

Second Session – Forty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

Official Report
(Hansard)

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

Vol. LXX No. 35A - 10 a.m., Thursday, April 6, 2017

ISSN 0542-5492

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Forty-First Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALLUM, James	Fort Garry-Riverview	NDP
ALTEMEYER, Rob	Wolseley	NDP
BINDLE, Kelly	Thompson	PC
CLARKE, Eileen, Hon.	Agassiz	PC
COX, Cathy, Hon.	River East	PC
CULLEN, Cliff, Hon.	Spruce Woods	PC
CURRY, Nic	Kildonan	PC
DRIEDGER, Myrna, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EICHLER, Ralph, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
EWASKO, Wayne	Lac du Bonnet	PC
FIELDING, Scott, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
FLETCHER, Steven, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
FONTAINE, Nahanni	St. Johns	NDP
FRIESEN, Cameron, Hon.	Morden-Winkler	PC
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Lib.
GOERTZEN, Kelvin, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
GRAYDON, Clifford	Emerson	PC
GUILLEMARD, Sarah	Fort Richmond	PC
HELWER, Reg	Brandon West	PC
ISLEIFSON, Len	Brandon East	PC
JOHNSON, Derek	Interlake	PC
JOHNSTON, Scott	St. James	PC
KINEW, Wab	Fort Rouge	NDP
KLASSEN, Judy	Kewatinook	Lib.
LAGASSÉ, Bob	Dawson Trail	PC
LAGIMODIERE, Alan	Selkirk	PC
LAMOUREUX, Cindy	Burrows	Lib.
LATHLIN, Amanda	The Pas	NDP
LINDSEY, Tom	Flin Flon	NDP
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MARCELINO, Flor	Logan	NDP
MARCELINO, Ted	Tyndall Park	NDP
MARTIN, Shannon	Morris	PC
MAYER, Colleen	St. Vital	PC
MICHALESKI, Brad	Dauphin	PC
MICKLEFIELD, Andrew, Hon.	Rossmere	PC
MORLEY-LECOMTE, Janice	Seine River	PC
NESBITT, Greg	Riding Mountain	PC
PALLISTER, Brian, Hon.	Fort Whyte	PC
PEDERSEN, Blaine, Hon.	Midland	PC
PIWNIUK, Doyle	Arthur-Virden	PC
REYES, Jon	St. Norbert	PC
SARAN, Mohinder	The Maples	Ind.
SCHULER, Ron, Hon.	St. Paul	PC
SELINGER, Greg	St. Boniface	NDP
SMITH, Andrew	Southdale	PC
SMOOK, Dennis	La Verendrye	PC
SQUIRES, Rochelle, Hon.	Riel	PC
STEFANSON, Heather, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
SWAN, Andrew	Minto	NDP
TEITSMA, James	Radisson	PC
WHARTON, Jeff	Gimli	PC
WIEBE, Matt	Concordia	NDP
WISHART, Ian, Hon.	Portage la Prairie	PC
WOWCHUK, Rick	Swan River	PC
YAKIMOSKI, Blair	Transcona	PC
<i>Vacant</i>	Point Douglas	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, April 6, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

Please be seated.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. Jim Maloway (Official Opposition House Leader): Today we are seeking leave to move to Bill 216, The Financial Administration Amendment Act.

Madam Speaker: Is there leave to consider Bill 216 this morning, The Financial Administration Amendment Act (Economic Indicators)? *[Agreed]*

SECOND READINGS—PUBLIC BILLS

Bill 216—The Financial Administration Amendment Act (Economic Indicators)

Mr. James Allum (Fort Garry-Riverview): I move, seconded by the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Selinger), that Bill 216, The Financial Administration Amendment Act (Economic Indicators), be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

Motion presented.

Mr. Allum: I'm pleased to get up and speak to this bill this morning. It's a very important bill. It's a very important bill for the people of Manitoba to ensure that they have the information that they need in order to evaluate the direction this government is taking.

And we've had to put this bill forward for one very simple reason, Madam Speaker. Last year's budget, without any warning, without any indication, government took what we called the affordability section of the budget which included a vast array of indicators that told us where this province stood,

where Manitoba families stood, and where they stood in relation to one another and where they stood in relation to other jurisdictions.

And, for some reason—some inexplicable reason, I might add—that section disappeared from the budget, robbing the people of Manitoba from the very information and the very comparators that are necessary to be able to evaluate what the government is doing, what they're saying, and what direction they're going in.

Madam Speaker, this bill rights that wrong, and we're not going to stand for it.

Now the government talked, during the election campaign, about they were going to be open and transparent, and what we've seen right from the beginning, from last April probably even into the election campaign, is a government that talks about accountability and transparency; it simply never practises it.

We've seen it in any number of instances, in any number of examples, and so what this bill does, it asks two things: It asks the government to present a long-term fiscal outlook—last year, no targets in the budget, no year-over-year projections of where their government is leading this province—that, again, missing from the budget.

So the bill suggests—recommends that the budget include a long-term fiscal outlook. It's only fair. *[interjection]* You only have to be open and transparent. My friend from Concordia says that it's only reasonable, and it is; it's fair.

And then, secondly, we are asking that a chart comparing major taxes and basic household costs across all provinces and territories for a range of representative households also be included. It's important for Manitoba families to be able to understand exactly what their status is in relation to others across the country, and one of the reasons that that's so essential, Madam Speaker, is that this is a government that, time after time, example after example, engages in a mythology about the state of the economy in Manitoba, where Manitoba stands in relation to other provinces in this country and where Manitoba is going in the future.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Friesen) gets up every day, as the Premier (Mr. Pallister) does, and puts on the record a series of misinformation and misinformed data that doesn't do any good. It's not open; it's not transparent. In fact, it does a critical disservice to the people of Manitoba.

And so what we're asking here today, and which I think all members of the House should be supportive of, is for a genuine comparators outlooks to be included so that there's an understanding—an understanding among all our constituents about the reality rather than the mythology that's put forward by this government, day in and day out.

So I'm pleased, Madam Speaker, to put this bill forward. I'm pleased to have it supported by my friends and colleagues on this side of the House. I know members opposite want to do the right thing. I know they want to do right by their constituents. I think it's a very simple elementary request that we're making that we get the unanimous support of this House that we should be open and transparent with the people of Manitoba.

Questions

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

Questions?

Mr. Derek Johnson (Interlake): The NDP claim to care about long-term fiscal outlooks and care about the tax that Manitobans pay. Yet the NDP implemented the highest tax increase in generations and never kept their promise on fiscal projections.

How can the member stand in this Chamber and claim to represent openness and transparency when it was his government that misled Manitobans about the proposed tax increases?

Mr. James Allum (Fort Garry-Riverview): Well, Madam Speaker, I have to say I'm disappointed by the tone and the content of that particular question, but the question goes to the very heart of why we need economic indicators that are transparent and objective.

*(10:10)

The member puts on the board information that is categorically untrue, and if he'd looked at the budgets where the affordability section was included in years past he would see that Manitoba's position on taxation is good, relative to every other province in this country and nor—more than that—that we had the most affordable utility bills in this country.

Why doesn't he get on board? Why doesn't he want to be transparent for the people of Manitoba?

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Fort-Garry—or, pardon me. The honourable member for River Heights.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): The NDP had fiscal outlooks going forward several years, but they often missed the mark, sometimes by a long way.

I would ask whether the member would agree that what should be included in here is also a report on how good the last several years' projections were and why they missed the mark so that those projections can be improved over time.

Mr. Allum: There was a lot in that question, and the member for River Heights makes a good point. Of course, he knows that in those occasions where targets were missed, we went through the greatest recession known to modern capitalism in 2009—and two major floods as well—so those projections are based on what would normally be understood.

What we're saying is that we need to put those things out there. We need to understand them in context. It's only fair. It's only right. I'm sure that he wants to be on side with that.

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): Yes, well, given the opening question from the member for Interlake, I think there is still some education needed today.

Could the minister—or the member, rather, just detail how this bill would require the government to be more open and more transparent with Manitobans about the state of the province's finances?

Mr. Allum: I thank my friend from Minto for that question.

Of course, the bill asks for two very important things: a long-term fiscal outlook that projects where Manitoba's going. That's critically important for an understanding of what the future holds for us; and then a chart comparing major taxes and basic household cross-across-costs across all provinces and territories for a range of representative

households. This is subjective data which the people of Manitoba can then evaluate on their own.

Mr. Reg Helwer (Brandon West): The member from Fort Garry talks about long-term fiscal outlook, but his government promised to return their budgets to balance in 2014 and then, oops, that wasn't going to work. Then, maybe we'll try for 2016, and then they just gave up all together on any predictions when that might occur.

Is that what the NDP means about long-term fiscal outlooks, just ignore everything and move along?

Mr. Allum: Well, it's unfortunate that the member from Brandon West, who's been here now for a second term, which has—would have such a cynical view of a process that simply is required to be open and transparent with the people of Manitoba.

Yes, projections are out there and then, yes, you're held accountable for why those projections are met or not met. That's the point, Madam Speaker, is to be open and transparent with the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): So I just wondered if the member could tell the House a little bit more about what the range of representative households would look like in the cross-provincial tax and household cost comparisons and why exactly it is important for Manitobans to know what this interprovincial financial comparisons look like.

Mr. Allum: I thank my friend from Concordia for that.

Bill—section 67.6(1) of the bill outlines the basic household costs that would be evaluated in this bill and it includes such things a rent or mortgage payments, child care, utilities, public transit or automobile insurance costs. And these are the things, of course, that Manitobans rely on from affordability in order to ensure that they can—they and their families can live happy and productive lives: transparent information transparently put forward, allowing the people of Manitoba to evaluate where they stand in relation to other Canadians.

Mr. Bob Lagassé (Dawson Trail): The NDP told Manitobans Bipole III wouldn't cost Manitobans a nickel, and now their legacy is a project costing taxpayers billions in overruns.

Is this the NDP version of financial openness and transparency?

Mr. Allum: Well, I'm sorry that my friend from Dawson Trail is missing the point entirely. Even his own \$4.2-million Boston Consulting Group says that the bipole needed to be built. He ought to read his own reports.

But more than that, Madam Speaker, what we're saying is let's put this information on the public record; let's be transparent, open and accountable. I can't imagine why the member from Dawson Trail would oppose that.

Mr. Swan: We know that providing a long-term fiscal outlook is challenging. For example, if there's a flood, I know from the member for Brandon West, we spent millions and millions of dollars protecting his community when the Assiniboine River rose, and those are the things that can be a challenge. I'm concerned that the government now has decided that because it's challenging, they're just not going to do it.

Could the member talk about the benefits of the government actually doing the work, being open and transparent, and providing that long-term fiscal outlook each and every year?

Mr. Allum: Well, I thank the member from Minto for that very important question.

It certainly benefits the government in terms of putting the full array of information out there for Manitobans to evaluate in their own right. But it also helps Manitobans to understand where we're going, year over year, and so that they can again have an important place to evaluate their status in relationship to where they might have been years before or in comparison to other Canadians.

This is a simple request, a simple recommendation. I'm sure all members of the House are on side with this.

Mr. Johnson: Madam Speaker, in '14-15 fiscal year, the NDP set a target in their budget of a deficit of \$324 million. In actuality, it ended up 635. The NDP would change their fiscal outlooks and charts every couple of years, both including and excluding various departments, making their spending difficult to track.

How can we take any lessons from the party that kept Manitobans in the dark and brought our province into a decade of debt, a decade of decay and a decade of decline?

Mr. Allum: Madam Speaker, it's inexplicable to me that a member of this Chamber should get up and say

that he's opposed to openness, accountability and transparency. Those numbers were put out there by our government. It was open and transparent to every single Manitoban.

He now has the ability to evaluate why that happened, what happened in context. That's the kind of debate, that's the kind of conversation we want to have in Manitoba, not the mythology put forward either by the member for Interlake (Mr. Johnson) or the Minister of Finance (Mr. Friesen).

Mr. Wiebe: The member has talked about how important this is to all Manitobans. Certainly, I agree with that, but specifically, I'm wondering if he could talk about who in particular this is most important to, who this kind of information can most affect, and how this can help make the budget more relatable and understandable to the average Manitoban.

Mr. Allum: Well, I think the member wisely, as he always does, answered his own question in answering, which is always helpful for the member for Fort Garry-Riverview, I might add as well.

But that's the point is that this is information for the citizens of Manitoba to be able to plan their lives in context to understand where they stand in relation to their neighbours and in relation to other Canadians. It's the kind of information that helps every Manitoba citizen, every Manitoba family, understand what their government is doing to make sure their families live happy and productive lives.

Madam Speaker, I know that's why you stood for election; that's why we stand for election on this side. This is what we intend to bring to the people of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker: The time for questions has expired. Debate is open.

Debate

Hon. Cameron Friesen (Minister of Finance): I'm pleased to stand this morning and put some comments on the record in respect of this Bill 216 brought from the member for Fort Garry-Riverview (Mr. Allum).

*(10:20)

You know, Madam Speaker, this place can be an interesting place, and there's days that we are in this Chamber that we wonder really about the relation between this place and the outside world. I've heard colleagues on both sides of the House describe this place as resulting in a condition known as dome-itis

where we can sometimes lose the connection to the real world. And I think in this case today, when I see this bill, I think that the member for Fort Garry-Riverview is losing his connection with the real world.

There is not a day in this Chamber that we would not welcome the opportunity on a debate about accountability, about setting targets, but about hitting your targets. And I noticed that earlier today there was—there were already questions to that member about the NDP government's own dismal record when it came to missing their targets every time. And today the member for Fort Garry-Riverview stands up and somehow feigns indignation. He wants to be seen as the protector of the public interest that he wants to drive this House to a greater accounting for its record, and indeed he should, and we do on this side. It's why Manitobans chose a new government on April the 19th, almost a year ago to this date. It was because they rejected the old method of the NDP of weaving a tortured fiction out there and pushing it out three years and then, as the member was already doing this morning, starting to back up full speed in reverse. And I hope he has one of those cameras, because he was going full speed in reverse saying, well, you don't understand. It's all about the projection. It's not about the context. You can't actually expect us to be measured on something as outrageous as results.

Madam Speaker, that member quarrels with me often, but I would submit in this place that he and I have many areas of shared interest, and today I found rare points of agreement with the member's brief comments that he chose to put on the record. The first one is this: that targets matter. The second one is accountability matters; however, he failed to quite get to the end. He failed to get to the point where even the member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard) tried to drive him to, saying but do results not matter as well. This member was silent on the issue of results.

Madam Speaker, I want to talk about the difference between targets and results. I'm looking at a document that is a piece of fiction, a piece of history. It was the NDP's summary budget outlook from the year 2013. This is a piece of fiction, but not quite the piece of fiction that the member for Fort Garry-Riverview tried to weave in his torturous way three days ago when he stood in this House and tried to convey that somehow the NDP had balanced a budget every year for 10 years. Now, that was a piece of fiction that would make Steven Spielberg

jealous or J.K. Rowling and say how did you—that's a fantastical voyage you're taking Manitobans on. It's like Journey to the Centre of the Earth. He's reflecting on audited statements. He's reflecting on statements that are produced according to generally accepted accounting practices worldwide, and he's saying, yes, but they got it wrong—they got it wrong. Look at all those other parts of the glossy document we prepared. Just try not to look at the Public Accounts because that is a needless distraction.

Manitobans, Madam Speaker, care about multi-year projections, and that's why we'll have multi-year projections in our budget as we said we would. Manitobans care that you hit your targets.

So back to the piece of fiction known as the summary budget outlook for 2013, here is what the NDP said on multi-years. They looked one back—they looked back one year and said, oops, we missed it. We've got a \$583-million deficit. But then they looked in that present year. They said, yes, but now we're on a four-year path back to balance, resulting in a surplus of \$49 million in the fiscal year '16-17. Now, I need to clarify the record. That does not mean the annual year 1617. No, this means 2016-2017. There was an issue of confusion that arose the other day when I tried to reference '19-20, referring to the fiscal years of 2019-2020, and the member was confused and thought I was referring to the great crash or something like that. So a \$49-million surplus in the year '16-17.

So, now, let's look at the audited statements and see how they did in the year '16-17. Well, it actually was a deficit even in '15-16 of \$865 million. But as other members have already reflected, they were saying at that time, even in that year—even in that year—saying it's going to be \$441 million.

Then they updated in the first quarter and said: Well, we meant \$505 million. They updated it in the third quarter and said: Did we say 505? We meant 666. And that's a very significant number. But then, in actuality, the number ended up at \$865 million.

Madam Speaker, that member cannot—even that member can hardly keep a straight face, and most days he keeps a straight face. If he tries to convey to Manitobans that they were at all focused on results—the bond rating agency said that that government had lost all fiscal discipline, leading to a continued and sustained increase in debt and debt service ratios beyond projections, exerting downward pressure on the ratings. At one point, rating agencies referred to their strategies and problems as adjustment fatigue.

Adjustment fatigue is rating-agency-speak for: we just don't believe you anymore.

And it is one thing to say you fly to Toronto and fly to New York and they don't believe you anymore, and that's one thing. I think the real thing is that Manitobans didn't believe them anymore. Manitobans demonstrated that they didn't believe them anymore. Madam Speaker, we have always said that we will be judged on our results. We will be judged on our record. We will be judged on the degree to which we expressed and demonstrated fidelity to big ideas, big ideas like truth and hitting your targets and sincerity. And on all of those issues and in all of those metrics, the NDP failed to deliver results, and the verdict is there. We don't have to talk about April 19th because the verdict was there.

So, when that member comes into the House in just a few days on April the 11th this year, he will open those budget documents and he will see multi-year projections, and he will be well served by those. The difference between the multi-year projections that we will provide and the ones they had is that we intend to hit our targets.

That member was asked a question this morning by the member of River Heights, and he immediately oscillated like a cheap fan, going back and forth, and he said: You don't understand. It was a period of economic recovery. And even though it was like—on one day they would say strong, robust growth, and the next day they'd say, oh, terrible situation; that's why we are not taking the salary reductions that we are by law instructed to take. They gave themselves a million-dollar raise. They misled Manitobans in terms of what was happening, and it results in a \$1.7-billion deficit by the year 2019-20 if left unchecked.

The simple trajectory drawn out on the average of eight years' expenditure and eight years' revenue, that gap, that differential in between that continues to increase, the simple mathematics—and I invite him to perform them—would be that you end up at \$1.7 billion.

Now, why does it matter? It does not matter because accountants don't like it. It matters because Manitobans depend on services. They depend on those healthy delivery of services. We saw, in the third quarter, debt service costs go up more than \$60 million. Those members stand up and they say, what about a gymnasium? Why aren't you building it? Think of how many gymnasiums they took away

from Manitobans by not getting their fiscal house in order—[interjection]

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Friesen:—every day they stand up and talk about the gymnasium they want now, reflects on two things: No. 1: They did not build it in 17 years and misled Manitobans; and No. 2: They could not afford it because they chose to make higher interest payments to happy money lenders in Toronto and New York, rather than make the necessary changes.

This government will do the right thing. This government will do the right thing for the right reasons. This government will be judged by Manitobans on the results and it should be that way, in the same way that Manitobans judged them for their failure to get results.

Madam Speaker: Order. Order, please.

* (10:30)

Mr. Ted Marcelino (Tyndall Park): The bill that was presented by the member for Fort Garry-Riverview (Mr. Allum)—not just Fort Garry, Fort Garry-Riverview—seeks to amend The Financial Administration Act in order to compel the Minister of Finance (Mr. Friesen) to include in his budget and subsequent budgets an outlook. They call it an outlook, but, actually, it's more of a goal or a target that the government would seek to accomplish. And governments fail and succeed, and governments reach that goal or even overreach that goal, depending on the circumstances of the economy of the province. It is as simple as that.

By omitting the fiscal outlook provision of last year's or last session's budget, what the Minister of Finance did was not set a goal, not set a target, not set a measure because a fiscal outlook is something that the Minister of Finance should be able to provide and at least give us a trajectory of where the finances of the province should go. It is more of a—not just a target, but it was more of a wish that we could be doing this and we will reach that goal so that we could provide the economy the impetus, the stimulus, the start so that—or they call it the jumpstart—so that the economy does not slip into the doldrums.

And the—I know that the Minister of Finance is very secure in his position as Minister of Finance, and that's the reason why this side of the House is trying to convince him that it's better if we had that fiscal outlook in the budget that will be printed up on

the 11th of April. It's only about six days away, isn't it? And the only reason why we are asking for that is because the data that is in the fiscal outlook usually shows how our province stands up against all the other provinces. We are a First World country. Canada is, Manitoba is a First World country. But then there is still that sense that some of our citizens are still living in Third World conditions, which really sickens me to the stomach because I cannot believe for the life of me that there are still people who are going hungry in this province and that there are still people who are homeless in our province.

And there are so many things that the Minister of Finance could alleviate those conditions. How? By providing a fiscal outlook, and that would be the target for housing, a target for health care, a target for daycare and child care. And those fiscal outlook, if we were to compare our performance considering—I mean, when I say our performance, the NDP had problems with the flooding of 2011 and then 2014, and prior to that in 2008 there was a financial meltdown all over the world. So it was something that this Minister of Finance probably did not hear about because he's so ensconced—e-n-s-c-o-n-c-e-d—ensconced in his own cocoon. He is so protected from the economic travails and suffering of others that he needs to know—maybe from our side or maybe from the other side too; there are backbenchers who might even know what I'm talking about—that, in the sense that he needs to know that there are people who are suffering in our province, that there are people who are still vulnerable in our province, economically, financially, socially. And sometimes, you know, when we say, okay, we will do this for our people; we will provide enough facilities and enough resources for women in distress; it's a target; it is a goal that we are trying to relieve the pressures, the social pressures, that are here in reality.

A budget is supposed to reflect the life of our province. It is supposed to show what our province looks like from this day up to, say, five years from now or 10 years from now. And that's why we need a fiscal outlook in order to provide that particular goal, that particular target, so that if you failed, you would know, and you would say, well, the deficit just rose a little bit or we're slaying the deficit.

From this side of the House, having been here for the last—how many years have I been here? Six.

An Honourable Member: Not enough.

Mr. Marcelino: Not enough. Not enough. And I am beginning to understand the difficulty and difficulties of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Friesen). The Minister of Finance is a very difficult job to do, but then, because he is our treasurer, he's in charge of our money. He should tell the people—who are his masters, because he's just a servant of the people—he should tell the people of Manitoba where he's taking us. Is he taking us down the river or up the river? Is he taking us for a ride, because without the fiscal outlook that is suggested and without those data that are needed in order to judge whether a minister of Finance is a failure or not should be in the budget itself.

I know that the Minister of Finance is trying to be safe. He's trying to be safe in what he does. So when he says, well, that's not what I said, he has an out; he has that wiggle room. He has that slack. He could always say, well, I didn't set the target; we never said anything about an outlook. Therefore, we could fail and you'll never know anything about it.

And I understand that the Minister of Finance needs to listen, not just to his friends, but most especially those who need government help. He cannot keep his ears closed to those people who are crying in the dark. In my constituency alone, there are people who are hurting. There are people who don't have homes, and there are people who have homes that are more of a hovel than a home. And it is amazing that the Minister of Finance would not even give us any of the solutions that he has got to come up with as a minister of Finance. In that, he fails.

* (10:40)

Mr. Derek Johnson (Interlake): Almost a year ago to the date, Manitobans elected a Progressive Conservative government committed to fixing our finances, repairing our services and rebuilding our economy. From day one we made it very clear that we would tirelessly work toward bringing our province's finances into balance and working towards staying on the massive—slaying the massive deficit that was left by the previous government.

Now the member from Fort Garry-Riverview has decided that he wants to legislate four-year projections of government revenues and expenditures. I find this particular suggestion quite funny coming from a member of the opposition. I'm glad that the opposition has now discovered the virtue of financial planning.

Let's talk about the NDP's financial plan. The province's debt doubled under the NDP, check. Manitobans are now paying some of the highest taxes in the country, the highest west of the Ottawa River, at least, and yet our province continues to rank near the bottom in education and health-care outcomes due to the previous regime.

Of equal concern is the money spent towards paying down the province's debt under the NDP. Debt services cost increased by \$13 million up to \$865 million. That—\$865 million that cannot go towards services and programs in Manitoba that Manitoba families depend on, rely on.

For a rural riding like the Interlake—or any rural riding, for that matter—to put this into perspective, a new arena could be built in 143 towns—143 new hockey arenas you could build. You could build a state-of-the-heart—art hospital for \$855 million. But instead, we sent that money to the banks in the form of interest every single year. That has got to stop.

Manitoba's new government is committed to making Manitoba the most improved province in all of Canada to make Manitoban families safer and stronger. That starts with getting this province's spending under control. What we know is that the NDP has been able to continue their unrestrained spending plans. If they were to continue, we would have ended up with a deficit this year of \$1.7 billion. That's an incredible amount to a province where the total government expenditures are 13 to 13 and a half billion. That was their plan, Madam Speaker. That was no plan at all.

Obviously, we have to wait and see what the budget is this coming week, but I think we can assume that will be a lot less than \$1.7 billion that would've been if the members opposite were in charge. I don't think I'm giving away any trade secrets by saying that.

So the first part of the bill before us today dealt with financial projections, clearly, something they know nothing about. The second part of the bill seems to be that they want to enshrine into law the idea of doing an affordability analysis as part of the budget. The NDP did this as part of their budget, of course, but all of the affordability calculations they put forward were a rather shabby attempt to disguise the fact that they made life more expensive in Manitoba for all Manitobans.

The fact of the matter is that the average Manitoba family has been forced to pay more than

\$5,000 in additional broken-promise taxes. Under they dysfunctional NDP government, Manitoba was the only government west of the Maritimes who did not increase their tax brackets to inflation, resulting in hard-working, low-income Manitobans paying more and getting less.

Despite what the members opposite say today about affordability and the previous government's legacy concerning affordability, it will be remembered for keeping Manitoba's basic personal exemption \$2,000 lower than the average across Canada. The previous government will be remembered for failing to end bracket creep; they will be remembered for robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Madam Speaker, elections are about making promises but good government is about keeping those promises. The member for St. Boniface (Mr. Selinger), as previous NDP leader, promised before the 2011 election that the notion of raising the PST was nonsense and ridiculous—ridiculous that the NDP has broadened the PST to home insurance and benefits at work. As well as all those other goods and services in 2012, they increased the PST from 7 to 8 per cent in 2013.

The NDP's shameful financial performance is strewn with broken commitments. In the 2012 budget, the NDP guaranteed they would eliminate the deficit by 2014; they broke that promise. They broke that promise and overspent by \$855 million. Just before the last election, the NDP hid the \$855-million deficit from Manitobans, one of the largest in our province's history.

They have had 17 years to address affordability, and, to be honest, they failed at every turn. Under the NDP governance, Manitoba's basic tax exemption remained stagnant, while Saskatchewan with its index has risen. Let's compare them: \$8,134 exemption in Manitoba, \$15,843 in Saskatchewan. How's that for affordability? To top it all off, Madam Speaker, the provincial debt doubled during the NDP decade of debt.

To be clear, none of the NDP record did anything to improve affordability for working families; in fact, they did quite the opposite. Madam Speaker, the NDP decade of dysfunction saw affordability eroded each and every year while historic broken-promise tax hikes, like the ones I've mentioned today, continued on.

So Manitoba does have an advantage, Madam Speaker, but it's under our watch that that's going to

come. We're going to make sure Manitoba is an affordable place to live. We will do that by managing hydro as a responsible way by keeping our spending, and thus our taxes, under control.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Speaker, [*inaudible*] several comments on the record with regard to this bill. Basically, I think it is important that we do have multi-year projections, as proposed in this bill, but I think that we need more than that; we need actual three-year moving budgets so that people can understand what the plan is going to be for the next several years.

The NDP tried this with universities but failed miserably. And the Conservatives should be challenged to start engaging in this process because we have a lot of people at the last minute as we go into the budget who don't know whether they're going to have money to employ people or not because of the tremendous uncertainties. And under the current budgeting process, there's tremendous uncertainties in universities about what their budget is going to be, up until close to the last minute, and in hospitals and many other operating agencies. If you can plan for several years ahead, you can get better results than if you're having to make last-minute decisions in the weeks leading up and just after the budgets.

* (10:50)

It is important to note that the NDP projections often missed the mark, and sometimes very substantially. This, of course, was blamed on the global economic crisis of 2008 and on floods. But, you know, in fairness, the Finance Minister needs to take into account the variety of factors which may come into place. The recession of 2008 had less impact, in fact, on the Manitoba economy. One can argue the reasons for that, but to blame that global recession at a time when Manitoba's economy didn't have as severe an impact actually [*inaudible*] to.

The other thing is that when we're blaming floods, one has to recognize that for a substantial amount of flood expenditures, the Province gets back 90 per cent of those dollars from the federal government. And so trying to blame all the flood expenditures on the causing problem or for the problems is overstating the situation. So the province, a province like Manitoba which has quite frequently, whether it is flood or forest fire emergencies, that we need to have a capability to

allow and to plan for such emergencies without every time there is an emergency getting into deep, deep trouble fiscally. And so the Finance Minister needs to be challenged to do better in these areas.

The—in any event, you must get to the basic point that we should have projections. The comments from the Conservatives that the projections in the NDP in the past were bad has to be acknowledged, but we still need projections and the Conservatives should be challenged to provide good projections. Furthermore, when projections go wrong, we should have some independent analysis, not some just straightly politicized talking points about why it went wrong or why it worked, that we should actually have some independent analysis that provides in depth an understanding of why the projections were so bad and what can be done to make sure that those projections are considerably improved in the years ahead.

Now, in spite of the issues with this bill, as I've said, we are certainly prepared to support both the—having the projections and, secondly, to support the other element of the bill, which is cross-provincial comparisons. We note, as have the Conservative MLAs, that some of the indicators were perhaps somewhat self-serving and—so rather than getting rid of the whole process, we challenge the Conservatives to provide indicators which are balanced. Perhaps they could use the indicators that have been used in the past, but add some other indicators so that there's a more balanced representation of how we compare provincially with other provinces. And I think that that needs to be done, and that's one reason why we will, in the final analysis, support this resolution. Even though there have been problems, which have been pointed out, that these things need to be done and the Conservatives need to be challenged to do them and to do them well.

Thank you.

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): Just a few minutes of comments on this bill.

I think it's pretty clear that any member of this House, any member of this Legislature who is truly committed to openness and transparency would have no reasonable choice but to support this bill.

And I listened to the words of the member for the Interlake just a few minutes ago. I wish the member well this weekend. It's going to be a beautiful weekend in the Interlake and across Manitoba. He should enjoy this weekend because

this is the last weekend that member is likely going to be able to walk around in his communities and not have people coming up to him and saying, why are you part of a government that's cutting apart the social fabric that my family and my community depend upon.

And the same goes for all those other Conservative backbenchers who, you know, they tell us they've enjoyed the last year, and I bet they have. They show up at dinners and they get to read their vanilla speaking notes that the Premier (Mr. Pallister) hands them and tells them not to deviate from. And that's all coming to an end on Tuesday, and it's going to be very interesting to see how they respond to the angry voices they are going to hear from Manitobans, and I expect some of them are just going to—they're going to turn turtle. They're just going to stop doing those things, stop going to things, stop listening to people, and by doing that, they'll be a lot closer to the way their Cabinet ministers have been acting over the past year.

This bill amends The Financial Administration Act to require the minister of Finance to prepare for each fiscal year, first of all, a long-term fiscal outlook, and, secondly, a chart comparing major taxes and basic household costs across all provinces and territories for a range of representative households. This outlook and this chart must be tabled in the Legislative Assembly and included in the Public Accounts.

How could anybody be opposed to that becoming part of the law of Manitoba? And yet, we have the Finance Minister standing in his place, and, I believe, saying, well, a fiscal outlook. It's hard to do so I'm not going to do it. And that's not good enough for Manitoba; that's not good enough for the people of Manitoba. Frankly, that's not good enough for lenders; that's not good enough for people considering investments in Manitoba. It's simply not good enough.

An Honourable Member: The credit rating downgrade.

Mr. Swan: Well, and I hear about the credit rating downgrade. We got a credit downgrade because that Finance Minister went out to New York and, I expect, did about as well there as he did when he went to meet with other provincial finance ministers on the CPP and embarrassed our province, about as well as he did when he missed \$163 million that he just couldn't seem to understand. We're understanding what these problems are, but I want to make

sure that this bill can move on to committee so I am going to leave it at that.

Any member of this House who hasn't read this bill should read it right away and should be prepared to stand up in this House and agree this bill should go off to committee. Let's hear what other people have to say and let's make sure that we continue to have a long-term fiscal outlook as part of the budget papers, a chart comparing all those taxes and basic household costs, important for affordability, which is so important for Manitobans. Let's pass this on to committee and let's make the law better.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Reg Helwer (Brandon West): Very interesting comments to listen to. I listened to the doom and gloom from the member from Minto as opposed to the optimism about the future and the current Manitoba economy that we hear out there on a day-to-day basis, Madam Speaker. That is what this government is about; it's about bringing prosperity back to Manitoba that was driven away by the former NDP government. The open-for-business signs are back in Manitoba; the closed-for-business signs have moved to Alberta with the NDP government there.

And, you know, there was some interesting things said. I listened to the MLA for Fort Garry-Riverview talking about robbing the people of Manitoba. Well, Madam Speaker, we all know who robbed the people of Manitoba of their sales tax, who robbed the people of Manitoba for—of opportunity, and that was the former NDP government. They went out and they promised that they would not raise the sales tax, they knocked on every door. They did so in Brandon and they promised the people of Manitoba that it was nonsense, that they would not raise the PST, and then what did they do? They went out and they robbed Manitobans of that opportunity. They instigated that sales tax without a referendum, ignoring legislation.

So legislation like this, Madam Speaker, I can see that the NDP would just ignore it again because they ignored much more serious legislation. The minister for Finance has already said that these guidelines will be in the current budget papers that are coming forward; just wait for it.

An Honourable Member: He said there would be targets.

Mr. Helwer: Just wait for it. There will be targets because we know the NDP never hit their targets, so there was a lack of fiscal discipline. No outlook, and

I listen to some of the other speakers talk about, you know, things that they had. They weren't really a target; it was more of a wish, Madam Speaker, kind of like the promises they made to Manitobans, more of a wish. And, you know, the former—the member for Fort Garry-Riverview (Mr. Allum), he was the minister of Education and when he made a promise to Manitobans, he made a promise about a school in Brandon, and I listened very closely—and the MLA for Fort Rouge should listen to this—because he promised Brandon a school. And when he was asked: Well, how much will it cost? Well, we have a process for that.

Well, where will it be?

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member will have eight minutes remaining.

* (11:00)

RESOLUTIONS

Res. 9—Keeping Post-Secondary Education Affordable for Students and Families

Madam Speaker: The hour is now 11 a.m. and time for private members' resolutions.

The resolution before us this morning is the resolution on keeping post-secondary education affordable for students and families, brought forward by the honourable member for Fort Rouge.

Mr. Wab Kinew (Fort Rouge): I move, seconded by the member for Fort Garry-Riverview,

WHEREAS the Provincial Government has lifted the cap on post-secondary tuition hikes which limited tuition increases to the rate of inflation, allowing tuition to be raised by five percent plus inflation and deregulated course fees; and

WHEREAS universities in Winnipeg and Brandon are preparing to raise tuition at the maximum rate, meaning thousands more dollars in tuition and course fees for students over a four year degree; and

WHEREAS university tuition must be affordable and accessible to all students and parents; and

WHEREAS a tuition hike will hit low-income students and families the hardest, and some students in Manitoba are already using extra supports like food banks to afford their education; and

WHEREAS tuition is the number one barrier to post-secondary education and Manitoba should continue to have the third lowest tuition fees in Canada; and

WHEREAS maintaining the cap on tuition fees will ensure that Manitoba universities can continue to attract students from all socio-economic backgrounds and allow everyone in the province to access education; and

WHEREAS the Premier has frozen wages for public sector workers at the same time he opened the door to tuition hikes, making it harder for students to access post-secondary education and find good paying jobs thereafter; and

WHEREAS the Premier introduced legislation to lift the tuition cap without consulting with students or their families, despite meeting with student leadership several times.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the provincial government to withdraw Bill 31 and maintain the cap on tuition fees so they rise by only the level of inflation and education remains affordable for every student and family in Manitoba.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Kinew), seconded by the honourable member for Fort Garry-Riverview (Mr. Allum),

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the provincial government to withdraw Bill 31 and maintain the cap on tuition fees so they rise by only the level of inflation and education remains affordable for every student and family in Manitoba.

Mr. Kinew: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I would also like to say a special thank you to all my friends from Earl Grey who are here in the gallery today, one of the great schools in the awesome constituency of Fort Rouge. And part of what makes Earl Grey so great, in addition to the very smart teachers and all the hard-working parents, are, of course, the super brilliant students in the school body of Earl Grey.

Mr. Doyle Pivniuk, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

And so I did want to share with you, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, that just a short time ago, before we came into the Chamber, I had a chance to speak with our young friends here about their futures, and I did encourage them all to go to university and college.

I was able to give them a little Golden Boy pin that they can wear with pride—and I hope that they do so as a keepsake. I see a few of them being worn right now, many of them being worn right now, actually, so—as a little souvenir for their visit to the Legislative Building.

But I'll tell you, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, I made a little deal with the students, if you will. I asked, who here is planning to go to college or university? And I was very inspired, my heart was filled to see every young person who's visiting here from Earl Grey say, I'm going to go to college; I'm going to go to university. So that was really good, very positive future here in Manitoba. And I want to make sure that they're able to follow through on those wishes.

And so I actually made a little deal with them, and I want to remind my young friends up there today that they promised me, about 10 or 20 years from now, I'm going to go and find them, and if anyone didn't go to college or university, they've got to pay me \$50. That was the deal that we made. Of course, just between you and I, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, I have no intention of actually collecting that \$50. It's just a little deal to try and maybe motivate some of our young friends here.

But that aside, I think that affordability, being able to actually pay to go to university and college is a super important factor in the success of young people such as the ones who are visiting us from Earl Grey here today. Right now in the province, the average student, after they're done college or university has a student debt load of about \$19,000 which, for a young person who might not even be able to pay back a \$50, you know, debt—\$19,000 is definitely very intimidating, especially when you consider that students, when they're coming out of college or university they want to do things like buy a new car; they want to be able to buy their first house; or if you live in an area like Fort Rouge, maybe buy their first condo, right?

And so, if we are able to keep the amount of money that students have to pay for college and university down, keep education more affordable, then we leave more money in the pockets of recent graduates to be able to get their lives started and make those important first purchases and those important first contributions to building their own net worth, basically to be able to build their own wealth over the course of their career.

And so that's why it is a major priority for myself and my colleagues to ensure that education is affordable. And that's why we're working with student groups like the Canadian Federation of Students, a fantastic organization that represents many of the college and university students across the province here. We're working with them to ensure that education remains affordable. And I was pleased to see that the Canadian Federation of Students is organizing a phone-in campaign where students at the post-secondaries are being encouraged to call the Minister of Education and share with the minister why it is so important for them that tuition, the cost that's paid to attend college and university, stays affordable.

Now we know that under the first decade of the NDP, the past NDP government, there was actually a tuition freeze, meaning that the level—the amount of money paid to go to college and university—it didn't go up for 10 years under one of the former NDP premiers here. And then, after that, it was tied to the rate of inflation. So just whatever amount of increase there was to the overall basket of consumer goods, that was the amount of money that—or that was the percentage increase which was allowed to be increased on the tuition charged in the province.

However, though that is the existing law in the province of Manitoba right now, we know that as a result of Bill 31 being tabled in this session, that that is now under threat and that tuition may actually go up by 7 per cent a year, if you assume that inflation continues at around 2 per cent per year.

So I just wanted to put a few figures on the record, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, as to what the real-world impact of that might be and to contrast that with what the situation would look like if there was a—just the existing law was—continued to be the policy with respect to tuition increases. So, if you assume that the average tuition for a Manitoba student is \$4,058—which is, you know, the Manitoba average in tuition right now—if you cap tuition at 2 per cent increase in—assuming that inflation will be 2 per cent, it means that next year, tuition would be about \$4,100; the year after that it would be just a bit over \$4,200; the third year after that, it would be \$4,300; and then in the fourth year, it would be about \$4,392.

However, if tuition is allowed to increase by 5 per cent plus an assumed 2 per cent rate of inflation, then in the first year, tuition is going to jump to \$4,342; second year, it's going to be

\$4,650 almost; the third year it's going to be close to \$5,000; and in the fourth year, it's going to be over \$5,300. So the difference in how much tuition will rise if Bill 31 is allowed to pass versus what students would be paying if it was kept at inflation means that in the first year, it's going to be more than \$200 higher than it would otherwise have been. In the second year, it'll be \$420 higher than it would have otherwise been. In the third year, it'll be \$665 higher, and in the fourth year, it'll be close to \$1,000 higher. So that's a real impact on the pocketbooks of—and the debit cards of—students here in Manitoba.

Now, we have heard some talk about changes to the MSBI program. And I do want to be fair to the government, so I went ahead and calculated what the increase on the MSBI program would mean for the average student at the University of Manitoba. Well, it would mean about \$115 difference, which, in the first year, when tuition is only going to jump \$200, adding \$115 in scholarship sounds all right, but when you get to the third and fourth year where you're talking about a \$650 increase and that level is flat at \$115, and then a \$926 increase and that level of scholarship to bursaries is again flat at \$115, you're starting to see that the money being charged to students is not being adequately complemented with an increase in scholarships and bursaries.

* (11:10)

So the net impact is that post-secondary education will become less affordable in Manitoba, and that has a real impact.

You know, when I was at the University of Winnipeg—I believe I've shared this with you before Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker—but when we spoke to low-income students, what some of them told us is that, well, if you're going to increase tuition by \$1,000 you might as well increase it by \$10,000, because for somebody coming from a low-income background it is that much of a barrier. And so we can surmise that there may be less low-income students who believe that post-secondary is a possibility for them to be able to change their own lives for the better, and that is very concerning.

And then, for other students who perhaps maybe come from a middle-class background or, you know, even upper-middle-class and upper-class backgrounds, the impact will be that the student debt load that they carry with them after they graduate will be higher.

Again, if you just sum up the figures that I shared there, you're looking at a few thousand dollars more in student debt being carried by students at the end of their academic careers. And that's very concerning to us because we think that that few thousand dollars would better be spent on somebody's down payment for their first home or on other necessary investments towards advancing their own lives.

So, with those few words on the record, I do just want to share with you, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, that education must remain—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time is up.

Questions

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

Mr. Scott Johnston (St. James): Many post-secondary institutions, administrators and faculties' departments have asked for tuition increases in years previous.

Why does the member for Fort Rouge think he knows how better to manage the PSE environment than university presidents, boards or deans?

Mr. Wab Kinew (Fort Rouge): Well, I guess the quick answer is because I called many of those people colleagues until about a year ago, so I do believe that I have a fair bit of insight into the administration of a post-secondary institution.

But I think that the more important point for the member from St. James to take home is that, you know, his government did not consult with students who are the most important stakeholder group when it comes to post-secondary education.

So, yes, it is important to talk to, you know, the senior executives of the post-secondary institutions. But it seems entirely remiss to me to not consult with the actual young people, the students themselves, as well as their families who are going to help them pay the tuition that we are debating here today.

Mr. James Allum (Fort Garry-Riverview): I'd like to ask the member, why is it important to ensure all

Manitoba students have access to post-secondary education?

Mr. Kinew: Well, I think that regardless of what party stripe you choose to carry out your political career under, I think that everyone in this Chamber understands that education is one of the most transformational interventions that we can make into the lives of young people.

I have seen first-hand, both in my family and in my in-laws family, that education is what has allowed, you know, the people in my social network to be able to lift themselves up out of poverty and into a life of success. And I believe that people from many different backgrounds here in the Chamber today can think of stories like that.

And so, again, keeping education affordable means that the maximum—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time is up.

Mrs. Sarah Guillemard (Fort Richmond): I just have a quick question. I'd like to know the post-secondary institutions that the member for Fort Rouge consulted with in drafting this resolution.

Mr. Kinew: Well, Chatham House rules prevail, so I don't want to divulge specific, you know, identifying details. But I have spoken to a number of, you know, the people that I used to work with in the post-secondary system about tuition. And though we don't always agree, I do think that it is fair to say that everyone in the post-secondary system agrees that affordability is an important determinant in ensuring access to post-secondary education.

Ms. Judy Klassen (Kewatinook): The Liberals are huge advocates for people who are largely marginalized. What does the member foresee happening to this marginally-marginalized gap?

Mr. Kinew: Well, if I could take a certain liberty and maybe just paint the picture for the member with, you know, a scenario for somebody from her own constituency, we could imagine a situation where a young person leaves the Island Lake area to come to Winnipeg to pursue post-secondary. And if tuition is in fact \$1,000—close to \$1,000 higher in the fourth year of their degree program, I think that that's going to cause real economic hardship. It's going to be taking the money away that they might otherwise spend to feed their—themselves and perhaps their families. And it would also create a greater burden

on the Post-Secondary Student Support Program in some of the First Nations communities—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time is up.

Ms. Amanda Lathlin (The Pas): Tuition is the No. 1 barrier to post-secondary education, and Manitoba should continue to have accessible and affordable tuition fees so that students from all socio-economic backgrounds can go to university.

So, with that, my question is: What kinds of barriers does a 3.5 per cent increase in tuition cause for students and their families?

Mr. Kinew: Well, I think I shared some of the impact that might be felt by somebody moving in from a rural centre. But if I could, you know, speak about people in my own constituency, again, you know, there are people in—young students in Fort Rouge who access food banks in order to be able to make ends meet.

So, if a young person is required to go every two weeks to get vegetables and, you know, pasta and canned goods from a food bank in order to make ends meet, then it seems to me that another, you know, few thousand dollars over the course of their academic career is going to cause real hardship and is going to force them, you know, into even more—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time is up.

Mr. Greg Nesbitt (Riding Mountain): Can my friend from Fort Rouge explain to me why the NDP in 2010 allowed tuition increases well past the 5 per cent ceiling to be approved? Was it because these programs were suffering under the former NDP government's tuition cap policies?

Mr. Kinew: I'm not exactly clear on what my colleague makes reference to, though I suspect that he might be referring to course-related fees and considering them as a basket. And I would just direct him that if he is concerned about the fee increases, that he should actually be very upset about the content of Bill 31, because it will deregulate fees, course-related fees, lab fees, program fees, entirely.

And so, actually, the overall net increase in the amount of money being charged for education could go up by more than the 5 per cent plus inflation because you may actually see hundred of dollars more in fees charged to post-secondary students.

Mr. Allum: I think, in light of the question from my friend just a moment ago, it might be worth it to talk about the government's record when they were in office. Could the member tell us what tuition fees were like when the PCs were last in government?

Mr. Kinew: Well, I know that under the—you know, the past Filmon government, that tuition did skyrocket, and that was one of the reasons why one of the first policy moves of the Doer government, which is actually a very popular administration on both sides of the House, I know—one of the first moves of the Doer government was to freeze increases to tuition so that, you know, the affordability piece would fall back into balance.

And again, you know, we've heard a lot of speculation from—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time is up.

* (11:20)

Hon. Steven Fletcher (Assiniboia): I wonder if my friend across the way is aware that in the last 15 years the student fees at UMSU have gone from \$75 all in, to this year \$954.12, and that is not even including the professional schools and additional fees there. How can this member—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Order.

Mr. Fletcher: How can this member say what he's saying and not critique the student union or the poor record of underfunding the university for 17 years?

Mr. Kinew: You know, I know that the member from Assiniboia watches the happenings at UMSU closely. He is a past UMSU president and, you know, I definitely respect his service there. I think I was actually part of the student body during part of the time that he was president.

And what I would say is, you know, if fees being charged to students is something that he's concerned with, again, he should take a look at Bill 31 and what that is going to mean for the fees charged by not just student unions, but also by the institutions themselves because fees are entirely deregulated under this bill. And so whereas previously, or at least under the existing legislation, fees were—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time is up.

Ms. Lathlin: This government gave itself a 20 per cent wage bump; it's obvious that they're paying for it on the backs of students and

their families. So how does this governments' refusal to raise the minimum wage create further barriers for students wanting to access post-secondary education?

Mr. Kinew: Now, I don't want to concede necessarily that, you know, Bill 31 is going to pass. But let's just play a little hypothetical scenario where it does. Increasing the minimum wage by 50 cents would put, you know, hundreds of dollars into the pockets of students in Manitoba, many of whom do work for minimum wage. So for a student working on minimum wage that would put hundreds of dollars in their pocket which would allow them to keep pace with the tuition increases, at least over the first few years of Bill 31 being in place.

So, when you have the double whammy, however, of Bill 31 coming into effect, but no concomitant increase to the minimum wage—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time is up.

The time for question period had expired.

Debate

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The debate is open. Any speakers?

Mr. Scott Johnston (St. James): I am happy to rise to put some comments on the record regarding this resolution presented by my honourable friend, the member from Fort Rouge.

Our government has made a commitment to review and evaluate how our government delivers services to the people of Manitoba. We have endeavoured to understand and address the needs of how education can have long-term sustainable success and accountability in the province of Manitoba. Our Premier (Mr. Pallister) created mandates for all Cabinet ministers, including the Minister of Education, to do better. The Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Wishart) should be complimented for his continued evaluation and efforts to continue on the road to recovery and to address our Manitoba educational needs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot support this resolution as it calls for the withdrawal of Bill 31. I'm sure that's a big surprise to my friends on this side of the—

An Honourable Member: I'm shocked.

Mr. Johnston: I am—

An Honourable Member: I am shocked.

Mr. Johnston: I'm sure you're devastated.

The Advanced Education Administration Act restricts increases in university tuition fees and course-related fees. Bill 31 amends the restrictions on tuition increases and removes the restrictions on course-related fees.

The provincial grants to a university may be reduced if the university increases tuition fees by an amount greater than allowed by the act. Grants may be reduced if the average tuition fees in Manitoba exceed the lowest average tuition fees in any province west of Manitoba.

Our government believes that universities must maintain their tuition competitiveness while allowing them to address the long-term financial 'sustainability' of education.

Our government has vision. Our minister has vision and will help guide us through these challenging times.

The universities understand their responsibilities and student needs. These Manitoba institutions are capable of decisions that take into consideration the best interests of all. I find it hard to believe that our universities would go out of their way to compromise their patrons, the students that they're committed to. Our government trusts our universities, and, certainly, Bill 31, which is in question here, addresses that.

Manitoba universities have indicated that current restrictions hinder their ability to be nationally and internationally competitive. A university has to be able to prosper to grow. Simple economics dictate that the higher enrolments allow higher revenues, which will offset overall costs. Our universities have to be able to compete and satisfy student needs. Also, being able to offer anything other universities can only can accommodate market demand and enhance enrolments.

Universities strive to enhance their existing programs. With unrealistic restrictions on tuitions and fees, they struggle to be able to maximize their offerings. Bill 31 gives universities the flexibility to set tuition rates while keeping Manitoba's tuitions in line with other western provinces. Our government is aware of the need for our universities to remain competitive with our neighbours to the west. Bill 31 also introduces a formula that limits this increase—increases to the rate of 5 per cent plus CPI. The

government recognizes the need for a stable approach to these increases are needed. As further government—governance on increases, the minister has the power to reduce university grants if Manitoba does not maintain the lowest average tuition fees in western Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, education is a priority for this government. In an effort to continue to support Manitoba students, our government has introduced improvements to Manitoba scholarships and bursaries. These improvements will enhance students in successfully completing their studies. Beginning this year, all funds must be provided directly to students rather than investing in endowments. This change will provide more students with the resources they need to successfully complete their studies.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, provincial investments totalling \$6.7 million—\$6.75 million in 2017-18 and changes to private donor matching ratio will result in up to \$20 million annually going direct to students. Bill 31 will not come in effect until 2018-19 school year, allowing significant time for planning, while 2017 and '18 school year will remain at the annual increase of 1.3 CPI.

Bill 31 allows the board of governors of each university to determine tuition fees. This puts the decision making with the custodians of the educational institution.

Our Minister of Education has done his due diligence presenting Bill 31. The minister has indicated right from the beginning that his office is—has been consulting with post-secondary institutions, various students groups and other interested parties. The minister will continue to consult with universities to develop policy, to establish required processes and procedures to enable this legislation.

* (11:30)

Bill 31 will also allow input from all interested parties: the university administration, staff, students, business and the general public. Education as a whole faces many challenges; it is the responsibility of government to be visionary. We must continue to look at the long-term viability and sustainability of our most significant resource, and I know that the whole House, all members of the House, agree with the importance of education—as I think my honourable friend from Fort Rouge indicated, and I thought quite clearly, that it's his belief. And I believe genuinely that education is certainly the way to create success for all members of our society.

Our province is dependent on securing—*[interjection]*—you know, I've got—I've got my audience here; I don't get to speak to them that often.

Our province is dependent on securing a steady supply of graduates able to contribute to the growth and needs, whether it be agriculture, aerospace, commerce, government, labour, medical. In order to meet the demands of these markets we need to secure long-term sustainable post-secondary educational institutions.

The other issue we have is maximizing the results of—our educational institutions are getting. We must ensure our educational system is able to access resources needed to ensure our graduates can compete. Our government is not only seeking to ensure the viability of our universities, we also have a long-term vision to ensure Manitoba students have built a foundation that prepares them from university.

A concern we continue to hear from our universities is a significant amount of high school grads are not able to perform at the university entrance levels. This puts a further strain on university resources, and our government is committed to ensuring better results coming out of high school.

All governments are dealing with this dilemma of escalating costs, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Education is only second to health care when it comes to government expenditures. It should be noted that the former Manitoba government addressed the need for additional revenues by allowing increases to tuitions. Then-Minister McGifford indicated extraordinary costs resulted in increases for dentistry, pharmacy, law and engineering—*[interjection]* Thank you for that clarification from my friend from Fort Garry-Riverview.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Bill 31 allows the people that know their educational institutions to act in the best interests of what they are responsible for, the institutions they are responsible. I support the university presidents, boards and deans to manage their post-secondary—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time is up.

Mr. James Allum (Fort Garry-Riverview): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to get up for—very shortly. I know that will please other members in the House, just put a few words on the record in support

of this very, very important resolution put forward by my friend from Fort Rouge.

One of the things that our government did exceedingly well was to make sure that we had an affordable, accessible quality education system that ran the full continuum from kindergarten all the way through to career. In less than one year the government is trying to roll the clock back to the dark days of the 1990s when tuition went up by 132 per cent. Let me repeat that for members: where tuition went up by 132 per cent and enrolment declined by 10 per cent, and the result was that universities and colleges were not affordable. They were not accessible and the quality of that education suffered as a result.

Now, I want to say, also, that we had a vision for education that far exceeded just its affordability, although that is critical to ensuring that everyone has an opportunity to be engaged in that game changer in education. And I have to say my friend from St. James who I know to care about education—he was a fine school trustee, comes from a family that cares about education—stands up and says, well, did you listen to the president?

Well, actually, what we did is we listened to students and we listened to their families, and we knew that we needed to make sure that everyone had the opportunity to go to a post-secondary institution. And at the same time we needed to make sure that those post-secondary institutions were modernized. And so, if you go to every single campus in this province you'll see them—a process of modernization going on that was nonexistent during the 1990s.

Former Premier Doer used to say we introduced the building crane, the formerly extinct building crane, back onto campuses, because they didn't exist during the Filmon era. He used to say that we fixed the engineering roof when—because when we came into government, it had a great big hole in it—*[interjection]* Yes. But, more than that, we built a whole new engineering school, and we were going to build another one at the U of M.

But, if you go to ACC, if you go to Red River College, if you go to Brandon University, if you go to the University of Winnipeg and, if you go to the University College of the North, which didn't exist when these guys were in government, then you'll see that modernization of our education system, a 21st-century education system, was accessible to every single family in this province.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to say, my friend from Fort Rouge has put a very, very important resolution on the table. The government needs to withdraw the bill that's currently on the Order Paper in relation to post-secondary education, and every member of the Conservative caucus needs to stand with our side of the House to make sure that we always have an accessible, affordable, quality education system for every student in this province.

Mr. Shannon Martin (Morris): Mr. Speaker, it's always—or, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's always a pleasure to rise in this House and follow my colleague across the way, the member for Fort Garry-Riverview (Mr. Allum), and as the smoke pours out of his ears and he rants on about this and that issue, he forgets his own legacy as a government.

I always wonder, though, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why he doesn't take that opportunity when he's speaking in the House to apologize again to my predecessor, Mrs. Taillieu, who left this position to take care of her husband, who, unfortunately, passed due to cancer. But instead, he and other members of his government chose to politicize that very personal decision, which is truly unfortunate. And maybe one of these days—one of these days—the member opposite will rise and actually apologize for those comments and the constant politicization of that very personal decision, a decision I would argue that all of us would undertake.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, tuition fees and university accessibility is obviously an issue that we all face here in Manitoba and one that we're discussing with this resolution and then obviously discussing, by extension, Bill 31.

So it's interesting, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that members opposite like to—they like to cite information, but they don't always like to do their research. So I've done some research for them.

So a former deputy minister of the NDP government wrote a paper while they were a member of the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba. And they noted that—and this was in Canadian Public Policy—that an examination of the evidence does not support the beliefs that substantial tuition fees exclude deserving students who lack the money to pay.

The author noted the following claims. He noted that low tuition levels have reduced the revenue available to universities and may have actually

limited universities' responsiveness that relatively low tuition fees have not resulted in substantial changes in the composition of the university population. Low tuition fees constitute a reverse income transfer, hence are socially regressive. Financial barriers are not the primary obstacle to greater accessibility to universities, and tuition is a relatively small part of the cost of attending in any case. And No. 5, accessibility could be improved more readily and more substantially through direct program efforts than through indirect measures as a tuition policy.

So, again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a deputy minister of the former NDP government in Canadian Public Policy whose academic achievements exceed mine. It goes on to say in the same report that if tuition fees were the key to who attends university, we would expect to find that universities enrol a group of students similar to the population as a whole. That is, as is well known, far from the case.

There is overwhelming evidence—and I'll say that again, Mr. Deputy Speaker—there is overwhelming evidence that universities draw their students very heavily from families which are already above average in education background and income.

* (11:40)

So, I mean, if members opposite want to disregard the advice of their former deputy minister of Education, they are free to. But it's interesting, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that their future leader, Michelle McHale—just recently, in *The Manitoban*—actually echoed the exact same sentiment when she said, and I quote: Right now, given tuition rates, even as they are, and the policy laid out by the former NDP government, education is only available for a certain number of people who have had a particular start in life. It's not fair to disadvantage people for things that they didn't choose.

Again, who said that, the future leader of the NDP members opposite. So, apparently, she agrees with the deputy minister in his analysis of tuition fee and tuition fee policy.

It should also be noted, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that countries who have experimented with reductions or even the outright elimination of tuition fees have not found that the policy change had a significant impact on who attended university. Among the examples which might be cited: Australia and Sweden—but in Europe, generally, where tuition fees do not exist in some circumstances; university students, as in

Canada, they are significantly overrepresented in those countries from individuals from more affluent and better educated families. So, again, the evidence doesn't back what the members are saying today.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the report goes on and the analysis goes on, which is, again, notes—and I'm going to quote. When we talk about the regressive nature of low tuition, a policy or a suggestion put forward in the *Canadian Public Policy* analysis, it goes on to say that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, not normally a bastion of socialism, put it: Low tuition fees benefit the middle and upper classes, which make the most use of Canada's universities; keeping tuition fees down burdens less wealthy citizens who pay more in taxes for higher education than they receive in direct benefits.

The CMA cited evidence for this view, including C.D. Howe Institute, the Bovey Commission in Ontario and the Macdonald commission, as well as the Nova Scotia Royal Commission on Post-Secondary Education.

So, again, there is an inordinate amount of evidence that suggests that the position put forward by members opposite, whether it's an academic review, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in terms of an analysis as to accessibility and the impact of low tuition and accessibility, or, again, their future leader, Michelle McHale, who agrees with the academic analysis that there is no correlation.

Now, that's not to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we need to look at, then, why. Why are individuals actually attending post-secondary institutions? And, again, I'll only refer to analysis done by *Canadian Public Policy* magazine on—or *Canadian Public Policy* on tuition fees and university accessibility. Again, written by a former deputy minister of the NDP, said that there is now a considerable body of literature on the factors influencing attendance in university which agrees that the decision as to whether an individual attends university is complex and is affected by many elements of a person's life. The most significant factors include a student's previous academic achievement and his or her concept of their own ability; the intention of friends and family; the educational background and income of parents; the availability of university programs nearby and, at appropriate times, ability to gain entry to the program of choice; perception of the institution as supportive of or not; alternative opportunities such as work and—believe it or not—chance or luck.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's a whole host of factors, and I think if anyone here is forthright and honest—even members opposite, if they can, you know, find their way to that path—would agree that their own personal decision to attend higher education was based far more on simply the potential cost of that education. I know members opposite—as do, you know, family members of not only current MLAs on all sides of the House, but previous MLAs—their children have attended university not just here in Manitoba, but across Canada and, indeed, around the world. And I applaud those young people for furthering their own education and expanding their own horizons both culturally and geographically. So one wonders if tuition was the only influence as to those decisions, then why didn't those same children strictly stay within here, Manitoba, as a result of the much-'ballhooed'-about NDP practice of low tuition policy. And, again, that's just more evidence that low tuition is only a very, very small component, as academically shown, within Canadian Public Policy, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

So, when we look at some of the decisions made by members opposite and some of the decisions made, when it comes to tuition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's always interesting that they rise and they say, you know, we need to hold tuition at the rate of inflation, and yet they ignore the fact that they allowed tuition to rise 4 and a half per cent one year, 5 per cent another year. In fact, in some instances, within the academic university setting, they allowed tuition to rise a staggering 91 per cent in a single faculty.

So they can get up and 'ceckle' all they want about the policy being put forward under Bill 31, but it would take 18 years under our policy, essentially, to achieve what they did in a stroke of a pen. In another program, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they increased it by 40 per cent. Again, it would take eight years under our policy to do what they did in a single stroke of the pen. The business program—25 per cent. So, again, they have no issue with raising tuition. It's very clear that this is, for them, this is 'cerely'—merely a political issue of which to score cheap political points. And, fortunately, I suppose, they would rather ignore academic research. They would rather ignore their own future leader, and that is truly—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time is up.

Ms. Judy Klassen (Kewatinook): Education is the foundation of a sustainable and healthy life.

Post-secondary education provides the basis for many to change lives—change their lives in the face of life's adversities. However, raising tuition fees can have many damaging effects on the current situation of students as, equally, their future. We have said before, that the students should not—should be free to focus on their education without having to worry about tuition fees being unaffordable. Pursuing a post-secondary education can be stressful enough. Many students state the cost of tuition is one of their biggest concerns in pursuing post-secondary education. Raising tuition fees decentivizes many from going to university or college, as they are unsure of the future prospects in their careers and the ability to pay off the debt on the student loans.

We have already seen impacts of the high cost of tuition in post-graduate studies, which have seen decreases in enrolment in the US. How can we help to expand the number of doctors and well-educated professionals in this province when we begin to decentivize education by making it unaffordable?

It is well documented that raises in tuition impact the lives of those who are at a socio-economic disadvantage the most. Even with programs to aid students who come from low-income backgrounds, tuition increases are correlated to lower enrolment rates among this group. When education is the pathway to life that low-income individuals have available to change their lives for the better, why do we make it hard for our most vulnerable to have a post-secondary education as a viable goal in their life? Mr. Speaker, Manitoba students are worried about being able to afford their education, and many have raised concerns regarding the removal of the cap.

The University of Manitoba, the University of Winnipeg and Brandon University provide food bank services through joint collaboration or through student unions to students in need. We have too many students relying on those food banks to survive and to receive nutritious food needed to support their studies. When students are not able to afford basic food and turn to support, how do we expect them to pay for those increases in the tuition?

This government did not raise minimum wage, and we know many students have to work while they study. So, while raising the tuition rates, caution must be taken to reduce the harmful effects on students, their finances and their future. Despite running a campaign that they say that they would make post-secondary education more affordable,

what we see is this government is going against their word. Bursaries and scholarships only go so far and will not help everyone affected by the increases. Mr. Speaker, the students of Manitoba should be encouraged to focus on their education and not have to worry about education negatively affecting their livelihood.

* (11:50)

The Manitoba Liberals are tired of governments who work in the illogical. The majority of Manitobans are students or are parents of students. If you're raising costs, then raise the minimum wage or retract that PST increase so that they can afford school. I know this government knows that and the logic this takes. We've heard several times from our colleagues across the floor of the unsubstantiated projection of a \$1.7-billion deficit. So maybe they do know math, so please use that logic to increase the minimum wage or retract that additional 1 per cent in PST. Otherwise, please be prepared for the repercussions of the ever-expanding marginalized group of Manitobans.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Greg Nesbitt (Riding Mountain): We're here this morning to debate a resolution by the honourable member from Fort Rouge, which I read it to say that we have already lifted a cap on post-secondary education. The member knows full well that this important legislation has been designated by his party for discussion this fall.

When passed, however, Bill 31 will give universities the flexibility to set tuition rates while keeping Manitoba's tuition in line with provinces to the west of us. The bill will amend the act by repealing existing restrictions on tuition fee and course-related fee increases for the 2018-19 school year. This will enable our universities to set tuition rates that better reflect their cost of delivering programs and reduce administrative burdens by removing any ministerial review of course-related fees. The bill will cap tuition increases at 5 per cent, plus any yearly increase in the consumer price index.

Currently, Manitoba's tuition fees are the third lowest in Canada, with only Quebec and Newfoundland institutions charging their students more for an undergraduate degree. And our tuition fees are guaranteed to remain the lowest in western Canada with the passage of this bill. The bill will improve university competitiveness and

accountability while ensuring that tuition remains affordable for our students.

Our minister will have the ability to reduce grant funding to universities if the institution increases tuition fees by an amount greater than that allowed by the act. Grants may also be reduced if the average tuition fees in Manitoba exceed the lowest average tuition fees in any province west of Manitoba.

For many years, Mr. Deputy Speaker, our universities have expressed concerns about the restrictions on tuition and fee increases which impacted their ability to enhance programming within their institution. They worried about their long-term financial sustainability, the administrative burden to comply with legislation, and the tuition and fee 'disparencies'—disparities amongst institutions.

I have a quote I would like to share: We believe the proposed tuition fee increases, coupled with additional financial supporters and access to programming, will help universities and college manage their budgets effectively while at the same time widening the range of post-secondary opportunities available to Manitobans.

Who said that, you ask. Diane McGifford, the former minister of Advanced Education and Literacy in the NDP government on April 22nd, 2009.

I would submit that small predictable increases in tuition fees are a small price to pay for the quality of education given. The amenities and tools that universities in Manitoba offer their students to gain higher education, including the excellent standard of university professors, are priceless. Consequently, even a modest yearly increase in tuition fees definitely makes it worth attending university as there is no other institution that can provide such high-quality facilities, teaching, help and advice, in addition to a highly regarded degree. This degree could potentially allow for huge salaries and pay packages in the long run, making the tuition fees paid to the university, which had made that all possible, seem insignificant.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, my friends on the opposition bench would have you believe the sky is falling by allowing a university, which, for all intents and purposes, is a business, to charge more for their product. That is simply not true.

Some Honourable Members: Oh. Oh.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Nesbitt: They're allowing the university to increase fees that will allow them to expand their programming, services and infrastructure to better service students now and into the future.

Here is a quote from Mark Frison, the president of ACC in Brandon, which provides post-secondary education to many of my constituents in western Manitoba: We're of the view that a less regulated tuition environment would be helpful, but when it comes to higher access education, tuition fees are probably not Manitoba's biggest program; the availability of programs is.

Certainly—Mark goes on to say: Certainly, in my view, having more resources available through tuition would be helpful and that potentially could draw more funding that comes from the government to be directed to program expansion rather than subsidizing tuition.

And Davin Barnard [*phonetic*], the president of the University of Manitoba, also agrees. He says: It is of critical importance that students in Manitoba have access to post-secondary education at modern, well-equipped, nationally and internationally competitive universities.

He goes on to say: At the U of M we have maintained consistently that increasing tuition rates to bring them more in line with those at similar universities across Canada will help achieve this goal.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government has not abandoned students. We have announced that we are strengthening our scholarship and bursary program to assist students with their post-secondary education. Our government is committed to helping post-secondary—to keeping post-secondary education accessible and has invested \$6.75 million in to the Manitoba Scholarship and Bursary Initiative for 2017-18. Other changes that will allow for leveraging more money from private donors will result in up to \$20 million annually going directly to students rather than flowing through endowments. Our government is committed to supporting a

high-quality post-secondary system for the benefit of all students and, in turn, for the benefit of employers across Manitoba. Our post-secondary education system is a key driver of our economy.

The honourable member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Kinew) was recently quoted in *The Manitoban* as saying: When I was in the university system, I heard from low-income students, if you're going to increase tuition by \$1,000 you might as well increase it by \$10,000, because it's that much of a barrier to them.

This may be what my friend heard, but it is not supported by fact. The Montreal Economic Institute compiled data from various Canadian provinces that showed no direct relationship between lower tuition fees and greater university access. In other words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, low tuition rates are not linked to high enrolments; in fact, the opposite is true.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it has been said that good governments make the difficult decisions necessary to—ensure the protection of sustainable quality services for all their citizens. And I am proud to be a member of such a government, one that has undertaken the hard work required to repair the damage of a decade of debt, decay and decline under the NDP and steer the—steer Manitoba on the road to recovery. Our government is focused on fixing the finances, repairing our services and rebuilding the economy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will support Bill 31 this fall, and I encourage all opposition members to reconsider their position over the next few months and get behind this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member for Riding Mountain (Mr. Nesbitt) will have one minute remaining.

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, April 6, 2017

CONTENTS

ORDERS OF THE DAY		Resolutions	
PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS		Res. 9—Keeping Post-Secondary Education Affordable for Students and Families	
Second Readings—Public Bills		Kinew	1132
Bill 216—The Financial Administration Amendment Act (Economic Indicators)		Questions	
Allum	1123	Johnston	1135
Questions		Kinew	1135
Johnson	1124	Allum	1135
Allum	1124	Guillemard	1135
Gerrard	1124	Klassen	1135
Swan	1124	Lathlin	1136
Helwer	1125	Nesbitt	1136
Wiebe	1125	Fletcher	1136
Lagassé	1125		
Debate		Debate	
Friesen	1126	Johnston	1137
Marcelino	1128	Allum	1138
Johnson	1129	Martin	1139
Gerrard	1130	Klassen	1141
Swan	1131	Nesbitt	1142
Helwer	1132		

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>