

Fourth Session - Fortieth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

Official Report
(Hansard)

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Daryl Reid
Speaker*

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Fortieth Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALLAN, Nancy	St. Vital	NDP
ALLUM, James, Hon.	Fort Garry-Riverview	NDP
ALTEMEYER, Rob	Wolseley	NDP
ASHTON, Steve, Hon.	Thompson	NDP
BLADY, Sharon, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	NDP
BRAUN, Erna, Hon.	Rossmere	NDP
BRIESE, Stuart	Agassiz	PC
CALDWELL, Drew, Hon.	Brandon East	NDP
CHIEF, Kevin, Hon.	Point Douglas	NDP
CHOMIAK, Dave, Hon.	Kildonan	NDP
CROTHERS, Deanne, Hon.	St. James	NDP
CULLEN, Cliff	Spruce Woods	PC
DEWAR, Greg, Hon.	Selkirk	NDP
DRIEDGER, Myrna	Charleswood	PC
EICHLER, Ralph	Lakeside	PC
EWASKO, Wayne	Lac du Bonnet	PC
FRIESEN, Cameron	Morden-Winkler	PC
GAUDREAU, Dave	St. Norbert	NDP
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Liberal
GOERTZEN, Kelvin	Steinbach	PC
GRAYDON, Cliff	Emerson	PC
HELWER, Reg	Brandon West	PC
HOWARD, Jennifer	Fort Rouge	NDP
IRVIN-ROSS, Kerri, Hon.	Fort Richmond	NDP
JHA, Bidhu	Radisson	NDP
KOSTYSHYN, Ron, Hon.	Swan River	NDP
LATHLIN, Amanda	The Pas	NDP
LEMIEUX, Ron, Hon.	Dawson Trail	NDP
MACKINTOSH, Gord, Hon.	St. Johns	NDP
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MARCELINO, Flor, Hon.	Logan	NDP
MARCELINO, Ted	Tyndall Park	NDP
MARTIN, Shannon	Morris	PC
MELNICK, Christine	Riel	NDP
MITCHELSON, Bonnie	River East	PC
NEVAKSHONOFF, Thomas, Hon.	Interlake	NDP
OSWALD, Theresa	Seine River	NDP
PALLISTER, Brian	Fort Whyte	PC
PEDERSEN, Blaine	Midland	PC
PETTERSEN, Clarence	Flin Flon	NDP
PIWNIUK, Doyle	Arthur-Virden	PC
REID, Daryl, Hon.	Transcona	NDP
ROBINSON, Eric, Hon.	Kewatinook	NDP
RONDEAU, Jim	Assiniboia	NDP
ROWAT, Leanne	Riding Mountain	PC
SARAN, Mohinder, Hon.	The Maples	NDP
SCHULER, Ron	St. Paul	PC
SELINGER, Greg, Hon.	St. Boniface	NDP
SMOOK, Dennis	La Verendrye	PC
STEFANSON, Heather	Tuxedo	PC
STRUTHERS, Stan	Dauphin	NDP
SWAN, Andrew	Minto	NDP
WIEBE, Matt	Concordia	NDP
WIGHT, Melanie, Hon.	Burrows	NDP
WISHART, Ian	Portage la Prairie	PC
<i>Vacant</i>	Gimli	—
<i>Vacant</i>	Southdale	—

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, October 27, 2015

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

Good morning, everyone. Please be seated.

Speaker's Statement

Mr. Speaker: I'd like to indicate to the House, before we proceed with our regular order of business, yesterday, on October 26th, 2015, when putting a vote to the House on the report stage amendment to Bill 70, I incorrectly stated that the question before the House was the amendment to Bill 18.

For the record, the question before the House yesterday just after 5 p.m. was the amendment to Bill 70, and I believe this was understood to be the case by members at the time, and the House records will reflect that the vote at the time was an amendment to Bill 70.

Thank you for your consideration of this.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

SECOND READINGS—PUBLIC BILLS

Mr. Speaker: Now move to orders of the day, private members' business, second reading of public bills.

Bill 209—The Results-Based Budgeting Act

Mrs. Heather Stefanson (Tuxedo): I move, seconded by the member for Spruce Woods (Mr. Cullen), that Bill 209, The Results-Based Budgeting Act; Loi sur la budgétisation axée sur les résultats, be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

Mr. Speaker: So we'll be calling Bill 209 under second readings of public bills.

And it's been moved by the honourable member for Tuxedo, seconded by the honourable member for Spruce Woods, that Bill 209, The Results-Based Budgeting Act, be now read for a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

Mrs. Stefanson: I am pleased to rise in the House today on second reading of Bill 209, The Results-Based Budgeting Act, and put a few words on the record as for the reasons that we believe it's very important that this type of legislation pass through the Legislature here in Manitoba.

We have modelled this legislation off of legislation that was passed a few years ago in Alberta. It has worked the Alberta government quite well over the course of the last several years and, in particular, it has worked the people of Alberta very well to whereby the Treasury Board in Alberta has found, through a subcommittee, ways of creating efficiencies and making programs that are offered to people in Alberta more effective for those who need it, Mr. Speaker.

I believe that Jean McClennan [*phonetic*], who's a partner at PricewaterhouseCoopers' public sector consulting and deals area, I believe he said it best when he spoke of results-based budgeting. And he said, and I quote: Results-based budgeting is a process to achieve optimum alignment between strategy, budgeting, performance metrics and outcome accountability.

And we believe in those words, Mr. Speaker, and that's why we're bringing forward this legislation. This is not the first time I brought forward this legislation before this House. I've brought it forward several times before, and members opposite have not—have seen fit not to pass the legislation, even though I believe it is in the best interest of the people here in Manitoba because it creates efficiencies and—its accountability of government programming and it allows government to find ways to better deliver those services to the Manitobans who need, want and deserve those services.

We've seen over the course of the last number of years, Mr. Speaker, that we have an NDP government that has spent beyond their means. They've been running budget deficits in this province even at a time when, despite global economic downturn, the

economy here in Manitoba has fared relatively well. There was only one year back in 2009 where it was flat. But yet this government, rather than doing what is fiscally responsible in this province and not run budget deficits because the economy has fared fairly well as it compares to other provinces across the country, but instead they have chosen to continue to spend beyond their means.

And we believe that that is a serious problem here in Manitoba with this NDP government and that's why I think that really they should support this legislation. Because it is Treasury Board that is actually setting up a subcommittee that will be responsible for reviewing, over a three-year period, a third of the programs each year during that period of time, conducting a review, seeing where we can create efficiencies within those programs that are already being delivered and perhaps create efficiencies within that.

And we do know from the Alberta model, they have come through theirs, and they've had a recommendation. They've had several recommendations over the last three years with respect to how they can create efficiencies within the programs that are being delivered to people in Alberta.

But this goes beyond just Alberta, Mr. Speaker. There are other jurisdictions around the world that practise results-based budgeting. Areas such as the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, Denmark, Sweden and even the United Nations General Assembly has adopted results-based budgeting.

This is nothing new. It would be new here in Manitoba, but this is why we need to step out and support this kind of legislation because it is what's in the best interest, I believe, in Manitobans who need, want and deserve the kinds of services that are best able to suit their needs.

So I would encourage members opposite to support this piece of legislation, because this is not about cutting and slashing programs; this is about creating and making programs more efficient and effective, having the results that Manitobans need, want and deserve as a result of the programs and services that are being offered by this NDP government here in Manitoba.

And that's why, I would think—you know, a review has not been conducted yet across the board here, and that's why it's needed. And I think if members opposite really wanted to do—and it really

wanted to focus on the best outcomes and the best results of the services and programs that are being offered here by the government in Manitoba, I would think if they really want the best outcomes that it's incumbent upon them to support this legislation which calls on their own Treasury Board—so it would be the Minister of Finance that would oversee it—and they would support this. It would be a subcommittee of the Treasury Board that would conduct this review over a three-year period, and a third, a third of the third programs each year for three years.

* (10:10)

And some of the results that have come out of Alberta are quite amazing, actually, and some of the efficiencies that they have created. Even the minister at the time, minister of finance at the time, said, and I quote: We have learned much from this process by looking at budgeting and decision making through a different lens. There is more collaboration between ministries and an enhanced, more strategic understanding of how diverse programs and services work together.

So this is a subcommittee that would be comprised of not only a member of Treasury Board but perhaps other MLAs, as the way it has been done in Alberta, as well as many people in the community, as well, including civil servants and front-line service workers, Mr. Speaker, as well as academics and business leaders in the community. And this legislation leaves it open for that subcommittee to appoint people to the committee to ensure that we have a broader level of consultation that takes place with respect to these programs and services that are being delivered by the Province.

And so we believe that this is the best way to go forward. I think if the government wants to be fiscally responsible and prudent here, to find out where they can create efficiencies, Mr. Speaker, that they would support this legislation, because that's exactly what this legislation does. And I know in the past that members opposite have refused to support this legislation that has been written in other years where I've brought it forward here in the Legislature. And they have given various reasons for it. And—but they haven't given appropriate reasons, because in ways where you can create efficiencies within existing government programs and services, it's incumbent upon them. This is what they should be doing. This is what the role of government is here in the province of Manitoba. And that's why this should already be being done.

Now, some of them have said that they have been done. But they haven't. There has never been this kind of a comprehensive review of all programs and services being offered and delivered in the province of Manitoba since this NDP government came to power. That's been 16 years, Mr. Speaker. So perhaps there are some programs out there that are duplicate programs, programs that are expected to deliver services to the most needy in our society. But they're not yielding the results, they're not helping those that they were designed, originally, to help. And so if we're not helping those that we're trying to help, then why are we continuing to fund those kinds of programs?

We need to ensure and switch the focus. We know this government is a government of ribbon cutting. We know that they are more concerned with going out and making announcements about millions of dollars being spent on various programs. We know they're more concerned with photo opportunities just prior to elections, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that they get re-elected. But that's not what Manitobans are looking for. They're looking for leadership on this. They're looking for outcomes.

Manitobans want to know that the services and programs that are being offered and delivered here in the province of Manitoba are working for those that need it the most, Mr. Speaker. And so I would think, if members opposite are concerned, truly concerned, about programs and services being delivered to the most needy and vulnerable in our society, that they would switch their outlook, that they would look at outcomes and not about inputs. It's not about the millions of dollars going into a photo opportunity for this NDP government just prior to an election. That may sound good, but it doesn't necessarily say what the outcome is. How many people are those millions of dollars for those ribbon cuttings helping in the province of Manitoba?

And so, Mr. Speaker, that's why I encourage all members of this House to support this legislation today. It's important for the most needy and vulnerable in our society.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate on this matter? Or, pardon me, questions for the sponsor of the bill?

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 1st, the opposition Finance critic, the member for Morden-Winkler (Mr. Friesen), was asked on CJOB radio what his plans would be if he

ever had the chance to bring in a budget. And he refused over and over again to offer a plan.

Now, the last time we had a PC government in Manitoba, we saw their review of results-based budgeting. That was to hire Connie Curran, an American consultant who they paid millions of dollars to advise on deep cuts to health care.

If the member's concerned about transparency and accountability with Manitobans, as she claims in reintroducing this bill, I'd like to ask the member when she will come clean and tell us and all Manitobans about the Progressive Conservative plans to cut services and programs that Manitobans rely on.

Mrs. Stefanson: Well, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the member for the question. And I think what's important here is that in Bill 209, is, in fact, creating efficiencies in a transparent and accountable way for government, and that's exactly what we're trying to do with this legislation. So I would think if the NDP is incumbent upon supporting that kind of a program that they would support this legislation today.

Mr. Dave Gaudreau (St. Norbert): Mr. Speaker, the member speaks of transparency, but when the Conservatives were last in office their budget consultation involved them inviting guests. They talked to their friends about what to do with Manitoba's money, but they didn't include the public in those consultations.

Two town hall meetings with 6,200 people attending them is how we've been consulting with people. We've also included people with mail-ins and asking people to attend meetings with the Finance Minister. What we want is the budget to reflect what Manitobans want for the province.

So I'd like to ask the Conservative member across the floor that the bill doesn't include any public consultation in it. Does the member plan to talk to Manitobans about this or just all of their rich friends and Connie Curran?

Mrs. Stefanson: Mr. Speaker, and I want to thank the member for the question, but I think if he had a chance to peruse the bill, he will see quite clearly that there is ample amount of opportunity for public consultation, much more than the kinds of public consultation that they conduct across the way that is nothing more than smoke and mirrors.

Mr. Swan: In that same interview on Monday, October 1st, the Finance critic for the opposition, the

member for Morden-Winkler (Mr. Friesen) was asked on CJOB a question about efficiencies by pointing to sole-source contracts, and the member even spoke about contracts which were used in times of emergency. And, in essence, what the Progressive Conservative Finance critic said is that he would wait for flood waters to recede and wait for a tendering process than actually get services to Manitobans in time of need.

Could the member please confirm that this is the kind of results-based budgeting that we could expect from a Progressive Conservative government?

Mrs. Stefanson: In fact, Mr. Speaker, if this legislation is passed through the Legislature now, it's the NDP government that's in power right now. They have the ability to set up this results-based budgeting through their Treasury Board. This is regardless of who is in power. They're responsible and they could take action here and do the right thing for those most vulnerable people in our society and to protect them so that they have the outcomes with the programs and services that are most needed for the most vulnerable in our society.

Mr. Gaudreau: Mr. Speaker, the member talks about results but we've got results here. We've got the second lowest unemployment rate and we've got the biggest job growth in the country. So, on Monday, October 1st, when the Finance critic for the Conservatives was asked on CJOB what he would do to balance the budget, repeatedly he refused to say that he would not cut services that Manitobans rely on, like health care and education.

Will the member today please stand up and tell Manitobans that they will not cut critical services like they did the last time when they were in government?

Mrs. Stefanson: And this whole legislation is all about that, Mr. Speaker. It's about creating efficiencies and making those programs and services more effective delivery services for those who need it most.

I am concerned that members opposite are afraid of that, Mr. Speaker. What are they afraid of? This is a time that they have to create those efficiencies, to make it a more transparent and accountable process for those most vulnerable people are in our society.

Why will they not support this? What are they afraid of?

Mr. Swan: Well, I'm interested to hear the member talk about vulnerable people because one of her colleagues, just the other day, said that he would stop the Maintenance Enforcement Program from collecting child support payments and spousal support payments. And it's clear, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Conservatives still believes in the same reckless policies as the last time we had a Conservative government in Manitoba. And, indeed, he mentioned that his budget would cut \$550 million out of services that Manitobans rely upon.

We know when he was a senior minister, the Leader of the Opposition cared more about people at the boardroom table than people at the kitchen table. Our budget has a balanced approach towards creating good jobs, growing our economy and building opportunities.

*(10:20)

Mr. Speaker, I ask the member again: What cuts to core services could we expect from a Progressive Conservative government?

Mrs. Stefanson: Mr. Speaker, this is all about creating transparency, creating efficiencies within existing government programs, and I encourage members opposite to, in fact, read the bill because I think if they did, they may see fit to actually support it.

But, instead, we know, Mr. Speaker, we know that this is nothing but politics for them. It's unfortunate because those most vulnerable people in our society deserve better than a government that is more concerned with their own political outcome than they are for the outcome of services and programs for the most vulnerable people in our society.

Mr. Gaudreau: Mr. Speaker, our government knows that Manitoba families rely on key services such as education and health care and child care, and in our budget in 2015 we continue to build on these.

We heard from the member from Lakeside that he thinks it's a burden on businesses for them to collect maintenance enforcement to help families stay out of poverty, Mr. Speaker. Is that the kind of results-based budgeting that we can expect from them?

When they were last in power they fired 1,000 nurses, laid off 700 teachers and cut \$8 million from child-care centres and parent fees more than doubled in the province. Our investments in

education and child care and making good jobs and life affordable for Manitobans is clear. That's the results in Manitoba.

What does the Leader of the Conservative Party want to do and make—why would the Leader of the Conservative Party want to make families more—less affordable here in Manitoba—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for St. Norbert's (Mr. Gaudreau) time on the question has elapsed.

Mrs. Stefanson: I'm not sure there was a question in that preamble, Mr. Speaker, but I will make a few comments.

And I would say that, you know, the member is quite right. In fact, Manitobans do rely on services that are being delivered in the province of Manitoba. What's unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, is that we're dead last in education. We're dead last in health-care services. We're dead last when it comes to our child-welfare system. We have more children in care than any other province across this can—across this country.

This is a spend-more, get-less government, Mr. Speaker, and it's unfortunate that they do not see fit to support a bill that would create better efficiencies among the services and programs that are being delivered here in Manitoba that would be there for those that are most vulnerable—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member's time on this answer has expired.

Hon. James Allum (Minister of Education and Advanced Learning): That proved to be much more entertaining than I thought it was going to be. It's—it was really quite interesting.

So, you know, the member has put this bill before this House on several occasions. It's like this blue box I'm looking at, and she just keeps recycling the same old thing over and over and over. I hear her say that she keeps hoping, but, you know, we're never going to do this, and so you see, I heard one of the members say well, what are you afraid of? Well, let's be perfectly honest: we're afraid of you and we're afraid of your leader and we're afraid of your agenda for Manitobans. It's a frightening, frightening scenario for Manitobans.

And then what we also know, that when the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable minister's time on this question has elapsed.

Mrs. Stefanson: I keep bringing this bill forward in the hopes, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite may get it one day and support it. That's—clearly that may not happen in the foreseeable future and they will continue to implement programs that are not properly servicing Manitobans, that, in the case of the member that just asked the question, the Minister of Education of our province, that is not serving our children well, in fact, is placing them dead last in our country. Those are not the needs, wants and desires of children in our province. We should be better. We should be better servicing our children in this province to ensure that they are protected.

Those people deserve to have the programs that they need, Mr. Speaker. I hope members opposite will support us.

Mr. Gaudreau: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite asked about—talked about Alberta having results-based budgeting underneath Prentice government.

How did that work out for them, running billions of dollars in deficits, billions, even with record oil revenues, Mr. Speaker? She wants to talk about how great their party is—with financial management. How about the fact that under the Conservative government we've seen \$169 billion added to the deficit and the Harper government ran deficits straight for eight years. How about that Stats Canada report that under the Harper government household debt to GDP skyrocketed? We can tell where their priorities are.

So I want to know from the member opposite if their results-based budgeting is to see Manitobans' household debts skyrocket like it has for Canadians underneath the Conservative—former Conservative government, thankfully.

Mrs. Stefanson: Mr. Speaker, we need only look at the NDP track record when it comes to the increase in debt in this province, and under this Premier (Mr. Selinger) it's more than doubled since he became the Premier in the province. It's unfortunate, and if they want to talk about Alberta they need only look that there's an NDP government that's about to run the largest deficit in the history of that province.

So I think that we need not learn from members opposite, Mr. Speaker. We learn from Manitobans every day, and we learn from them what they want and they need, and that is the delivery of programs that yield the results that are for the most vulnerable people in our society.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Time for oral questions on this bill have elapsed.

Now, is there any debate on this legislation?

The honourable Minister of Education, for second readings of Bill 209.

Mr. Allum: I didn't get to ask my question earlier because there was so much to say and to premise it so I—let me just go back to where I was a few moments ago and say—remind the folks that when you say what you're afraid of, we've made it crystal clear, we're afraid of you. We're afraid of your agenda. We're afraid of your leader—

Mr. Speaker: Please, I want to caution members of the House and, in particular, the Minister of Education, when he's placing his comments, please place them through the Chair.

Mr. Allum: My apologies, Mr. Speaker; you're absolutely right.

What I meant to say, through you to the opposition, is that you're quite right, we're absolutely afraid of them. We're afraid of their leader. We're afraid of their agenda for Manitoban. We know that when the member from Tuxedo gets up to talk about results-based budgeting, that's code. And the code is for substantial and reckless cuts to the very programs and services that she's talking about. And then for the member from Tuxedo, of all places, to talk about the most vulnerable in our society is really quite rich and something that I, frankly, in my view is quite unforgivable.

The government constantly goes through program evaluation. I do it in my department. Others do it in their departments. Treasury Board's constantly doing it, and we are looking for results. We don't need some phony results-based budgeting bill which really masquerades as a list of cuts the member wants to make if she ever—God forbid—if she ever should get her hands on the wheel of government. We're never going to permit that to happen. We're never going to go down a process where she's going to invent some phony criteria to cut education, to cut health care, to cut child care—well, they've never actually done child care but to cut child care.

And I hear the one member say it's all about results, but their definition of results is frankly quite alarming, because their record shows—*[interjection]* If the member from Tuxedo would let me speak for just a moment, their record shows that they're

interested in one thing and one thing only: that's to cut a half a billion dollars from the budget and forget about real balance in our society and in our economy.

So they want to talk about results, well, we can do that. Manitoba's creating jobs faster than any other province in 2015 and we have the second lowest unemployment rate in the country. Let me say that again for her: Manitoba is creating jobs faster than any other province in 2015 and we have the second lowest unemployment rate.

Mr. Speaker, those are results, but she denies it. Every day she gets up in this House, creates some fanciful statistics that she pulls from the air, takes things out of context, but the real facts—the real facts is that this government is standing with Manitobans. We're creating jobs. We're developing the economy and it's a fairer, more just community for all Manitobans. It's something they've never done in their history, and just a week ago, eight days ago, this government, this country, said no to the very kind of agenda that this opposition has in mind.

An Honourable Member: They said no to you guys.

* (10:30)

Mr. Allum: No, I am frankly—when the member says they said no to the NDP, they said no to the Conservative Party of Canada, and in very short order they're going to be saying no to the Conservative Party of Manitoba, and the reason for that is because we stand shoulder to shoulder with Manitobans. We're on their side. We invest in public services because we believe in public services, and we're never ever going to lay down for these guys across the floor. We're going to fight them every stretch of the way, and in short order we're going to be back for a fifth term and they will be back where they belong in opposition.

The truth of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that this government has gone through four mandates supported by the people of Manitoba. And they've done that—we've won four elections in a row—and we've done that because we stand with Manitobans, because we invest in public services, because we invest in education and we invest in health care.

Let's just take education as an example, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, the member got up and asked me a question about capital spending on education in Manitoba: \$1.4 billion have been spent renewing our education system after the disgrace and

the mess that they left behind during the 1990s; 35 new or renovated schools in Steinbach, in Morden-Winkler, new schools all across the province; in addition to that, new gyms at schools all across the province; new science labs all across the province; new shops; new trades training; new shops; state-of-the-art facilities so the kids have not only the education, but the skills they need to get into the job market.

But the interesting thing—*[interjection]* And I hear the member for Morden-Winkler (Mr. Friesen) calling across the floor, and he's saying, more debt, more debt, more debt. You know, that just goes to show you what their agenda actually is for Manitobans. They intend to cut services. They intend to cut investments in education. Because the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, they don't really care about Manitobans. They care about their friends at the Manitoba Club. That's what the Opposition Leader stands for. He stands for a very few, and then they bring out their charitable notions, their old standby of noblesse oblige. They don't believe in a fairer economy. They don't believe in a more equitable economy.

When it came time to vote on creating inclusive schools and inclusive classrooms, what did the members opposite do? They voted against it. They wouldn't support—

An Honourable Member: Point of order.

Point of Order

Mr. Speaker: Member for Steinbach (Mr. Goertzen), on a point of order.

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Official Opposition House Leader): It's a point of order, but I suspect I should have raised it as a House matter.

But I believe there was an agreement between the Government House Leader (Mr. Chomiak) and myself, and I'll apologize to other members who weren't informed of this, that we were going to be moving at 10:30 to the bill sponsored by the honourable member for Assiniboia.

So as soon as the minister of whatever he is these days wraps up, then we'll move to the other bill.

Mr. Speaker: Just on the—are you rising—Minister of Education—rising on the same point of order?

Mr. Allum: On the same point of order.

Mr. Speaker: On the same point of order.

Mr. Allum: Mr. Speaker, my friend's quite right across the way. It is true that it was my understanding, too, that we would be winding up debate on the results-based budgeting bill, that same old piece of legislation that keeps being recycled in this House, that we would be done that at 10:30 and moving on to other more important business in this Chamber.

I actually, Mr. Speaker, was waiting for you to end my time. So my apologies for going on, if that's what happened.

Mr. Speaker: On the point of order raised by the honourable member for Steinbach, while I understand that the members may have had some understanding or an agreement amongst the sides of the House with respect to the timing of the debate on the legislation, I needed to have some clear indication to allow me to put the question to the House.

And so while I listened carefully to the comments with respect to the point of order, I must respectfully rule that there is no point of order.

* * *

Mr. Speaker: But if there is an agreement of the House to adjourn the debate on Bill 209 now, and that has to be in agreement to the House, so I'm asking, is there leave for that matter to reflect that the House will adjourn now and we'll proceed on with debate to bill—the debate will adjourn, pardon me, on this Bill 209? *[Agreed]*

Okay, and we'll now—and the honourable member for—Minister of Education will have three minutes remaining.

Bill 210—The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: And we'll now proceed to call Bill 210, The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act.

Mr. Jim Rondeau (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member from St. Norbert, that Bill 210, The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la location à usage d'habitation, now be read a second time and referred to a committee of this House.

Motion presented.

Mr. Rondeau: I'm pleased to present Bill 210.

I believe 210 is a win for renters, a win for landlords, a win for the environment in future, and a

win for the province. The bill requires landlords to replace appliances such as fridges, toilets with ENERGY STAR or water-efficient appliances only if and when they need replacements. It does not require landlords to make capital expenses if the fridge or toilet is working. It only comes into play if and when the appliance needs to be changed or replaced.

The items that need—will be included in this bill will be listed in regulations. Appliances that do not have at least a 25 per cent return on investment would not be recommended in this regulation. The advantage of ENERGY STAR, or energy-efficient appliances or water-efficient appliances is that, in terms of fridges, as an example, they have better compressors, they have more insulation, they have better heat-transfer systems, they have a longer service life, which could be up to 30 to 40 per cent, and, therefore, they don't need to be as—replaced as often, so, therefore, the capital expense in this type of investment is less over time.

In terms of fridges, they have to be a minimum of 15 per cent better insulated than mid-efficient fridges, and often they are double the efficiency of low-efficient fridges. An ENERGY STAR fridge, which we had just previously bought, has a usage of 295 kilowatts per year, whereas a mid-efficient was 595 and some low-efficient are much more extreme than that.

And, a clothes washer, which we just purchased, has 35 to 50 per cent less energy use and 60 to 80 litres of water per load less water. Dishwashers have 25 per cent less water and electricity. And this continues. In fact, a toilet that moves from a low-efficient to a high-efficient can have a return on investment of the entire cost in nine to 10 months. So it's truly a huge success.

I'll give you an example of why this bill came to fruition. And, it's quite simple. We have a condo that we rent out, and we went to a retailer and we were going to purchase a fridge for this. And we were looking at ENERGY STAR fridges that were available in the 549 to 599 range. The mid-efficient fridges were 499 to 529. So, what we did was we looked at the return on investment. Basically, it showed that the energy saved was between \$60 and \$70 a year on the one appliance. That means the entire fridge, the difference in the fridge, was about nine months of cost.

Now, the other thing that's interesting is that, if you look at the costs, simple things like a chest-type

freezer—and I'll go through some of these comparisons—a chest-type freezer is—uses about 658 kilowatts per month, whereas an ENERGY STAR one uses only 326 a month. The old fridge, and I used another example of a very commonly bought fridge, an old fridge which is mid-efficient, not low efficient, is 479 a month. A new fridge is 295.

* (10:40)

Frost-free fridge freezer: energy-efficient one uses 450 kilowatts, the non-energy efficient mid-efficient uses 1,044, where old ones use up to 1,500 kilowatts per year. And this goes on and on as far as hot water heating, as far as toilets, et cetera, and so it is really amazing to see the amount of money that you could save.

So I started looking at it and said, okay, if the difference in price is \$75, what's the difference as far as the renter? Well, if the renter is paying the electric bills, then what happens is if the difference in price is \$50 or \$100, they would save that much money almost in a single year.

As far as a toilet, they would—and they're paying the water bills—the renter's paying the water bills, they would save that much money on their rent in nine months to 10 months. So this is very, very good for the tenants.

Now, you look at the landlord's case, and a lot of land—I have to admit, we do own a few properties that we rent out. But on that case, here's what the truth—we did—is we actually replaced the toilets. Why did we replace the toilets in our apartments that we're renting? And the reason is because it was a good investment, because we took a water bill and we almost cut it by 40 per cent. And so this was a very, very effective thing and it's also very, very good for the tenants because they get new, efficient appliances.

I want to assure the House that we've done the math. I then sent it to other people who've done the math and have said that this is a win for both landlords and tenants. I'd also like to reiterate that when we looked at it, we said, okay, does it really cost landlords more? Because they're going to have to put forward the \$75 early or the \$50 early. Well, here's the deal. When they put forward the money, the life of the product will be extended by 25 to 40 per cent—because it's got a better compressor; it's got better mechanics; it's got better insulation in their fridge or freezer. In the case of a washer, it is

very much more efficient and you might get up to 40 per cent more efficient as far as life expectancy.

So when you don't have to buy or replace it as often, the landlord saves money over time, and so you're not putting out this capital investment on buying cheap; you're buying better, more efficient. And then I look at where else it saves. Well, to be blunt, when I say it's going to be a benefit for the province, here's one of the benefits of the province. We currently continue to expand the water and sewer infrastructure. If we use less water, then the pressure on those systems goes down and our capital expense as a system, as a province, goes down.

And then you sit there and say the same is true for energy infrastructure. If we can lower the demand, we can lower the consumption by all consumers, then what'll happen is we don't have to invest as fast in the dams. So if energy keeps on going up, energy demand keeps on going up 1 to 2 per cent, if we can lower that to 1 per cent or a half a per cent, then our investment in dams in the future can go down.

So I think that this is a wonderful example. I believe that we—if you amortize the 'agditional' cost over 96 months, it comes to \$8.32 on a fridge. And the funny part is that if you do that, what'll happen is the savings are bigger than the investment. So the cost is a lot less—the difference in cost, sorry, I'll rephrase that. The difference in cost is about \$2.09 a month and the savings are in about \$10 a month. So even if the landlord charges the tenant a little bit more money, like, that extra \$2 a month, \$2.09 a month, then what would happen is that the savings would be over \$10 a month, and thus we're—they are ten—\$8 ahead.

So I look at saving—and by the way, I was shocked. When they said that the saving in electricity could be up to \$110 to \$120 for a low-efficient fridge, I was shocked. *[interjection]* That's pretty—I even have my colleague from Dauphin agreeing to this.

So toilets would save about 4,000 gallons a year, which is about \$90 to \$100 of water and, basically, a toilet would save—are you ready for this—about \$2,500 to \$3,000 a—over its lifetime or serviceable lifetime.

So this is real, it saves and I think I'd love a unanimous recommendation to move this forward because it's a not only a triple win but quadruple win for all involved.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Now, as is our practice for questions on second reading of bills, any questions?

Mr. Ron Schuler (St. Paul): I would like to ask the member: What are the prescribed circumstances that a landlord would not need to replace a major appliance which meets energy-efficiency standards?

Mr. Rondeau: Basically, if it could be repaired, then the landlord would be able to continue to repair it. It's only if it needed to be replaced would the landlord need to replace it. So if a toilet was totally not functioning, it would be replaced and that's on the call of the landlord.

Mr. Dave Gaudreau (St. Norbert): I would like to ask if the member can tell us what the cost return is for the investment of a toilet for the renters.

Mr. Rondeau: The renter can save enough money so that the return on investment, if there's one single toilet with two occupants, it's basically nine- to 10-months return on investment for the difference in cost, and it's really good. In fact, they can save up to \$100 to \$110 a year on a toilet.

Mr. Speaker: Further questions?

Mr. Schuler: What are the prescribed circumstances that a landlord would not need to replace a toilet which meets water efficiency standards?

Mr. Rondeau: Basically, the regulations, as I envision them, would say that if the toilet was functioning then it would not have to be replaced. If the toilet was not functionable or not fixable, then they'd have to replace it.

Mr. Gaudreau: So I'd like to ask the member what the cost savings for the mid-efficiency and high-efficiency fridges would be for towards the tenants.

Mr. Rondeau: The interesting cost would be about \$6.53 per month minimum for mid to high, and it could be up to \$10 per month for low to high-efficient. So it could save about \$120 or about \$75 for mid-efficient to high-efficient.

Mr. Schuler: What are the current price differences between ENERGY STAR and non-ENERGY STAR major appliances?

Mr. Rondeau: In the case of a fridge, it can be as little as \$45 to about \$200. In the case of a frost-free fridge, again, it's about \$75. In the case of a toilet, it's less than \$100. So, again, that's why it does vary according to the attributes to the fridge or freezer,

whether it has a water dispenser, how fancy it is, but basically you can get down to as little as \$50 to \$100 difference in cost between mid-efficient and high-efficient and so that it's not expensive in any way, shape or form.

Mr. Gaudreau: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the member, we do have the lowest cost of home heating, auto insurance and electricity in the country, so I'd ask the—I'd like to ask if this bill fits in with making the renter more efficient in the current system. Would it cost the renters any more than it currently does?

Mr. Rondeau: Because of the way the rent increases are calculated, it goes according to the employer's—or the landlord's costs. If the landlord costs are lower, then the rent increases will be lower. And, No. 2, this will not in any way cost the landlord more or the tenant more over time. It actually saves money. The return on investment will save money in time, and I did the calculations on whether the tenant pays the bills or the landlord pays the bills, and virtually in all cases it saves money; it saves money over time. And the other interesting part is I actually had to work at about 10 or 12 different mathematical formulas to see what worked and absolutely every one of those worked. So if you take it out over four or five years, every single case works where the replacement to ENERGY STAR makes sense.

* (10:50)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable minister's time on this question has elapsed.

Mr. Schuler: How many landlords will be affected by this legislation?

Mr. Rondeau: All of them.

Mr. Gaudreau: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the member if this would cost the landlords any more than it currently does under the current system.

Mr. Rondeau: No, it won't cost more. Because what happens, if they pay a little bit more for a fridge, that can be considered as part of the rent, but then the savings also have to be part of the rent. And so it will not cost the landlords more, nor will it cost the renters more.

Mr. Schuler: Has the member consulted with the Manitoba Landlords Association, and what did they say?

Mr. Rondeau: I have not consulted with the Landlords Association. However, I have consulted

with a number of landlords, and what I've done with the number of landlords, which included large landlords, is they actually agreed that this made sense. They've already gone to this policy. In fact, part of the landlords who have approached me are rather large landlords, and what they've said is it makes sense. And it was no different than when I was in the store and I knew that I had to pay another \$45, \$50 for the fridge. It made sense because I wouldn't have to replace the fridge as often and I wouldn't have as many issues with it.

Hon. Mohinder Saran (Minister of Housing and Community Development): Sometimes small landlords, they are left with even water bills, and so this also will cost extra money to small landlords.

How do you think that this will be good for the small landlords?

Mr. Rondeau: You're absolutely right.

What happens often if someone's going to skip on the rent, if there's any issues, the landlords generally pay the rent in vast majority of the cases. If they are replacing the toilets to be more water efficient, the small landlords, the medium and large ones will all save money.

The other one is, for the small landlords, if they have to go out and they buy the fridge and they have to buy one fridge every 20 years versus one fridge every 15 years, this will save them money.

And, finally, I wanted to make sure that all landlords were treated equally. When I did the math on my own units that I rent out it made sense, and all the bigger landlords have already—a lot of them have already converted this type of policy.

Mr. Schuler: The member made it very clear this applies to all landlords. He made it very clear that he hasn't spoken to the Manitoba Landlords Association, but stated that he had spoken to some very large individuals who have a lot of apartments—large landlords.

Could he tell us: Who exactly did he consult with?

Mr. Rondeau: I'd have to ask with them first. I have talked to a number that have worked on this and I have brought them up. I will talk to the member privately.

I haven't talked to the individuals, so I'd like to talk to the individuals first and then provide it to him off the record, please.

Mr. Gaudreau: Mr. Speaker, we've recently announced that we're going to be doing a lot of initiative around cleaning up the lakes.

I guess what I'd like to ask the member is, by installing all these low-flow toilets, would this also have an impact on clean water in the lakes and the volume of sewage treatment that the City of Winnipeg would have to treat, and all other jurisdictions?

Mr. Rondeau: Yes. Mr. Speaker, one of the concerns and one of the wins here is that if we reduce the amount of water and sewer in the system, then what would happen is our capital expenditures for the entire province would go down because—therefore, if we're using less water, we're using less toilet flushing. Then there's less pressure on the system to replace the big capital costs of sewage treatment water plants. Thank you.

Mr. Schuler: I mean, it's a little bit concerning that the member brought a bill forward which he didn't consult on. I mean, by his own admission, he did not consult with the Manitoba Landlords Association. He mentions that he did consult with individuals whom he may not speak of and, Mr. Speaker, that is troubling for the Legislature, because if he did consult with them on legislation, then he should be prepared to list who they are. That's common practice. We do that in this Legislature when we consult with somebody that should be public information.

Again, I'd like to ask him: Could he tell this House, who exactly did he consult with?

Mr. Rondeau: Well, in response, Mr. Speaker, I'm open to talk to the Landlords Association. I will call them again today and respond. I will be open to talk to anybody about this bill, and I'd be happy to show them my numbers, et cetera.

So I would suggest—I would agree with my member from St. Paul, my friend from St. Paul, I think that what we do is need to prove that this does work. The math works.

So if you have a list of people you want me to call and discuss I'd be pleased to meet with them because I'll tell you I tried to poke holes in this bill, I couldn't find them and I'd be very, very open to talk to the Landlords Association, large landlords, small landlords, medium-sized landlords, because I really believe in what this does. And I'd also be happy to talk to the renters association because I think this

wins. So I'm open to conversations. Hopefully we can move this forwards.

Mr. Speaker: Time for questions on this bill have elapsed.

Is there any debate on this matter?

Mr. Schuler: This was the first time I had the opportunity to participate in a question period on a piece of legislation and I think it was a—something that was done previously and it's now been brought back, and I think it's a good exercise, and I think it's an important part of the legislative process, and was pleased to be part of it this morning. And, you know, what it did do is point out to a member who brought forward legislation that consultation is important.

I was also going to ask him if he had participated with any of the tenants associations to get their feedback on it, and generally do what is done with legislation is shop it around and ask what individuals think, send it out. I know he hasn't spent a lot of time on the backbenches, and I'd like to welcome to the backbenches. I see he now shares the same row I do and it's a different vantage point sitting here than from where he was previously. But it is important to take these bills and take them out and go speak to different organizations and different people and do it in a very upfront and truthful fashion.

I know he is stepping back from politics so I hesitate to be too critical of him because he has indicated he's not going to be running, but I would suggest to him that it was his party in the last election that went door to door, knocked on every door, and said by the way, we are promising an exorbitant amount of promises and we will not raise taxes. We will not raise taxes on tenants, on tenants who want to perhaps, let's say, put insurance on their apartment, and the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) was one of the leadership who came up—the member for Kildonan was the individual who came up with the policy to mislead the public on the PST. He is the—one of the great oracles of the NDP who came up with this great policy that talk about a PST increase before the election, keep it quiet, don't tell anybody the truth. You'll go door to door and tell people exactly the opposite, and then he was one of the masterminds who brought in the PST after the election, and he too will have to go door to door and account for that.

But the individuals that we are talking about in Bill 210 are the very individuals that were attacked by this government. They're the ones that were

attacked with the PST increase. They were attacked by the broadening of the PST, Mr. Speaker, when they went to go and renew their insurance for their apartment, or get insurance for their apartment, they found out for the first time ever under this NDP and under the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak), the member for Kildonan who actually sat on this one and hid it from the public as a member of Cabinet, who held this information away from the tenant, every tenant who has insurance now must pay PST. And then, if that wasn't bad enough, a year later they raise the PST on them, the very people that they purport to stand up for.

What Bill 210 is is actually an individual, the member for Assiniboine, and I believe that he's trying his best against what's going on in the NDP. I mean, even he bailed out of the SS Titanic NDP and not even he can run for them this time around, Mr. Speaker. This piece of legislation is one that is sad because it really does highlight what the NDP did. The member for Kildonan, the great oracle of the NDP, the individual who foresaw what was going on and made sure—and I'm sure he sat at the Cabinet table and said a PST increase—

* (11:00)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order, please.

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

RESOLUTIONS

Res. 16—Calling on the Federal Government to Work with Manitoba

Mr. Speaker: It is now time for private members' resolutions, and the resolution under considered this morning is sponsored by the honourable member for Tyndall Park, and the title of the resolution is Calling on the Federal Government to Work with Manitoba.

Mr. Ted Marcelino (Tyndall Park): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Gaudreau),

WHEREAS the provincial government works with its federal partners regarding shared progressive values and priorities; and

WHEREAS it is important to Manitoba to have a federal partner that is at the table working for a progressive agenda that helps Manitobans; and

WHEREAS the provincial government is a government with progressive values, and having

progressive governments at the provincial and federal levels allows for more priorities to be accomplished; and

WHEREAS the Premier has called for a national inquiry into missing and murdered indigenous women and girls, and the provincial government looks forward to the federal government calling this inquiry; and

WHEREAS all Manitoba students have the right to a good education, and it is anticipated that the federal government will provide full education funding and support federally funded on-reserve schools; and

WHEREAS the provincial government understands that affordable, accessible child care supports families and allows children to get a strong start and looks forward to the new Prime Minister being an active partner in building a strong public system rather than privatizing child care as called for by some; and

WHEREAS investing in infrastructure helps create good jobs, and a federal partner will allow for more building infrastructure across Manitoba; and

WHEREAS the new Prime Minister has promised major new investments into northern and remote roads such as the east-side road and Freedom Road, and the provincial government will be at the table to partner on those projects; and

WHEREAS Manitobans work hard and deserve to have income security when it's time to retire, and the newly elected Prime Minister has committed to reversing the rollback of eligibility for OAS and CPP and increase the benefits seniors receive; and

WHEREAS Canadians, including Manitobans, take pride in having a universal health-care system, and the provincial government looks forward to having a new and fully engaged federal partner to help deliver more and better health care to Manitobans.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba congratulate the newly elected government of Canada; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly be urged to work closely with the provincial government and the government of Canada to be an active partner in making life better for Manitoba families; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly urge the provincial government to continue to reject calls from the opposition to cut and privatize services and instead continue working to deliver on the priorities of Manitobans in conjunction with its new and progressive federal partner.

Mr. Speaker: It's been moved by the honourable member for Tyndall Park (Mr. Marcelino), seconded by the honourable member for St. Norbert (Mr. Gaudreau),

WHEREAS the provincial government works with its federal partners regarding shared progressive values and priorities; and

WHEREAS it is important to Manitoba to have a federal partner that is at the table working for a progressive agenda that helps Manitobans and—dispense?

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense. *[interjection]* I—sorry, I thought I heard one.

The resolution is in order.

Mr. Marcelino: It's always with great pleasure to be able to speak up about something so dear to my heart.

This motion, this resolution, is a testament to the attitude that the provincial government has taken when it involved the federal government. We have always sought to co-operate and affirm the nature of our Confederation.

It is only fitting that when the previous government was elected out, that we cheered in some ways—in more ways than one, actually—I finished a whole bottle of wine. And, of course, it was in celebration of a confederation of our government and our society, the co-operation that we always espoused, promoted and affirmed every time that we asked the federal government to please take a look at the interests of our province. We have always attempted to present our case.

Canadians and Manitobans have elected a federal government that promised to make strong investments in health, education, child care, retirement security, roads, First Nations issues and other priorities that the provincial government espouses, promotes, and we are very thankful that we will have a good partnership with the new federal government.

It is the silver lining in cloudy days prior to October 20th. The cloudy days, then, involved hatred, fear, division, and it is not Canadian. The Canadian way that I have learned to appreciate during the last 35 and a half years that I was here, as an immigrant, is that we have a society that accepts, that will invite people over, that will share, that will give us most of the hospitality that Canadians have been known the world over. I am a very proud Canadian.

And when we speak about our own destinations in this journey, my real honest-to-goodness attempt at public service is always to be able to point out to the resources that our government, both federal and provincial, have been giving our people.

Mr. Rob Altemeyer, Acting Speaker, in the Chair

Public service is such a thankless job. When I got elected at age 65, even my wife was questioning the wisdom. I told her that maybe I just want to serve and maybe I just want to do a payback. It is a concept that Canadians really appreciate very much.

* (11:10)

In Tyndall Park, Weston and Brooklands and Garden Grove, I have seen changes in the way that things have been. They have accepted that an immigrant could be their member for the Legislative Assembly. They voted me in and, in return, I have expressed with all humility and with all due respect the obligation that was imposed.

You know what that obligation, Mr. Speaker or Mr. Deputy Speaker, means to me? It means that I have to behave the way that I am expected to be: a gentleman, a very good public servant, a good legislator whose intention is always to serve the people of this province as a whole.

When we went to Churchill, I accompanied the Minister of Finance and I saw the beauty of the North. When we went to Thompson, I saw the variety of fauna and flora and I said, wow, aren't we missing something if we do not promote it.

When I saw that bear inside the jail when it was caught near the town of Churchill, it was a pregnant bear, 958 pounds all in all. It winked at me and I told the conservation officer, I said, I think that bear likes me. And I attempted to get a little bit nearer and he says—the conservation officer said, don't get any nearer; she likes you for lunch.

And I found myself really mesmerized by the beauty of those animals that we have been trying to

conserve and preserve for our children and grandchildren.

The government that we have in Manitoba has always shown itself as the promoter of the best interests of our province. There's no doubt about it. I have seen it close up and I have seen it personally. That all of the elected people in this Legislature have always been with the best interests of all our people at heart, and I thank you for all of the service that you do, Mr. Speaker, and we, at this side of the House, will continue to be doing that during the next 20 more years or until such time that I die.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Official Opposition House Leader): Mr. Acting Speaker, I'm asking for leave of the House, even though our agreement on the rules doesn't allow for question period, a 10-minute question period of the sponsor of a private member's resolution until after the election. I'm going to be asking for leave for a 10-minute question-and-answer period for the sponsor of the resolution, in accordance with the spirit of the agreement that we've come up to. So I'm asking for that leave.

The Acting Speaker (Rob Altemeyer): I will put the question to the House.

The request has been for a 10-minute question period on the motion before us. Is there leave to allow that to happen? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): Mr. Speaker, I ask the mover of the resolution—the Federal Liberals in their campaign indicated that they want to eliminate mandatory minimum sentences for those who deal drugs. I wonder if, in the spirit of co-operation, this government intends to co-operate with the Liberals on the elimination of mandatory minimum sentences.

Mr. Marcelino: I thank the member for the question. It's a very specific question that could be answered specifically, but, then, the resolution that we have, that I have proposed, is just to indicate the mental attitude of co-operation in all the issues that will face us on a day-to-day basis. Thank you.

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the member bringing this important resolution before the House, gives us an opportunity to ask a few questions and to delve a little bit deeper. So I do appreciate that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I—we had seen in the last federal election that many Canadians see the value in investing in our economy through direct government investment in core infrastructure, a plan certainly that is not foreign to us here in Manitoba and something I think that many Canadians see the value in, whether it be in the outcome in jobs created or infrastructure improved. I know my own area, \$200-million overpass being built which was—couldn't be built before.

Can the member just talk a little bit more about infrastructure and the importance in the Manitoba economy?

Mr. Marcelino: Mr. Speaker, the question is an easy one. The thrust of all the programs of the provincial government is to create jobs, steady jobs, because austerity never worked. It was seen in Europe when Greece was asked to be cheap on the public service, to cut employment. It didn't work. Greece almost went down the tubes.

In this province we have stimulated the economy—

The Acting Speaker (Rob Altemeyer): Order. The honourable member's time has elapsed.

I'll just remind everyone, it is a 45-second time block for both the question and the answer.

Mr. Goertzen: Mr. Speaker, the member's resolution is about working co-operatively with the federal government. There's been discussion among those in the federal Liberal Party about bringing back the failed long-gun registry to criminalize farmers and hunters.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the provincial government is now committing to working together with the federal government to bring back the failed long-gun registry.

Mr. Marcelino: Mr. Speaker, the larger issue of the long-gun registry and all other little issues—*[interjection]* The social issues of poverty and employment is always at the top of our priorities.

It's not the long guns that you have.

Mr. Wiebe: I understand there's differences, Mr. Speaker, in the issues that people hear on the doorstep. But I can't image that the member for Steinbach, if he were out today knocking on doors in his home constituency, would not hear issues about child care, because that's what I get on the doorstep every single day.

This government has been a strong proponent of a strong child-care system throughout the province, and now, I believe, we have some opportunity with the federal government.

I'd like to ask the member how we plan to work together with the federal government to improve our child-care service delivery here in Manitoba.

Mr. Marcelino: I thank the member for the question, another easy one. We have created—

An Honourable Member: Harder ones coming.

Mr. Marcelino: We have—keep them coming—we have created more child-care spaces, but there's more that are needed.

* (11:20)

One of the problems of those parents—I have 11 grandkids—one of the problems is the provision of daycare, and it's a good thing that I have my wife who has retired and she substitutes for the parents of the younger ones—

The Acting Speaker (Rob Altemeyer): Order. The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Goertzen: Mr. Speaker, one of the things that the federal Liberals ran on was the reduction of expenditures at the federal level by 1 per cent.

I wonder if the member will be working co-operatively with the government to cut expenditures in the federal government by 1 per cent.

Mr. Marcelino: The 1 per cent cut is—in the question itself—is reflective of the difference in the approaches that the Conservatives have from our New Democratic government. They speak of cuts. We speak of investments. Thank you.

Mr. Jim Rondeau (Assiniboia): Currently CentrePort's in my constituency, and I'm worried about how CentrePort can grow, our economy can grow, new jobs can be created. I'm wondering if there's a way that you believe that the province can work with the new federal government on increasing employment and working with CentrePort to develop.

Mr. Marcelino: I have been to the CentrePort project over the last four years. I visit it because it's so near my own place, Tyndall Park, and the municipality of Rosser, which is also benefiting from the creation of that CentrePort project, has always been very supportive. Our government has been

contributing enough funds in order to make it, to make a go of it.

And I know of some proposals from people from outside the province who have projects from inside—

The Acting Speaker (Rob Altemeyer): Order. The honourable member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Goertzen: The federal Liberals have committed to legalizing marijuana; that would probably include some provincial regulation.

I wonder if the member has already committed to working co-operatively to bring forward the legalization of marijuana in the province.

Mr. Marcelino: It's the same answer that I had. Those small issues about legalization of marijuana or the creation of a long-gun registry, those are smaller issues that do not concern us too much. Social justice does not involve legalization of marijuana or long-gun registry; social justice is at the forefront of all that we do as a party.

Hon. Mohinder Saran (Minister of Housing and Community Development): Yes, I have two important issues to my—in my constituency.

Number 1, mailboxes: Can we get those home delivery back?

And No. 2, about citizenship that was knowingly made hard for the people so they, people working, but they don't participate in our democratic process. Will we get that easier?

Mr. Marcelino: Just recently I believe that the Canada Post has suspended the imposition of mailboxes in all communities. And we support heartily the desire of Canada Post to revert back to door-to-door delivery. We campaigned hard for the door-to-door delivery in order that all those who cannot go to the mailboxes will have door-to-door delivery.

The Acting Speaker (Rob Altemeyer): This will be our last question.

Mr. Goertzen: Mr. Speaker, the federal Liberal government has committed to rolling back the top limit on contributions to tax-free savings accounts from \$10,000 to \$5,000.

I wonder if the, in the spirit of the resolution, if this government is suggesting that they support this and they want to work together with the federal government's rolling back the TFSA limit.

Mr. Marcelino: I thank the member for the question.

I dabbled with insurance before and sold life insurance for 17 years until I quit. But the TFSA, it is a, shall we say, a vehicle for the rich who have money to spare, to put in. The middle class who do not have money to spare usefully cannot take advantage of that. However—

The Acting Speaker (Rob Altemeyer): Order. The honourable member's time has elapsed.

We will now move to formal debate on the motion before us.

Mr. Goertzen: Well, that was a very helpful and instructive question-and-answer period with the member for Tyndall Park (Mr. Marcelino), Mr. Speaker.

On the one hand, he's talking about a resolution where he wants to work together on a lot of their—lot of issues, but of course, there's some that he doesn't want to speak towards, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think he's done a very thorough job of reading all of the different platforms.

We asked him about the TFSA and I would argue, I mean, one could argue about the upper limit, but he went so far as to say that it's not a very good vehicle for people other than the rich. I can tell you, in speaking with many people who I wouldn't necessarily classify as rich, those that I would classify as trying to save for the future, whether it's their kid's education, of course, they can do that through a TFSA or an RESP. But I know a lot of people who contributed TFSAs that I wouldn't consider wealthy. Now, maybe in the world of the NDP and that rarified air, Mr. Speaker, that they live in, in that tower that reaches 50 storeys in the sky, maybe for them.

Those—the poor people who are struggling just to save for the future and who decide to put a few dollars, whether it's, you know, a couple of hundred dollars or \$1,000 into a TFSA, I would say that that's a very helpful thing, and I wouldn't classify it as something just for the rich.

But now we know the agenda of the government. We know the agenda of the NDP, is that they'll work with the federal Liberals to do certain things that will certainly hurt Manitobans, Mr. Speaker, and we are disappointed by that.

I was interested to hear his answer on the long-gun registry. Of course, he was very vague and didn't

want to say that he wouldn't be supporting the \$1-billion 'boongoggle' which was the failed long-gun-registry, which did nothing, of course, to reduce crime, Mr. Speaker, and—

An Honourable Member: Old news.

Mr. Goertzen: Well, and, of course, I hear the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) saying this is—that this is old news, of course, Mr. Speaker, but, it's new news when his member suggested it might be something that would be coming back. And when you look at what happened there, with the \$1-billion waste of money, I'm shocked—I'm shocked that there's any member in this House who would suggest that they should be looking to bring it back.

I was interested also to hear his answer on the spending reduction of 1 per cent, and I heard the member for Kildonan, in heckling, Mr. Speaker, suggest that that was a terrible sort of thing. I heard the member for Tyndall Park say that that was the difference between him and others.

Actually, if they look back in their own budget only a couple of years ago, they'll see that that's what they proposed. Now, they didn't follow it, of course, Mr. Speaker. They weren't actually able to do what they said they were going to do, and that's no surprise to Manitobans. We hear over and over again that this government doesn't do what they actually propose and say they're going to do. We saw that with the PST; they made a promise about not raising the PST. They said the whole notion was ridiculous.

And then, of course, after the last provincial election, they expanded the PST to include products such as insurance, to include products such as haircuts, Mr. Speaker. And then the year after that, after they expanded the application of the PST, they increased it from 7 to 8 per cent.

So it's no surprise that this government wouldn't necessarily listen to the advice of Manitobans or even follow their own advice, Mr. Speaker. But it was their advice—it was their advice—in their budget by the member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers), the former Finance minister, who came forward and said that they were going to reduce spending by 1 per cent. But now we hear the member for Tyndall Park saying, well, that's a bad idea.

Perhaps they should have a caucus meeting, Mr. Speaker. Now, I know caucus meetings aren't very happy things for the NDP these days, and they must be difficult meetings, and they probably happen infrequently. But they should still—they should still

get together and try to discuss their lines to ensure that they are at least speaking the same thing, even if it's not the truth. They should at least be consistent in being untruthful. And so, they should all get together and perhaps have that discussion.

* (11:30)

So this particular resolution is interesting, when the member for Tyndall Park (Mr. Marcelino) brings it forward and says, oh, we want to work together. But there's a lot of things that we don't want to talk about or there are things that are going to hurt Manitobans, and those are the things we're going to work together on. I don't think that that's good for Manitoba.

What Manitobans expect is for a government to have a professional and a good working relationship with the federal government, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, this government didn't have that with the former government, and, I think, to the detriment of Manitoba in many ways. But they expect that professional relationship, but they also expect the provincial government—the Manitoba provincial government to stand up for the interests of Manitobans.

Ultimately, that is the clear goal that any provincial government should have is to stand up for the interests of Manitobans, Mr. Speaker, and that's not what we heard from the member for Tyndall Park. When he says that he would be open to the return of the failed long-gun registry or he thinks that tax-free savings accounts—and maybe it was the tax-free part that threw him off, you know, anything that's tax-free must be bad according to the NDP. So maybe that's what got him off onto a little bit of a sidetrack.

But when you look at things like trying to roll back the TFSA, or trying to say that it's only for those that are wealthy—well, that's not interest of Manitobans, Mr. Speaker. There are lots of Manitobans. There are lots of—*[interjection]*

Well, and I hear the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) saying, well, you lost the election. So that means there must be no good ideas. That must be his suggestion. Well, of course, that's not true. I mean, everybody knows that in any election those who win and those who lose, there are good ideas on both sides. And so now, the member for Kildonan's perspective is, because there's now a federal Liberal government, that everything they do must be good.

Well, I look forward to hearing him and see if that continues on, Mr. Speaker, if he continues to feel the same way. And I—of course, I didn't get a chance to even ask him about the Senate. Of course, the federal Liberals support the Senate; now, apparently, the NDP do as well.

So we continue to have this sort of dichotomy, Mr. Speaker, where the government, the NDP, say they're going to work together with the new federal government regardless of how bad those ideas or interests are for the province of Manitoba.

Our expectation is that any provincial government will go to Ottawa and will sit down in a professional and a respectful way with their counterparts, whether that's on a ministerial or a premier-to-a-Prime Minister level, and to have those discussions respectfully, but to always have as your clear laser focus, to always have in your target when you go into a meeting in Ottawa or whether those representatives from Ottawa are here in Manitoba, to always have clearly in your target the best interests of Manitobans.

And what we heard from the member for Tyndall Park wasn't the best interests of Manitobans, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that bringing back a boondoggle is in the interests of Manitobans. This government has enough of their own boondoggles, let alone having to bring in other boondoggles. I don't think rolling back the TFSA and saying it's only for those who are somehow wealthy, and that others shouldn't have to—shouldn't—don't avail any positive aspects of it, that's not in the best interests of Manitoba.

The issue regarding even balanced budgets, I mean, the federal Liberals have said they want to assure that there's no balanced budget legislation. Well, I know that that'll ring true to the hearts of New Democrats in this province, Mr. Speaker, but is that in the best interests of Manitobans? They don't want to talk about having a 1 per cent reduction in spending that the Liberals are suggesting and, actually, that the NDP suggested in one of their provincial budgets only two years ago, because none of this this is about doing what's in the best interests of Manitobans.

And that, ultimately, is why this resolution fails. This is the provincial government that has never, never put the interests of Manitobans first, never put the priorities of Manitobans first. It's only put their own priorities first. Now, if there's the—course, the vote tax, and I should have asked about the vote tax,

because I understand that the federal Liberals are also in favour of a vote tax federally. No doubt that'll be coming next, Mr. Speaker. And this is a government that continues to cash the cheques.

We know they can't raise money on their own. We've seen that from the election returns, Mr. Speaker. So they have to take it from Manitobans. So, ultimately, this isn't about this government wanting to work co-operatively with the federal government on the interests of Manitobans, we saw that from the question period. Their agenda's been laid bare. It's not about standing up for the interests of Manitobans, if you're not going to support an ability for families to be able to have money put away and to not be taxed on that money. If you're not going to support reasonable expenditures, if you're going to support the return of boondoggles, how does that help Manitobans?

And so I appreciate the fact that the member for Tyndall Park (Mr. Marcelino) was willing to take questions. It really clarified things for us a lot, Mr. Speaker. We saw clearly what the direction of this government is going to be. It's not going to be to go to Ottawa and to have a respectful dialogue with the Trudeau Liberals, but in a way that puts the interests of Manitobans first. It's not going to be about having the kind of relationship between a federal and provincial government that we would expect between two levels of government. It's going to be about supporting things that hurt Manitobans; it's going to be about not standing up strongly for the best interests of Manitobans. That's a continuation of the pattern that this government has had for years, both in the province of Manitoba and federally.

Well, I'm here to say, Mr. Speaker, that if there is a change of government after the next election, we look forward to having a positive working relationship with the federal government, but even through that positive working relationship with the federal government, we will always—we will always—we will always put the interests of Manitobans first.

Hon. Melanie Wight (Minister of Children and Youth Opportunities): I'm very pleased to be here to speak to this resolution.

I guess, for me, our previous government's desire to win so much that they were prepared to bring in a racist, hateful campaign is what was most disturbing to me. It was a—with great relief that Canadians came through and we saw that that was not to be. That was not what was in the heart of the majority of Canadians, and I'm so grateful for that.

We, of course, work with whatever government is in Ottawa. That is always what we're doing. The problem was, the previous government wasn't at the table. So it's kind of—it was kind of hard to actually work with them when they never came to the table, when they never had a meeting with the first ministers, when they never showed up for that.

So it—and it was interesting to hear the member from Steinbach speaking of MPs as if they had ever stood up for Manitobans. I never saw that happen. It always was a tremendous disappointment to me, Mr. Speaker, that at no time did they ever stand up for us. In fact, they sat in the loge at one point to ensure that the provincial Conservatives didn't stand up for us either, and there was no worry of that; they didn't need to sit in the loge in order to do that because they were never going to have done that. So we never saw them ever fight for what mattered to Manitobans and for our province. So I'm hoping that this new government will be standing up, and our MPs in the city of Winnipeg now will be fighting for the betterment of all for Manitoba.

One of the things that was so hard to get a hold of was the past government's refusal to call an inquiry into missing and murdered indigenous women and girls. And his statement that, I think we should not view this as a sociological phenomenon, was just beyond—it was beyond belief to me. And, you know, we have stood firmly, calling for that inquiry. Our Premier (Mr. Selinger) has been a leader in that area. I'm so grateful that we have a leader that is standing up for the things that matter most to the vulnerable people of our province, and I am so grateful that I believe that this new government will call an inquiry into missing and murdered indigenous women so—and girls.

So there's so many other areas where they just weren't there. I'm hoping that this federal government will also want to put money back into creating jobs for those people with barriers. The past government felt like that was throwing money down the toilet, and actually said words very similar to that effect when they cancelled that and changed the way they did the funding for that. And every province—every province—stood up against that, and it didn't matter because as the past leader said, you know, he was a train rolling through. If you're—you know, get off the track because I don't care. I don't care what you think and—or what the provinces believe.

* (11:40)

So I do have hope. I have hope that on these kinds of bigger issues we will be seeing a government that is at least at the table, who's there and really wants to see Canada grow and progress.

And one of those areas, of course, is in universal child care. So we're really hoping that this government that is now in—I know they were about to bring in a program before they got voted out the last time, and then, of course, when the Conservatives came in they killed that because that is exactly where they're coming from. You know, they got rid of that idea. So we're praying that this time the—this government that's in Ottawa will now bring that forward again. We have made all kinds of investments into child care since we've been in, but we need a federal government that's at the table on these issues, and we believe that they are.

We know what our opposition here wants to do. We know that they have a record of deep cuts to child care and we know that they are not interested in ensuring that there is a universal child-care policy. I believe they've spoken of privatizing it, Mr. Speaker, now. So I'm certainly looking forward to a federal government that will be there to help us do things like—and, you know, we have the lowest child-care fees, for example, in Manitoba, outside of Quebec. And we're hoping that we will see in this federal government somebody who wants to really be working on that and building.

When it comes to infrastructure, well, you know our plan here and how that has stimulated the economy, the jobs that that has created. The private investment that it has attracted to our province has been phenomenal. And I'm very, very proud of that choice that we made to do that, to really be investing. But, again, we were, you know, alone at the table. And so to have a federal government say that they are going to, you know, be investing in infrastructure across the country is a gift that will be a gift for every Canadian, certainly for every Manitoban. It's what we need to see across the country, not only in Manitoba.

So I'm very pleased. We know what the Conservative government in Manitoba believes about that. We know what they did in the past. We know what they've said they're going to do now. They have said they want to cut half a billion dollars out of the budget. But it's not only that, Mr. Speaker. They're not builders. We saw over and over the last time they were in government: they don't build anything. They don't build anything. They mothball projects, they

cut seats—even when it's things like do we build doctors, they don't build doctors. So when it comes to actual buildings, when it comes to roads, they didn't build those. In fact, the entire North wasn't even on their map the last time they were—when they were in government. And they don't build the infrastructure of people.

I think of my own department. I went to an event where I—we were celebrating some of the good outcomes in early childhood development. And the room was full of people from the North, and they had just recently in the last few years really gotten excited and interested in early childhood development. They were getting training, and I was giving this speech in celebration only to learn that half of the room had received their pink slips from the federal government because they were cutting that on reserves. It was heartbreaking. It was absolutely heartbreaking.

And so to have a government in Ottawa that wants to build not only buildings but brains, building children's brains, which we want to be doing—*[interjection]* Yes, it's an infrastructure. You may never have heard of it. The member opposite may never have heard of that before, but it is building on the infrastructure of people—*[interjection]* Yes. Children's brains actually grow by stimulation, by having the right nutrients, all of those kinds of things. And that is actually what it's referred to now. And so we want a federal government at the table, Mr. Speaker, who is going to be doing that kind of thing. And we won't see the same kind of heartbreak that we have seen from the past Conservative government and the past one that we saw here in Manitoba that did not build anything, but cut.

And so I am looking so forward to us having the opportunity to work with the new government and do our very best to do the best for all of Manitobans.

Mr. Doyle Pivniuk (Arthur-Virden): Deputy Speaker, I would like to put a few words on the record for this private member's resolution. Talk about federal government working with Manitoba.

First, I want to congratulate Mr. Trudeau and his team for their victory. Also I want to congratulate all the members who are going to be returning and all the new ones that have actually been elected for this time around.

I'd like to also thank Mr. Harper for all the time that he's put in for the decade of being a Prime Minister of Canada and being a very good

ambassador to other countries and to the world and how wonderful a place Canada really is.

I also want to also talk about, in my financial world, I remember when I used to talk to my clients about markets and volatility and stuff, we always had a famous words—saying, goes: history doesn't repeat itself, but it does rhyme. And the rhyming is that, back in the '90s, when the Filmon government was in place, we had to work with the Liberal—federal Liberal Party that came into power in 1993. And with that Liberal Party there was a lot of—we were in financial hard shapes. We had to do a lot of austerity measures. And for the provincial PC Party, we had to deal with transfer payments cuts.

But fortunate for this—it's hard to believe that the member of Burrows how—talked about how bad the Conservative Party was, but they didn't have what we had back in the 1990s with transfer payments reduced severely, where we had to make sacrifices. We had to bridge a lot of different programs.

A member of River East was telling me about the culture, how they—the Filmon government had to bridge the expenses to make sure that the culture survives and lives, especially in the cultural centre such as Winnipeg.

The thing was, also, I would like to say that with working with the federal government, I really believe that we have our time, History will rhyme, and we will have an opportunity to work with a relationship with this new government in 2016.

And I always believed, when I was in business, you know, the most important thing is to always build up that relationship, if it's a relationship with your colleagues, with other businesses, with your clientele, it's important to have that fundamental foundation of partnership.

And so far, this NDP government has a proven record of not working with their partners. One, as example, is the floods that we had back in 2014 and 2011. Again, there was very little communication with the Saskatchewan government when it came to the amount of water that was coming from Saskatchewan. This government didn't even know how much water was coming our way.

When I talked to the minister of water security, Scott Moe he basically said that he never talked to any of the ministers here. And here we just had a crisis, like months before that, when Melita and Pierson were inundated with water. And actually, the Premier of Saskatchewan, Brad Wall, actually did a

tour of the southeast Saskatchewan. Where was our Premier (Mr. Selinger) in the early days of 2014 of June?

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

Until the—it really got into the papers in July of 2014, when the Premier had to do a photo op, so he showed the people—the Manitobans that he was going to be here for Manitobans, but it was all it was, was a photo op.

And so—and the other thing is also the western partnership. You know, there is a Liberal Party already in BC. How come this government has not worked with the Liberal Party with a partnership, western partnership?

It's important that any alliance that you have with any kind of governments, when it comes to federal or provincial counterparts, you do want to have that relationship. There's opportunities that are going to be missed. There's—I know every time I went to a conference, when it came to a financial conference, it was really interesting talking to your colleagues, your counterparts, and getting ideas. Because those ideas you can bring back and, really, you're there to service the people of Manitoba. And some of those benefits that are happening in Alberta and Saskatchewan and British Columbia, those are—can be benefits that we can come back to our—to Manitobans.

* (11:50)

And when we take government in 2016, April 2016, it'd be great to work with these counterparts and all the provinces and with the federal government. It's so important that we're here for the people of Manitoba. We're here for the people of Canada and for our local constituents. We want to make sure that we are the voice, and we are going to work on their behalf to make a better place for us to live in if it's the country, the province, or a constituency.

Also, this—you know, the government here, you know, they had opportunities of record transfer payments, plus they still had to raise taxes on the PST and actually bring in 2012 taxes on insurance. I was an insurance broker at that time and it was a sneaky way of hiding the cost of increased PST on insurance products. You know, not too many people have to—only on an annual basis have to pay that bill, and if it's their house insurance or their life insurance they have to pay only on a monthly basis, so it

doesn't remind them that this—how this government had snuck in the increase in the PST on that product.

And then, on top of it, they need more money. Even with the increased transfer payments they want to increase the PST to 8 per cent. There was even talk that they wanted to even increase it to 9 per cent. So Manitobans are, again, are sick and tired of paying more and getting less. They're getting less in services. Our infrastructure is a mess and, you know, when you go around the areas throughout the province of Manitoba and, again, you see proactive approaches in other jurisdictions like North Dakota, Saskatchewan, they're putting the infrastructure in before they even start this construction.

This government all—is always a reactive type of government and, again, with the extra revenue that they get from the transfer payments, what happens now if the transfer payments are refused? Where is this government going to get their increased revenue? They're supressing this economy from growing, adding more taxes and finding more and more people who are getting frustrated moving out of the province. Businesses are moving out of the province.

We need an environment and a working relationship with our federal government to bring that business back to Manitoba, to have more of a prosperity in the province of Manitoba and for—and that's where we will increase our tax revenue, is from increase in the growth of the economy, not increase in the PST or—and, again, we also have one of the highest taxes when it comes to personal income tax of any province besides Quebec. And here's an opportunity to work with the federal government to do the indexing on our—on different tax brackets.

And, also, when the member of Burrows—or member of Tyndall was talking about the tax-free savings account, well, when I was a financial planner the tax-free savings account was important for low-income earners, actually. You know, they might have a low income that they still want to put money away, but an RRSP doesn't make sense for them because they don't get the benefit from the tax deduction. So a tax-free savings is a way that they can accumulate money, have it grow without paying taxes on there. And that is, also, it's not just for the rich; it's for the—all levels of income levels. That benefit is there for—you know, there's a lot of people out there that have a low income. But it's not how much you earn, it's how much you save. And there's a lot of people out there, including my

mother-in-law, who can make—my wife always said she always could make a nickel into a dollar because she was a very thrifty individual. She came from Jamaica; she knew how to save, and products like the tax-free savings is important for her to put money away so that it'll accumulate and then it'll actually accumulate compoundly without having to pay income tax on that portion of money.

So it does work for all levels of government, and by taking that away or not—increasing it to the \$10,000 a year, it's important to all Canadians, not just for the wealthy.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Wiebe: I don't want to take too much time here this morning because I do expect that we can have an opportunity to vote on this resolution, Mr. Speaker, and find some support from across the House.

In the sense that we as—at least on the—as a local constituency people and somebody, if I can speak for myself, who spends a lot of time in the constituency, tries very hard to connect with my constituents and, quite frankly, I've, you know, built a lot of trust across the spectrum—the political spectrum. I don't see myself as a particularly partisan person when it comes to working on local issues and things that all Manitobans can agree on. And I appreciated the comments from the member from Burrows in the sense that in my own experience, at least on the local level, you know, to this point I've had absolutely no support from the federal government whatsoever, and it's been difficult. And we, you know, I think we've accomplished a lot and we've worked on a lot of important issues, but there's been major, major gaps in what we've been able to accomplish because we haven't had a federal partner at the table, and that's been on the local level.

I've seen that in my own constituency, but on the provincial level where we have some really exciting forward-thinking ideas, whether it's child care, whether it's on infrastructure, there's housing, we have a whole number of issues where we as a provincial government have been punching above our weight, and we have been getting these issues some profile on the federal level, but we haven't had the partner at the table.

So I just—I wanted to take just a couple of minutes here, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the member for bringing this forward, allowing us to discuss this, and to discuss how we are hopeful—we are hopeful—that we now have a partner in Ottawa

that sees the value in what we're doing on the provincial level, sees us as a positive partner.

Another one is the Provincial Nominee Program, something we've been fighting very hard for on the provincial level that the Conservatives here and in Ottawa have had no interest in supporting and seeing the value of what we were doing very well, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, on a provincial level.

So I am excited. I am hopeful. I do believe this is a resolution of hope and of the future and a vision, and we continue to have that vision. We're looking forward to having our federal partners sit at the table now and we can continue to move forward on that vision and make Manitoba a better place.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Dennis Smook (La Verendrye): It is an honour to stand up today and speak a little bit on this PMR calling on the federal government to work with Manitobans.

Before I start, I'd like to congratulate Mr. Trudeau and his team on their victory. Canadians have spoken so we'll see what they come up with over the next four years and how they fare with some of their promises. But I'd like—also like to thank Mr. Harper for all the work that him and his team have done in the last decade for Canadians.

One thing that I can agree with, the first thing in this resolution, is agree to work with federal government. But this is something that the NDP is saying in this resolution but they've never been able to practise, Mr. Speaker.

I've been an MLA for four years. In all these four years the NDP have blamed the federal government. They have blamed the weather. They have blamed the economic downturn in the economy. They have blamed just about everybody except themselves.

And, you know, Mr. Speaker, I agree that working with others is very important. It doesn't

matter what we do in life, whether it be working with a marriage, working with anything, working with people is important. But this NDP government does not have a clue of how to work with people. They have condemned everybody.

As a matter of fact, when you look at some of the areas that the federal government is talking about, finding efficiencies of \$500 million in the first year, well, this NDP government we all know that in the last number of years all they've done is spend, spend, spend. Public Accounts shows that the deficit was \$100 million greater than the deficit that they predicted.

How can they say one thing that they agree with something but then go on the other side and do something completely different? It goes right back to the election of 2011. This government made all kinds of promises but never fulfilled them, actually broke them. And here's a good example. Mr. Trudeau already has made a couple of his promises come true with the mailbox and some other stuff. This NDP government broke every promise that they made in the provincial election.

One of the areas that this resolution speaks to is BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly be urged to work closely with the provincial government and the government of Canada to be an active partner in making life better for Manitoba families.

Well, Mr. Speaker, raising the taxes as they did with the PST, raising everything else that they've done—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order, please.

When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member for La Verendrye will have seven minutes remaining.

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, October 27, 2015

CONTENTS

Speaker's Statement		Resolutions	
Reid	2561	Res. 16–Calling on the Federal Government to Work with Manitoba	
ORDERS OF THE DAY			
PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS			
Second Readings–Public Bills		T. Marcelino	2572
Bill 209–The Results-Based Budgeting Act		Goertzen	2574
Stefanson	2561	Wiebe	2574
Swan	2563	Rondeau	2575
Gaudreau	2563	Saran	2575
Allum	2565	Wight	2578
Bill 210–The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act		Piwniuk	2579
Rondeau	2567	Smook	2582
Schuler	2569		
Gaudreau	2569		
Saran	2570		

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

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