekends, or at least a mechanism to provide greater dialogue and engagement.

I think that our Police Accountability Coalition has suggested that there could be more frequent engagement with the coalition. It represents over 95 community groups and there is many opportunities to engage. All of these groups, I think, would be happy to have meetings as needed, and so I think this is—perhaps the bill will pass, you know, can't hurt to try to ask, but definitely I think there's an opportunity, in this space, moving forward, to commit all of us to having more dialogue, because these issues can be—we can make some real progress together, but it does require a more frequent engagement and greater promotion of opportunities to speak.

**Mr. Chairperson:** The Honourable Mr. Gerrard, but you'll have to make it quick because we've got 23 seconds left.

**Mr. Gerrard:** You mentioned that the Civilian Monitor Program needs greater oversight. Can you be specific about what kind of oversight?

**J. Montebruno:** You know, I don't know if I have time to speak to it, but I will suggest to speak to some of the comments made earlier, in particular by Shereen Denetto and Louise Simbandumwe.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Ms. Montebruno, if you could ask the committee for leave to answer the question?

**J. Montebruno:** I would like to ask the committee for leave to answer the question.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Is there leave for Ms. Montebruno to finish her answer? *[Agreed]*

It's been agreed that we will allow Ms. Montebruno to continue her answer.

**J. Montebruno:** Thank you for that leave.

You know, basically, I can speak to the idea that more civilian oversight would be recognition of the fact that when 1,700 complaints were filed during the past decade, only 1 per cent—if I'm looking at my notes correctly—only 1 per cent have ever been referred to public hearing. I just feel there is a correlation between additional civilian oversight on civilian complaints and the amount of complaints that would be seen as deemed appropriate to refer to public hearing. And those are numbers that I understand have

been in the place since 2012, so I just think there are many pieces.

And happy to share our policy recommendations with Mr. Gerrard and others if needed and asked for.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Montebruno.

I will now call on the next presenter for Bill 7, Michael Redhead Champagne from the Restorative Justice Association of Manitoba, and ask the moderator to invite them into the meeting. Please unmute yourself and turn your video on.

Mr. Champagne are you there? Seeing as that Mr. Champagne is not there, we will drop his name to the bottom of the list.

I will now call on Rachael Howgate from SEED Winnipeg. Ms. Howgate, are you there?

I would ask you to please unmute yourself and turn your video on. Ms. Howgate, you may proceed with your presentation.

**Rachael Howgate (Supporting Employment and Economic Development Winnipeg):** Good evening and thank you for allowing us to speak again tonight.

I am here on behalf of SEED Winnipeg and in support of the document presented by the Police Accountability Coalition.

SEED Winnipeg is an organization operating in the North End where we serve a high proportion of Indigenous, newcomer and racialized community members, primarily those living on low levels of income.

We just wanted to echo that our communities have legitimate concerns regarding police and police accountability. We agree with the position of the Police Accountability Coalition that the proposed changes to the IIU in Bill 7 will not provide the level of oversight, transparency and accountability that our communities need and deserve.

Some of our key areas of concern—many of them have already been highlighted by my colleague speaking prior to me, but: the independence of the investigators, as we've spoken about; the diversity of those on the IIU responding to complaints.

So, currently, the IIU has no ability to launch investigations without notification from the police service, and in many cases police services fail to notify the IIU of relevant incidences. And this really hits back to the point of independence of those on the

IIU and just the independence of the Independent Investigation Unit.

If we're relying on officers to report for themselves, then independence and trust comes into question. And so we would recommend that the IIU be allowed to launch investigations when notified through the public, which would create a system—oh, sorry—to create a system to track complaints against specific officers to highlight patterns of behaviour and in the case that complaints do not meet the threshold for IIU investigation.

Another area that Jennifer had just brought up before me was the domestic and sexual violence by police officers. And so, in Bill 7 the mandate for the IIU is not expanded. It does not include sexual or domestic violence regarding on- and off-duty police officers, and we would really like to reiterate the importance of expanding the mandate to address those issues of sexual and domestic violence by police officers, and to also address the lack of accountability that exists with police and IIU investigations in this area.

\* (19:00)

So at this time, in concluding, we would again support the call to withdraw the bill and engage in consultation with communities, and I know we've spoken of consultation, but these are our recommendations.

Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Howgate.

We will now move on to questions.

**Mr. Goertzen:** Yes, thank you, Ms. Howgate. More of a comment. And thank you for coming and supporting previous presentations; I know you were emphasizing and supporting a lot of the positions before.

I do want to thank you for your work with SEED. I've, you know, had the opportunity to see, in different roles, the work you do with newcomers, English as a second language, I think even supporting newcomers in terms of shelter and home buying, and those are really, really important programs.

So, thank you for the presentation that you're on topic with tonight but also, more broadly, what SEED does in the community in supporting those who are coming to Canada and making a home of Manitoba.

So, thank you very much.

**R. Howgate:** Thank you for your comments.

**Ms. Fontaine:** I would echo some of my colleague's comments. So, miigwech for the presentation and for sharing and reiterating a lot of what—important, important points that people have brought up here tonight. So I say miigwech for that and also for the really good work that SEED does.

Again, I know that I asked this earlier, but I would—I want to really explore, every single presenter has talked about—and again, we know this to be true—that there was a lack of consultation. And so I'd like to explore a little bit more with you what you would like to see in consultation.

The previous presenter had talked about, and rightly so, you know, potentially more consultation in the evenings or on the weekends, but, from your perspective, what would you like to see in respect of, like, a comprehensive consultation?

**R. Howgate:** Yes, so [*inaudible*] that would be having an array of different times that people can meet to make that process more accessible is, of course, important.

And Louise, who spoke first, also spoke of her surprise in finding out that no Black-led organizations were consulted in the process of this bill, and so that's another one. Again, emphasizing the importance of actually consulting with those communities who are most affected.

And I think the last point would just be, like, really emphasizing meaningful consultation. So, not just to say that we consulted with community members, but reporting back what did the community say and what in this bill represents—did we meet with community and hear them, or did we meet with community and simply say that we met with them?

Thank you.

**Mr. Gerrard:** You spoke about the importance of the IIU having the ability to investigate sexual and domestic violence for on- and off-duty policemen.

Let me give you an opportunity to expand on why you think that is so critical.

**R. Howgate:** Yes, so, we did speak about—the rate of domestic and sexual violence by police officers is high relative to the general population. And so I do think that it's of particular importance that we set a standard that those behaviours are unacceptable and those behaviours warrant investigation.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Any further questions?

If not, we thank you for your presentation, Ms. Howgate.

And just for the committee's information, we've been in contact with Mr. Champagne. He will not be able to make it this evening, so his name will be taken off the list for Bill 7 and Bill 30.

**Mr. Goertzen:** I might make the suggestion that if Mr. Champagne wants to make a written presentation, that he be provided maybe until the end of the day tomorrow to provide a written presentation that can be circulated to committee members.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Is that in agreement with the committee? [*Agreed*]

We shall get in contact with Mr. Champagne and ask him if he's interested in doing a written presentation.

We will now call on the next presenter for Bill 7, Ms. Kate Kehler from the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg.

Ms. Kehler, are you there? I would ask you to—the moderator to invite you into the meeting. Please unmute yourself and turn your video on.

Ms. Kehler, you may proceed with your presentation, if you are ready. Ms. Kehler.

**Kate Kehler (Social Planning Council of Winnipeg):** Good evening. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak with you this evening.

I am Kate Kehler with the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg. We're an organization with over a hundred-year history of working to create a better Winnipeg through community-led development and progressive public policy advocacy. And, as such, we've also had a long history of supporting community-based coalitions, such as the Police Accountability Coalition.

So we were an active participant in developing the original brief and also on the recommendations for the legislation on IIU, Bill 7, so—or, what we would like to see in Bill 7.

So we already went through the consultation process that we were able to do within the community and spoke to the concerns. There are very great remaining concerns. I just wanted to highlight again the fact that we were able to get support from the Public Interest Law Centre and—who did that scan for us. And I think it's very important that we note that that scan demonstrated that the original legislation was amongst the weakest and—of—across jurisdictions.

And while any improvement is welcome, what Bill 7 proposes is too long 'overtue' and does not go far enough. The latitude that is afforded law enforcement officers to choose to lay charges or not, to use force or not, and finally, to use lethal force or not is upheld more often than not.

The current oversight institutions, police boards, the Law Enforcement Review Agency, the Independent Investigation Unit, Manitoba Justice—through the Crown attorney's office—either do not question operational decisions, such in the case of police boards. They outright dismiss concerns or fail to offer support to complainants, such as LERA; is governed by legislation that is too far behind—that's the IIU—and finally, even when the IIU recommends charges, often refuses to proceed on the grounds that a conviction is unlikely, and that would be through the Crown attorney's office.

So, I want to again highlight—I want to again just support what my colleagues have said today and add my voice to what they already brought forward, and I'll just speak to a couple of other ones, as well.

So I wanted to specifically mention, although it has been already, that the IIU currently has no ability to launch investigations without a notification from the police, and in many cases, police services fail to notify the IIU of relevant incidents: that our recommendation is to allow IIU to launch investigations, whether notified by the public or through public sources, and create a system—and this is the important thing to highlight, I believe: create a system to track complaints against specific officers in order to highlight patterns of behaviour in case there is a number of complaints that are made but they don't quite make the threshold of the IIU's definition of harm.

As has been highlighted many times, there are certainly concerns around the consultation process, and while I've heard Minister Goertzen say that you—you know, you want—you don't want the good to be the enemy of—or the profession to be enemy of the good, I think what's important to highlight here is that we know that continuous work can be done, but we also know that only so much work gets done in any legislative sitting.

So this has to be prioritized because there is harm being done. We, here in Winnipeg, unfortunately went through one of those cluster events in 2020 where three people were killed by police in just 10 days, and there seems to be a pattern of cluster. In research there—that it does seem to happen when there is one incidence, there can be a number of incidents that

follow afterwards and that certainly needs to be investigated further to find out why that happens.

\* (19:10)

But what's—why it needs to be prioritized is given the number of cases that do not go forward, that criminal charges are not laid, it's my understanding that the families, the survivors, don't even get access to victim support services because no crime has occurred. So there is real harm being done, and that's why we need to strengthen the IIU legislation here and now as much as we possibly can.

So the—while we do want to recognize that there are a few other recommendations that we have—while officers should be entitled to the same Charter rights as everyone else, the right to not self-incriminate must be balanced against the trust and power that individual officers enjoy over members of the public. All officers' work product must be considered public property so the IIU can access it for investigations.

The—just a very simple one that we haven't mentioned yet is just the reports need to be written in plain language so people can actually understand what's going on; that's key to transparency.

And, I guess, again, I'll just close by, you know, again, reiterating what my colleagues have already said. I know you guys have got a night—a long night in front of you, so I don't need to drag it out. I would like to say, though, is that I am going to respond to the monitor's email and put our PAC recommendation in front of you. We have submitted it to opposition parties, also to Justice, but I'm not sure if it's made it into the hands of the committee members here. So we'll make sure that we can get that moving forward.

But I just want to close by saying for people to have confidence in the police, who quite literally the power of life and death over them, the people need to know that members of the various police services are held to the highest standard. No one denies that it can be difficult and dangerous work at times, but they cannot be used to justify what seems to become for some members a sort of siege mentality; there very much seems to be a you're-either-with-us-or-you're-against-us mentality out there. We as a society have override on police—over-relied on police to fix all other systems failures; that has been a costly failure in both actual dollars, but also on our collective humanity. We need better and actually best practice oversight for everyone's sake.

Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** We thank you for your presentation, Ms. Kehler. We will now move on to questions.

**Mr. Goertzen:** Yes, thank you, Ms. Kehler.

And I think you corrected me, although you may not have known it. I think I accidentally said earlier on I don't want the good to be the enemy of the perfect. As you properly said it, the phrase is, don't want the perfect to be the enemy of the good.

But I actually don't want anybody to be enemies, and so this might surprise you when I say that I have—you mentioned that the IIU legislation, when it was introduced by the former NDP government, was the weakest in Canada. And yet I have some sympathy for Minister Chomiak, who I spoke to at great length at the time that he was introducing the legislation and the struggle that he had in trying to balance certain things, and now I'm in the chair with some of that same struggle.

So, you know, you speak of the, you know, the right not to self-incriminate, which I think is, you know, delineated in section 13 of the Charter, I believe, as a protected right, and I know that those things can be balanced out through a test. But those are the struggles that, you know, these pieces of legislation create.

I do think it's an improvement. I do have sympathy for my former ministers of Justice, even other parties, who struggle with the legislation, but I take your point and others' point that there needs to be more advancements and not an end to consultations, and I appreciate that.

**K. Kehler:** Thank you for that.

I would just say that that was another one that struck. When we had mentioned the ones that really struck in—struck home to the people that we consulted with, that was another one. It's that it really is the case: they do have the power of life and death, so they have a tremendous amount of power, so that has to be absolutely balanced out.

**Ms. Fontaine:** So, miigwech, Kate, for presenting here this evening. You know that I always appreciate every time that you show up and I get an opportunity to hear from you directly and all of the good work that you're doing. You are quite obviously everywhere in the community and do such phenomenal work at supporting so many different community organizations and community events. So I just want to take a quick second just to lift you up for that work.



I think it's interesting that you talk about the reports being written in language that folks can understand and is comprehensible. Can you comment a little bit more about that, in your consultations, some of the concerns that had come up with that?

**K. Kehler:** I can only imagine, actually, being a member of—a loved one of somebody who has been involved in an incident and have lost the—a life has been lost or serious damage has been done, and has been trying to read one of those reports, where it's impossible to follow it through. It's officer 1, officer 2, officer 3, and then it goes—it—you know, you can't actually read it.

I mean, I have a university education, I'm not saying anybody other—doesn't, but it's like—it's extremely complicated to read. And so, plain language would be in the essence of transparency.

So that's what—not—people who have looked at the reports—again, in our consultations, it was more with—people who are actually involved in PAC have actually gone to look at the reports, and they're—yes, the same—it was the same answer, is that it's incredibly difficult to follow.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Are there any further questions for—the Honourable Mr. Gerrard.

**Mr. Gerrard:** First of all, thank you very much for all the good work you do at the Social Planning Council and your involvement in putting together the report which you presented to our caucus, and to others.

The ability for the IIU to launch its own investigation without the police having referred it seems a—pretty critical. Can you speak a little bit more to that?

**K. Kehler:** It is the—it's just that concern, that—of the—again, for building trust and—so people can understand that they actually have the power to bring a complaint forward as opposed to waiting, because it's just another measure where the police get to police themselves. They get to say this meets the standard. And if they say it doesn't meet the standard, then it doesn't go forward to the IIU.

And so, that's of concern.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Kehler.

This concludes the list of presenters I have before me to Bill 7.

Are there any further presenters?

Seeing's none, we will now move to Bill 27.

### **Bill 27—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Alternative Measures for Driving Offences)**

**Mr. Chairperson:** I will now call on our first presenter for Bill 27, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act, Diane Redsky. I would ask the moderator to invite them into the meeting.

Please unmute yourself and turn your video on, Ms. Redsky.

**Floor Comment:** Hi there.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Ms. Redsky, you may start with your presentation.

**Diane Redsky (Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata Centre):** Thank you.

*Ojibwe spoken. Translation unavailable.*

That is, I wish to honour and start the meeting in a good way, also acknowledging Treaty 1 territory and homeland of the Métis Nation and Winnipeg, part of Shoal Lake First Nation water.

So I'm here to speak against the changes being proposed to the highway and 'traffict' act in regards to repealing the requirement to suspend the driver's licence of those not participating in alternative measures. And so, I'd like to begin with, firstly, the background, in case anybody doesn't know some of the experience that I bring here, why I feel so strongly about this and so you know where—in what context this is coming from.

So, the Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata Centre is one of many community-based organizations working to end the sexual exploitation of women and girls in Winnipeg, and especially for the Ma Mawi Chi Itata Centre, the sexual exploitation of women and girls—of Indigenous women and girls. And this is really important because we view sexual exploitation as violence against women, and this is particularly harmful for Indigenous women and girls.

And I wish to remind this important group—that we do have a provincial strategy to end all forms of sexual exploitation and sex trafficking in Manitoba, and that strategy is called Tracia's Trust. And as a leader, I've been working on this for over 20 years. I've led a national task force in 2011 to 2015. I trained law enforcement all on the issue of sexual exploitation.

\* (19:20)

At the Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata Centre, we're part of a sexually exploited youth community coalition of a number of other community-based organizations. We opened up the first safe house in Winnipeg in 2003, so, 19 years ago. And in 2010, we opened up a rural healing lodge, which continues to be the only rural healing lodge for child victims of sexual exploitation and sex trafficking in Canada. And we really—we opened this, really, resulting from the men who kept parking in front of our safe house that was located in Winnipeg.

We also operate a mobile outreach program that operates in the middle of the night from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m., six days a week, and in the past three years, we've served over 6,800 women and girls who have received outreach services. We have reported over 400 trap houses; 500 men buying sex. And out of those 500 men that are using their vehicles to buy sex, 180 of them were approaching minors.

So some of the key points that I wish to make to inform this committee: If you don't already know, sexual exploitation is violence. Bottom line. Period. This impacts Indigenous women and girls and its impact to their lives is a lifetime of healing. Many survivors share with us that each of these individual instances of where they are bought for sex are individual incidences of paid rape. Women and girls are often on their healing journey for a lifetime.

It is important to understand what motivates men—which are primarily men—who are in these vehicles, who are driving around, approaching women and girls who are on the street, that sexual exploitation is about power, control and greed. It is racism, sexism and classism at its very worst, and all strategies to address this must stop. This must be with serious action. Softening the approach to address the demand is a real concern. It is a crime to buy sex in Canada, and the criminal provision should align with the intent of this federal legislation and should also align with our own provincial strategy within Tracia's Trust.

Removing—losing your licence if you don't follow through on the alternative measures sends the wrong message to society. We need this tool within this legislation that you can lose your licence because what we know—because of what we know on how vehicles are being used to commit this crime. Losing your licence would immediately protect women and girls because there are less men driving around looking to groom, lure and sexually exploit our women and girls.

We also can't wait for the justice system to play their role. It can—it takes way too long for those to go through the processes and creates a large window of opportunity for men to continue their criminal activity and this violence against women and girls. This is a very serious issue and it's not getting any better. In fact, it's getting worse. I've been working on this issue for over 20 years, and when I started, the average age of the victimization of girls was 16 and today, it's 13 and getting younger and younger.

We really need sexual exploitation to be viewed as violence consistent with Tracia's Trust. There needs to be a clear message to all Manitobans that women and girls are not for sale here. The Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata Centre is taking this issue of addressing the demand and addressing the men who are perpetuating this violence against women in a four-year project called engaging men and boys to address the sexual exploitation and sex trafficking in Manitoba.

We are pleased that two departments of the federal government and the Winnipeg Foundation have approved this funding for this project. And so I thought since while I'm here, I may as well let you know we're waiting on the Province to approve your portion to this really important project at \$140,000 a year for four years, so we can start this really important life-saving work. Miigwech.

I can take questions now.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Redsky.

**Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Yes, thank you very much, Ms. Redsky. Thank you for making the pitch at the end. It's good to use your time in every way that you can, and you used it well.

You know, I acknowledge all of what you said in terms of, we need to do as much as we can and more when it comes to stopping sexual violence against women. And I'll give credit to my colleague for St. Johns; we sometimes disagree on things; we don't disagree on that, and she's a strong advocate on that issue for sure, and I acknowledge that.

On the issue that you raised about the suspension of the driver's licence, I want to assure you that this law doesn't change anything that currently happens now or that has happened over the last 15 or 20 years. It has always been the case that those who are not suitable for diversion or cannot complete the diversion program and then get charged criminally, it's always been the case that they don't have their driver's

suspended because, under Canadian law, they're presumed innocent until found guilty. Of course, if they agree to go into diversion, then they are acknowledging fault. I think their charges get staid and my lawyer friends will tell me if that's not the right procedure. But they agree to go into diversion and agree to have their licences suspended.

If they drop out of diversion or are not eligible for diversion, then they go into the criminal process which has much harsher sanctions ultimately, but then they fall under the Canadian law and premise that you are innocent until proven guilty in a court of law. But this doesn't change anything that has happened over the last 15 years. That's always been the case and practice in Manitoba Justice under this government and the previous government.

**D. Redsky:** Thanks for that. I understood that the suspension of driver's licence, if they do not complete the alternative measures, is the proposal, if that section of it is to be repealed.

**Mr. Goertzen:** I believe it's repealed because it's considered a spent force because it's never actually been applied.

**D. Redsky:** Well, I would still advocate to keep it in, even though it's not being used.

**Mr. Chairperson:** The minister—

**D. Redsky:** We [*inaudible*] all hands on deck when it comes to violence against women and beyond. And so I would advocate to keep it in and I would advocate to make it stronger so that we're actually making impact and reducing the violence that is happening on Winnipeg streets.

**Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns):** Miigwech, Diane, for your presentation and then certainly, of course, all the work that you do in respect of sexual exploitation of Indigenous women and girls and two-spirited, particularly here in Manitoba, but in general as well. So I do want to acknowledge that. And you and I have worked together for many, many years on this and so I always have the—I'm always glad when we get to spend a couple of minutes together.

You know, your last comment was you'd like to see things strengthened. While we have the minister's ear, what could the government be doing to strengthen mechanisms to, you know, in respect of child sexual exploitation?

**D. Redsky:** And, you know, the answers are always in—at the community level, and so we do have a strategy, Tracia's Trust, there is—I've certainly like to

see more consultations where we have survivor voice to increase their voice on identifying where those areas are. But where we are right now, where the province has some control today, is really looking at engaging men and boys in being part of the solution. And that proposal that we have is, you know, ready to go with the Province of Manitoba being the only funder not yet that committed to the next four years

And I—so—and I do think that engaging men and boys is going to be a really important part of part of the solution because there's one thing we can do about community and protecting and creating safety nets, but this is really getting at the root cause, you know, to stop men from continuing to victimize women and girls in Manitoba. And this is one way to do it, is to have them sit at the table and focus in on what are those solutions—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Unfortunately, Ms. Redsky, time for questions has expired. We thank you for your presentation and we will now move on to the next presenter, Hennes Doltze [*phonetic*], private citizen, and if I'm not pronouncing your name properly, could you please correct me.

\* (19:30)

I will now call on Hennes Doltze [*phonetic*] and ask the moderator to invite them into the meeting.

Please unmute yourself and turn your video on.

**Floor Comment:** Hello and good evening. Yes, so the first name you got—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Hennes Doltze [*phonetic*], you may proceed when ready.

**Hennes Doltze (Private Citizen):** Sorry, yes. Well, thank you very much for the invitation and for the ability to speak here. So, the—my name is Hennes Doltze, so Doltze is the last name. I want to thank the committee for the opportunity to talk about the Bill 27 and the proposed changes, similar to what Diane Redsky had talked about.

So, to give you a little bit about my background, I'm a social worker and I've worked in the criminal justice field for the last 20 years, with a focus on restorative justice, domestic violence and sexual exploitation. Between 2013 and 2020, I was the program co-ordinator for the Winnipeg-based Prostitution Offender Program, which is a collaboration between Manitoba Justice, the Winnipeg Police Service and the Salvation Army Correctional and Justice Services.

In that role, I counselled many men who had exploited vulnerable people for sex, and I have spoken at various conferences nationally, internationally, on the issues of domestic violence and sexual exploitation. I'm actually currently employed by the Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata Centre and will be part of that development of the project that Diane Redsky was talking about to engage men and boys in the fight against sexual exploitation.

However, for this committee hearing, here, I'm speaking as a private citizen with the experiences that I have had from the Prostitution Offender Program. I'm also here to speak against the proposed changes in Bill 27 as they relate to section 273.3 of The Highway Traffic Act, and my remarks will only be related to that part of the bill, not to the—any other provisions of Bill 27.

Before I give you my reasons for that, I'd like to give you a little bit more of a background of the alternative measures program that is referenced in the bill with just the Prostitution Offender Program that I oversaw.

So, as I mentioned, it's an alternative measures program, according to section 717 of the Criminal Code, and has been successfully running since 1997. It's a community-based program with a focus on accountability, education and rehabilitation. Teaching sex buyers about the impact of their behaviour on the sex industry and how it fuels sexual exploitation, prostitution and trafficking of vulnerable women and girls is a major goal for it.

And it is run by Salvation Army, however, with input from community and like-minded agencies that work in this field—also, survivors, Manitoba Justice and the police services. And in the program, different speakers come to talk about the issue of exploitation from various angles. So, Crown attorneys, StreetReach, which is part of Tracia's Trust, Canada Border Services Agency, former sex buyers, survivors and the community activist who talks about the missing and murdered Indigenous women and girls, as well as a counsellor who focuses on recover and healing for men.

And, as was mentioned before, sexual exploitation and sex buying is highly gendered. So, most of the women and girls that are exploited are women and girls or two-spirited people, whereas the sex buying occurs almost exclusively amongst men. And we saw this many times in our program, where I'd never seen one woman in the program when I was managing it.

And once a person has completed all of the requirements, which is an intake and a closing meeting, attendance at the program, fee payment and some community service hours, the Crown attorney can stay the charges. And the minister was absolutely correct saying that it's a stay of proceedings that participants will receive. And the majority of the men actually do participate and complete it; however, there is some that do not, for various reasons.

And I want to talk a little bit about those that do not complete it, what the consequences are right now. So, if somebody does not follow through with their requirement, then the program manager will inform the Crown attorney of the unsuccessful completion and the case is dealt through the regular court system. So, this could include another referral or just a longer process that then leads to conviction. But it can definitely take many, many months. As we know, the justice system sometimes is not very quick, and during that time, nothing would happen with that person.

The other response that has been in place right now is the suspension of the driver's licence according to section 273.3 of The Highway Traffic Act, which is an immediate consequence if somebody does not complete the program and the alternative measures. And this is an effective tool as it impacts offenders and their lives immediately, and they feel the consequences right away. So, they're not able to use their vehicles for either regular activities or for committing offences including sex buying as well.

So, it's always been a valuable tool when I was in the program and—of deterrence—whereas the risk of criminal proceedings in a lot of people's minds is way further down the road. And doing my time, there was a number of times when I actually did use the—this provision that the Highway Traffic Act allowed us in order to instill those consequences on some of the participants.

And I'd like to focus now on the, I think, the impact that the—a repeal would have that—if that section would be repealed. So, I think having the ability of the—for the staff of the program to suspend driver's licences is an important tool to all defenders accountable who commit procuring offences under section 286 of the Criminal Code of Canada, which is the prostitution laws. Generally, when offenders get arrested, their car gets impounded and they're referred to the program. If they get accepted, the car will be given back to them, but then if they do not attend any of the program participation, then they don't have any ability—there's no consequences for them. Now, about

90 per cent of the men who get arrested in Winnipeg are using vehicles for their offences, so this is a very high number as well.

And the Canadian prostitution laws, PCEPA, were changed in 2014, making it illegal for the first time in Canada to purchase sex anywhere, whether it's in person, on the street or in any other venue. And with this law, the government put more of an emphasis on the accountability of offenders of prostitution and the use of sex trafficking victims. And a repeal of the provision in the Highway Traffic Act would send the wrong message to those offenders, as well as to the general public.

A repeal will also lessen the accountability and would be against the spirit and the ideas of the Manitoba framework to address gender-based violence from 2020, Tracia's Trust strategy, which was already mentioned, as well as the recommendations from the Manitoba Advocate for Children and Youth office to address demand and highlight those—the need to intervene in that level in different ways. So, all of those agencies and strategies have placed an emphasis on addressing sexual exploitation by focusing on the demand—meaning on those who commit those offences and exploit both children, youth and adults for their own—often for their own pleasure.

Manitoba is often seen as a leader across the country in addressing sexual exploitation by focusing on the demand, and part of this is the arrest of sex buyers and a strong legal framework and the ability for law enforcement to—and non-profit organizations—to use these laws as important to send the message to exploiters that this behaviour is not welcome here and that there are consequences if people are engaged in this activity.

So, in closing, I would just like to urge you to not repeal section two-eighty—273.3 of The Highway Traffic Act, but to keep it in place as an important tool for accountability for men and for those who exploit vulnerable people, women and girls, particularly of Indigenous background.

Thank you very much.

**Mr. Chairperson:** We thank you for your presentation, Mr. Doltze [*phonetic*].

**Mr. Goertzen:** Thank you very much for your presentation and for your work in the Diversion Program. I appreciate hearing your view of its success, and I've heard that from others as well.

I just want to restate information that I've been provided from Justice officials.

So, when a person is eligible to go into the Diversion Program, their charges are essentially stayed. You know, those who would choose to go into diversion because it's less consequential than a criminal charge, if they complete the diversion program, you know, then that's been completed. If they fail to, they then—they are charged and they go into, you know, the criminal system, which is, as you would know, is more significant with potential for higher penalties, although you acknowledged, I think rightly so, that it can sometimes take time.

\* (19:40)

But my understanding from officials that has always been the case, that those who are not suitable or don't complete diversion do not face consequences, then, until the conclusion of the prosecution because under our system of justice in Canada, people, when charged, are presumed innocent until proven guilty. And my understanding from officials is that this is a provision that has not and cannot be used. So, while my officials indicate that it's being described as a tool, it's a tool that hasn't been and cannot be activated.

So, I very much appreciate your comments. I think you're absolutely right in the work that you're doing and the importance of diversion, but my understanding is that this doesn't actually change anything that's been happening.

Now, but—you and others have made the point: there could be things done that could make things stronger. And I think that those are very important points, and I commit to you that I've taken your suggestions, and if there are other things that we can develop or create that fit within the framework of our criminal justice system and that don't put us offside or ultra vires with those laws, I would be very interested in doing that because it's important to protect those from sexual violence.

**H. Doltze:** Yes, thank you for the feedback.

So, I think there's two points that I would like to make. I think one is, you mentioned the issue of finding—of being—somebody being found guilty. So, when I was in the program, what we usually were asking people to accept a level of responsibility, and I always said to the men, we're—you're not in a courtroom here, so you do not plead guilty or not guilty, right? But throughout the conversation—and this is a requirement of any alternative measures under 717 of the Criminal Code—is that this person accepts

responsibility for the offence. So, if somebody says, yes, I did engage with that other person for the purpose of sexual purposes, then that person would be eligible. If somebody says, no, I did not do that, then the regular court proceedings would come into place anyways. So, that is the first thing.

During my time, there were some men—there wasn't a lot, so the number is not very high, but there were men where we used that section of The Highway Traffic Act after they had accepted responsibility, participated but maybe only halfway through the program and then for some reason were not finishing it up. And we would always get extensions and find out the reasons why—like, we wanted to be flexible enough because things happen in people's lives, right? So, we were not, just, okay, you didn't just attend one phone call that we had planned or one meeting that we had planned and off you go and you get, you know, consequences right away. So—but there were some that were just not taking any kind of initiative to complete it, really, even though we had tried very hard. So, in those circumstances, we have done it, but, again, the number was very low.

But I fear that taking this away gives one less ability for the program staff to put some teeth to this. And, like you said, it is already an outcome that is very positive for somebody who completes it because they avoid a criminal record through the stay of proceedings, whereas a guilty finding in court would lead to a criminal record automatically, which has a lot of other implications.

So, it is a very positive outcome for a lot of people, so—but this tool, I think, is important for the program and putting some pressure—and I say this sort of lightly to say, okay, to say this is important for you to listen to and to participate in and to hear what impact your behaviour may have on other people.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Doltez [*phonetic*].

This concludes the presenters I have before me for Bill 27.

### **Bill 30—The Police Services Amendment and Law Enforcement Review Amendment Act**

**Mr. Chairperson:** We will now move on to Bill 30, The Police Services Amendment and Law Enforcement Review Amendment Act.

I will now call on Louise Simbandumwe [*phonetic*]. And, Louise, if you could please correct

me in the pronunciation of your name, I would appreciate that. Louise, from the Immigration Matters in Canada Coalition, and I ask the moderator to invite them into the meeting. Please unmute yourself and turn your video on.

**Louise Simbandumwe (Immigration Matters in Canada Coalition):** You did a pretty decent job with my name. It's Louise Simbandumwe, but my mother informs me that I don't pronounce it correctly either, so I think you're off the hook.

Yes, so, thanks again for the opportunity to present to Bill 30, which is the amendment regarding the Law Enforcement Review Agency.

And I'm going to start by sharing a personal story in terms of how I became aware of LERA. My sister, who had just moved back to Winnipeg—I guess there was a bad information that was provided to the police, I think they were relying on an informant that didn't provide good information. But they were under the impression that there were—there was a drug dealer living in her apartment.

And so, what ended up happening was the police burst in using a no-knock warrant—so, they literally broke the door down—and handcuffed her. They tossed the apartment looking for drugs, obviously didn't find anything because, again, it was based on bad information.

But in the process, and in terms of how she was treated—like, I came—like, I was at a meeting when I got the call from her, and I went to—I rushed as fast as I could, and when I saw her she was, like, pretty well in a catatonic state. Just absolutely and completely traumatized by that encounter with the police. And I really struggled as someone that prides myself as a community advocate, and having done this and supported other people, just trying to figure out how to support my sister through this.

And in my research, one of the possibilities was to submit a complaint to the Law Enforcement Review Agency around the police conduct and the use of that particular procedure in this case. And, again, reminding you that, like me, she comes from a refugee background, so what happened to her was retraumatizing on a number of different levels.

And the feedback that I got from community members was, don't even waste your time making a complaint with LERA, because nothing is going to happen. And so, I trusted these community members and continued to look at other avenues to address the situation.

And again, when I joined the Police Accountability Coalition when it was still forming, I did some research into LERA. And, again, what the community members told me was absolutely borne out by the data. So, looked at LERA reports over a five-year period between 2019 and 2015, and over that period, they processed 527 complaints, in terms of complaints that were closed—98 per cent of them—98 per cent—were dismissed, abandoned or withdrawn—98 per cent.

So, out of that 527, three were resolved informally, four went to public hearings before a judge and one was disposed by criminal procedures. And CBC did a longer retrospective look at LERA and found the same stats. It's—so, not surprising that there is no faith in terms of feeling like this is an effective mechanism through which to bring forward the complaints.

And—so, while I think it is a good—it's a good thing and completely support the idea of increasing the length of time that people have to submit a complaint—because that's been a long-standing issue—there are—and also the move towards creating a police code of conduct. I think that there are many long-standing issues that aren't clearly addressed by this bill.

\* (19:50)

And so I'm not going to go into a lot of detail because I know that my colleagues will speak specifically to a number of them, but would just like to maybe speak a little bit to community consultations because that's come up and that, again, many of our recommendations in relation to LERA are very much consistent with the Police Accountability Coalition recommendations related to the IIU, because the structure and the concerns are really similar.

So the community consultation is a really key point. I would say that this is a form of consultation. What would make it meaningful would be to have some faith. Like, I take the point that this legislation is likely going to pass, but is it going to pass with amendments that reflect what you've heard here today? Is that really going to be taken into consideration, or is it going to be sort of congratulating ourselves and saying, hey, at least we have this mechanism for people to voice their concern but it's going to be business as usual, and the time that we spent preparing for this will be—will have been for naught?

The other thing that I would ask is to really consider, while I think it's wonderful that—and I'm

really appreciative of this opportunity to speak to this committee, just to really consider who wouldn't feel comfortable or be intimidated or not know how to navigate the bureaucracy or not have the flexibility in terms of their work, to be able to, with very short notice, drop everything and look at and prepare for a hearing of this nature; whose voices aren't heard at this committee level, and what changes maybe you could look at making to bring some of those voices to the table so that they can feel comfortable and not alienated by this process.

In terms of broader community consultations, I would really encourage proactively reaching out, again, to individuals that are disproportionately impacted by engagement with police. So, that involves key organizations that serve them, like, particularly grassroots community organizations and not just the political organizations that represent these communities, and also reaching out directly and hearing from community members with lived experience and being very thoughtful about how to structure these engagement sessions in a really thoughtful and accessible way.

So, working with community organizations, having the consultations happen at community locations, using interpreters, recognizing that there's out-of-pocket expenses and opportunity costs associated with people participating. So, providing small honorariums to respect people's time, to cover out-of-pocket expenses such as transportation and child care.

And in cases like this, when it comes to issues of civilian oversight, we have to really acknowledge that a fundamental trust has been broken, if it was ever there. And in that case, much more needs to be done and so I would really challenge you to think about models for consultation. Rachael talked about that feedback loop of saying this is what we heard and this is what we're acting on, maybe we can't act on this just yet. And so, having those really difficult conversations, but maybe having enough trust to engage in a co-creation process with community would also be a way of having more robust and meaningful consultations and really inviting people into the process of building legislation that directly impacts their lives.

So, that's everything that I have to share and I'm open to questions.

**Mr. Chairperson:** We thank you for your presentation.

**Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Good evening, again. It's good to see you again.

One point you made about the ability to come and make presentations and how it is intimidating for people, and I think that that's true. And while we're unique—well, almost unique in Canada on this, I think we've tried to make this better, but I think there's room for improvement. The ability for people to make presentations from their living room is something that's only happened in the last couple of years and I hope makes it a little bit more accessible for people and maybe make people more comfortable than coming into this, sort of, grand building and having to leave their homes. So—but I get your point that there could be other things done.

I want to be clear on this: So, LERA—this was never intended to be a bill that reformed LERA. It was clearly that there needed to be some changes to LERA in terms of timeline of application, but I do think that this bill could reform LERA in a different way.

So, right now if you have a complaint against the RCMP, there's an online portal, you can make a complaint against the RCMP. If you—of course, if there's a criminal charge, the IIU can look at that and we've discussed that earlier this evening. But there's all this stuff in-between with other forces that isn't captured.

And so this is intended to create a uniform code of conduct for police officers across the province so that all those other issues—and you mentioned, sort of, breach of conduct—where those complaints can be, you know, imported into those uniforms coats—codes of conduct, of which there will be consultation on, and capture all that.

So, it may not make LERA irrelevant, but it probably will speak to how LERA—if it doesn't change significantly—how it may not be—if it's ineffectual, that these—that the ability to speak to a uniform code of conduct and have direct action perhaps more quickly and more directly with the police agencies involved, I think, could be a much better process. But that'll involve consultation, and I think it will change how we look at LERA in the future, once those codes of conduct are filled.

So, I hope that that's something of a comfort or of a clarity, but I do actually take the point that LERA isn't working in the way that the community and others feel that it should. And this legislation, I think, will go a long way in changing that, even if it doesn't

move into LERA, because it will indirectly change the need for LERA in many ways.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Ms. Sambambuwe [*phonetic*]-Simbandumwe.

**L. Simbandumwe:** Thanks for that clarification.

And in terms of the operation of this committee, I had someone from the community who is a youth school member who was, I think, in a really good position to speak to her direct-lived experience. And one of the questions that I had was, well, can she present alongside me? And the response that I got is, yes, that's possible, but there's this whole big process that we need to go through in order for that to happen.

And—yes, so it's procedural pieces like that that can make it really challenging for people, because I do think it is really helpful when crafting this legislation. And part of the reason why I shared my own direct experience is to really have a sense of how it impacts people ultimately on the ground, and what kind of damage can be done over a long period if you don't get it right.

**Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns):** Miigwech for your second presentation this evening and for sharing your personal story and that of your sister. It's important to have that on the official record.

My colleague and I differ, obviously, in respect of this bill. You know, I don't think that this bill actually does anything, actually, to reform LERA in any substantial manner, other than adjusting the time frame for which people can make complaints. You know, the code of conduct—there's nothing in this legislation that says if you break this code of conduct—which we don't know what the code of conduct—here are the consequences. So, I don't have much faith in this bill versus my colleague there.

I am curious, Louise, what you would like to see in respect of codes of conduct for police officers.

**L. Simbandumwe:** I think, to begin with, having a code of conduct is really important, that is broader and more universal.

I think one of the key pieces that I would like to see is the duty to—if they see something happening that breaches the code of conduct, the duty to report that to an independent investigation—to some sort of independent investigator because one of the—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Unfortunately, Ms. Simbandumwe—

**An Honourable Member:** Leave.



**Mr. Chairperson:** Leave has been requested.

You may continue. Louise, you may continue.

**L. Simbandumwe:** Yes, so a key concern is that the people that are in the best position to see these breaches are not compelled to or required to report and to provide information about infractions by fellow police officers. So to really make that part of the culture, because my concern is quite the opposite is happening right now.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Ms. Simbandumwe, we thank you for your presentation.

We will now move on to the next presenter, Zamhat [*phonetic*] Zagros, from the Aurora Family Therapy Centre.

Mr. Zagros, I ask the moderator to invite you into the meeting. Please unmute yourself and turn your video on.

\* (20:00)

**Damhat Zagros (Aurora Family Therapy Centre):** So what I'm seeing here, and what's also that concerns me here in Bill 30, it's seeing that—I kind of talked about that earlier, it's like shifting of power. Seeing here that the person who's going to create the standards of police service operation is like the head of police, has really concerned me, and it's really again creating another tool where we give power to individuals to create the standards.

So seeing that is really concerning me and it's like—it's not just like we're giving power, it's like we're using another person who's coming from the same school, from the same background. So I think in the sense of, like giving all that power to individuals in policing will be more helpful that there's been kind of like standards already being created using some kind of, like, human rights framework where there is—independent agencies will define this kind of standard and the power will be going—the shifting of power's been happening so we don't really create other tools that will make things worse and worse.

So seeing that was really a concern to me—that's oh, here again, we're going to create another tool, we're going to give more power to these individuals and the fates of many people in the community will depend on the knowledge and the experience of the person who is in charge.

Thank you.

**Mr. Goertzen:** Yes, thank you and good evening. Again, I want to just say one point about the codes of

conduct, and I appreciate the previous presenter speaking in favour—I think it's very important and I think it could change how—it could be more effective than LERA. And I recognize my friend from St. Johns indicated that those standards are not in the act, but I suppose if we'd have put the standards in the act, we would have been criticized for not consulting before putting the standards.

So I think it's important that we put—we have consultations and develop those standards because a key part of the presentations tonight have been about standards.

In your comments, I think you may have been indicating that the police commission will be responsible for monitoring the compliance on the standards and that is true. The police commission was established by the previous government, essentially as civilian oversight; they're appointments. And so, you know, somebody has to do the standards and—but they're not, it's not the police who are doing the checking; it's the police commission who are appointments from the community, as was established under the previous government.

But I—your point is a good point. We had to make sure who's, you know, who's monitoring these things, that they are seen to be both capable but independent; so thank you for making that.

**D. Zagros:** Thank you for your comment.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Ms. Fontaine? No questions?

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** Yes, thank you for your comment. And I'm just curious. Establishing the standards and making sure that everyone's aware of them is one important aspect, but one of the other aspects, of course, is enforcing those standards, or, providing that somebody who breaks the standards has a—fields a measure of contrition or punishment or what have you.

I mean, what would your advice be in terms of how police officers who break the code of conduct should be treated?

**D. Zagros:** I think it will be very helpful to define a mechanism where people can be held accountable. So whoever the person is, however—like what discipline, what kind of background they have, if there is a mechanism, if there is like an independent agency, can have the power to question everyone and to—and like, there is many—in many cases there is many police officers that have kind of protection because of where they belong to.

So having—giving the power to the right places will make sure that everyone is being held accountable. So I think having—giving the power to the right sources, the right position will help them.

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

Are there any further questions?

Seeing no further questions, thank you for your presentation.

I will now call on our next presenter, Shereen Denetto. I won't—and I would ask the moderator to invite them into the meeting.

Ms. Denetto, could you please unmute yourself and turn your video on.

Ms. Denetto, you may proceed with your presentation.

**Shereen Denetto (Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization of Manitoba):** I, as previous speakers have mentioned—so, again, I'm the executive director at IRCOM, serving 110 newcomer refugee families and many more newcomer families in the surrounding downtown—over 1,000 newcomers a year.

Just to say that I would just support what a number of speakers have said already. Sure, we greatly appreciate a longer period for making a complaint. That would be a starting point and, as people have mentioned, it's going to pass. But I'm really hoping that there can be an examination of barriers to access, to make these complaints. Clearly, there are huge barriers.

So, we work with newcomers, refugees. And, you know, a number of our families have experienced in-your-face hate crimes. As an example, so, being spit on, being harassed, getting your hijab pulled off—like, really egregious things happening. We have not been able to get a single person to file, you know, a complaint.

And this is a different area, but I'm just saying it's all related, right? It just speaks to how—and this is with the backing of an agency that is, you know, advocacy sort of focused. People will not come forward. They have come from repressive regimes where nothing good comes from identifying yourself in the eyes of the police or the system. Sometimes their immigration status is still in process, so they're not going to flag anything.

So, we're talking about a very disempowered group of people—systemically disempowered. We've

also tried over time—when a lot of our youth, as I mentioned earlier, were getting, you know, for lack of a better word, being profiled, pulled over, carded and so on—we tried to encourage them to write down—just to write it down, just to write down what they have experienced, and then our idea was to work with them and to see if they wanted to proceed. And it didn't even get as far as writing anything down. There was just no way that they were going to engage in this process.

So, you know, just to add to the comments that—we have solutions. We, you know, you've—the Province funds us to create access, right? We have—as Louise mentioned, we have child care, we have interpreters, we have cultural brokers, we have folks who can do this work. We're struggling when it comes to linking people to the police system. But I think, together, we can make a difference and increase access. So that's sort of my first point.

I was really glad to hear about the development of the uniform code of conduct. As a senior manager, I would say that it's—a code of conduct is—again, it's the starting point, right? (1) It has to reflect multiple voices. If people are engaged in the process, it will speak to them, and I believe that means, you know, it's not—it is the community who has to speak to this. It's also the—also police. There are police in the system that may want to have a voice in how to uphold, you know, a code of conduct, and I think that's also important.

And, you know, I guess I would just say it's self-evident. But the code of conduct is only as good as the system that is in place and that surrounds it to uphold it and to hold members accountable, right?

Again, as a senior manager, we spend a lot of time trying to figure out how to make policies relevant, how to make them lived and how to make sure that we're making change.

And I think the only other thing I would say is—and I think I'm say—I said this earlier—is that I, you know, I'm involved in some sort of provincial level change around diversity, equity and inclusion. And the thing that I have learned about this is that data can drive change. You know, data is just really important. And so, we have some really good/bad statistics about the performance of LERA and the rate of acceptance of claims or complaints and the numbers that were dropped.

So, I would really strongly encourage that we set a baseline—we have a baseline—and that this be monitored over time and that the community would

be, I think, more than interested in speaking about those metrics as we revisit them over time. I think accountability—and, again, I speak as a senior manager of an organization that, you know, accountability is everything. We can put a lot of things in place, but we have to demonstrate that we've made some change.

\*(20:10)

So I hope, in the future, to see decreased rates of abandoned and withdrawn complaints to LERA, you know, decreased numbers of complaints that are dismissed out of hand; couple of easy indicators to measure and ones that will tell a story.

Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Denetto.

**Mr. Goertzen:** Good evening, again, and thank you for staying with us and making a presentation on this bill as well.

So you know, again, in terms of the codes of conduct, I think that'll inform us what LERA looks like going forward, and we want your voice on both of those things. Once there's a uniform code of conduct in place, you know, how LERA operates might change as well because many of the things and complaints that may be going to LERA might be captured under a code of conduct.

But I really liked your point that you made that maybe doesn't get enough attention, that it's not just when the complaints go in, that maybe people don't feel satisfied in terms of the result, or maybe even the process to get to a result, that people might be fearful to even make the complaint. And I think that that's a very good point.

And so my officials have been listening to your presentation, and I think that they—they'll engage with you both as we look to the consultation on the code of conduct and then what implications that has for LERA as well, because those are—they're very good points, so thank you for that.

**S. Denetto:** Thank you. I appreciate, you know, having the opportunity to remain connected and provide input. Thank you.

**Ms. Fontaine:** Miigwech for your second presentation this evening. It's much appreciated.

I do want to revisit the whole discussion in respect of Bill 30 and the code of conduct, and I think we should put on the record here that—and I'll just read it into the record here: So a code of conduct for police

officers in Manitoba Police Services may be established by the director of policing. The chief of a police service must provide the director of policing with a report on each contravention of the code of conduct by a police officer.

So, again, maybe there's going to be a code of conduct. They may produce a code of conduct, and then, if there is a code of conduct and there's a contravention, the only consequence of that is a report to the director of policing. It's just a report, and that's what the bill says here.

And so I would like your opinion on what kind of code of conduct, if a code of conduct is actually established for policing institutions, what kind of things would you like to see in a code of conduct for police?

**S. Denetto:** It's a great question. I think we need to see direct measures that—I don't know if I can speak to the details of a code of conduct, but I would say that we want to see non-biased, you know, non-racist behaviour. We want to see equitable treatment. We want to see people—there were comments earlier about officers off duty and sexual violence and those kinds of behaviours. I mean, all of those accountability pieces have to be included in the code of conduct.

I think the consequences have to be serious. You know, again, in a workplace, if someone's accused of harassment—sexual harassment, racial harassment—we have to take that very seriously. There's a power imbalance here, and of course in the police and public context it's even greater. And, you know, police and racialized BIPOC peoples it's even greater.

So, of course, suspending officers, conducting investigations, it goes back to the IIU process in making sure we have independence and that we have civilian oversight. All of those pieces fit together to hold the whole system and individuals in the system accountable.

Thank you.

**Mr. Gerrard:** I think I heard in your presentation that, you know, the problems with LERA are severe. They shouldn't wait until there may be codes of conduct. And maybe one of the things that the current minister might do is to initiate a consultation with regard to the future of LERA.

Do you think that would be a good move?

**S. Denetto:** I believe—I can't speak for the whole community, but I would say that that is—that would be really welcomed by the Police Accountability

Coalition and many members of newcomer communities and my guess is Indigenous communities. Yes, if we could re-open it and have those discussions, that would be welcome.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Ms. Denetto.

Time for questions—there seems no further questions. We will now move on to the next presenter.

I will now call on Jennifer Montebruno and ask the moderator to invite them into the meeting. Please unmute yourself and turn your video on.

Ms. Montebruno, are you there?

Ms. Montebruno, please proceed with your presentation.

**Jennifer Montebruno (Police Accountability Coalition):** Hello. Welcome—or, welcome?—thank you, I meant to say, and I'm glad to be here to speak.

Again, apologies. I'm putting my video back on.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you again this evening on Bill 30, this time about the law enforcement review amendment act.

I just wanted to make some clarification that earlier I spoke to a statistic about complaints that I referred to for the IIU. Unfortunately, those complaints are actually referring to the—to LERA. So that was actually from statistics found by CBC over the past 10 years, that Manitobans had filed more than 1,700 complaints and that the vast majority were dismissed by the commissioner or abandoned by the person who made the complaint. So, again, just want to make that clarification.

Of course, I'm speaking to you tonight as a member representing the Police Accountability Coalition, who wishes to just make some points in regards to the proposed changes to Bill 30.

Again, not going to belabour this point. I'm sure it's clear to everyone in this call that there has not been, in our opinion, meaningful consultation with priority communities prior to the introduction of this bill. So we urge you to not pass Bill 30 as it is, recognizing that we appreciate that there have been ongoing, you know, consultations and suggestion that there have been fulsome consultations, but as spoken to by my colleagues and previous speakers, these consultations have neither been meaningful nor thoughtful and certainly have not been as accessible as we would like to see for such a consideration.

Louise spoke to some ideas about how community consultation may be more significant. Of course, looking at things like location of consultation and the introduction of honorariums and interpreters to ensure that the voice of the community is actually being heard would be important. From the Police Accountability Coalition's perspective, we want to ensure that we clarify that our concerns need to be addressed for meaningful reform, including the involvement of, as mentioned, former police officers and investigators.

Of course, the high dismissal or abandonment of complaints—that indicate that there is a lack of trust in an opportunity for justice when it comes to police culture. And the—of course, as mentioned earlier, lack of robust civilian oversight over LERA.

So while there are several changes that are encouraging to see in Bill 30, overall, we know that this agency has not been effective over holding police accountable for misconduct. And the recognition that there has not been the consultation, as mentioned, with priority communities to ensure that the voice is clear ensures that we cannot trust that the process related to the new position that Bill 30 will create, which is that director of policing position that has been mentioned, will have both advice and authority that will create true accountability standards for police service operations and province-wide codes of conduct, as mentioned, for—moving forward.

So we want to ask whose voice will be prioritized in the creation of both that code but also in the overall accountability related to that new, incredibly important position. So, to just, you know, to clarify and to just make sure that we're clear, you know, we are hoping for more additional community input and do believe that, although people want to move forward, we do believe there is an opportunity to pause and not to pass the bill but rather to consider additional support, empowering the voices that should be considered as central in this conversation.

\* (20:20)

So thank you. I'm open to questions now.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Montebruno.

**Mr. Goertzen:** Thank you very much again and good evening again. I want to just make sure the record is clear in terms of the codes of conduct and consequences that come from it.

So, the codes of conduct will have the consequences for breaching a code of conduct within them

and those have to, by virtue of the act, have to be reported upon in terms of what those breaches and the consequences were for. So it's important that there are consequences in a code of conduct and they'll be reported upon.

I do appreciate your comment about consultation and ensuring that they're done in a way that is accessible, and that was made by a previous presenter as well. And there will be consultations on the codes of conduct and they'll involve, you know, the ability for people to make those presentations in the best way possible, so we'd be open to your advice on that.

I personally believe that the need to have codes of conduct is very important and I'd be, you know, reluctant to wait two or three years, and the way the legislative process is, it might be that way. And I think it's important that we start that consultation and engage with the community after this bill has passed, to develop those codes of conduct and I'm reticent to hold off, again, knowing how long it takes and the importance of those codes of conduct for the community.

So we look for your advice in terms of how we can ensure that those consultations are accessible and meaningful for the community.

**J. Montebruno:** Thank you, Minister Goertzen. I appreciate your comments and suggestions and the open offer to engage on what code of conduct might look like.

I do want to mention, however, that, while I appreciate the opportunity to have engagement and consultation now, perhaps this would have been seen with more accountability and trust if this consultation had been more robust in the past, say, six to eight months to even have more opportunities for, you know, the coalition itself and the member communities and the organizations to really engage in a thorough and meaningful way.

So moving forward, that sounds fantastic; however, would want to make sure that we're clear that the comment would be that would have been appreciated in the past, and does further provide opportunity to recognize that it is the length of the process and the lack of the clarity around it that further erodes trust, which, of course, you know, just makes our—both of our jobs much more difficult.

**Ms. Fontaine:** Well, I appreciate the minister clarifying that there will be consequences attached to contraventions of these codes of conduct, so I think

that that's important that that was put on the record today.

And, again, I guess it would be the same question, is, you know—well, first off, I also think it's really good that it's on the record that the minister is saying that he is more than willing to engage in consultation, I would imagine, almost immediately or kind of immediately with your group, and so I think that that's something to make note of.

But, you know, what would—what are some of the codes of conduct that you would like to see?

**J. Montebruno:** Thank you, Ms. Fontaine. I think it's, you know, to be honest with you, the coalition feels, frankly, that the process has been unclear to date and that it's hard to comment on what code of conduct could look like when there hasn't been a thorough dialogue to even engage in what has been previously agreed to. So, I don't feel prepared at this point to speak on behalf of the coalition in regards to specific aspects because, quite frankly, I don't have the information that can allow for that conversation to occur at this time.

**Mr. Gerrard:** Yes, the minister has said that he's going to engage in consultations on the code of conduct, but it may take some time and we have major problems with LERA.

Do you think the minister should also be engaging in consultations on the future of LERA?

**J. Montebruno:** I mean, I'll—you know, to echo the comments of my colleagues and previous speakers, absolutely, you're not going to hear a grassroots coalition of organizations tell you that we wouldn't want to have dialogue with our government. We absolutely would appreciate and are open to these conversations occurring as soon as possible to robustly look at what LERA really could do to move police accountability in Manitoba forward.

Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your 'presentatious'—presentation, Mrs.—Ms. Montebruno. Tough night.

I would call—I will now call on our next presenter, Rachel Howgate, and ask the moderator to invite them into the meeting. Please unmute yourself and turn your video on.

Ms. Howgate does not appear to be available. We will drop her name to the bottom of the list and return to it when we're—when we've concluded the other presenters.

So, I will now call on Kate Kehler from the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg.

I would ask the moderator to invite them into the meeting. Please unmute yourself and turn your video on.

Ms. Kehler, please proceed with your presentation.

**Kate Kehler (Social Planning Council of Winnipeg):** Good evening, again. Thank you for the opportunity. Again, being in a, you know, near the end of a list of speakers, I don't want to go over the points over and over again, but I am here to lend my voice and to the idea that, you know, while we did understand, or there's—now we have better understanding that this was not ever meant as, like, a LERA overhaul, but why we're here is to obviously point to the fact that LERA needs to be overhauled. And we're concerned that the process that's being put in place is not fulsome enough.

So, that's what we're trying to establish here. So, again, as others have said, Bill 30, you know, obviously we support that longer period to make a complaint. As for communities that are traditionally marginalized and racialized, to only have a very short period of time in order to gather the strength, in order to take on a police service, is—takes more time than that, and they need to be able to garner community support. So, we do applaud that part of the legislation.

But it does seem that this—from the reading of it, is that the director of policing is the one who will have the power to create the standards for the police service operations and the province-wide code of conduct for all police services. So, that's what we're looking for clarity on because, again, consultation—and just so that they're read into this part of the Hansard, you know, we want those priority communities to include Black, Indigenous, 2SLGBTQQA+ communities, sex workers, people who use drugs, individuals living in low incomes and community-based organizations working with affected communities to develop that code of conduct. So, this could be a time for an amendment that would actually codify that. And that that becomes a priority, and those voices are the ones that are prioritized in the development of that code of conduct.

So, just as far as, you know, again, understanding that this is not about revamping LERA at this point, but there is just so much wrong with LERA, and it has been such an ineffectual body. That has been pointed out. But I wanted to relate a couple of stories.

When I was with the John Howard Society of Manitoba, we actually met with LERA and—to, you know, to be—have a presentation on how they work. The investigating officer was a former police officer, and when discussing, like, okay, what constitutes a breach, the person couldn't actually get any—give us any sort of clarity on that, and kind of—he basically shrugged his shoulders and, this is almost a direct quote, he said, well, you know, that's how business gets done. Basically justifying intimidation.

Now, I've not been intimidated by a police officer—that when I get stopped because I've done something wrong, the exchange is usually very polite. I've never been stopped for not doing anything wrong. Yes, I can be a little heavy on my foot in the car.

\* (20:30)

But, as Shereen has pointed out—you know, and has been pointed out earlier in other presentations with PAC—is, like, even IRCOM staff is—are not safe from being stopped by the police. And the fact that they actually came out and admitted that to her, that racial profiling is a useful tool, whereas I have only ever had the conversation where they say, oh, no, no, race has nothing to do it; we are data driven. And then, when you go back to them and you say, well, actually, if you are policing in one particular area and the data demonstrates who lives in that area, you are over-policing those communities. That's just how it falls out.

*Mr. Vice-Chairperson in the Chair*

So—yes, sorry, I don't want to repeat what everybody else has already said. So, what I think maybe I'll end with is—I thought was a very interesting point, is that the last time there was meant to be some sort of adjustment to LERA, there was quite a bit of uproar from members of the WPS, and over 200 of them apparently came to the Leg. in plain clothes. And that speaks volumes to me, to the idea that they are very concerned with maintaining what they would call their tools. As they said, racial profiling is a useful tool. Those tools are doing harm to the community.

Another story: I was in a car with friends, they—daughter of a friend of mine who's a refugee family. She was driving. Her brother was much taller, so I'm like, don't be ridiculous, you get into the front seat, I'll get into the back seat.

We were driving. We were pulled over. Couldn't tell why, but I was sitting in the back. This is an old, probably fourth-hand van that was being driven. And the police officer approached the driver's window and

said: nice car, drug money? And I leaned forward and said, excuse me? And the conversation completely changed.

So, what's important to know is that those community voices need to be able to have—you know, as has been pointed out, they need to have safe consultation, a way to safely tell those stories so they actually lead to real change. Because police officers—I've had police officers say they never use intimidation, and I've had other police officers who will say, well, of course, we use intimidation; but then they justify it because they believe that, well, at least it's not violent.

Well, again, never having been impacted by that sort of intimidation, I don't know that, but I can only imagine, you know, a youth driving home after a long day at work, who's a newcomer themselves, being stopped time and time again. Intimidation is a form of violence. And so, we just need to prioritize those voices.

Thank you.

**Mr. Vice-Chairperson:** I want to thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

**Mr. Goertzen:** Just a quick comment.

Thank you again for staying with us this evening. I certainly heard your frustration with LERA. You've—you were very clear on that, and I appreciate you stating that and also sharing difficult but personal stories that you were involved with or witness to.

And I also made note of the groups that you're looking for in terms of consultation with the codes of conduct. So thank you for sharing that as well.

**Mr. Vice-Chairperson:** Ms. Kehler, would you like to respond?

**K. Kehler:** No, just say thank you.

**Ms. Fontaine:** Miigwech again for—again, I'll reiterate what my colleague is saying—for staying with us tonight and for your words on the official record tonight. And again, for sharing what is a really important story about that interaction between WPS or any policing institution within Manitoba, certainly, and BIPOC folk. And if it weren't for you having been in that vehicle, I'm sure that that interaction would've looked a lot different.

So, miigwech for sharing that and putting that on the official record tonight.

**Mr. Vice-Chairperson:** Ms. Kehler, would you like to respond?

**K. Kehler:** Am I allowed to respond a little bit outside that comment? Because you've asked some of my colleagues around the code of conduct, and I just wanted to reiterate my support around that idea of—that duty to report needs to be something—because what we have heard, you know, it's been mentioned here again tonight, you know, that whole idea of a few bad apples.

What we need is the actual whole entire police service—and that includes their union—to actually remember that that is not the way that that ends; it says a few bad apples spoils the whole bunch.

And they need to recognize the fact that if they're not going to call out their own, they are all going to, they are all going to have to wear those mistakes and the harm that is done.

**Mr. Vice-Chairperson:** Is there any other questions, Mr. Gerrard?

**Mr. Gerrard:** You've again brought up the major problems with LERA, and I think that there's some doubt whether just putting in the code of conduct will solve things.

So, would you be in support of the minister doing a broader consultation to make changes to LEDA [*phonetic*]-LERA, in—to move forward in terms of understanding and making a commitment to a better future for LERA?

**K. Kehler:** Yes, absolutely.

You know, as Jennifer pointed out, you know, you don't go to—you don't work in community without being willing to talk. So definitely, we would want that.

**Mr. Vice-Chairperson:** Is there any other questions?

If not, we'll move down to—I'll call on Lisa Forbes and ask the moderator to invite them into the meeting. And I'm going to ask Ms. Forbes to please unmute yourself and turn your video on.

*Mr. Chairperson in the Chair*

**Mr. Chairperson:** Ms. Forbes, you may proceed with your presentation.

**Lisa Forbes (Stop Violence Against Aboriginal Women Action Group):** Tansi, committee members.

I am a Winnipegger and a member of the Peguis First Nation. I'm speaking on behalf of the grassroots

coalition of Indigenous and non-Indigenous women citizens who gather occasionally over the past 12 years to lend our voices to urgent issues. At the risk of being seen as not having the ability to see the whole of police conduct matters, I'll start as others have this evening by sharing a positive experience.

So, I have been present at public demonstration events where I would have expected police intervention, but the Winnipeg Police Service chose to stand down as to not escalate the situation and incite violence. So, tonight I am here as a member of the Police Accountability Coalition. We—and as part of that, we join in requesting that Bill 30 not be passed as it is and instead undergo meaningful community consultation. My presentation will differ a little bit from what you've heard and I'll talk a little bit about what that could mean.

So, LERA is not an effective way for citizens to report and expect justice for police misconduct, and I'll share a bit of a story with you. In 2020, on the graduation day of a self-employment training program that I facilitate, I received word that a dedicated, enthusiastic First Nation young woman participant would not be able to attend to give her final project presentation because she was in hospital, having been physically assaulted by members of the Winnipeg Police Service a few days prior.

Unknown at the time of the incident, she sustained an internal injury and finally at the urging of family members, went to receive emergency treatment at hospital. Someone suggested that she file a LERA complaint. I assisted her in doing that. She met what was required of her, including filing within the time limit, and subsequently, her case became one of the 98 per cent of LERA cases that do not make it to a public hearing.

To reiterate what Ms. Denetto, the IRCOM representative, said earlier this evening, this incident didn't see the light of day in terms of public exposure or justice, but to her and her family, it was life altering—not in lasting physical injury, but in mental torment of the physical and also deeply cutting verbal assault. Because it's so ineffective, I do not encourage or use the LERA process.

Contributing to what my colleagues have said this evening, robust civilian oversight and meaningful consultation is needed so I'll talk a little bit about that. There is a key principle of the United Nations declaration on the rights of Indigenous people, and it's also referred to in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's Calls to Action, which is: representatives in

a consultative process need to be chosen by members of the community. In the case of Indigenous peoples—that is, Indigenous women, men, LGBTQ, two-spirit people and, finally, as a member organization of the immigrant matters in Canada coalition, I would further say this principle could apply to representatives for Black people and people of colour.

\* (20:40)

Even though we are calling for Bill 30 to be scrapped until consultation has happened, I support my colleague Louise's request at the beginning of this hearing that since you are likely to pass it, I implore you, Minister Goertzen, to please amend to include a requirement for meaningful community consultation on its aspects, including the code of content—code of conduct.

Thank you. Ninaskomtin [*Thank you*] for hearing me.

**Mr. Chairperson:** We thank you for your presentation, Ms. Forbes.

**Mr. Goertzen:** Thank you, Ms. Forbes, and thank you for being with us tonight on this bill and also for reinforcing the previous comments that were made about the need for consultation. I think the message has been heard, and I appreciate you adding a unique perspective, and sharing also a difficult personal story, as well, to make us mindful of the need for change and in a lot of different ways. And thank you, again, for reinforcing the need for consultation.

**L. Forbes:** Thank you. I have—thanks for hearing me, and I have nothing else to say.

Thanks.

**Ms. Fontaine:** Miigwech for your presentation this evening and for sharing some important experiences and stories to the committee.

When I was at Southern Chiefs Organization, a lot of the work that I did was helping folks navigate the different complaints processes—so, the RCMP complaints process, the WPS—WPS' Professional Standards Unit and, of course, LERA. And at the time, we didn't have the IIU.

And as you shared, you know, the story about the woman that is, you know, one of the 98 per cent of folks that don't get any justice. One of the things that I always tried—and still today, even in the House, I try to share—is what that does for people, what that does for citizens who come before a body that they hope will give them some semblance of justice and how



defeated and hopeless people feel. And so I am curious if you wanted to share the—maybe some of the impacts of when you do file these complaints and nothing happens, what that feels like for folks.

**L. Forbes:** Thank you. I'm just contemplating whether or not I should—whether I should say what this was like. So, I am regretful that I did encourage her to do the LERA process because when I spoke to her, I went to visit her in the hospital, and she told me that when—I said in my statement today that it was deeply cutting, the verbal—the lasting sort of intense, just cutting of her—how—what the assault meant. And so I know that the process added to that. She had said to me she was intending to commit suicide, but a family member stopped her.

So it made me very, very regretful of having—I'm very used to being very active and proactive on things, and I wish I hadn't in this case because I know that the whole process contributed to her anguish. So, yes, I hear you. That's—I think that that happened in this case as well.

**Ms. Fontaine:** Miigwech, Lisa, for sharing that. I know that as difficult as that is, and you're probably really conflicted about sharing something so personal and so—as you said, even so cutting—to such a public space, but it is important because, you know, there's consequences to when we have a public complaints system that doesn't work for citizens. There are very real consequences. And, as your—you've just shared and put on the official record, you know, they can have long-lasting, devastating consequences when people are looking for justice in respect of their interactions with the police.

So that was such an important story and an important narrative to put on the official record, so I say miigwech.

**L. Forbes:** I would just—I just want to just finish off by saying that there has been work, you know, decades of work to make the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People. This is really important that—you know, we've been throwing around what community consultation means. But having representatives come who are chosen by the communities is so important, and I'd like to—again, I encourage Minister Goertzen to offer an amendment to this legislation this evening, to be able to include meaningful consultation.

It just so happens that we all, as citizens, you know, off the side of our desks, came this evening to

do this. But we need to have a formal way to get community consultation involved, and you can still do that tonight, Minister Goertzen, and I hope you do.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Forbes.

We will now move on to the—sorry—before we go ahead to the next presenter, Rachael Howgate is unfortunately feeling unwell and will not be presenting to Bill 30 tonight. We hope she feels better soon, and her name will be taken off the presenters list.

I will now call on Catherine Biaya and ask the moderator to invite them into the meeting. Please unmute yourself and turn your video on.

Catherine? Catherine Biaya, you may proceed with your presentation. Catherine, are you muted?

**Catherine Biaya (Private Citizen):** Okay, can you hear me now?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Yes, Catherine. Please proceed.

**C. Biaya:** I'm originally from the Democratic Republic of Congo, where the word accountability exists only in the dictionary. But people don't care about that.

So when I heard about PAC, Police Accountability Coalition, I went in back to them, talking as a Canadian citizen, a pastor. Because I'm also a pastor for Saturday church here, a francophone church, and mostly people connect with us easily and they tell us [*inaudible*] all kind of stories because we speak the language they speak. So—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Unfortunately, Ms. Biaya, we're having a hard time hearing what you're saying. Ms. Biaya, can you continue?

**C. Biaya:** Yes. So I was saying that I'm so happy about the bill. There'll be some changes that they initiate and that you took to make the Bill 30 and the act of conduct is very good as my—people preceding me have said is really vague. They said is très [*very*] vague—is vague. We'd like to have something concrete.

And everybody's talked about the consultation piece, which is very important because the systemic racism or discrimination is intergenerational, is ongoing, and sometimes people have difficulty to accept that it even exists. But we are dealing with people on the front line; we deal with it every day, with stories coming from people.

For example, young—we have international students—I'm dealing with international students, with refugees. So these young people, they work hard, and as young people coming from a country, war-affected zone, where they couldn't have even the opportunity to buy a car, when they start working here, the first thing they do, they buy a car and those cars—not bought cash, it is loan. But the police usually, they see them with those cars, they think it's—the car, the money came from the drugs.

\* (20:50)

So one—two of my boys are in the church, they were driving. One have a beginner licence, the other one have a full licence. So they were pulled over; the one who have a full licence was a little bit tired and was, kind of, not sleeping but was—has his eyes closed. Sorry, my English—I'm a French-speaking person. So, when they pulled them over, the question was asked again; they start searching, asking questions where they get money to buy that car. So the boys said that, we are working at the centre; we are students. Then they said, no. They pulled them and they say, because you were sleeping and the one who have a beginner was driving in this case, come out; the car was towed.

And I know the law; the Manitoba public—MPI said that someone who have a novice or a beginner driver licence, when he has someone with a full licence, there is no contravention. So, because they were Black, they were pulled, the car was towed, so they have to pay and the towing and the ticket when it shouldn't do—shouldn't be like that.

So my concern is about that this fear, that the fear that has been created, that newcomers or international students can't even complain or write the complaint because they know that nothing will be done. When we come with this high expectation, that we come from a country where there is a lot of police harassment, we come to a free country where we are safe; and suddenly this safety is in question. So how can we build again the trust?

And like my colleague has spoken about, the consultation is very key. We will not consult with any community. So, how we can create the bridge or collaborate with PAC, with people who are already in place [*inaudible*] every day who can help with giving the feedback is the key. And I know that people are still dealing with very, very difficult—so when the people were living those mistreatments, they should be part of people also. Not all of them, of course, but it is a coalition already representing them. That's not exactly what's going on—can help—which will help the

minister and his Cabinet in writing the code of conduct.

And I'm also grateful because there is something in place, but pausing that this—pausing for a little bit—comment on dit? [*how do you say?*]-it's coming in French. So pausing back this bill will be good when something sustainable is there and concrete, so it can be passed once from all.

And that's what I wanted say because all my presenters have said it all.

And also how to create awareness to build trust between the community members and police. So, is there any findings that can be put in place where the PAC will be organizing community education where the police would come and present, because still, our people are lacking of information like gang and drug awareness, how do the recruitment for gangs happen, and how the PAC can help to support the kids and where they can go in case such things happen. Those—all those things are needed to be in place.

Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to speak.

**Mr. Chairperson:** We thank you for your presentation, Ms. Biaya.

**Mr. Goertzen:** Thank you, Pastor Biaya, for your presentation. I appreciated—there was a little bit of connection issues there, and—but from what I heard of you, it was very clear and very passionate, and I appreciate where your heart is at and for bringing the perspective that you have.

And I know, as a pastor, in your congregation you will be a person of trust and no doubt people share with you many different experiences that they have, whether it's with the police or other experiences coming to Canada.

I very much appreciate and support the idea of more consultation.

Near the end of your presentation, if I understood correctly, you're looking for more opportunities to have police maybe make presentations or have connections into your community.

I will ask my officials to get the contact information for you and to connect with maybe WPS, because I know they have community liaison officers, and to see what type of presentations might be helpful to you, whether through your congregation or otherwise.

So, thank you again for that.

**C. Biaya:** Yes. Yes, thank you. You're welcome and I truly appreciate it.

And I—and what I would like to add is, you know, we have already, like, of course I can be the representative person, but how can his community [*inaudible*] the Police Accountability Coalition in whole, in one?

We can have that space where we can—yes, because I'm representing a few people, just francophones who are Christian, but there are different people in the community. There are Muslim, there are other congregations who need all those kinds of information.

So, I would like to emphasize that it's not only me or the francophones that I am dealing with, but there is different communities that—a lot in my congregation or attend my church. So, this is really the community wide.

**Ms. Fontaine:** Miigwech for your presentation this evening. It was good to hear. And for the committee's sake, it was good to hear the story in respect of students just driving. And they should be able to drive. They should be able to drive on our streets and not get stopped and not then have to deal with the consequences of getting their vehicle towed or having to pay a fine or tickets.

So that was a really important story because I don't think that, you know—often, you know, when there are stories about interactions with police, often they're kind of dismissed or not believed, and so I really do believe that every opportunity that we have, or citizens have, to put those on the official record are really important. So, I appreciate you doing that this evening.

**C. Biaya:** I appreciate the comment. Thank you.

**Mr. Gerrard:** Merci bien pour votre histoire. C'est très important, les histoires de vos enfants, et—

#### **Translation**

*Thank you very much for your story. The stories of your children are very important, and—*

#### **English**

I hope that your words and those words of others here will be helpful in enabling some improvements both in the 'cos' of—code of conduct, and also it's very clear that we need some improvements in LERA, as well, because we have heard time and time again from presenters that it's not functioning very well right now.

Thank you.

**C. Biaya:** Yes, thank you so much for listening, and thank you for approving and—what we just said. Thank you. Merci beaucoup.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Biaya.

This—that concludes the list of presenters I have before me for Bill 30, Bill 27 and Bill 7.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Chairperson:** In what order does the committee wish to proceed with clause-by-clause consideration of bill number—of the bills?

**Mr. Goertzen:** Mr. Chairperson, I would propose that we proceed numerically, starting with the lowest number first.

\* (21:00)

**Mr. Chairperson:** Is that agreed upon? [*Agreed*]

#### **Bill 7—The Police Services Amendment Act (Enhancing Independent Investigation Unit Operations) (Continued)**

**Mr. Chairperson:** We will now move on to clause by clause of Bill 7.

Does the minister responsible for Bill 7 have an opening statement?

**Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** I do have an opening statement.

Normally, I sort of go through and answer questions that I got at second reading. I think a lot of them may have been answered through interaction with the committee members—sorry, with the presenters who were here with us tonight.

You know, I want to make it clear, I—and I don't mean this is a criticism; I really don't. Some of the presenters indicated that the IIU legislation is among the weakest in Canada. That's not a criticism of the former minister, Mr. Chomiak, who I hold in high regard, who brought the legislation in, or his predecessors—or, sorry, his successor as NDP Justice ministers. I know it was difficult and I know he struggled with it, and even as his critic we had good conversations about the challenges of it, as I do with my critic on different issues.

So—but I also take as instructive and I know there was significant discussions with the grand chiefs, I believe, on this legislation, that it is an improvement.

Will it be the perfect solution? Clearly not, and presenters made that abundantly clear. Will it be the last change to the IIU legislation? I'm sure it will not be. And so there'll be further opportunities for enhancements and improvements.

But I do believe it is a step forward. People can make, you know, criticisms or make opinions about how big that step is, and that's fair in democratic system, but I still think it's imperative upon us as legislators to move forward on legislation that is an improvement to the situation that exists while still continuing to look for further improvements in the future.

So with those comments, I want to thank the members who came to make presentations on this bill. Where there were criticisms about consultation or the need for more consultations, I'll take those on as my responsibility and, you know, consider that in future iterations and future pieces of legislation.

**Mr. Chairperson:** We thank the minister for those words.

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

**Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns):** Well, first I just want to thank all of the presenters this evening and those that spoke to Bill 7.

And, you know, I remember being a part of—when all of the discussion for the IIU started to happen, I was the director of justice for Southern Chiefs' Organization, and I remember, as part of my responsibilities, one of the things that I was really pushing the government of the day was to develop what, at that time, we were calling independent investigations, or a special—I can't remember what we were calling it, but an independent investigations unit. And I remember that we brought the Ontario special investigations unit—and I can't for the life of me remember his name, but I had organized a community information session with him, and he talked about how Ontario had started their independent investigations unit and started this discussion.

And then the government of the day, the NDP, had established a working group with MKO, SCO, AMC and MMF. And so we sat with and we were working with Glen Lewis, at the time, because he was in charge with dealing with the police act.

And I remember those discussions. I—you know, the same things that were brought up here tonight, we had those discussions, including, you know, about not

having former police officers or, you know, seconded police officers on the IIU.

And so I agree with the minister, those are really difficult discussions and things to kind of navigate. And so, you know, is the IIU perfect? Absolutely not; I agree with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Goertzen). I think that there are some good changes here, and certainly we have to see more changes to make the IIU, you know, perhaps not one of the weakest in Canada, and we can strengthen it as we go along.

And in that process of trying to strengthen it and make it better, I would suggest that as we heard repeatedly tonight, the importance of consultation with community members across Manitoba, and certainly community members within that—the BIPOC community.

So I think that that's about it. I'll leave it there for right now.

**Mr. Chairperson:** We thank the member for those words.

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

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

Is that agreed? [*Agreed*]

Clauses 1 through 3—pass; clauses 4 through 9—pass; clause 10—pass; clauses 11 and 12—pass; clause 13—pass; clauses 14 through 16—pass; clause 17—pass; clauses 18 through 22—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass; Bill be reported.

**Bill 27—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act  
(Alternative Measures for Driving Offences)**  
*(Continued)*

**Mr. Chairperson:** We will now move on to Bill 27. Does the minister responsible for Bill 27 have an opening statement?

**Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** So, it doesn't appear that there was lots of concern regarding the IRP portion of this bill, but there was a couple of presenters and my friend from St. John raised this in second reading about the issue of the suspension of the drivers if somebody drops out of the diversion program.

So it's been assured to me, and I've tried to provide the assurance to others, that this doesn't change anything that's been happening over the years. But I will commit to reconfirming with officials prior to third reading that again that that is in fact the case, in that there aren't individuals who have dropped out of diversion before who then had their license suspended prior to conviction because a conviction gets imposed again after they move out of—if they don't complete diversion and then, you know, the presumption of innocent—innocence kicks in.

But if—I want to make this clear, you know, to do a double check to ensure that that has not been the case where the suspension has been put in place, where there's a diversion, someone who doesn't complete diversion, because that's not the intention. The intention is to essentially make the legislation as it's being applied and needs to be applied.

But I want to give assurance to those who presented—the two individuals who presented tonight, and to the MLA for St. Johns who's raised this before.

**Mr. Chairperson:** We thank the minister for those comments.

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

**Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns):** So, once again, I just want to thank everybody that presented on Bill 27.

And again, to me, there's still—it's not entirely clear, because one of our presenters said that if an individual, if an offender chose not to complete the program, that they had the ability to suspend the licence, which was an immediate consequence, and that was the words that he put on the record. And he said that the offender then immediately feels those consequences. So—but then when the minister was speaking earlier, the minister had said, well, but it's not being used.

\* (21:10)

So I'm still not clear, right. Like, we've got—we've kind of got two discourses coming out here: (1) it's not being used; and when it is being used and it's an immediate consequence and a deterrent. And so I would like some clarification on that and some assurance.

But, you know, I want to go back to what Diane Redsky was saying, in the sense that, you know, all of us at this table, all of us as legislators should know the realities on the street right now. You know, we have outreach workers that are on the streets until the wee

hours of the morning who go out to particular areas of our city because they know that there are little ones out there. And Diane was talking about, you know, when she was starting to do this work, the median age was—for a child sexually exploited—was 16. That's gone down to 13 years old, a baby.

I know families that I've worked with in—MMIWG family members, one in particular that I will not name, who was murdered when she was 17. She came into contact with a pedophile, with a predator, when she was 10 on Ellice at the 7-Eleven. And he knew that he would find a vulnerable Indigenous child, a girl child—he knew. He was 42. And he sexually exploited her until she was—she ended up being murdered.

And so why I share that is because that's the reality of what's going on in our streets today, tonight, right now as we sit here and we debate this bill. And so when Diane says that, you know, we should be doing everything within our power, we should be doing everything within our power.

One of the things that strikes me—or struck—struck me about one of the presenters was, well, you know, if the individual can't do it, you know, I reach out and I, you know, try to make allowances, can we reschedule this; maybe I'll do another referral. I'm so sick of—and I say this, probably, you know, at least, you know, six times a week—I'm so sick of the way that patriarchy bends over backwards to protect its own, and this is a good example. We have men—and they said it, our presenters, and we all know it, that it is predominantly all men that are sexually exploiting women and children, and the system bends over backwards so that there's no consequences.

And so my concern with this is that the little consequence of having their licence taken—suspended—and if they're married, they have to be accountable to their wife—why the hell do you not have your licence? Now, if that's taken away, if there's not that immediate response, that's concerning. So, again—and I appreciate—I know that we've had this conversation to try and get some clarity on there because, like I said, now, you know, our presenter said that that—it's an immediate consequence.

Miigwech.

**Mr. Chairperson:** We thank the member for those comments.

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.

Is that agreed? *[Agreed]*

Clause 1—pass; clause 2—pass; clause 3—pass; clause 4—pass; clause 5—pass; clause 6—pass; clause 7—pass; clause 8—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

**Bill 30—The Police Services Amendment  
and Law Enforcement Review Amendment Act**  
*(Continued)*

**Mr. Chairperson:** We will now move on to Bill 30.

Does the minister responsible for Bill 30 have an opening statement?

**Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** I want to thank the presenters for all the bills who came forward tonight. They all came forward virtually, which is good that that ability exists, and that's something that all opposition parties agreed to, to continue on. And I think it's good that we did.

So, there's a couple of points here of clarification I want to make. I think there may be some conflating between standards and codes of conduct. Standards are the things that will be publicly known in terms of the operations of policing. And so I found this out: if you go onto the British Columbia website, you can find policing standards publicly available, and they'll talk about, you know, standards for high-speed chases, or the use of force and a variety of other things. And you can—it's a provincial-wide standard in terms of policing and how they, in certain operations, in certain matters, they have to conduct their business, and I think that that's important. Those are standards—policing standards.

On the other side is codes of conduct, which also then had lots of discussion, and this is about, you know, the expectation of the public or of the police in interacting with the public and that—making that clear and transparent. And that doesn't mean that police forces don't have some degrees of standards at this point, but I think that they be uniform and that they be publicly known is important because I think it can have a significant impact about how complaints can be made or how maybe complaints can be avoided, can be acted upon even before there's a complaint, which might have an impact on the frustrations that we've heard about LERA. I think those are very important things.

Lots about consultation tonight. And I suppose all of the codes of conduct that have been built into the

act—I think there have been questions about consultation. I think it's better to consult first, have those standards put, you know, in the act. There were some questions about whether we could amend the act to prescribe who should be consulted with. My concern there, of course, you know, is to start to delineate individuals or groups who can be consulted with, almost invariably you would have people say, well, hang on, how come we weren't included in that? And now the whole thing feels less inclusive instead of more.

So I think that the important point is that there is a commitment for consultation on the codes of conduct. I took the point from presenters, you know, in being mindful of how that can be done in a way that, you know, people can meaningfully—have meaningful engagement but that there's accessibility for that as well.

Those are good points, and, you know, we got really good feedback tonight and look forward to further feedback from those and others who weren't able to make it here tonight.

**Mr. Chairperson:** We thank the minister for those comments.

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

**Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns):** So, once again, miigwech to all of the presenters on Bill 30.

You know, the minister earlier said, and I think it's really important to kind of reiterate that again, because I would suggest most of the public don't—I didn't know this, obviously, before I became elected, but this process of standing committees where the public have the opportunity to present to the minister and the committee and MLAs is actually—again, I think—like, I think we're only the second province—*[interjection]*—yes. So, you know, very, very few jurisdictions do this across Canada.

So, you know, I always feel, even though it's very long days and long evenings, I feel very fortunate when we get to hear from the public and the public gets to engage in this process that otherwise they wouldn't have an opportunity to do.

So, again, I say miigwech to each and every one of them who presented tonight.

You know, LERA is—you know, there has been many, many concerns and many criticisms for many, many years. You know, I started at Southern Chiefs' Organization in August of 2002, and the vast—and

I worked at Southern Chiefs' Organization for, I believe, 10 years. The vast majority of the work that I did when I was there was on police relations and police complaints. And LERA was as disappointing then and as ineffective then as it is now.

\* (21:20)

And so, you know, how long do we continue to tinker with LERA until we realize it needs a complete overhaul or dismantling to put in place a complaints body or a complaints mechanism that actually works for the community, and works to ensure that we have the best policing institutions that we can have?

Because we don't have the best policing institutions that we could possibly have, and LERA is not a part of that space to make things better, because we still have complaints. We still have 98 per cent of those citizens who come forward with interactions between the police service and themselves and feel that they were violated and their rights were infringed on, and nothing has happened.

So, you know, is it—you know, when do we look at doing more?

You know, I said in second reading debate that, you know, it was an opportunity to do a little bit more in this bill. I would suggest it does the bare minimum. I know that we keep talking about the code of conducts. You know, it's not unreasonable for someone like myself, who's been doing that work for—community work for a long time, to not have faith or trust in the system—in the very system to develop codes of conducts—and expect, then, that there will be changes in LERA. And it's not unreasonable for the community also not to trust that.

But we did hear from several presenters saying that they're happy that there's going to be codes of conduct. And we did hear from the minister today—tonight—commit to doing those consultations. So, if anything, I think that those are two good things that came out of tonight.

Miigwech.

**Mr. Chairperson:** The member for those—*[interjection]* Oh. We thank the member for those comments.

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

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

Is that agreed? *[Agreed]*

Clauses 1 and 2—pass; clause 3—pass; clauses 4 and 5—pass; clauses 6 through 9—pass; clause 10—pass; clause 11—pass; clauses 12 through 15—pass; clause 16—pass; clauses 17 and 18—pass; clauses 19 and 20—pass; clauses 21 through 24—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

The hour being 9:25, what is the will of the committee?

**Some Honourable Members:** Committee rise.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Committee rise.

**COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 9:25 p.m.**

The Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Debates and Proceedings

are also available on the Internet at the following address:

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