

**Fourth 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*

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Forty-First Legislature**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Constituency</b>	<b>Political Affiliation</b>
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	Man.
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	Ind.
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
LAMONT, Dougald	St. Boniface	Lib.
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, Hon.	St. Vital	PC
MICHALESKI, Brad	Dauphin	PC
MICKLEFIELD, Andrew	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
SMITH, Andrew	Southdale	PC
SMITH, Bernadette	Point Douglas	NDP
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, Hon.	Gimli	PC
WIEBE, Matt	Concordia	NDP
WISHART, Ian	Portage la Prairie	PC
WOWCHUK, Rick	Swan River	PC
YAKIMOSKI, Blair	Transcona	PC

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, April 16, 2019

*The House met at 1:30 p.m.*

**Madam Speaker:** Good afternoon, everybody. Please be seated.

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

**Madam Speaker:** Introduction of bills? Committee reports? Tabling of reports? Ministerial statements?

### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

#### Gowns for Grads Winnipeg

**Mr. Shannon Martin (Morris):** Madam Speaker, high-school graduation is a memorable life event, but the formal dress requirement can be a source of worry for many young women.

With a new floor-length gown selling for hundreds of dollars, Madam Speaker, the cost is out of reach for some grads and their families. Luckily, the volunteer-run charity Gowns for Grads Winnipeg offers free dresses and accessories to youth who otherwise might skip the graduation and dinner because they don't have a suitable outfit.

Melissa Lee donned her own grad dress from 10 years ago to help promote her campaign to collect grad dresses and accessories to donate. Headingly resident Melissa said she first heard about the charity after deciding she wanted to do something special to mark the 10th anniversary of her own graduation from Westwood Collegiate.

She found out that one of her former teachers is a Gowns for Grads volunteer, and that helped her decide to part with the dress that carries a lot of memories. She also decided to look through her closet and found another dozen dresses that could also be used for graduations.

Melissa, who teaches at St. Charles Catholic School in Winnipeg, started talking to colleagues and friends about her idea to collect dresses for donation.

She said she put on her grad gown for a final photo that she posted on Facebook to attract attention. She said she got a quick response from about 14 friends contacting her and, after collecting 30 dresses, her mother challenged her to set a target of 100.

As of today, Melissa has collected an outstanding 156 dresses, but she also knew that there is

more to grad than a nice dress so she's collected dress shoes, purses and evening bags and jewellery that she included in the donation.

Melissa and her mom did more than simply collect. They volunteered their time at the drop-off site. To quote Melissa: It was so amazing to see how this organization works and to help girls feel like a princess on their grad day. There was also a few emojis in her post, but I don't believe Hansard is ready for those yet.

So I ask all my colleagues to join me in congratulating Melissa, who's here in the gallery today, along with her mother Marie, her father Glenn and her sister Kaitlyn.

Congratulations and thank you.

#### Privatization of Liquor Sales

**Mr. Cliff Graydon (Emerson):** Recently, I read the Parliamentary Budget Office annual report that has received very little media attention but raises serious alarm bells for the Province of Manitoba regarding the direction of long-term debt. The report states Manitoba is on track to be among the highest debt-burdened provinces in Canada and they're projecting Manitoba's debt could rise from 37 per cent of the GDP to an incredible 449 per cent of the GDP if left unchecked.

This high debt combined with an increased interest rate would be disastrous for Manitoba in terms of being able to provide quality health care, decent education and other social and infrastructure programs that Manitoba taxpayers expect from their government.

It is time for the Manitoba government to explore all opportunities to reduce and streamline spending and look for efficiencies that can be realized. Although there are many opportunities, it seems that the government of Manitoba seems reluctant to make these changes.

Today I would like to call on the government of Manitoba to review the most efficient role for the Manitoba Liquor & Lotteries commission. It is time to consider privatization of all Manitoba liquor sales.

Studies have shown that privatization of liquor sales in other provinces like Alberta and Quebec

have had very positive impacts on government revenues as well as much improved consumer choices at lower prices. Ontario is now considering some very significant changes as well.

I'm suggesting that the government of Manitoba consider changing the role of Manitoba Liquor & Lotteries to a regulatory and tax collection role and allow for a move to privatize liquor sales system in Manitoba.

Consumers would see a—price, choice benefits. And also, research that—found that Alberta generates 7 per cent more in capital sales revenues from liquor sales and then provinces with state-run monopolies, and another benefit would be the sale of retail outlets currently owned and leased by Manitoba Liquor & Lotteries could raise significant one-time income that could be used to lower overall provincial debt—

**Madam Speaker:** The member's time has expired.

**An Honourable Member:** Ask for leave.

**Madam Speaker:** The member asks for leave to conclude his statement.

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Madam Speaker:** Leave has been denied.

### Clearspring Centre

**Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Education and Training):** In May of 1980 a significant development happened in the growth of the city of Steinbach with the opening of Clearspring village shopping centre.

The mall was started by Steinbach—former Steinbach MLA Jim Penner, owner of Penner Foods, and Ernie Penner, the former owner of E.G. Penner Building Centre, the two main anchors at the time.

A little more than a year after that opening of the mall, Bob Frey, who had worked with former MP Jake Epp, and former MLA Bob Banman, was hired as the manager of Clearspring mall.

Over the next 37 years, Bob was instrumental in dealing with the challenges and opportunities of running a mall in a rural environment. From record-high interest rates, to stores coming and going, to the changing shopping patterns of customers with different trends and the creation of the Internet and online shopping, Bob was—offered a steady hand through the challenges and opportunities over those almost 40 years.

As mall manager, Bob oversaw not only the challenges and changes of renovations, but the reinvention of the mall itself over those many years. In addition, the mall itself changed around it. The land on which the mall is located changed dramatically, with a number of national stores and restaurants being added to the footprint.

Thirty-seven years is a long time to survive and thrive in the retail environment. In managing to do just that, Bob made a significant impact not just on Clearspring mall, but to the adjacent area and the retail sector in Steinbach and the southeast. Clearspring Centre and the surrounding area—become a destination point for the southeast region and Northwest Ontario residents. Bob has been instrumental in making that happen.

Bob recently retired from his work as mall manager at Clearspring village. He leaves an impressive legacy and an indelible mark on the retail sector of Steinbach and the southeast. I wish him well in his retirement and thank him for all his service to Steinbach and Manitoba.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Matthew Frost**

**Mr. James Allum (Fort Garry-Riverview):** I rise today to honour the memory of my nephew, Matthew Frost, who was born on April 16th, 1972, and would have turned 47 today. Sadly, Matthew died of cancer at the age of 33 in 2005, but not a day goes by that I don't think about him, especially on his birthday.

Matthew was the eldest son of my sister Nancy and her husband Rick; brother to Jonathan and Carolyn; and loving husband to his beautiful wife Lorena. He was the only grandchild my mother ever saw and the oldest of 12 grandchildren on the Allum side of the family. He was much loved and highly admired by his many, many cousins.

Matthew was remarkably accomplished for a person who died much too young. He was a graduate of Kelvin High School and the U of M, but made his mark as the public relations officer for the Manitoba Moose before moving on to work for the Toronto Maple Leafs.

To their credit, True North not only allowed our family to hold a memorial service for Matthew at the Bell-MTS centre, but named a press conference room the Matt Frost Media Centre in recognition of

his passion, dedication and commitment to the organization.

When the Jets returned to Winnipeg, Gary Lawless, then a sports reporter with the Winnipeg Free Press, wrote that no one would've treasured it more than Matthew. Lawless said that his old pal Frosty could be feisty, stubborn and combative—kind of a family trait, Madam Speaker—but he also noted that Matthew was diligent, kind and funny.

I'm proud to say that Matthew's legacy also lives on through the Winnipeg Foundation's Matthew Frost Sports Fund, which provides scholarships for students in recreation studies at the U of M and funding for children to attend sports camps.

Want to thank all members for indulging me this afternoon. Fourteen years later, this is still a difficult day for my family so I just want to say: Matthew we love you. We miss you, but I know that somehow, some way we'll meet again.

Thank you.

### **Roderik George Toombs**

**Mr. Dougald Lamont (Leader of the Second Opposition):** Tomorrow, April 17th, marks the 65th birthday of one of Manitoba's great athletes, musicians and showmen. I rise today to pay tribute to Roderick George Toombs, born April 17th, 1954, in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, also known by his performing names The Masked Canadian, Piper Machine or, most famously, Rowdy Roddy Piper.

Roddy Piper was raised here in Winnipeg and attended Windsor Park Collegiate. His father was an RCMP officer and they lived in The Pas.

\*(13:40)

As with any professional wrestler, myth and legend are mixed in with history. Roddy is said to have wrestled for the first time in Churchill, Manitoba, in front of an audience of lumberjacks.

His first pro match was when he was only 15. His pipe band played him in, where the announcer proclaimed: Ladies and gentlemen, here comes Roddy the Piper, and so a legend was born.

He entered the ring to face, quote, 329 pounds of Nordic Viking, Larry "The Axe" Hennig, who beat Roddy in 10 seconds by busting his nose and eyes open, setting one of many records of Roddy's: shortest match in the history of the arena.

The Daily Telegraph said that Roddy Piper was considered by many to be the greatest heel—or villain—wrestler ever.

By 19 he was wrestling full-time in California. Eventually, he joined the WWF—later the WWE—and played a key role as wrestling exploded in popularity during the 1980s.

Piper also parlayed his charisma and performance into a second career acting and doing voice work, including the John Carpenter cult classic, *They Live*, which includes an immortal line that, sadly, cannot be repeated due to its unparliamentary nature.

Roddy died at the age of 61 on July 31st, 2015. He was survived by his wife Kitty, and by a son and four daughters. At the time, Vince McMahon said, Roddy Piper was one of the most entertaining, controversial and bombastic performers ever in the WWE. And John Carpenter said, he was a great wrestler, a masterful entertainer and a good friend.

Rowdy Roddy Piper brought joy to millions of fans around the world. Winnipeggers and Manitobans should be proud to call him one of their own.

### **Introduction of Guests**

**Madam Speaker:** Prior to oral questions, we have some guests in the gallery that I would like to introduce to you.

Seated in the public gallery from Linden Christian School we have 25 grade 11 students under the direction of Mark Glor, and this group is located in the constituency of the honourable First Minister.

On behalf of all members here, we welcome you to the Manitoba Legislature.

### **ORAL QUESTIONS**

#### **Notre Dame Cathedral Fire Statement of Sympathy**

**Mr. Wab Kinew (Leader of the Official Opposition):** Madam Speaker, one of the most iconic sites in Paris is the Notre Dame basilica. Certainly a beautiful structure, but it also represents a deep spiritual connection for many people around the world, including for Parisians themselves.

So we were very saddened to see such a marvellous building go up in flames yesterday. Obviously, we are grateful for the many firefighters and first responders who helped to preserve some of the building, also for all those who rescued many

artistic treasures from inside and preserved a great part of our collective world heritage in the process.

Madam Speaker, there is, of course, a sad connection to Winnipeg. We know many residents of St. Boniface also know what it's like to lose a cathedral, and so I just want to acknowledge that many people in Winnipeg and St. B. have a connection to that, as well.

We do wish Paris well in their time of need and we trust that those repairs will happen in short order.

I would like to ask a question about addictions and health care, but I thought it fit to put these comments on the record first, Madam Speaker.

**Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier):** Yes, of course, our sympathies go out. This is a—not just an historic, but a globally significant event; the loss of an iconic landmark is important.

It's important to note, also, that there has, at this point at least, not been a loss of life or injury. That being said, of course, losing a landmark is a significant issue.

I would add that it is important, and certainly, this government is investing accordingly, to preserve our landmarks, for example, the significant investments that I hope will be supported by all parties in restoring our Legislative Building here in Manitoba and making sure it's a safe place for people to come and to enjoy in our province from wherever they may emanate.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** I'm probably going to break a rule here, but I will just indicate that those are statements that I will accept from members.

And now we can go into oral questions officially.

**Mr. Kinew:** Okay, got a freebie—

**Madam Speaker:** Oh, and I would ask the desk to please reset the time on this.

The honourable first—the honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

#### **Addiction Treatment Services Request for Government Plan**

**Mr. Wab Kinew (Leader of the Official Opposition):** Well, thank you kindly for that dispensation.

For months the Premier has argued with other levels of government and we know that in some instances they have left resources that could be used to help Manitobans just sitting there on the table. At the same time, there is a severe addictions crisis here in Manitoba that seems to be getting worse week by week.

Previously in this House we have established that this government has not yet set—spent any of the ETF resources that are available to them to help combat the addiction crisis, but now today, through this document uncovered through freedom of information requests, we also see that the government—and I'll table it for the benefit of the Premier—that the government is also trying to claim expenses dating back to January 2016 for this new one-time injection of addiction funding.

I would ask the Premier: When is he going to come forward with a real plan to fight the addictions crisis in Manitoba?

**Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier):** We're investing on a number of fronts, Madam Speaker, but the principle of the member's preamble was that resources sit idle.

Madam Speaker, the resources of Manitobans are a key concern to this government. Unlike the members opposite, we are very concerned there be more money on the kitchen table, not less. We expressed our concern to the federal government when they proposed to jack up taxes on small businesses and led the provinces in organizing opposition to those tax hikes, while the members of the NDP sat idly by.

They sat idle while Manitoba's resources were threatened. They do the same with other taxes, and where they will not stand up for Manitobans, we will.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, on a supplementary question.

**Mr. Kinew:** Madam Speaker, the addictions crisis in Manitoba is very severe; we hear that word meth in the media all the time these days. And what has the Premier's response been? Well, he's thrown reports on the floor. He's frozen the funding to the Addictions Foundation of Manitoba, and now we find out that he's leaving millions of federal dollars on the table that could be used to help communities and families.

Now, because of that FIPPA that I just tabled here, we see that the government not only is not

using the federal money at their disposal, but they're also trying to claim—they're trying to get money back by claiming expenses dating back to January 2016—again, even into another government's term in office.

Why is the Premier refusing to act to fight the addictions crisis?

**Mr. Pallister:** The important thing would be, Madam Speaker, to read studies and to comprehend them. That is what our ministers are doing. That is what members on this side of the House continue to do.

The actions we have taken take many different forms. I have listed them repeatedly for the member. He continues to put false information on the record.

Where they sat quietly by and decided they would do nothing to stand up for Manitobans, we are standing up for Manitobans.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, on a final supplementary.

**Mr. Kinew:** No. No. The previous actions of the government—this Premier is now trying to use that to get money paid back to him by the federal government. That's what the document that I tabled just shows. They are going back to January 2016 and using expenses that were paid many, many years ago to try and qualify for this new federal funding.

But where is the action being taken today in 2019 to help the 2019 face of the addictions crisis our province is currently struggling through?

We know what actions need to be taken. There needs to be a comprehensive approach that includes not only treatment, but also a real commitment to harm reduction, in order to fight this addictions crisis. But, of course, the Premier also needs to get those federal resources.

Will he commit today to undertaking such a plan?

**Mr. Pallister:** The trouble with the member's position, Madam Speaker, is that it's consistently aligned with the federal government, whereas our relationship with the federal government isn't influenced by a desire to be liked. It's influenced by a desire to be right and to stand up for Manitoba's interests.

So when the federal government proposes to raise taxes on small businesses, the NDP says that's fine with them. When the federal government proposes to take \$2 billion out of health transfers over the next decade, the NDP says that's fine with them.

Madam Speaker, when the federal government proposes to inject a higher carbon tax that escalates upward and is to the detriment of working Manitoba families and seniors living on fixed incomes, the NDP sits on their hands and says nothing.

The problem with the NDP is they like to take sides, but they're always against Manitobans. We're for Manitobans on this side.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, on a new question.

### **Concordia and Seven Oaks Hospitals Request to Retain ER Services**

**Mr. Wab Kinew (Leader of the Official Opposition):** Well, it certainly doesn't seem that way, Madam Speaker, because one of the issues that Manitobans keep asking about over and over again is health care.

\* (13:50)

And what is this government doing on health care? Well, they're closing emergency rooms. They're closing the emergency rooms at Concordia and at Seven Oaks, if that weren't enough.

Are they listening to the experts who say that in order to improve wait times we need to enhance primary care? No, they're not. They're closing primary clinics right across the city and, indeed, across the province.

Are they expanding coverage for medical devices and prescription drugs? No, they are not. They are rolling back Pharmacare, Madam Speaker.

We know that this Premier's direction on health care is completely wrong.

Will he commit today to keeping the emergency rooms at Seven Oaks and Concordia open?

**Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier):** Well, again, the member's caught, Madam Speaker. He's not only got to take ownership of a deplorable record, the worst in Canada in terms of health care under the previous NDP government, but now he has to take ownership of the fact they failed to stand up for Manitobans

when the federal government decided to cut health-care transfers to our province.

He owns no solution, Madam Speaker. He only tries to own the fear. That's why he uses nurses as pawns in his game and says that they're—they should be afraid and their children should be afraid. That's why he says that doctors should be afraid in this province. That's why he tells patients they should be afraid.

Madam Speaker, Canadian institute of health information says our wait times are going down in emergency situations. Our wait times are improving; nine other provinces' wait times, including those governed by NDP governments, are worsening.

He doesn't own the solutions; he only owns the fear.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, on a supplementary question.

**Mr. Kinew:** The Premier knows full well that wait times have been going up—up—ever since he started to close emergency rooms and acute-care centres in the city of Winnipeg. Those are just the numbers.

The advice that this government is getting from medical professionals is that if they want to reduce those ER wait times that they have seen skyrocket that they need to invest in primary care. They're not doing that. They're also being told that they need to invest in something called secondary prevention, which means when somebody goes to surgery they shouldn't have to go for repeat surgeries, Madam Speaker.

But you know what the challenge is that Manitobans have under this government? They show up at the hospital at St. Boniface to have a heart surgery and the whole surgery is cancelled, never mind a repeat visit, Madam Speaker.

So we see full well the nature of health care under this government. It's failing. We need to fix it.

Will the Premier clear the way for a future NDP government to repair health care by keeping Concordia and Seven Oaks hospital emergency rooms open?

**Mr. Pallister:** Well, we're going to clear the way to better patient care for Manitoba families, Madam Speaker, that's what we'll do. And while the previous NDP government had advice on how to shorten wait times that had been followed by virtually every other major centre across the country:

concentrate your resources in fewer locations; have your specialists there; have your testing equipment there; be able to diagnose and treat people there. They didn't follow that advice.

They didn't have the courage to stand up for better health care. We do, Madam Speaker.

Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, on a final supplementary.

### **Emergency Room Services Moratorium on Closures**

**Mr. Wab Kinew (Leader of the Official Opposition):** Here I am standing up for health care once again.

Madam Speaker, we know full well that this Premier is cutting \$120 million from health care in this year's budget alone. That comes after he underspent the health care budget by \$240 million in the last fiscal year. Manitobans are seeing what the real impact is on their lives and their health care.

Not only are they closing the emergency rooms, not only are clinics closing, not only are surgeries being cancelled, but we also hear many, many stories from the emergency rooms and hospitals themselves about patients being treated poorly, about nurses being stressed out and a complete consensus across the WRHA that this government's plan for health care is failing.

Will this government turn over a new leaf and commit to a new course of action on health care that would begin by them putting a moratorium on emergency room closures in Winnipeg?

**Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier):** Well, we inherited a situation where we had a heck of a lot of emergency rooms and longer waits than everybody else, Madam Speaker.

Just with the actions we've taken so far we've reduced the amount of time that Manitobans have to spend in emergency rooms in the first two years of our government versus the last two of the NDP by almost 50 years. Fifty years is a long time, and Madam Speaker, Manitobans don't have to wait that long for better health care. They're getting it now.

Now, the reality is thousands of Manitobans don't have to be re-transported under our model. Our shared-service model means more resources are available for the front line instead of the backroom,



and PCH wait times, MRA services, CT scans are all going up.

Madam Speaker, the problem with the member is that he has to cite month-over-month stats to try to make a point that isn't enforceable by the real facts and by any credible analysis.

We know they broke the system, Madam Speaker, and we know we're fixing it.

### **Bilateral Health Agreement Timeline for Signing**

**Mrs. Bernadette Smith (Point Douglas):** Money for mental health and addictions treatment and home care could have been helping patients long ago. This is not the first time that the Premier (Mr. Pallister) has been one of the last to hold out on signing a health-care deal.

Clearly, health care is not a priority of this government. They delayed signing the federal health-care deal in 2017, and now they delayed signing the bilateral health agreement in—for 18 months.

Could this minister please explain to the House and to Manitobans why he took so long to sign on to the bilateral health agreement?

**Hon. Cameron Friesen (Minister of Health, Seniors and Active Living):** That member has incorrect information. Had she attended this morning's announcement, she would've understood that Manitoba forgoes no benefit of any other province.

We stood up for Manitobans. We made sure we got a good deal for Manitobans. We were proud to make those investments for Manitobans.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Point Douglas, on a supplementary question.

**Mrs. Smith:** Disagreements are not new to this Premier. He argues with the mayor. He argues with the Prime Minister. But this is simply unacceptable when we are talking about money on the table that could help people struggling with mental health and addictions tackle this crisis that's happening right here in our province; money that can be used to help funding our aging population to ensure that they are comfortable at home, delayed for 18 months, leaving money on the table.

Why did the Premier or the minister play games with federal government as people suffering with

addictions continue to wait for action from this government?

**Mr. Friesen:** Madam Speaker, the premise of the member's question is incorrect. Manitoba has full benefit under this bilateral agreement, just like any other province has. There is no benefit that is forgone as a result of us taking adequate time to negotiate well on behalf of all Manitobans.

We are pleased to see the federal government acknowledge in their agreement certain strengths we have, allowing us to profile new investments in new areas of need. These are all for the benefit of Manitobans in order for Manitobans to get better health care sooner.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Point Douglas, on a final supplementary.

**Mrs. Smith:** Nearly \$400 million was jeopardized by this government, \$400 million over the next 10 years to help aging Manitobans, Madam Speaker, to stay in the comfort of their homes, to help those facing addictions right here in our province that is at a crisis level. It's concerning to see how low of a priority that is for this government.

Just because the minister signed this agreement doesn't mean that he's going to live up to his priorities or to his promises.

Why did the government delay—[interjection]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mrs. Smith:** —critical, needed funding for Manitoba's aging population and those facing addictions?

**Mr. Friesen:** Madam Speaker, the member is misleading Manitobans. She indicates that something is in jeopardy. I remind her there is nothing in jeopardy, Manitoba forgoes no benefit. It has signed the bilateral agreement. We will be making good investments in home care, in mental health, in addictions. We have already done that.

But, Madam Speaker, I would remind that member that when it comes to mental health and addictions, the budget there shows \$23 million more than in the first year that we received government.

### **Disability Services Funding Concerns**

**Ms. Amanda Lathlin (The Pas):** The Department of Families say there's a growing demand for services for children with physical and intellectual

disabilities, yet last year the Pallister government made program changes and froze the intake for the inclusion support program. As a result, the number of children provided service through the inclusion support program fell by 8 per cent last year to the lowest it has been in nearly a decade.

Despite record demand, the minister and the former minister cut back services providing—provided to children living with a disability. It's a mistake, Madam Speaker, and one the minister needs to correct.

\* (14:00)

Will the minister ensure that the inclusion support program has the resources it needs to meet the needs of Manitoba children?

**Hon. Heather Stefanson (Minister of Families):** I thank the member for the question.

Of course, we care very deeply about children living with disabilities in our province, Madam Speaker, and that's why in the Department of Families we're spending more than \$200 million more than the NDP ever did when they were in office, because we care very deeply not only about children with—living with disabilities, but adults as well and all those other vulnerable Manitobans out there; and that's why we'll continue to invest in programs that are working to improve the lives of those vulnerable Manitobans.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for The Pas, on a supplementary question.

**Ms. Lathlin:** The minister is also making it harder for adults living with a disability to live a life of dignity. Staffing supports are inadequate and the government is making it harder for people to live independently.

Last year we raised this issue. Those living independently are being forced into group care. It turns out that the minister has given a directive to, quote, bend the cost curve, end quote, for disability services. As Rod Lauder of Inclusion Winnipeg stated—said at the time, quote: It boils down to the bottom dollar. It's going backward. End quote.

Will the minister ensure that supports for those with disabilities are there when they need it?

**Mrs. Stefanson:** Yes, we will, Madam Speaker, and, in fact, we are—we have invested more than \$13 million more in community living and disability services in this budget alone.

And so I would encourage members opposite to understand that we will continue to invest in programs that are yielding very positive results for Manitobans, and I will remind members opposite that they have a choice to make: they can either choose to vote for this in our budget or they can choose against it.

I encourage them to do what's in the best interest of vulnerable Manitobans.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for The Pas, on a final supplementary.

**Ms. Lathlin:** The Pallister government also cut funding to the Manitoba League of Persons with Disabilities last year. The league does good work and advocates on these issues. They fight for independence for those living with a disability and for better supports for young people.

But the Pallister government clearly doesn't want to hear about those issues, not when they froze the inclusion support program and are bending the cost curve in adult disability services.

Why is the minister only focused on the bottom line?

Ekosi.

**Mrs. Stefanson:** Well, Madam Speaker, what we're focused on is getting better outcomes for those Manitobans living in these vulnerable positions and we will continue to make investments. *[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mrs. Stefanson:** I will remind the member opposite that, again, we have spent more than \$200 million more in the Department of Families than they ever did when they were in office, Madam Speaker. So I will take no lessons from the members opposite.

#### **Employment and Income Assistance Basic Needs Rate Reduction**

**Mr. Dougald Lamont (Leader of the Second Opposition):** It was announced yesterday that single persons on EIA will face a \$25-a-month cut, or \$300 a year.

Madam Speaker, I table a document that shows EIA rates for the last number of years. The budget for basic needs for an individual is \$195 a month. It has increased only once in the last 20 years, by \$20. But the provincial basic needs rates are lower today than they were 27 years ago in 1992, not just for single people who—but for parents and

people with disabilities—27 years; because for a generation the PCs and NDP alike maintained the same sadistic punitive policies towards people living in poverty.

Can the Premier (Mr. Pallister) explain how going out of his way to make people on welfare even poorer is going to make them better off?

**Hon. Heather Stefanson (Minister of Families):** Well, yes, I'd be happy to explain that to the Leader of the Second Opposition.

In fact, Manitobans are wanting to move from positions of being dependent on government programs to being independent in the community, and that's why we will focus on investing—the programs that will do that for them.

This particular program was not doing anything towards seeking jobs for Manitobans, Madam Speaker, so we are continuing to invest in other areas that will support the services that are needed for those vulnerable Manitobans to get them back to living independently in the community.

#### Poverty and Full-Time Employment

**Mr. Lamont:** What Manitoba needs is growth. People need good jobs with good wages. But this government is going out of its way to make people poorer, freezing their incomes—[interjection]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Lamont:** —and by putting people out of work.

There is something broken in our economy because the number of people on EIA is at an all-time high, over 71,500 people, and it has been going up every year for 10 years straight because this government is pushing people into poverty.

It's not just people on EIA. The Premier boasts of shrinking the government workforce by 8 per cent. There are also thousands of people in Manitoba who are working incredibly hard at jobs, that include caring for children or adults with disabilities, whose wages are so low that they are trapped in poverty as well.

When thousands of people working full time can't get out of poverty, Madam Speaker, what jobs on—are people on welfare actually supposed to apply for?

**Mrs. Stefanson:** Well, Madam Speaker, I believe we have one of the lowest unemployment rates in the

country, and we will continue to work towards improving our economy to that end.

But, Madam Speaker, what I will say is that, again, our government is focused on yielding real results for Manitobans, positive results for Manitobans, particularly those most 'vulnerablenal' in our society. We want to move towards people being—dependent on government programs towards being independent in the community, and we will work with them.

I work with the Department of Education and Training, as well, to provide the education and training supports that those Manitobans need in order to be able to live independently in the community. We will continue to work with them to that end.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable Leader of the Second Opposition, on a final supplementary.

**Mr. Lamont:** In the last 27 years, Madam Speaker, there have been seven NDP and PC governments, and it's worth out—pointing out that between the two of them they voted 10 times to change a balanced budget law so they could avoid a pay cut while people with disabilities on EIA got nothing.

Today the media is reporting that Direct Action in Support of Community Homes, or DASCH, is laying off 99 people living with mental and physical disabilities. The CEO said, quote: It's horrifying. I talked to another staff that has one of her managers buying her food because \$13.75 an hour just doesn't cut it. End quote. She said the wages have to be fixed.

I know the answer will be evasion and denial, but I will ask the question anyway: Will this government act immediately to improve wages so Manitobans who work full time aren't living in poverty?

**Mrs. Stefanson:** We value the work done by our service-delivery partners, including DASCH, Madam Speaker, to help support adults living with intellectual disabilities.

Our main priority, Madam Speaker, is to ensure that essential services are being provided to those who need them. I had the opportunity to speak to Karen Fonseth earlier today, the CEO of DASCH, and she has assured me that the current restructuring plans within DASCH will not have a negative impact on the programming for those clients that they serve.

Madam Speaker, we will continue to work with our service-delivery partners to ensure that essential services are being provided to those Manitobans who desperately need them.

**Employment and Income Assistance  
Basic Needs Rate Reduction**

**Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns):** You don't balance the budget on the backs of the poor. That's what Kristen Bernas and the Right to Housing Coalition said last year when the Pallister government cut housing benefits for thousands of people for the second year in a row.

Unfortunately, the Premier and his minister aren't listening. We know that on Friday they quietly passed a regulation cutting the basic EIA rates that pay for food, Madam Speaker. It's a cut of \$25 per month or 11 per cent of the basic EI rate.

Why has the minister made such a cruel cut, and how does she sleep at night doing so?

**Hon. Heather Stefanson (Minister of Families):** Well, Madam Speaker, I sleep at night knowing that we're providing better programming for Manitobans who need it, and we on this side of the House will continue to deliver programs that are actually working towards their—what they are to achieve.

This particular program was introduced by the NDP, it's called the job seekers allowance and it has absolutely zero to do with job seeking in Manitoba, Madam Speaker, to find those Manitobans living on EAA the jobs that they need.

We will continue to work with the Department of Education and Training to provide the much needed training and education for those Manitobans to ensure that they can live independently with jobs in the community.

\* (14:10)

**Madam Speaker:** Just a reminder to the member that comments should be addressed through the Chair and not directly to the minister.

**An Honourable Member:** Shame on you.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for—

**Some Honourable Members:** Shame.

**Ms. Fontaine:** Shame on me? Shame on this government—

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Madam Speaker:** Oh. Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa. Order, please.

I would urge caution too, to the member, that in any way—even indirectly—reflecting on the Chair is very inappropriate.

The honourable member for St. Johns, on a supplementary question.

**Ms. Fontaine:** To be clear, I was referring to what members opposite said when they said shame on me for bringing up in question period the fact that this minister and this Premier have cut \$25 from Manitoba's most vulnerable and marginalized citizens of this province. Shame on this government and shame on every single member opposite.

Josh Brandon from the Social Planning—*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Ms. Fontaine:** —Council—*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Ms. Fontaine:** —calls it, I quote, a step backward for poverty reduction in this province. *[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Ms. Fontaine:** Miigwech, Madam Speaker.

The minister has cut from those who literally can least afford it. She calls it a handout.

It's offensive, Madam Speaker, that the Pallister government is giving millions of new dollars to horse racing, but cutting \$25 to Manitoba's most vulnerable.

Will the minister reverse this decision immediately?

**Mrs. Stefanson:** Well, Madam Speaker, I will remind the member opposite—and maybe she wasn't around back in 2008 when this particular program was introduced in the Legislature, but it was called the job seeker's allowance and there was not one part of it that was—that provided incentives for people to actively seek jobs.

What we want to do is take Manitobans from living dependently on programs, government programs, to living independently in the community by finding them—actively finding them jobs. That's why the Department of Families is working with the Department of Education and Training providing the supports to—*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mrs. Stefanson:** –those who need it through programming that will actually seek the jobs that they need to live independently in the community. *[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

The honourable member for St. Johns, on a final supplementary.

**Ms. Fontaine:** In fact, the \$25 helps pay for bus passes that allow people to go out and search for jobs. And how does this minister sit in this—*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Ms. Fontaine:** –House and attempt to put down people that are trying to get jobs? With what evidence is she providing us today?

Twenty-five dollars works out to an additional 83 cents a day. For people living at the extreme edge of poverty it makes a difference, despite of—this minister calling it a handout.

Meanwhile, the Pallister government spends tens of millions of dollars on friendly consultants and their friends, and millions of dollars on horse racing, but not on Manitoba's most vulnerable and marginalized.

**Madam Speaker:** The member's time has expired.

**Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier):** Well, the member cashed a paycheque—*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Pallister:** –gladly for over half a decade and did virtually nothing that anyone has ever seen any results from. She didn't produce a single report. She was happy to cash the cheque—ran and cashed it and spent the money, but left—*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Pallister:** –no evidence of any real compassion. Happy to buy—*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Pallister:** –a \$600 cake and show off, but not happy when a government spends more on social services for families than the NDP ever did: \$286 million more this year than ever before.

Very happy, Madam Speaker, to try to get credit and place blame; not happy to find results. I don't know—*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Pallister:** –how the member can sleep at night knowing the NDP created a billion-dollar debt-service cost that comes at the expense of all programming—all the programming in this province that we would like to expand more quickly than we're able to because of the realities imposed on this Province by the fiscal mismanagement of people who were asleep at the switch, Madam Speaker.

Maybe they can sleep at night, but they shouldn't be able to with the record that they left us to clean up.

**Madam Speaker:** I'm going to just give everybody a warning right now.

I'm hearing a lot of heckling from a few members and I'm going to give them a chance to cease and—before I call them out on it, and I would ask for everybody's co-operation, please. We've got guests in the gallery and I need to be able to hear the questions and answers properly.

### **Cider and Cooler Sales Amendments to Bill 11**

**Mr. Derek Johnson (Interlake):** Madam Speaker, our government is committed to providing Manitobans with options regardless of where they live. Bill 11, specifically referring to cider and cooler sales at beer vendors, will provide the opportunity for rural businesses to expand their product assortment to meet consumer demands.

Can the minister of Crowns please update the House on these exciting new changes Manitobans can expect to see with the amendments?

**Hon. Colleen Mayer (Minister of Crown Services):** I'd like to thank the member for the Interlake for that question.

And the member is absolutely correct, our government is giving Manitobans more options, Madam Speaker. The amendments to the liquor, gaming, cannabis control act would reduce red tape, would provide consumers with greater choices and give rural consumers the same opportunities that we have here in our urban centres.

A greater assortment of products closer to home is good news for Manitoba consumers, Madam Speaker. Bill 11 will mean better access to products that Manitobans want.

### **Carbon Tax Government Position**

**Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows):** Today I'm joined by some fellow Spartans, students from Sisler High School who have started a non-profit organization called Youth in a Green War. This organization is a movement that demands world leaders to take action against climate change and treat it like war.

The students of this organization have some questions, the first being: If so many Nobel Prize economists say that carbon taxes work, why is this government fighting the carbon tax?

**Hon. Rochelle Squires (Minister of Sustainable Development):** I'd like to welcome the students into the gallery today to be part of this very important conversation on climate change.

Our government is committed to reducing our carbon footprint here in Manitoba while making investments to ensure that our habitat and conservation remains protected for future generations. We were very proud yesterday to announce a historic \$102-million Conservation Trust, which will ensure that there are projects on the landscape in perpetuity that will help with carbon sequestration and other many environmental benefits, and we're very proud of our commitment to protecting the environment in Manitoba.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Burrows, on a supplementary question.

### **Single-Use Plastics Request for Ban**

**Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows):** The movement, Youth in a Green War, is growing. As of today their petition, which I table a copy of now, has almost 17,000 signatures.

Currently, single-use plastics are ending up in our oceans, polluting and killing the marine life, and being buried in many landfills to stay there for an eternity.

Madam Speaker, the students want to know: If other governments like European Union and PEI are banning single-use plastics, why aren't we?

**Hon. Rochelle Squires (Minister of Sustainable Development):** I'd like to thank the students for their concern for the use of single-use plastics here in Manitoba.

Our government is very concerned about the excessive plastics that do go into the landfill every year and we are working with all our partners across the government at the federal and provincial and territorial ministers to ensure that Canada overall reduces its consumption of single-use plastics.

And here in Manitoba we're working with stewards to ensure that the amount of plastics going into the landfills every year is reduced and we're very pleased with some of the outcomes that we've received from our stewards that were working to reduce the single-use plastics.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Burrows, on a final supplementary.

### **Government Vehicles Transition to Electric**

**Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows):** Madam Speaker, on Monday, April 22nd, which is Earth Day, Youth in a Green War are going to be marching to the Legislative Building. This challenge-for-change strike is meant to urge us, as provincial politicians, to take action.

The students from Sisler want to invite everyone out on April 22nd, and you can find all the details if you search #youthinagreenwar.

Their last question is: When will this government ensure that all new vehicle purchases by this government are electric?

\* (14:20)

**Hon. Rochelle Squires (Minister of Sustainable Development):** Another great question from our future generation about the use of vehicles, and our government's taken strong action on that.

We reduced our vehicle fleet significantly, saving significant carbon emissions and reducing our footprint. We reduced that fleet by 20 per cent, Madam Speaker, and that's achieving real outcomes here in Manitoba.

### **Employment Standards Office Proactive Investigation Unit**

**Mr. Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon):** Yesterday we revealed that the minister has axed the proactive investigation unit of the Employment Standards office. The minister responded by saying, well, that was just to look good. And that's just silly, Madam Speaker.

The whole point is to protect vulnerable kids and newcomers. It's not, Madam Speaker, just to look good. It served a purpose. It protected those vulnerable people.

Will the minister backtrack on his plan to do away with the proactive investigations at Employment Standards?

**Hon. Blaine Pedersen (Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade):** Well, Madam Speaker, I understand why the member keeps being grumpy on this, because he gets an answer and he still doesn't like the answer.

The—what we're doing as a government is we're being very proactive on investigations, going to those industries and businesses—*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Pedersen:** —who have a reputation or who have—has been brought forward as being a problem, and those are the ones we are actively investigating, rather than just doing a blanket investigation across the province, making a former government try to look better by the number of investigations.

We're being very proactive.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Flin Flon, on a supplementary question.

**Mr. Lindsey:** I think we've discovered the problem, Madam Speaker: the minister doesn't understand the difference between proactive and reactive.

If he was being proactive, he would go out and find those bad employers. He wouldn't sit at his office and wait for some poor kid to have to phone and complain about them.

So will this minister backtrack on his plan and reinstate the investigation unit today, or will he just continue to leave kids and vulnerable newcomers hanging in the lurch?

**Mr. Pedersen:** Madam Speaker, through you to the member for Flin Flon, I would suggest that he take some time and go online and take the youth course for workers. He would find it very instructive about finding out what safe work looks like, what the rights and responsibilities are as both an employee and an employer.

I think that he would find his time very well used by taking that online course. *[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

The honourable member for Flin Flon, on a final supplementary.

**Mr. Lindsey:** You know what I would find a valuable use of the minister's time? To go out, get his department to actually do proactive investigations to protect young people and vulnerable newcomers to this province. They shouldn't be left hanging just so this minister can save a few bucks to protect his raise.

Madam Speaker, this is too important for this minister to just shrug off and make glib comments. Bad employers are going to cause damage to young people and to newcomers.

Will this minister stand up for those kids and for those newcomers and actually start doing proactive investigations again and quit just trying to save a couple of bucks?

**Madam Speaker:** The—*[interjection]* Order.

**Mr. Pedersen:** Madam Speaker, speaking of proactive, perhaps the member could go out to his own constituency, be a little proactive in asking them why he continues to promote a carbon tax, an even higher carbon tax than what the federal government has put in, why he wants to have a PST remain even higher. Perhaps he should be a little proactive in talking to his constituents about the real cost to his constituents of these programs that the NDP continues to want to put money into the pockets of the NDP instead of leaving it on the kitchen table for Manitoba consumers.

### **Carbon Tax GST Exemption**

**Mr. Blair Yakimoski (Transcona):** Our government was elected with a mandate to fix Manitoba's finances so we could leave more money on the kitchen table for Manitoba families.

While we are committed to reducing the tax burden on Manitobans, the federal government has introduced their new rising carbon 'tatch'-tax, which will make life less affordable.

As a former grocery store owner, I am very well aware of the increased cost of fuel for shipping food and heating warehouses and stores, and that impact—*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Yakimoski:** —it'll have on the retail price of basic groceries, negatively impacting the cost of living to all Manitobans.

Can the Minister of Finance tell the House about the steps our government is taking to reduce the financial pressure of the made in Manitoba–Ottawa– or made in Ottawa, sorry–

**Madam Speaker:** The member's time has expired.

**Hon. Scott Fielding (Minister of Finance):** We know that the–*[interjection]*

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Fielding:** –federal government is interested in charging GST on the carbon tax, the job-killing carbon tax that's out there. It's going to cost Manitobans on an annual basis over \$230 a year.

We don't agree with charging a tax on a tax, Madam Speaker, and one thing's perfectly clear: it's a contrast between our party and the opposition parties. We want to put more money in Manitobans' pockets and the opposition wants to tax Manitobans to the max.

**Madam Speaker:** The time for oral questions has expired.

### Speaker's Ruling

**Madam Speaker:** And I have a ruling for the House.

Following the prayer on March 15th, 2019, the honourable member for The Pas (Ms. Lathlin) raised a matter of privilege regarding the government's intention to introduce conflict of interest legislation and misleading statements made by the Premier (Mr. Pallister) regarding his involvement with a private company. She concluded her remarks by moving, and I quote, that this matter, especially the Costa Rica part, be moved to an all-party committee for consideration. End quote.

I took the matter of privilege under advisement in order to consult the procedural authorities. As the House knows, in order for the matter raised to be ruled in order as a prima facie case of privilege, members much demonstrate that the issue has been raised at the earliest opportunity while also providing sufficient evidence that the privileges of the House have been breached.

On the condition of timeliness, the honourable member for The Pas indicated that this was her first opportunity to rise on this matter after having taken the time to consult the relevant authorities and experts. While I would have appreciated more information from the member making the case for timeliness, in this instance I will accept the word

of the honourable member that the test of timeliness was met.

Regarding the second condition of whether a prima facie case was demonstrated, I must inform the House that this matter is clearly a difference of opinion over facts. Past Manitoba Speakers have ruled on several similar occasions that a dispute between two members as to allegations of fact does not constitute a breach of privilege.

As well, Bosc and Gagnon advise on page 148 of the third edition of House of Commons Procedure and Practice, that if a question of privilege involves a disagreement between two or more members as to facts, the Speaker typically rules that such a dispute does not prevent members from fulfilling their parliamentary functions, nor does such a disagreement breach the collective privileges of the House.

Further, Beauchesne, citation 31(1), advises that a dispute arising between two members as to allegation of facts does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege.

Finally, Joseph Maingot, on page 223 of the second edition of Parliamentary Privilege in Canada, states that, and I quote: A dispute between two members about questions of facts said in debate does not constitute a valid question of privilege because it is a matter of debate. End quote.

Accordingly, I rule that a prima facie case of a breach of privilege has not been demonstrated.

## PETITIONS

### Daylight Saving Time

**Mr. Cliff Graydon (Emerson):** I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

And the background to this petition is as follows:

(1) The loss of sleep associated with the beginning of daylight savings time has serious consequences for physical and mental health, and has been linked to increases in traffic accidents and workplace injuries.

\* (14:30)

(2) According to a Manitoba Public Insurance news release, collision data collected in 2014 showed that there was a 20 per cent increase in collisions on Manitoba roadways following the daylight–spring



daylight saving time change when compared to all other Manitoba–Mondays in 2014.

(3) Daylight saving time is associated with a decrease in productivity the day after the clocks are turned forward with no corresponding increase in productivity when the clocks are turned back.

(4) There is no conclusive evidence that daylight saving time is effective in reducing energy consumption.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to amend The Official Time Act to abolish daylight saving time in Manitoba effective November 4th, 2019, resulting in Manitoba remaining on Central Standard Time, throughout the year and in perpetuity.

This petition is signed by Tom Bueckert, Remila D. Desrosiers [*phonetic*] and Ryan Boutet and many, many more fine Manitobans.

**Madam Speaker:** In accordance with our rule 133(6), when petitions are read they are deemed to be received by the House.

#### **Early Learning and Child-Care Programs**

**Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights):** Madam Speaker, I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) Early learning and child-care programs in Manitoba require increased funding to stabilize and support a system that is in jeopardy.

(2) Licensed, not-for-profit early learning and child-care programs have received no new operating funding in over three years, while the cost of living has continued to increase annually.

(3) High-quality licensed child care has a lasting, positive impact on children's development, is a fundamental need for Manitoba families and contributes to a strong economy.

(4) The financial viability of these programs is in jeopardy if they cannot meet the fiscal responsibility of achieving a balanced budget, as all operating expenses continue to increase.

(5) The workforce shortage of trained early childhood educators has continued to increase; quality child care is dependent on a workforce that is skilled and adequately remunerated.

(6) Accessible, affordable and quality early learning and child-care programs must be available to all children and families in Manitoba.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to increase funding for licensed, not-for-profit child-care programs in recognition of the importance of early learning and child care in Manitoba, which will also improve quality and stability in the workforce.

Signed by Alexander–Alexandra Forsythe, Jason Taylor and Brittanie Cabral and many others.

**Mr. Dougald Lamont (Leader of the Second Opposition):** I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to the petition is as follows:

(1) Early learning and child-care programs in Manitoba require increased funding to stabilize and support a system that is in jeopardy.

(2) Licensed, not-for-profit early learning and child-care programs have received no new operating funding in over three years, while the cost of living has continued to increase annually.

(3) High-quality licensed child care has a lasting, positive impact on children's development, is a fundamental need for Manitoba families and contributes to a strong economy.

(4) The financial viability of these programs is in jeopardy if they cannot meet the fiscal responsibility of achieving a balanced budget, as all operating expenses continue to increase.

(5) The workforce shortage of trained early childhood educators has continued to increase; quality child care is dependent on a workforce that is skilled and adequately remunerated.

(6) Accessible, affordable and quality early learning and child-care programs must be available to all children and families in Manitoba.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to increase funding for licensed, not-for-profit child-care programs in recognition of the importance

of early learning and child care in Manitoba, which will also improve quality and stability in the workforce.

Signed Susan Hiebert, Kendall Kuhl and Brooke Furet and many more.

**Madam Speaker:** Any further petitions? Grievances?

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

*(Continued)*

### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

#### House Business

**Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Government House Leader):** Pursuant to rule 33(7), I am announcing that the private member's resolution to be considered on the next Tuesday of private members' business will be the one put forward by the honourable member for Swan River (Mr. Wowchuk). The title of the resolution is Respecting Manitoba's Climate and Green Plan.

**Madam Speaker:** It has been announced by the Government House Leader that the private member's resolution to be considered on the next Tuesday of private members' business will be the one put forward by the honourable member for Swan River. The title of the resolution is Respecting Manitoba's Climate and Green Plan.

\* \* \*

**Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Government House Leader):** Could you please call for debate on second reading of Bill 16, The Budget Implementation and Tax Statute Amendment Act, 2019.

**Madam Speaker:** It has been announced that the House will now consider debate on second reading of Bill 16.

### DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

#### Bill 16—The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2019

**Madam Speaker:** I will therefore call Bill 16, The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2019, standing in the name of the honourable member for St. Johns, who has unlimited speaking time.

**Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns):** Again, I want to thank the Government House Leader for yesterday's water. It actually did come in quite handy. A lot to talk about in respect of Bill 16.

Madam Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to reiterate our concerns with the undemocratic provisions of Bill 16, BITSA. Our concerns with this bill are focused squarely on the fact that this bill makes it harder for low-income people, individuals from marginalized communities and people from northern, remote and rural communities to participate in our political processes here in Manitoba. That is why we have opposed these provisions of this bill.

There was no consultation by the Pallister government with people from low-income communities, from people from northern and rural Manitoba, from people who have never been 'represented' in this Legislature in this province to date.

There was no consultations with Manitobans, if this is what they in fact wanted. There was no attempt, Madam Speaker, to base these changes on shared values and common-sense solutions Manitobans expect us to deliver.

The best place—in fact, the only place, Madam Speaker—we can properly address and rectify these concerns is at the committee stage of this bill, which is the Committee of the Whole.

That is where we can change and remove undemocratic changes to BITSA, whose negative impacts and ramifications, Madam Speaker, will disenfranchise future generations of Manitobans and prevent them from fully participating in our democracy and seeking a seat in this very House.

Our concerns were not and are not regarding the PST, to be absolutely clear, Madam Speaker. The Premier (Mr. Pallister) and the government know full well the reduction to the PST will come into effect regardless of what actions we take in this House.

That is why we feel, Madam Speaker, it is so urgent to address the offending provisions of Bill 16 and that this is why it is important that we move this bill to committee as soon as possible. And that is why our caucus and party will allow this bill, Bill 16, to proceed to committee, so we can immediately address this egregious and offending issue.

I would therefore request the Government House Leader to immediately call the Committee of the Whole once debate at second reading is concluded, so we can all enhance our democracy here in Manitoba, not only now but ensuring for future generations.

Miigwech.

\* (14:40)

**Madam Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable Government House Leader, on a point of order?

**Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Education and Training):** I'm speaking to the bill, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Oh.

The honourable Government House Leader, speaking to Bill 16.

**Mr. Goertzen:** Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I know—I heard members opposite for several days encourage members of the government to speak to the bill and now they don't want members of the government to speak to the bill.

Classic of the NDP, Madam—[*interjection*]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Goertzen:** —Speaker, to have one position on one day and another position on another day. In fact, we've seen the different positions and I listened to the—[*interjection*]

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Goertzen:** —opposition—I listened to the opposition House leader carefully. I'm sure other members will want to do the same in return, Madam Speaker, and I appreciate that her two-hour filibuster has ended. And I did listen to many of the comments that she made, in particular now she indicates that her party's opposition isn't to the reduction of the PST.

Well, Madam Speaker, we see the course that actions speak far louder than words. This is an opposition that, when they were in government, spent the entire summer of 2013 trying to ensure that the PST went up. There were hundreds of Manitobans who came to the Legislature who made presentations at committee. Those few members of the NDP who actually went to the committee didn't listen to those Manitobans. They were quite disrespectful. They didn't go and listen to the protests that were outside of this very building on the front steps of the Legislature of Manitoba. They did everything they could to ignore those Manitobans.

We sat here through the summer in 2013 trying to implore the NDP not to increase the PST. In fact, even when that wasn't successful, we asked the court to ensure that they would uphold the referendum law, the very referendum law that the NDP were then trying to break through the balanced budget legislation because, of course, it was a major tax increase and it had to go to a referendum.

The government amended that bill to prevent it from going to a referendum and then fought in court with taxpayers' dollars, Madam Speaker, to ensure that Manitobans have had to pay more over the last few years.

That is what their record is. That is what it stands to be and what it continues to be, and now, when our government has fulfilled our promise to reduce the PST, something that we ran on in 2016, they've done everything they can since that point to stall this bill, Madam Speaker.

We know that their objection clearly is not to give more money back to Manitobans. In fact, the member opposite herself, at the beginning of her speech, started to talk about a different way she would rather spend the money for the PST. She put it on the record that there was different things she would rather have money spent on, didn't want it to go back to Manitobans, and now, within the course of a week, she's trying to convince Manitobans that it's something entirely different, that it's the opposite of that.

We clearly know that they have an objection to giving more money back to Manitobans. That is their track record; that is their history; that is their party, Madam Speaker.

But there's something else at play, of course. We also know that they have fundamental objections, and I'm sure they'll express it to committee and I'm more than willing and happy to call committee this afternoon, Madam Speaker, but I'm sure that they're going to express objection and concern about the rebate.

We know that in 2013, during that election the NDP defended the vote tax that they'd brought in years before, Madam Speaker. They brought it in under the guise of trying to do nothing more than to make it a level playing field. But, of course, what they did was they gave more money to their political party.

Our party never took the vote tax on principle that there were enough and—probably more than

enough vote subsidies, so we didn't take that funding. The NDP was not only happy to take the funding, they wanted to keep it. In fact, there were discussions that they were even going to increase it, Madam Speaker.

That is what their issue is. Their issue is about getting more taxpayers' money into the pocket of the NDP and keeping Manitobans from getting more of their own money back into the pockets of Manitobans.

So they will clearly, I'm sure, when we get to committee, demonstrate that what their objective is, what they are looking to do, is to ensure that they continue to get a subsidy. When you look across Canada, Manitoba already has one of the most generous political subsidies in the country.

If you look just at when people donate to a political party there is a very significant and generous political rebate or a tax credit that comes to those Manitobans. On the first \$100, maybe it's \$200, they get 75 per cent back. Madam Speaker, that's a generous donation. Collectively it's in the millions of dollars.

The NDP now are concerned, though. And I know why they're being—why they are concerned: they are raising less money. We saw just this week the report that showed that they've made—raised \$200,000 less money, Madam Speaker, than they did the year before.

Now why is that? Well, there's probably a lot of different reasons; no doubt that's partly an expression that Manitobans are concerned of the direction of the NDP. They are worried about what would happen if they would come back into government.

So they're voting in some ways with their pocketbook; they're not giving to the NDP because they are concerned about the direction that the NDP would go in again if they were ever to form government because they remember because it wasn't that long ago of the direction that they went in before. And so that is no doubt one of the reasons why they raised less money last year than they did before.

Some of it, also, is raising money is not easy; it's hard work. I think we all know that as elected officials. While it is part of the job to try to ask people for support, both in terms of political support, voter support, financial support, it's not easy. Some would say it's not the most enjoyable part of the job, but it is part of the job.

And I suspect for many New Democratic members that's a difficult thing for them to do, and they don't want to do it, particularly when they're getting far more noes than yeses, I'm sure, when they're asking for support from individuals.

And so they lost, or they didn't make nearly as much money last year as they would have made the year prior, Madam Speaker. And so now they're in defence of this political subsidy because they don't want to do the hard work; they don't want to do the hard work of going and asking Manitobans for support, for that individual support when they are looking for a donation or a contribution.

They don't want to listen to the feedback that Manitobans because they know it's probably going to be negative, Madam Speaker, when they talk to those Manitobans.

That's reflected in poll numbers as the NDP, of course, have lagged in the polls for many years, and justifiably so, because of the different things that they not only propose now in opposition but demonstrated by the things that they did when they were in government, bringing our economy into a 'circumstans' and a debt level that will be reverberating to young Manitobans for many, many years; they are left to pay for the legacy of mismanagement and overspending of the NDP. And yet they don't learn their lesson. *[interjection]*

Well, now I hear the member for Minto (Mr. Swan) who's encouraging me to sit down after he was encouraging me just a couple of days ago to stand up, Madam Speaker—

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Goertzen:** So he's not sure. Does he want me to speak? Does he not want me to speak? Does he want to run federally? Does he want to go provincially? He's not sure, Madam Speaker; he's got lots of different options and lots of different things bouncing around.

But I am certainly pleased here to be able to say that there's a clear pattern in the actions of the NDP. And it's not just the PST. The PST is clearly the most definitive issue around this after the two-hour filibuster from the member, the leader of the opposition, Madam Speaker, which was sort of a mini-filibuster, I suppose, a microfilibuster.

But their actions speak clearly that they don't want Manitobans to have more money. And that's largely because they believe that they can spend the money better than can Manitobans; that's always

been their philosophy. They believe it to their core. They ultimately believe if they take the money from Manitobans they will be able to redistribute it better in a way that would be more fitting to their beliefs.

We believe in the individual ideas and the individual decisions of Manitobans. We believe that if we leave them more money, not only does that help them individually, but they can make their own decisions. We believe that they should be able to make the decisions with their money, while the NDP believe that they are always in a better position to make those decisions on behalf of Manitobans.

That is at the core of the NDP, and the leader—or the Official Opposition House Leader (Ms. Fontaine) stated that in the beginning of her microfilibuster, Madam Speaker, that they wanted to be able to keep that money and distribute it within their own ways.

Now the other issue, and I'll just 'sumise' with this, is to say they clearly are worried about their ability to raise money. They're clearly worried about their ability to go to the door, to talk to Manitobans, to ask for support; they're having a difficult time. *[interjection]* Well, you know, I hear members opposite maybe saying that that's not true, but I've just seen their financial statements. It's clear they raised a quarter of a million dollars less last year than they did the year before.

Obviously, Manitobans are saying they don't necessarily agree with them, and they're not willing to do it. Or, potentially, the alternative is those members aren't willing to go and ask that; I'm not sure which it is. They could explain to me, are they not willing to get the money or are they just not—are they not willing to do the work? Maybe it's a combination of both, Madam Speaker.

But it is clear that the NDP have demonstrated two things, and we'll see it when this goes to committee, Madam Speaker, that they don't want Manitobans to keep more of their hard-earned money, and they want to take more of Manitobans hard-earned money and return it into the pockets of the NDP. Both are shameful, and both will be demonstrated when this bill goes to committee.

\* (14:50)

**Madam Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**Madam Speaker:** The question before the House is second reading of Bill 16, The Budget

Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2019.

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

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Madam Speaker:** I heard a no.

#### Voice Vote

**Madam Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

**Some Honourable Members:** Yea.

**Madam Speaker:** All those opposed, please say nay.

In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

The honourable government—or the honourable opposition House leader.

#### Recorded Vote

**Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (Official Opposition House Leader):** Madam Speaker, a recorded vote, please.

**Madam Speaker:** A recorded vote having been called, call in the members.

Order, please. The one hour provided for the ringing of the division bells has expired. I am therefore directing that the division bells be turned off and the House proceed to the vote.

\* (15:50)

The question before the House is second reading of Bill 16, The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2019.

#### Division

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

#### Yeas

*Altemeyer, Bindle, Clarke, Cox, Cullen, Eichler, Ewasko, Fielding, Fletcher, Fontaine, Friesen, Gerrard, Goertzen, Graydon, Guillemard, Helwer, Isleifson, Johnson, Johnston, Kinew, Klassen, Lagassé, Lagimodiere, Lamont, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Marcelino (Tyndall Park), Martin, Mayer, Michaleski, Micklefield, Morley-Lecomte, Nesbitt, Pedersen, Piwniuk, Reyes, Smith (Point Douglas), Smith (Southdale), Smook, Squires, Stefanson, Swan, Teitsma, Wharton, Wiebe, Wishart, Wowchuk, Yakimoski.*

### Nays

**Deputy Clerk (Mr. Rick Yarish):** Yeas 51, Nays 0.

**Madam Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

### House Business

**Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, on House business, I'd like to announce that the Committee of the Whole will meet immediately to consider Bill 16, The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2019.

**Madam Speaker:** It has been announced that the Committee of the Whole will meet immediately to consider Bill 16, The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2019.

The House will now resolve into the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, please take the Chair.

### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

#### Bill 16—The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2019

**Mr. Chairperson (Doyle Pivniuk):** Can the Committee of the Whole please come to order.

Does the minister of—the minister responsible for the Bill 16 have any opening statements?

\* (16:00)

**Hon. Scott Fielding (Minister of Finance):** It's my pleasure to speak to Bill 16, the Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2019, that implements the tax measures and The Election Financing Act amendments announced in Budget 2019. These measures continue our journey on a road to recovery that began three years ago, a journey that we began to fix the finances, repair the services of the Province of Manitoba and rebuild the economy.

There are four main parts to this bill: The Fuel Tax Act; The Income Tax Act; The Retail Sales Act; and The Election Financing Act.

The Fuel Tax Act is amended by the bill to assist Manitobans' forestry industry by expanding the fuel tax exemption to include mill site equipment used for log handling and processing.

The amendment to The Income Tax Act are as follows: extending the Cultural Industries Printing Tax Credit for one year to 2021 and limiting the tax

to \$1.1 million per taxpayer; extending the Small Business Venture Tax Credit by three years to 2023; extending the Book Publishing Tax Credit by five years to 2025; eliminating the sunset clause for the Film and Video Production Tax Credit and making it permanent.

I'd also mentioned that Budget 2019 has significantly increased funding available on an annual basis for this tax credit, and substantially increase the annual budget for the Department of Sport, Culture and Heritage, which has historically been one of the smallest departments with the lowest funding levels during the NDP years. So this budget begins to correct that, and amending the Manufacturing Investment Tax Credit as a result of reducing the sales tax rate to align the credit with the new lower PST, Mr. Deputy Chair.

Bill 16 also fulfills a promise we made to Manitobans during the election, and this is to lower the PST by one point, bring it down to 7 per cent from 8 per cent. This is promise made and a promise kept.

In the 2011—in 2011, the NDP told Manitobans they would not raise taxes and, as soon as the election was over, they went to work to start planning to hike the PST to 8 per cent. This was wrong and Manitobans knew it was wrong. They broke the law of the day by not holding the referendum on the tax increases as required by the legislation. Thankfully, Manitobans did not let them get away with it, and in 2016 they remembered the NDP's betrayal and punished them at the electoral polls.

Our government is different. We are looking to get—we're looking out for Manitobans. While Justin Trudeau is imposing a carbon tax on everything and is even taxing the carbon tax with GST, we are taking steps now with this bill to not apply PST on the federally imposed carbon tax. We are excluding the PST from the carbon tax.

We believe that Manitobans are taxed enough, taxed to the max at this point, and they deserve a break. We know that many Manitobans cited by recent study have less than \$200 left at the end of the month and I'm sure many have far less than that. So we want to make life a little bit more affordable for Manitobans and we're doing this by lowering the PST.

We are also eliminating the 50 per cent election campaign expense subsidy for political parties and

the candidates. In 2016 election, this subsidy cost Manitobans over \$3 million. The subsidy is one of the most generous in Canada and unfairly supports large parties over small ones. We do not believe Manitoba families should be forced to subsidize political parties and view they do not agree with.

This subsidy hurts small parties like the Green Party and the Liberals and independents for years. It disproportionately benefits the large parties including the NDP.

Fix—we are fixing the—we are fixing that, and the PC Party is doing the right thing and giving up the subsidy which benefits the parties most. We believe it is unfair being—taking money away from Manitobans' pockets. We believe that this \$3 million is better in the hands of Manitobans than political parties' bank accounts.

This is why we are working to make more—life more affordable for Manitobans by indexing tax brackets and basic personal exemption. That is why we're lowering the PST by 1 percentage point, giving \$500 back to a family of four in early years.

Further savings will be passed on to municipalities, and school divisions will also see a benefit for this. We think these tax measures are appropriate and we, therefore, encourage all members to support the government's plans—

**Mr. Chairperson:** The honourable minister's time is up. We thank the minister.

Does the critic for the official opposition have any opening statements?

**Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto):** Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I'm surprised the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) didn't fall on his knees and give thanks to Ottawa, which is the only and sole reason that this government's able to come forward and cut the provincial sales tax.

You know, their own budget papers make it very, very clear what happened in this province over the past decade. For five years or more, the federal transfers under the Stephen Harper government, that I think the Finance minister thought was the greatest government ever, froze funding transfers to the Province of Manitoba. And somehow, over the last four years, this government has become the biggest beneficiary in the country of additional federal revenues, and, in fact, this government is now taking in another \$900 million from the federal government, than it did its first year in power.

So, I mean, had we had this opportunity, we would've cut the PST and we wouldn't have made cuts to education, and we wouldn't have made cuts to health care. We wouldn't have illegally frozen the salaries of civil service workers. There's so much more that could've been done with this money.

Our real concern, obviously, is this government's decision to take a big step backwards in how democracy in this province operates. By this bill, this government has added a provision which would do away with the election rebate, which has been in place in Manitoba for a long, long time.

And it's interesting, you know, Mr. Chairperson, this wasn't a promise that the government had made. This was not something that was recommended by the Chief Electoral Officer. In fact, as far as I know, the government never even asked the Chief Electoral Officer the question.

Who was calling for this? Well, I suppose the Premier (Mr. Pallister), and perhaps he took it from the playbook of right-wing leaders across Canada and the United States who really, really don't like democracy, who believe that the golden rules—that whoever has the gold makes the rules—and, unfortunately, this Premier is taking Manitoba, frankly, backwards.

You know, there's different ways the different jurisdictions provide funding for political parties. Sometimes those include tax credits for donors, which exist in Manitoba. Secondly, many jurisdictions have regular funding for political parties. Of course, the federal government had that and it was taken away. That did exist here in Manitoba. That was taken away. And the third pillar is the reimbursement of a certain amount of election expenses. And now, at a stroke of a pen, this government plans to do that.

And, you know, it's fascinating—we've seen this Premier (Mr. Pallister) that has a—I know he likes to talk about a bromance that some have with Justin Trudeau—I think we can talk about the 'momance' that he has with the Saskatchewan premier. But, having said that, Saskatchewan, that shining green light of conservative thought—well, Saskatchewan not only has an election rebate, they're actually very proud of it. And I'm very glad my colleague the member for St. Johns (Ms. Fontaine) put on the record the quote—and I quote this from their website: an important part of Saskatchewan's electoral system is the provincially financed program that supports registered political parties and candidates.

And, in Saskatchewan, a registered political party has to get 15 per cent of the valid votes cast. And we can certainly discuss whether 10, 15, 5, 2—whether there's some other appropriate amount—but those parties who receive that amount, then get 50 per cent of the appropriate election expenses reimbursed, once their chief official agent submits an audited election expense return.

\*(16:10)

In terms of individual candidates, candidates who receive at least 15 per cent of the vote in their own constituency in Saskatchewan are eligible for reimbursement. And what's interesting, despite what the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) put on the record, Saskatchewan's credits are more generous. And, actually, candidates can be reimbursed up to 60 per cent of their election expenses once their business manager submits their audited election expense return.

So we always hear this government trying to compare themselves to other provinces, trying to—when it comes to cutting, trying to justify things. In this case, we are going to leave provinces with reimbursements: Saskatchewan; New Brunswick; the two provinces with the largest populations, Quebec and Ontario; and British Columbia.

And, again, without any justification besides the Premier's own strange ideological view, without any consultation with Manitobans, with opposition political parties, with the Chief Electoral Officer, this government wants to take away one of the pillars of democracy, and we do not agree with that.

Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** We want to thank the member.

Does the critic for the second opposition party have any opening statements?

**Mr. Dougald Lamont (Leader of the Second Opposition):** We'd like to express our serious reservations about much of the content of this bill, especially when it comes to the changes that are being made to The Election Financing Act.

We made these—my position clear, as far as when I met with the First Minister because it's—in terms of actually having a level playing field and competitive politics and actually having as many people as possible being able to participate, in terms of not just candidates, but parties as well, the fact is we live in a very unequal society.

There're surprisingly few people who are engaged in party politics. There aren't that many volunteers and there are very few donors.

And one of the aspects of having a—what was pejoratively known or put down as being known as the vote tax is that it actually empowered ordinary citizens, who might not be able to—or who might not make donations on their own, might not have the extra money to make donations on their own, that their vote counted even more, because with a single vote, they could also—for the party that they believed in, that they would also—there would also be funding attached to that for that party.

The flip side of that is that when you have extreme, very highly concentrated income and very highly concentrated wealth, and one of the things that democracy is supposed to exist for is to be a countervailing power and a bulwark against that, because though we live in an unequal society, that at the ballot box, we are all equal, that a homeless person is—has exactly the same say, at that moment, as someone who's a billionaire.

And the fact is that in Manitoba and other jurisdictions, there have been—there's a long history of manipulating campaign finance in different ways, and of parties in power manipulating finance and gaming elections in many ways that are very serious.

It is true that the NDP brought in a couple of reforms, but it only happened after they had already won more than one majority government.

I am the Leader of the Second Opposition, so I know what it's like for a third party to—the challenges that a third party faces, in terms of everything from candidate recruitment to fundraising to policy initiatives, and that if we actually want to have competitive elections, it—and it means that we have to make—that we have to compensate for the inequalities in our society, because democracy is fundamentally about people being equal.

The irony, for me, is that in 1999, or just after 1999, the—when the NDP won their first—won a majority government, one of the first things they did was to change campaign finance.

And they actually made it, in many ways, somewhat similar to the situation we're in right now, where they eliminated various types of donations—union and business donations—but didn't do anything to replace that fundraising, which meant that the established parties were in—were essentially protected, and that many of the other roles that had



been established since then, including fixed election dates, including restrictions on election advertising, were brought in after that had been abused by both NDP and PC governments.

So is it—there are very serious concerns about this bill, especially about the impact it has. I recognize that people have a lot of problems with political parties, for all various reasons. We're all—we are all partisans one way or another.

Some people dislike all political parties, but political parties are a fact of political reality. They've been baked into our political system, and, as a consequence, we have to work with that and we have to make sure that we—that democracy and that different political parties and different ideas can come forward and compete and not just be drowned out by money.

And that, basically, my—our concern is that this—especially with the—this campaign finance bill that is part of a whole series of long-term measures which are designed essentially to subvert democracy by pursuing measures that will create an established or a permanent majority for one party.

And the one thing I find, although I find it disappointing, that that's—that a party or a government in power would pursue that kind—those kind of policies. The one thing I find encouraging is that these—such policies have, in the past, almost inevitably failed.

**Mr. Chairperson:** I thank the member.

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

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

Is it that agreed? *[Agreed]*

Shall clause 1 pass?

Clause 1 is accordingly passed.

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Chairperson:** I hear a no.

**Mr. Swan:** I'm just a little bit curious about how the fuel tax changes are going to be taken into account, and I've had a look again. I put on the record some of the comments out of Saskatchewan about how fuel tax is treated, and in particular I got an information bulletin from 2017 and that's intended to assist producers, farmers in the province of Saskatchewan to talk about how the fuel tax in Saskatchewan is treated.

And, in particular, there's details about licences, about tax-reduced and exempt sales reporting, and other important information.

I'm just wondering, is the minister prepared to confirm on the record that the fuel tax provisions for Manitoba producers are equal to or better than those provided in the government of Saskatchewan?

\* (16:20)

**Mr. Fielding:** The expanded exemption will provide reduced red tape and administration from having marked fuels used while logging but have to empty their tanks and use clear fuel on the same type of equipment when used on the mill site.

Marked fuels can be used by forestry industry for harvesting and forest products, off-road transportation of forest products, maintenance of 'logging' roads and forest renewal activities. And, to specifically asking your question, Manitoba is very similar to three other provinces that are the provinces—are places such as Ontario, places like Nova Scotia, places like PEI as well as Labrador.

**Mr. Swan:** My question was specifically about Saskatchewan. Again, can the minister—is he prepared to confirm that—with this change, that the law is as beneficial or more beneficial than it is for producers in Saskatchewan?

**Mr. Fielding:** I can confirm that the forestry industry will be better off in Manitoba as opposed to that. I have indicated the provinces that have similar regulations, similar proposals, similar tax measures, and the provinces, again, that do things like—whether it be in-bush or mill site, are places like Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick—or, sorry, Ontario, Nova Scotia, PEI and Newfoundland.

**Mr. Swan:** Could I ask what prompted the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), then, to make this change to the fuel tax regime in Manitoba this year?

**Mr. Fielding:** So this is something that was looked at, brought forward by industry. We reviewed this. It's obviously a red tape element of things where

what industry has to—would—forestry industry does right now where they would literally have to change the fuel—they'd have to empty their tanks and use clear fuel for their equipment when they're using it. That's on the mill site.

So this is a red tape element of things. This is something exactly that other provinces like Ontario, Nova Scotia, PEI and Newfoundland have incorporated into their type of BITSA legislation, I guess, if you owe their tax measures. We don't want to be behind these other provinces. We want to make sure the forestry industry is as competitive from these industries as others.

**Mr. Swan:** Well, the minister describes this as red tape, but really, it's a provision, much as it is for farm producers, that if you want to get the fuel, which is taxed at a lower rate, there are certain things that have to be done.

So is—the minister says that it's then going to widen the ability of the forestry industry to take advantage of the lower rate, and does the minister think that's a fair trade-off, then, for what's being done?

**Mr. Fielding:** Well, like every policy decision, there's a balancing act between making sure industry is supported, and when you have other provinces—three or four other provinces that are—have these regulations, I guess, if you owe their tax measures. And we're behind the fact. It's something that you, as a Province, really, as a government, need to make decisions on.

And, again, this is very similar to other jurisdictions in terms of Ontario, Nova Scotia, PEI and Labrador.

So this isn't exactly new 'bround'—ground we're breaking. It just allows for better administration, less red tape, to ensure that the forestry industry grows and prospers, similar to other provinces, like Ontario, Labrador—Newfoundland-Labrador, PEI, as well as Nova Scotia.

**Mr. Swan:** But what this will do is actually—and I await the minister's advice on exactly what the impact will be, but this is going to reduce the amount of fuel tax the Province of Manitoba's going to take in.

I'm not asking the question to put a value judgment on that. I'd just like the minister to tell us, then: what does his department believe the revenue

implications for government are going to be, going forward, for this year?

It's slated to take effect on June the 1st, so I realized it'll be less than a full year, but can the minister tell us how much additional—well, put it another way, how much less revenue will the government receive in-year at an annualized basis? How much less revenue does the government anticipate receiving in years to come?

**Mr. Fielding:** I guess the answers to these things, sometimes, are in the eye of the beholder.

On a full-year basis, what this red tape does, the existing red tape that isn't, you know, the regulations that don't—you don't have to follow from other provinces like Ontario, Nova Scotia, PEI and Newfoundland—represents an important step we think will provide enhanced incentives to get not just the environment right but also the forestry industry.

And, to answer your question, the full year amount will be \$300,000.

**Mr. Swan:** Yes, no, the question, though, was what does the minister anticipate the reduction in revenue is going to be from this change?

And again, there's not value judgment on that. I'm just asking the minister, who's the Minister of Finance, to put on the record what his department anticipates the financial impact of this change will be.

**Mr. Fielding:** I'll confer with my officials for seconds.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay.

**Mr. Fielding:** Yes, again, my answer really won't change. In a full-year basis, it represents around \$300,000. For—if you're talking about '19 fiscal year, it represents close to \$100,000.

**Mr. Swan:** I thank the minister.

Now, can the minister indicate why the intended change to the fuel tax would come into force on June the 1st?

\* (16:30)

**Mr. Fielding:** It's very similar to, kind of, the PST, generally, for the most part. You give a little bit of time, and businesses need a little bit of time. It's mainly related to the sellers, but traditionally you want—and this is, kind of, with past practice—give a little bit of time for businesses to make adjustments to their particular businesses and, quite frankly, to

communicate to people in the industry what changes have been made.

That sometimes does take a little bit of time. So that's the reason why it's implemented on June 1st.

**Mr. Swan:** Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) can just confirm, I presume, that these are fuels that the carbon tax would apply to? Is that correct?

**Mr. Fielding:** Sorry, could you repeat the question?

**Mr. Swan:** Let me just refocus, Minister.

Could the minister just confirm that these are fuels that the carbon tax now applies to?

**Mr. Fielding:** Yes, I confirm that this would be applicable to the carbon tax diesel fuels.

**Mr. Swan:** Now I understand back before the Premier (Mr. Pallister) suddenly changed his mind, which came as a surprise, I expect, to the Minister of Finance, to the Minister of Sustainable Development (Ms. Squires), to all the other ministers and all the backbenchers—before the Premier decided to abandon his own long-standing plan to a carbon tax in Manitoba and emptied out the field so that the federal carbon tax would apply, my understanding is that the Province of Manitoba was going to provide a number of exemptions to the users of various kinds of fuel.

And I'll break this down into a couple of pieces dealing with this section of The Fuel Tax Act. First of all, am I correct that the original intention had been to exempt Manitoba farm producers from the impact of the carbon tax?

**Mr. Fielding:** Yes, so we take the approach that any sort of measures that other provinces are doing as it relates to forestry industry, we don't want to be below the curve or away from other provinces. So let's say, for instance, you're in Ontario, you're in places like Prince Edward Island or Newfoundland to a certain extent, as well as Nova Scotia, you know, when you're trying to compete on a global scale, this is one element, one element of things that makes a difference. So we think, if you provide some relief in so many different ways that other jurisdictions are doing, you're going to be more competitive.

To answer your question, I guess, essentially the exemption that was in place would have been in place obviously for this element. But my argument back to you is that the exemption that we're making, or the changes that we're making here, part of this legislation will help—will dramatically help forestry

and the forestry industry more than the exemption that was part of the existing carbon tax, so it be there. So they'll be better off under this plan than the previous plan.

**Mr. Swan:** But, you know, to quote Tom Waits, the large print giveth and the small print taketh away. I mean, you, today, I mean you're not able to say, for example, what Newfoundland is doing with the carbon tax for producers, including the forestry industry.

By the Premier deciding to walk away from his long-standing plan, to impose a carbon tax with certain carve-outs for various industries, we now have the federal governments come in and simply impose the carbon tax on all different kinds of fuels.

We know in Ontario that that's also the situation.

But does the minister know what Newfoundland has done? Have they given any particular protection to various producers from the impact of the carbon tax?

**Mr. Fielding:** Well, this is—you know, it's funny when you talk to citizens out there, I mean, whether I'm in Kirkfield Park or in Minto or wherever constituency, you know it's really important to have a contrast between parties, and one thing is very clear: that there is a very big contrast between our party, the Progressive Conservative Party that is opposed to the carbon tax and both other opposition parties that are for higher taxes, that are for higher carbon taxes. In fact, I think the Leader of the NDP has clearly said that it needs to be even higher than what's being implemented by the federal Liberals to have a real difference, to make a real difference, so he really wants to sock it to Manitobans more effectively than us.

So, if you're asking me what's the—to contrast our position versus the NDP's position, who want even a higher tax, and the Liberals, I would suggest that the answers would clearly be that there's only one party in this Legislature that doesn't support the carbon tax to really sock it to Manitobans. We think that putting more money in Manitobans' pockets makes a difference, and so that's why we're very supportive of lower taxes, putting more money in the pockets of Manitobans.

**Mr. Swan:** Mr. Chairperson, I think we want to move on with some other areas this afternoon, but the point I'm trying to make, which I think the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) knows but won't put on the record, is that there were a number of

different sectors in Manitoba that had read the earlier version of this government's climate plan and believed they were going to be exempt from the carbon tax as long as Manitoba was in the game.

And there are a number of Manitobans now, including farm producers, including, I expect, the forest rangers in some other areas, that expected they were going to be exempted who now find themselves caught up by the tax because the Premier (Mr. Pallister) took the ball and went home, and the minister's chosen to try to portray a phony narrative.

All I was putting on the record was that other provinces may be treating this differently, and we'll be back to the minister with questions in future as we support the industry in Manitoba. But, having said that, we're prepared to move on to other sections of the act.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Does the minister want one final word on that? Okay, we'll continue with clause by clause.

**Mr. Fielding:** Well, I—you know, would just like to say that, you know, our government is always interested in making sure that businesses are growing and prospering here in the province.

I can tell you I had an opportunity to meet with some of the people in the financial communities and get feedback from individuals in the bond rating agencies. The one thing that we really emphasize is the fact that our government is really focused on encouraging capital come here, and that's part of businesses. It's getting the fundamentals of business right; it's reducing red tape; it's making sure businesses can grow and prosper; and in Manitoba we're leading the nation right now in private sector capital investment.

So you have businesses that are coming in, businesses like Roquette that are coming in, a pea production—or pea processing plant that is setting up shop here in Manitoba. You have places like Simplot and McCain's and others that are expanding their production, and that's largely to do—and other businesses, for instance things like Ubisoft that's creating some great technology types of jobs, things like the movie industry.

So, as a government—and I'm getting to my point, Mr. Deputy Chair—we're trying to have a—encourage an environment where businesses can grow and prosper, and a part of this is these little things. Sometimes other parties will say, you know, these little things just don't matter to businesses.

Well, we've heard pretty clearly that they do matter. Red tape does matter; getting the fundamentals, being more competitive on your tax environment, whether it be items like this to make it a little bit more affordable and make us more competitive as a—really as a government, to provide that option, because businesses have options of where they want to go. They can move, you know, to provinces to provinces, and so that's really been a focal point, and we're very proud of that as an organization going forward, so that's why we support issues like this

\* (16:40)

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay. So we'll go back to clause by clause.

Clause 1—pass.

Shall clauses 2 and 3 pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Chairperson:** I hear no.

**Mr. Swan:** Yes, just one question for the minister: I know we hear with great—

**Mr. Chairperson:** On which clause?

**An Honourable Member:** On clause 2.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Two? Okay.

The honourable member for Minto (Mr. Swan).

**Mr. Swan:** You know, it wasn't long ago that the previous minister of Finance stood up in this House, and with great fanfare, said there were going to be major increases in the threshold at which people would start paying income tax. I believe it was \$20,000 by 2020.

What happened to that?

**Mr. Fielding:** Well, thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair. And we're very proud of the fact that we've got the best green plan in Canada. We were very disappointed that the federal government didn't come to the table and agree with Manitoba's plan to reduce carbon, essentially.

We do think we've got the best plan that's there. When we made the decision—unfortunate decision, caused by the federal Liberals, to change the position on the carbon tax because we thought that it would hurt Manitobans too much, the same day we had suggested that basic personal exemption, we would

not be increasing it to 2020 in 2020. We would be moving at, you know, indexed inflation level.

But one thing we did emphasize, what was important to Manitobans, is to provide a PST reduction. That's what we did.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Any further questions? No? Okay.

Clause 2 and 3—pass; clause 4—pass; clauses 5 to 7—pass; clauses 8 and 9—pass; clause 10—pass; clause 11—pass.

Shall clauses 12 through 18 pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Mr. Chairperson:** I hear a no.

The honourable member from Minto, on which clause?

**Mr. Swan:** Clause 12 to start.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Clause 12? Okay.

**Mr. Swan:** Why does the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) think it's appropriate to move democracy backwards, to take away an election rebate that exists not just in Saskatchewan next door but in five other Canadian provinces?

**Mr. Fielding:** Our government truly believes that election subsidy kickback scheme that's in place right now is not appropriate. We think that investing \$3 million on a yearly basis saves—are money that Manitobans could invest in services and supports. We think that's important. We're putting money back on a kitchen table, while the members opposite really want more money in Manitobans' campaign accounts.

So you're going to raise your own money, instead of Manitobans'. We don't think that's right, and we think that this is something that smaller parties and newer parties and independents and start-ups will be disadvantaged for it.

We know that the financing kickback scheme that's in place right now magically creates—taxpayers have to pay about \$125 on that, you know, existing \$100 donation that's there. And so that's our position. And we think that Manitobans know better where that money should be spent, as opposed to going to political parties—should be spent on Manitobans' services that they value.

**Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns):** You know, I have to say that it's incredibly disappointing to hear the Minister of Finance refer to rebates that allow individuals to participate in the political process as kickback schemes. And, you know, I think that the member, you know, should be fully transparent with the House and for members that are going to go back and for citizens that are going to go back in Hansard and read that every single member across the way took the 50 per cent rebate.

So, on the one hand, the Minister of Finance is, you know, choosing today of all days to put on the record that somehow the legislative framework that we have in Manitoba that, at one point, as I put on the record yesterday, at one point was actually celebrated across the country as equitable and certainly, you know, contributing and enhancing to democracy—today, chooses to construct it as a financing kickback—[interjection]—scheme. Thank you. Thank you, again, to the minister for repeating that. I think that Manitobans should be very, very concerned that members opposite are fundamentally attacking democracy and putting in place—and, again, let me put this on the record—

**An Honourable Member:** They take the money and run.

**Ms. Fontaine:** Yes, you know, take the money and run. But I do want to put on the record that, you know, unlike other provinces and territories across the country that, as I noted for everybody yesterday, you know, not only support democracy but actually enhance democracy in respect of their rebates that both parties and individuals have, and we are coming to a place in Manitoba history that will, I'm sorry to say and I fear to say, will have an impact for generations to come.

And, you know, let me just say this for the record so that people know where I stand and that it is perfectly clear: the composition of the current MLAs in this House does not reflect Manitoba. It does not reflect the Manitobans that I am so blessed and honoured and privileged to meet every day that are a reflection of the diversity of so many cultures and so many different places in the world. Despite the Premier (Mr. Pallister) at one point saying that members opposite represented the most diverse caucus in the history of Canada—and, again, I—those of us on this side of the House can't believe that even came out of the First Minister's mouth—but it certainly does not.

And you would imagine that the minister and all members opposite would actually want to enhance democracy and enhance representation in this House, but, actually, what we see is a regression of democracy by getting rid of what the finance of—Finance Minister today calls a kickback scheme.

So I ask the minister today: Why does he feel that this is a kickback scheme?

**Mr. Fielding:** Manitoba has one of the most generous election financing processes that are in place, really, across the province—across the country, rather. We know—actually, this week we found out that the NDP, of course, are having hard times raising money, so that's, you know, fairly clear. So it kind of, you know, it's disappointing. I'll have to admit—I'll have to imagine it's a little rich even coming from the NDP.

You know, we're here; we want to give more money back to Manitobans and, clearly, they want to put more money in the pockets of their political war chest. I could understand why, but, you know, to be quite frank with you, we'd rather spend a good portion of that money on better services for Manitobans. We think that's appropriate; we think that Manitobans will be part of that, and so we think that it's appropriate measure.

This is something that we did—took pride in the fact with a vote tax. First thing that we didn't accept it as a party. We want our first piece of legislation that we've removed the vote tax. We don't think it's appropriate to take monies away, and so we think that it's in line with exactly our process, that we think that more services should be supported by Manitobans.

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

**Mr. Lamont:** Yes, I also want to express I think it's really inappropriate language to talk about—essentially that there's a criminal implication, and I'm not even sure that it would be all right to say those things outside of the Chamber, outside of a committee.

\* (16:50)

The fact is that, in terms of these rebates, one of the things that's just been a question of what party benefits and—or which rebates and which government money or public money that parties have been able to avail themselves of. However, I would just ask the question: If we're going to be getting rid of public subsidies and if the Finance Minister is concerned

about where money—about how this money could be better spent, why are we maintaining any kind of donation credit at all? Why not eliminate all subsidies?

**Mr. Chairperson:** The—sorry, the honourable member—the opposition—Second Opposition House Leader.

**Mr. Lamont:** Well, it just seems to me that if—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Sorry, the Leader of the Second Opposition (Mr. Lamont). Sorry about that. Do you want to repeat what you want to say, or?

**Mr. Lamont:** Well, simply, it's a—the question is, why aren't we getting rid of subsidies for donations as well?

**Mr. Fielding:** Yes, I think it's pretty straightforward that we think that more money should be spent on services for Manitobans.

We routinely hear from members of the opposition—both parties—that somehow there isn't enough servicing that are there, and so we think that Manitobans deserve that money or should have the money put there. We think that the donation levels are generous, and that allows for people that are trying to get into politics—that gives them—you know, allows them to get donations like everyone else. And we think that things like this, things like the vote tax that were in place were wrong. And we think that more money should go towards the residents of the province of Manitoba for services. It's quite simple.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Is there any other further questions on clause 12? No?

Shall clauses 12 through 18 pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**Mr. Chairperson:** I hear a no.

Clause 12—pass.

Shall clause 13 pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**Mr. Chairperson:** I hear a no.

Anybody have any comments or questions? No? Okay.

Clause 13—pass; clause 14—pass; clause 15—pass; clause 16—pass; clause 17—pass.

Shall clause 18 pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**Mr. Chairperson:** No? I hear a no.

**Ms. Fontaine:** I have an amendment.

THAT clause 18—sorry, sorry.

I move, seconded by the member for Concordia (Mr. Wiebe)—[interjection] Okay.

I move

*THAT Clause 18 of the Bill be replaced with the following:*

*18 The first paragraph of the overview to Part 10 is amended by striking out "10%" wherever it occurs and substituting "5%".*

**Mr. Chairperson:** It has been moved by the honourable member for St. Johns (Ms. Fontaine)

*THAT Clause 18 of the Bill be replaced with the following:*

*First paragraph—18 The first paragraph of the overview to Part 10 is amended by striking out "10%" wherever it occurs and substituting it with "5%".*

Is there any—the floor is open for questions—the amendment is in order. The floor is open for questions or comments.

**Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Education and Training):** You know, obviously, looking at this amendment, there's a lot of questions about what would be the motivation for the members. I don't think that we're entirely close-minded to the discussion. Obviously, our intention on the amendments within the bill were to try to ensure a level playing field for all political parties. There certainly isn't an equity right now as it exists in terms of the rebate, and the use of the funds and whether or not it's the appropriate level has always been, I think, a concern for us.

And I know that members have put on the record about, you know, why have rebates been accepted previously by political parties. I think if the member looks back, he'll see a history of our party talking about the fact that the rebates within the Manitoba system are among the most generous in all of Canada, and that there likely was too much, and I think that most Manitobans would accept that.

I think if Manitobans knew the various levels of rebates that were available at the first instance when an individual donates to a political party and can receive 75 per cent back of their donation up to a level of, I believe, the first \$200 or maybe it's the first \$400, but it's in that range—I mean, that's significantly higher than any charitable organization, which I think maxes out at about 33 per cent. And so there's already significant generous credits that are available at the instance of donating to a political party, and that's a long-standing position by our party.

But I suspect that the member has tabled this amendment with the feeling or the belief that there should be somewhat more equity within the system, and I'm not, again, close-minded to that discussion and to get a better sense of how it is that she's coming to that feeling, and I'm willing to have those discussions, and I think our Finance folks would be willing to have those discussion with the member as well.

We do believe though, certainly, and it's clear from our position in the act, that there are already many generous subsidies that are available to political parties, and recognizing that at different times in a political party's life cycle, they seem to have more challenges raising money than in other times. And I recognize for the NDP and perhaps for the Liberals—we'll find out when they file their statements some time in the next week or two—they are having a challenge raising money.

Now, that can be attributable to a couple of things; one might be the effort that they're expending on trying to raise money; one might be the message that they're using to trying to raise money, because you need both a message and the means, you need both the effort to be willing to put into raising funds and you need the right message as well.

And so that is certainly something that I think needs to be looked at and considered.

I do think, clearly, the motivation for the NDP in this instance on this amendment is that—the instance and the motivation for the NDP is that they are having a difficult time raising money and having a difficult time getting the funding that they believe that they need.

And I would encourage them to look more inwardly, instead of trying to take money from Manitobans in a forced way, to try to look for a

way to do it in a voluntary way by asking for their support, by putting forward that effort, by ensuring that they're saying things to Manitobans that would get that support, such as having a more affordable Manitoba, having a Manitoba where the debt isn't a burden upon their children or upon future generations, Mr. Chairperson. Those are the things that I would encourage the—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order.

The hour being 5 p.m., the House—the committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

### IN SESSION

**Madam Speaker:** The hour being 5 p.m., this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow.



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, April 16, 2019

## CONTENTS

<b>ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS</b>			
<b>Members' Statements</b>		Carbon Tax	
Gowns for Grads Winnipeg		Lamoureux	1294
Martin	1283	Squires	1294
Privatization of Liquor Sales		Single-Use Plastics	
Graydon	1283	Lamoureux	1294
Clearspring Centre		Squires	1294
Goertzen	1284	Government Vehicles	
Matthew Frost		Lamoureux	1294
Allum	1284	Squires	1294
Roderik George Toombs		Employment Standards Office	
Lamont	1285	Lindsey	1294
<b>Oral Questions</b>		Pedersen	1295
Notre Dame Cathedral Fire		Carbon Tax	
Kinew	1285	Yakimoski	1295
Pallister	1286	Fielding	1296
Addiction Treatment Services		<b>Speaker's Ruling</b>	
Kinew	1286	Driedger	1296
Pallister	1286	<b>Petitions</b>	
Concordia and Seven Oaks Hospitals		Daylight Saving Time	
Kinew	1287	Graydon	1296
Pallister	1287	Early Learning and Child-Care Programs	
Emergency Room Services		Gerrard	1297
Kinew	1288	Lamont	1297
Pallister	1288		
Bilateral Health Agreement			
B. Smith	1289		
Friesen	1289		
Disability Services			
Lathlin	1289		
Stefanson	1290		
Employment and Income Assistance			
Lamont	1290		
Stefanson	1291		
Employment and Income Assistance			
Fontaine	1292		
Stefanson	1292		
Pallister	1293		
Cider and Cooler Sales			
Johnson	1293		
Mayer	1293		

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

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