

**First Session – Forty-Third Legislature**  
**of the**  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**  
**Standing Committee**  
**on**  
**Social and Economic Development**

*Chairperson*  
*Mintu Sandhu*  
*Constituency of The Maples*

**Vol. LXXVIII No. 7 - 6 p.m., Monday, May 27, 2024**

ISSN 1708-6698

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Forty-Third Legislature**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Constituency</b>	<b>Political Affiliation</b>
AL TOMARE, Nello, Hon.	Transcona	NDP
ASAGWARA, Uzoma, Hon.	Union Station	NDP
BALCAEN, Wayne	Brandon West	PC
BEREZA, Jeff	Portage la Prairie	PC
BLASHKO, Tyler	Lagimodière	NDP
BRAR, Diljeet	Burrows	NDP
BUSHIE, Ian, Hon.	Keewatinook	NDP
BYRAM, Jodie	Agassiz	PC
CABLE, Renée, Hon.	Southdale	NDP
CHEN, Jennifer	Fort Richmond	NDP
COOK, Kathleen	Roblin	PC
CROSS, Billie	Seine River	NDP
DELA CRUZ, Jelynn	Radisson	NDP
DEVGAN, JD	McPhillips	NDP
EWASKO, Wayne	Lac du Bonnet	PC
FONTAINE, Nahanni, Hon.	St. Johns	NDP
GOERTZEN, Kelvin	Steinbach	PC
GUENTER, Josh	Borderland	PC
HIEBERT, Carrie	Morden-Winkler	PC
JACKSON, Grant	Spruce Woods	PC
JOHNSON, Derek	Interlake-Gimli	PC
KENNEDY, Nellie	Assiniboia	NDP
KHAN, Obby	Fort Whyte	PC
KINEW, Wab, Hon.	Fort Rouge	NDP
KING, Trevor	Lakeside	PC
KOSTYSHYN, Ron, Hon.	Dauphin	NDP
LAGASSÉ, Bob	Dawson Trail	PC
LAMOUREUX, Cindy	Tyndall Park	Lib.
LATHLIN, Amanda	The Pas-Kameesak	NDP
LINDSEY, Tom, Hon.	Flin Flon	NDP
LOISELLE, Robert	St. Boniface	NDP
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MARCELINO, Malaya, Hon.	Notre Dame	NDP
MOROZ, Mike	River Heights	NDP
MOSES, Jamie, Hon.	St. Vital	NDP
MOYES, Mike	Riel	NDP
NARTH, Konrad	La Vérendrye	PC
NAYLOR, Lisa, Hon.	Wolseley	NDP
NESBITT, Greg	Riding Mountain	PC
OXENHAM, Logan	Kirkfield Park	NDP
PANKRATZ, David	Waverley	NDP
PERCHOTTE, Richard	Selkirk	PC
PIWNIUK, Doyle	Turtle Mountain	PC
REDHEAD, Eric	Thompson	NDP
SALA, Adrien, Hon.	St. James	NDP
SANDHU, Mintu	The Maples	NDP
SCHMIDT, Tracy, Hon.	Rossmere	NDP
SCHOTT, Rachelle	Kildonan-River East	NDP
SCHULER, Ron	Springfield-Ritchot	PC
SIMARD, Glen, Hon.	Brandon East	NDP
SMITH, Bernadette, Hon.	Point Douglas	NDP
STONE, Lauren	Midland	PC
WASYLIW, Mark	Fort Garry	NDP
WHARTON, Jeff	Red River North	PC
WIEBE, Matt, Hon.	Concordia	NDP
WOWCHUK, Rick	Swan River	PC
<i>Vacant</i>	Tuxedo	

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**Monday, May 27, 2024**

**TIME – 6 p.m.**

**LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba**

**CHAIRPERSON – MLA Mintu Sandhu  
(The Maples)**

**VICE-CHAIRPERSON – MLA Jennifer Chen  
(Fort Richmond)**

**ATTENDANCE – 6 QUORUM – 4**

*Members of the committee present:*

*Mr. Balcaen, MLAs Chen, Moyes, Mr. Nesbitt,  
MLAs Pankratz, Sandhu*

**APPEARING:**

*Hon. Matt Wiebe, Minister of Justice and  
Attorney General*

*Hon. Jamie Moses, Minister of Economic  
Development, Investment, Trade and Natural  
Resources*

*Wayne Ewasko, Leader of the Official Opposition*

*Hon. Lisa Naylor, Minister of Consumer  
Protection and Government Services*

*Hon. Uzoma Asagwara, Minister of Health,  
Seniors and Long-Term Care*

**PUBLIC PRESENTERS:**

*Bill 31– The Captured Carbon Storage Act*

*David Grant, private citizen  
Andrea Pelletier, Manitoba Energy Justice Coalition  
Eric Reder, Wilderness Committee*

*Bill 33 – The Change of Name Amendment Act (3)*

*Jade Null, private citizen  
Rowan Moyes, Sunshine House*

*Bill 36 – The Regulated Health Professions  
Amendment Act*

*George Fraser, private citizen  
David Grant, private citizen*

**WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS:**

*Bill 201 – The Manitoba Emblems Amendment  
Act (Provincial Stone)*

*Ben McGillivray, private citizen*

*Bill 31– The Captured Carbon Storage Act*

*Heather Fast, private citizen*

**MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION:**

*Bill 29 – The Body Armour and Fortified Vehicle  
Control Amendment Act*

*Bill 30 – The Unexplained Wealth Act (Criminal  
Property Forfeiture Act and Corporations Act  
Amended)*

*Bill 31 – The Captured Carbon Storage Act*

*Bill 33 – The Change of Name Amendment Act (3)*

*Bill 34 – The Liquor, Gaming and Cannabis  
Control Amendment Act*

*Bill 36 – The Regulated Health Professions  
Amendment Act*

*Bill 201 – The Manitoba Emblems Amendment  
Act (Provincial Stone)*

*Bill 211 – The Drivers and Vehicles Amendment  
Act (Manitoba Parks Licence Plates)*

\* \* \*

**Clerk Assistant (Mr. Tim Abbott):** Good afternoon. Would the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development please come to order.

Before the committee can proceed with the business before it, it must elect a Chairperson.

Are there any nominations?

**MLA Jennifer Chen (Fort Richmond):** I elect member for The Maples.

**Clerk Assistant:** MLA Sandhu has been nominated.

Are there any other nominations?

Seeing none, MLA Sandhu, please take the Chair.

**The Chairperson:** Good evening, everyone.

Our next item of business is the election of Vice-Chairperson.

Are there any nominations?

**MLA Mike Moyes (Riel):** I'd like to nominate MLA Chen.

**The Chairperson:** MLA Chen has been nominated.

Are there any other nominations?

Hearing no other nominations, MLA Chen is elected Vice-Chairperson.

Before proceeding with the business before the committee, I want to make everyone aware that—this evening that we have Assembly staff collecting footage for the Assembly's education video series Inside the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. Our camera operator has permission from the Speaker to collect a variety of angles, and so we will be moving around the room.

As a reminder to all those here this evening, no other photography or video is allowed in the committee room. Thank you for your co-operation.

This meeting has been called to consider the following bills: Bill 29, The Body Armour and Fortified Vehicle Control Amendment Act; Bill 30, number—Bill 30 The Unexplained Wealth Act (Criminal Property Forfeiture Act and Corporations Act Amended); Bill 31, The Captured Carbon Storage Act; No. 33, The Change of Name Amendment Act (3); Bill 34, The Liquor, Gaming and Cannabis Control Amendment Act; Bill 36, The regulated health professional amendment act; Bill 201, The Manitoba Emblems Amendment Act (Provincial Stone); Bill 211, The Drivers and Vehicles Amendment Act (Manitoba Parks Licence Plates).

I would like to inform all the attendants of this provision in our rules regarding our adjournment. A standing committee meeting to consider a bill must not sit past midnight to hear public presentations or to consider clause by clause of a bill, except on unanimous consent of the committee.

A written submission from Ben McGillivray, private citizen, on Bill 201 has been received and distributed to the committee members on MLA portal.

Does the committee agree to have the document appear in the Hansard script of this meeting? *[Agreed]*

Prior to proceeding with the public presentations, I would like to advise members of the public regarding the process of speaking in a committee.

In accordance with our rules, a limit of 10 minutes has been allotted for the presentations with another five minutes allowed for questions from the committee members. Questions shall not exceed 30 seconds in length, with no time limit for the answer. Questions may be addressed to the presenters in the following

rotation: first, the member sponsoring the bill; second, a member of official opposition; and third, an independent member.

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

\* (18:10)

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

On the topic of determining the order of public presentations, I will also note that we do have order of presenters in attendance marked with an extra X on the list.

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

**Hon. Matt Wiebe (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** As we've done in the past, I think it's appropriate to have our out-of-town presenters present first. Sorry, I should clarify: if those out-of-town presenters are in—present in the room here this evening.

**The Chairperson:** So Minister Wiebe has recommended that if there's presenters in the room who are out of town, they will go first.

Is the committee agreed? *[Agreed]*

Thank you for your patience. We will now proceed with the public presentations.

I will now call on Ms. Shannon Hancock. Is she in the room?

So Ms. Shannon Hancock has been called once and will be dropped to the bottom of the list.

Now we will start from the top of the list.

### **Bill 31—The Captured Carbon Storage Act**

**The Chairperson:** We will start on Bill 31.

And our first presenters are—is Mr. David Grant.

Mr. Grant, do you have any written material for distribution to the committee?

**David Grant (Private Citizen):** Materials to present? No.

**The Chairperson:** No written material. Mr. Grant, you can proceed.

**D. Grant:** I must say that the bills being dealt with tonight are excellent bills and will help Manitobans.

And on the carbon storage bill, I would offer caution. I think people are already aware, but when you put something into the ground, sometimes it doesn't stay there. And there have been cases of natural emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> from volcanic lands which have bubbled up out of the ground overnight, flowed down the mountain and killed a whole village. So it's something we have to be concerned about is make sure that the—and I'm sure it will be done right—but just to make sure that, as we authorize these things, that the safety of them is maintained.

And that's about my only comment. I'm a chemical process engineer for many decades, so I'm aware of that stuff. And I'm aware that until recent years, people mostly used underground caverns as a cheap way to store natural gas, because to build a huge tank to store enough natural gas would be millions of dollars. But if you've just emptied out a hole a thousand feet down to—as you stole the salt from down there, now you've got a huge chamber, and you just pump the natural gas or CO<sub>2</sub> into that place.

So we may have porous subsoil rocks and so on, but I'm not sure we'll ever compete with a place like Louisiana or Ontario or Ohio, where they have huge underground repositories.

But it's a noble effort as to whether we can attract the market or not. Just—we should be careful not to ever let it bubble up when we're not expecting it.

And that's about it. And otherwise, I wish you well on this bill.

Thank you.

**The Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Grant, for your presentation.

Do the committee—do the members of the committee have a question for the presenter?

The—[interjection]—Minister Moses.

**Hon. Jamie Moses (Minister of Economic Development, Investment, Trade and Natural Resources):** Thank you very much for your presentation today and, you know, saying your thoughts on the bill. I think it's really important that we get the—you know, everyone's feedback on this.

You know, it's had—could have a big impact, and so we want to make sure that we consider your comments around noting that—that note of caution and particularly around the safety, and that's something that I take, you know, very seriously whenever, you know, going through this bill and considering it—how it will be implemented.

I think one of the reasons why we are trying to take additional layers of safety is that in the bill, we require two different sets of licences. So one would be for the drilling in the well licence process—

**The Chairperson:** Please, order, please.

Minister Moses, the questions are for 30 seconds only. Sorry. Minister Moses, I will give you a few seconds to complete your question.

**Mr. Moses:** Just want to say thank you and we're taking safety very seriously for—as part of this bill.

**The Chairperson:** Mr. Grant, you can answer—if you want to, you can proceed with your answer.

**D. Grant:** Thank you for the kind words.

**The Chairperson:** Any other questions?

**Mr. Greg Nesbitt (Riding Mountain):** Thank you, Mr. Grant, for coming out tonight and giving words of caution on this bill. And it's good to hear the minister say tonight that he's taking your words of caution to mind as well.

So again, thank you very much for coming out in front of the committee tonight.

**The Chairperson:** Mr. Grant, you would like to respond?

**D. Grant:** Thank you.

**The Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Grant, for this evening.

Any other questions?

No more questions. Thanks, Mr. Grant, for your presentation.

Now I call on Ms. Andrea Pelletier.

Ms. Pelletier, do you have any written material to distribute to the committee?

**Andrea Pelletier (Manitoba Energy Justice Coalition):** We have submitted a written submission as well. So it's got all the references and additional materials. There's a figure in there to look at.

**The Chairperson:** Ms.—you can please proceed.

**A. Pelletier:** Thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight on Bill 31, The Captured Carbon Storage Act.

My name is Andrea Pelletier. I am here as a representative of the Manitoba Energy Justice Coalition. These comments and the written submission were produced in collaboration with the Manitoba Eco-Network, the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives and other environmental community members.

We have been discussing Bill 31 with the grassroots environmental community since its introduction in April, and we're preparing to provide some community education on this new legal approach in mid-June since there was no public consultation undertaken by the government before the bill was introduced.

We were caught off guard by the committee meeting scheduled today but were still able to get some comments together since it's important for you to hear the community's concerns.

We recommend that Bill 31 be withdrawn from the legislative process until more meaningful public engagement occurs on carbon capture technology. The environmental community is confused why the government has invested time and money in developing a regulatory scheme for a technology that has not yet been proven to work effectively. If seeking to improve environmental protection and better address the climate crisis, there are a number of other licensing and approval processes under the responsibility of Honourable Minister Moses that should have been prioritized first.

For example, the many outdated decision-making and approval processes under The Mines and Minerals Act, which regulates activities from exploration to extraction that are directly responsible for significant negative environmental and climate impacts. There are also a broad range of other climate solutions that are proven more effective, have broader community support and will cost Manitobans less.

\* (18:20)

Critiquing the carbon capture approach. Although carbon capture and storage, CCS, technology has been promoted for the last 20 years as an effective climate mitigation measure, it has not been proven to be a successful method of reducing carbon emissions. There are currently only 30 commercial CCS projects operating globally, which capture less than 0.2 per cent of the necessary emissions reduction needed to close the emissions gap by 2030.

CCS is also very energy intensive. There's a significant amount of energy required for the capture and compression of carbon, with additional amounts needed for transportation and storage. CCS projects usually increase the energy demand of the facility they capture carbon from by 15 to 25 per cent on average, which often increases carbon emissions, depending on the energy source used.

In general, CCS technology is considered to be highly energy inefficient and often results in the generation of additional GHG emissions. Local climate organizations like the Climate Action Team and Climate Change Connection have demonstrated that Manitoba needs all of the power and energy we currently have to heat buildings, fuel our vehicles. We do not have energy to spare for inefficient CCS technology.

CCS technology also has an extremely high cost: billions of dollars, with the bulk of this cost often being borne by taxpayers. Due to the high energy needs of the process and the significant infrastructure required, CCS is one of the most expensive emissions reduction measures. CCS is a very expensive approach to decarbonization compared to other measures. See figure 1 in our written submission. As a result, the IISD has suggested that investing in CCS is a risky investment for taxpayers and comes with a significant opportunity cost for near-term, more cost-effective solutions.

The environmental community has concerns about who will be paying the extremely high costs associated with CCS developments and how government will ensure taxpayers are protected from ultimately footing the bill. Based on recent media coverage, it seems that the target and biggest supporters of CCS regulatory regime are large industrial emitters. The proposed regulatory framework does not appear to include adequate incentive mechanisms or enforcement tools to ensure private industry is willing or required to pay the entire cost of a CCS project and ensure taxpayers are protected.

Overall, CCS technology continues to be unproven and is not considered an effective approach to reduce emissions. The potential costs are extremely high, with limited benefit in terms of emissions reductions. The proposed regulatory framework also does not appear to protect taxpayers from bearing the costs of CCS developments in the future. For these reasons, Bill 31 should be withdrawn. Better climate solutions are needed.

Instead of investing in CCS, the government of Manitoba should instead focus on proven solutions to reduce Manitoba's emissions. Many such solutions have been documented in the Climate Action Team's road to resilience, including: developing more wind and solar electricity generation projects; reducing the need for vehicle transportation and making all vehicles electric; working with the private sector and federal government to expand charging infrastructure until every community connected by road has enough charging stations; making our buildings as energy efficient as possible; heating and cooling our buildings affordably without fossil fuels, for example, using geothermal systems; ensuring that the public has access to reliable climate change education; and that progress towards climate goals is reported upon regularly, and that failure to meet target results in remedial action.

These solutions, among many others, would more effectively support the reduction of emissions than a CCS approach and would also help reduce energy costs for Manitobans and make people's more affordable.

Since elected in 2023, the environmental community has been assured that the current government is a listening government, looking to rebuild the grassroots connections that have been strained to a breaking point over the past 10 years. However, there have already been a number of missed opportunities to engage with the grassroots about new legislative developments, including the proposed changes to The Environment Act and The Manitoba Hydro Act under Bill 37, The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2024.

In fact, the introduction of these changes as part of the omnibus budget bill, instead of a stand-alone legislation, has actively prevented public engagement on these changes, since there will be no standing committee review.

More needs to be done to meaningfully engage with the public and environmental grassroots community about proposed environmental law and policy changes in Manitoba. Withdrawing Bill 31 until a meaningful public consultation process can occur would be a step in the right direction and would go a long way to prove that the government is in fact listening.

Thanks.

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

Do the—do members of the committee have a question for the presenter?

**Mr. Moses:** Thank you very much for the presentation. I appreciate, you know, all your comments, and I think it's very thorough and—about what different approaches can be taken for reducing emissions. I think this is just one of the many different approaches.

Just want to say thank you for the written submission as well. We'll take a look at it. I just received it now, so we'll take a look at and go through some of the detail of it. Thanks very much for the presentation today.

**The Chairperson:** Ms. Pelletier, do you like to respond?

**A. Pelletier:** Thank you for looking it over, and we look forward to hearing your comments about it.

**The Chairperson:** Thank you very much.

Is there any question—Mr. Nesbitt.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** Well, thank you, Ms. Pelletier for your presentation here on behalf of the Manitoba Eco-Network, the Manitoba Energy Justice Coalition and the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

Given the fact that this government says they're listening, are you surprised that the minister and his department didn't consult with your coalition of groups here, to get your perspective on this proposed legislation? *[interjection]*

**The Chairperson:** Sorry, I have to recognize you first. Ms.—would you like to respond?

**A. Pelletier:** Of course, we would like to be consulted about these decisions. I think they affect everybody, and like I said in my presentation, more meaningful consultation is necessary.

**The Chairperson:** Thank you for your response.

Is there any other questions?

**Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Leader of the Official Opposition):** Thanks, Ms. Pelletier, for coming tonight and putting a few words on the record in regards to Bill 31. And it is interesting in regards to the lack of consultation that this government has been doing, and you've, in fact, also named a few other examples of that being shown.

On—I'm looking at page 8 of your submission, written submission to Bill 31, bottom paragraph, and I'll just read from it. And so if you can expand on this a little bit.

The community has concerns about—

**The Chairperson:** Order. Sorry, your time is over.

Ms. Pelletier, do you like to respond?

**A. Pelletier:** Out of time? Okay, then I don't have any response.

**The Chairperson:** Thank you very much.

Is there any other questions?

**Mr. Ewasko:** So here's the quote: the community has concerns about who will be paying the extremely high costs associated with CCS developments and how government will ensure taxpayers are protected from ultimately footing the bill.

I don't believe that the government ran on this, but then, do you have some comments in regards to those two statements that you put into this submission?

**The Chairperson:** Ms. Pelletier, do you like to respond?

**A. Pelletier:** No, I don't have any additional comments on that. I think it's—

**The Chairperson:** Thank you very much.

Any other questions?

**Mr. Ewasko:** So you have no additional comments on the fact that it says that an extremely high cost associated with the CCS developments and how this government is going to ensure that the taxpayer—so do we have any idea of how extreme these costs could actually get? *[interjection]*

**The Chairperson:** Excuse—sorry, I have to recognize you first.

Ms. Pelletier, do you like to respond to the question?

**A. Pelletier:** I can get back to you on that with more information if you want. So you want to know about, like, how much the costs would be to implement this? I'm just clarifying the question.

**Mr. Ewasko:** Again, thank you for coming and presenting tonight.

But in your statement here it says that there's extremely high costs. I'm just trying to find out what type of high costs and how you came to that assumption that there's really high costs. Thank you for that.

**The Chairperson:** Ms. Pelletier, do you like to respond?

**A. Pelletier:** I'll get back to you with more information on that.

**The Chairperson:** Thank you very much.

Is there any other questions?

No more questions, thanks for your presentation.

\* (18:30)

I will now call on Mr. Eric Reder. Mr. Eric Reder, do you have any written materials for distribution to the committee?

**Eric Reder (Wilderness Committee):** I do.

**The Chairperson:** Thank you very much.

Please proceed with your presentation.

**E. Reder:** Thank you for having me in, again, short notice, to come and talk to you about a couple of things—6:31, 10 minutes, okay.

The last time I was here, the government was killing the carbon tax—the made-in-Manitoba carbon tax that we were sold as environmentalists—and there were 65 people presenting, and it was the second night around midnight that I got to present. So I'm happy that I'm going to be able to go home and put the kid to bed at a reasonable hour.

To start off, the 76-page Bill 31, the PDF that I looked at online, I did a quick word search. And the word search that I did was for environment, because I was looking through the legislative scheme in terms of permitting. And the document came back, said that the environment isn't mentioned once in the—in there. The word search came back and said the environment isn't mentioned once.

And for me, for the—I've been doing this since 2006 as the director, so I've seen some governments. And one of the things that we've seen at a regular basis is The Environment Act is failing Manitobans.

And so what we have now is a new scheme of how to store carbon underground in this legislation, but we're not putting this under The Environment Act, which is the thing that has cared for Manitoba since 1988 when it was brought into—in place.

So that's the very first thing, I think, sort of the things that I'm going to give you. Some of these things you can fix; some of them you're going to ignore, because you have a majority government. Some of them you're going to hopefully think about as you go forward.

So this is one you can fix. You can go back and say, look, we have to put The Environment Act—we have to explicitly state that projects that are going to go under carbon storage are going to be regulated under The Environment Act.

Moving on to two of the other four points I have. The process itself was mentioned earlier. The—Andrea



came up and presented some work from some of my colleague organizations. They're doing excellent work. They have lots of knowledge on this. I'm the wilderness guy, so I talk about the things that we—you know, they're working on with the Climate Action Team or listening to what Energy Justice Coalition is putting forward.

But as the Wilderness Committee, we've worked on carbon capture and storage, so it's in a document called give up the greenwashing that I've just handed out to all of you. And you can look in there, on the very first piece inside is Carbon Capture Full of Hot Air. So there's information you can read about that at your leisure.

The costly piece that I want to mention, Andrea didn't have the specifics to mention to you, but the Boundary Dam in Saskatchewan is a stunning piece of ineptitude in terms of public funding, public project and an absolute failure of a carbon capture project.

The Boundary Dam doesn't run at the promised amount of carbon emissions. Half the time, the—sorry, carbon emission reductions. Half the time, the technology isn't working, and it's been billions of dollars.

Now, in Saskatchewan, we've also had carbon capture storage projects where they've spent billions of dollars and the engineers are sitting there going, but we don't think this is going to work, and they've killed the project after again spending billions of dollars in public money.

There is no chance that the Manitoba government should be investing in carbon capture and storage at all. If there's companies that want to show us they can do this, they should be showing us with studies, with the proper processes and show it works.

Now, in terms of how much it'll actually do, the direct air carbon capture coming online in Iceland right now is 36,000 tons a year. This is the biggest project ever. It's coming online in May 2024. I think there's two of them coming online this year. The—so, 36,000 tons a year.

The annual fossil fuel emissions are 93 million tons per day. So it's—look at the math: 36,000 tons a year or 93 million tons a day.

This is not where we're going. This is not the future. This is not going to save the planet.

Good, I'm only halfway through. This is perfect.

So that's all I wanted to talk about the carbon capture storage. It's a really bad idea. You can read in the publication that I just handed out.

Something that I want to mention that I am disappointed in is that, why are we doing this now? Because the mandate letters that we got said we were going to get a real critical minerals strategy. We know that the previous government had a horrific climate and green discussion paper that they—had no teeth to it and they never went through with.

So we've been asking for a climate plan. We need to see those documentations right now.

The Environment Act is woefully behind. In 1988, when it was brought in in Manitoba, it was a stunning piece of legislation. We were the leaders in Canada, but it is not 1988. Nobody is going to Blockbuster to get their videos. Like, we are way behind schedule here.

The Environment Act in 2014—the Manitoba Law Reform Commission wrote a document about revamping The Environment Act. It was sitting on the government's desk in 2016 when they lost power. The very first thing I said to the Sustainable Development minister when I met with her was that we should—we need to move forward with the revisions to The Environment Act, and yet we haven't seen that happen.

We have a new government. This is your opportunity. The Environment Act—rather than building a new legislative scheme for carbon storage, bringing The Environment Act to date and putting anything you want to do with carbon storage into that, that's where you should go with it.

Two more pieces I want to mention here. This is the other—this is what I'm a specialist in: the carbon storage in Manitoba. The future is wild. The paper I've just handed out to you, I published this in 2019 and it says: peatlands are climate powerhouses. This is what we need to be working on in Manitoba.

Going back to legislature that we have had in the past: The Save Lake Winnipeg Act in 2014, I think, was about peat mining and the effects on Lake Winnipeg. We said we were going to put a new peatland stewardship regime. We're going to start protecting peatlands in Manitoba, designating provincially significant peatlands; 50 per cent of a peatland is carbon. So what we have, since 2014, we haven't moved forward with anything like that. We haven't protected new big chunks of peat. You could

talk about the amount of peat that's going to be protected when the Seal River Watershed initiative goes in place—that's a wonderful thing.

There's a lot of things we can do, but what I'm hearing right now from folks is that on the Washow Peninsula—that's Peguis and First Nation territory—the Beaver Creek cottage owners association are talking about another peat mine opening up on the Washow Peninsula. The same peat mine company already flooded Lake Winnipeg and would have put sediment out into walleye spawning, which is bad for the lake. That same peat mine started on fire and burnt down six cottages in the Beaver Creek community.

So what we're doing is, instead of protecting peatlands as the world is calling for and using that as our carbon storage, Manitoba's gift to the world, we're keeping going with peat mining. So that's an absolute mistake.

And the last piece of all of this is 20 by 30. It's not just peat that stores carbon; it's all sorts of nature stores carbon. When we put nature into an area where it can't be disturbed, when we protect an area according to the IUCN guidelines, the protected area goal that this government has agreed to, that the global community has agreed to, is protecting 30 per cent of Manitoba by 2030. That's how we store carbon in Manitoba.

We don't need these other processes; these other processes cost a lot of money. They cost a lot of energy. They're unproven and it's simply something to delay our real look at the amount of fossil fuels we're using and figuring out how to get off fossil fuels for our transportation, for our stationary heating and for growing our food.

Those are the three things. The 30-by-30 piece is really covered off in read more—Need more nature, this is the last publication that I handed out to you. And the four pieces about a vision for 30 by 30 is we need to act on climate with our protected areas, protect biodiversity, have people-powered trails, and we need to decolonize our protected areas as we go forward with that.

And that is my presentation.

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

Do the members of the committee have a question for the presenter?

**Mr. Moses:** Thank you very much for the presentation.

You've outlined a lot of different initiatives that can go towards decarbonization and I know our government is looking at many of them, and so I appreciate all your efforts there.

And I also just want to say thank you for the documents that we're going to look at and appreciate your, you know, thoughtful and very detailed approach to what you said today. So appreciate that.

Thank you.

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

Do the—presenter can respond to the question from the minister if he wished.

**E. Reder:** Yes. Thank you very much. Appreciate being here.

**The Chairperson:** Any other questions?

**Mr. Nesbitt:** Well, thank you very much, Mr. Reder. It's good to see you again.

Seeing you published this in 2023, Carbon Capture Full of Hot Air.

Am I to assume that this government didn't consult with the Wilderness Committee at all prior to the putting forward of this bill?

\* (18:40)

**The Chairperson:** Mr. Reder, do you like to respond? Go ahead, please.

**E. Reder:** Yes. The opportunity to speak to the government has happened a couple of times. I've sat down with Minister Moses and I've sat down with Minister Schmidt on a couple of occasions. And some of my colleagues with the Climate Action Team have been speaking to the government.

The role of the Wilderness Committee is often not to sit with government. In fact, the previous government, every year I would sit with the Conservation minister, Sustainable Development minister, minister of Environment and Climate. Actually, all the way back to 2006 I did that until 2019, and after meeting with Minister Squires, I was never invited back to consult.

So I have been invited twice by this government, but it had been quite a while since that had happened.

**The Chairperson:** Any other questions?

Hearing no other questions, thanks for your presentation.

**Bill 33—The Change of Name Amendment Act (3)**

**The Chairperson:** Now we move on to Bill 33, The Change of Name Amendment Act (3).

I will now call on Jade Null. Do you have any written material for distribution to the committee?

**Jade Null (Private Citizen):** I do not have photocopies of the material I want to provide, but I will point you to the 2016 submission to the—of the Ontario Human Rights Commission, to the minister of Government and Consumer Services regarding storing and sharing name- and sex-designation-change information. Again, I do not have copies to distribute, but I can access them online.

**The Chairperson:** Please proceed with your presentation.

**J. Null:** I'm a Manitoba citizen. I am a trans person. I'm a business owner and I'm a person who's faced discrimination and harassment, both for being trans and for being queer.

I'm here to speak in support of this bill and the amendment to the bill to offer the option for trans people to not publicly disclose their status as being trans.

I want to point to the 2016 submission from the Ontario Human Rights Commission, and where I will quote: Systems for storing and sharing information relating to name and sex designation changes 'discriminate'—discriminate against trans people in violation of Ontario's Human Rights Code, in so far as it fails to protect privacy and confidentiality relating to transgender status and transition history. Disclosing information of such a sensitive nature not only harms dignity, but also can expose people to significant barriers, disadvantages and even health and safety risks.

I want to point to other provinces, including—so, Ontario, Quebec, BC, who all have either exemptions or do not have requirements for people to disclose name changes.

I don't have anything else to add at this time, but I just wanted to speak in support as somebody who's personally experienced harassment and discrimination for being trans.

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

Do the members of the committee have a question for the presenter?

**Hon. Lisa Naylor (Minister of Consumer Protection and Government Services):** Hi, Jade. Welcome here.

I really appreciate you coming and sharing your perspective. This is a really busy time for our communities, so I appreciate you taking the time out to speak about this tonight. I'm very hopeful that we'll be able to pass this bill this session and make things safer for transgender folks who are changing their names.

So thanks for bringing your perspective.

**The Chairperson:** Jade, do you like to respond?

**J. Null:** Yes. Thank you.

**The Chairperson:** Any other questions?

**Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Leader of the Official Opposition):** Thanks, Jade, for taking the time and exercising your democratic right and coming forward and sharing the words, and I'll take a look at what you were referencing as well. So thank you very much for taking time.

**The Chairperson:** Jade, do you like to respond?

**J. Null:** Yes. Thank you.

**The Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation and have a good evening.

I will now call on Rowan Moyes.

Rowan, do you have any written material for distribution to the committee?

**Rowan Moyes (Sunshine House):** No, I do not.

**The Chairperson:** Please proceed with your presentation.

**R. Moyes:** My name is Rowan Moyes. I work at Sunshine House as the two-spirit and trans ID support manager. I started the program because I saw a need within our community for more comprehensive aid in legal name and gender-marker changes, and we've helped close to 100 people through those application processes since it began in the spring of 2022.

In that time, I've spoken with an even greater number of people about the process, whether or not they require or seek help with it. As part of my work, many people have shared their motivations, as well as their reservations with me. And although I don't track what specifically concerns participants, I can anecdotally say that discrimination is a tremendous issue facing two-spirit, transgender and non-binary people in Manitoba in many aspects of life.

Despite discrimination based on gender being legally protected in Canada, this issue was identified as the top legal problem—sorry—the top legal problem in a study published earlier this year by JusticeTrans.

They're a national, non-profit organization. And they found that 73 per cent of two-spirit, trans, non-binary and gender-diverse people who are interviewed in Canada have experienced discrimination based on their gender identity alone.

In my experience, many two-spirit and trans people are updating their IDs to afford themselves more safety in their lives. Having ID that does not reflect who you are creates huge barriers to accessing health care, in the workplace, finding safe housing and beyond. We live in a world where information is readily available to anyone with an Internet connection, and being outed as trans because your name change was publicly published absolutely affects the safety and well-being of gender-diverse people in Manitoba. Using search engines to look up an individual is a common practice when applying for jobs or housing, and two-spirit and trans people are already at a much higher risk of discrimination in these and other areas.

It's a privilege to be comfortable with the name and gender that you were given at birth, and trans people don't deserve to live with an increased risk to their safety and well-being for not having that privilege. In a time where we are seeing—seeing a rise in transphobic attacks and violence more generally, removing the requirement to publish two-spirit, trans and non-binary people's name changes could go a long way in affording gender-diverse people in Manitoba further security without the need to go through extra hoops in updating their IDs and their voter registration.

That is my presentation. Thank you.

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

Do the members of the committee have a question for the presenter?

**MLA Naylor:** It's more of a comment. I want to thank you, Rowan, for taking the time to come here tonight and to share your perspective. I also want to thank you for the work you do at Sunshine House. That's really, really important work.

I'm hopeful that we'll be able to do even more improvements to our vital statistics and work to make gender-marker changes that make things safer for trans people. But I'm really excited to get to introduce this bill right now, in terms of not publishing names and just having that measure of safety and privacy for anyone who's trans or non-binary who's changing their name in our province.

So I really appreciate you coming and speaking on this.

**The Chairperson:** Rowan, if you wish, you may respond to the minister.

**R. Moyes:** Sure, yes. Thank you, it's a pleasure to be here today. So I appreciate it.

**The Chairperson:** Any other questions?

**Mr. Ewasko:** Thanks, Rowan, for coming and—with your presentation. As you know, that Manitoba is one of the only democratic provinces that has this committee stage piece where members of the public can come and state how they feel and various different things.

Is there anything in Bill 33 that you see could be strengthened?

**The Chairperson:** Rowan, if you wish, you may respond.

\* (18:50)

**R. Moyes:** I feel like it's a good start. As I think Lisa also identified, there are more changes to be made, but I am happy with this as a beginning point, so.

**The Chairperson:** Any other questions? I see no more questions.

Thanks for your presentation.

### **Bill 36—The Regulated Health Professions Amendment Act**

**The Chairperson:** Now we move on to Bill 36, the regulated health professional amendment act.

I will now call on Mr. George Fraser.

Mr. Fraser, do you have any written material for distribution to the committee?

**George Fraser (Private Citizen):** No.

**The Chairperson:** You may proceed with your presentation.

**G. Fraser:** Yes. First, just to introduce myself to the committee. I've been speaking to the amendment to the act itself since I'm going back to 2003, when Dave Chomiak as Health minister introduced the concept of Manitoba having a regulated health professions act, and I've had the privilege of serving the community of massage therapy as executive director of two organizations through the last 20 years. So, on occasion, I've been in here, in this room, speaking to amendments—pro and con, I will add.

I—the amendment that's before you is generally a housekeeping amendment, I would see, as the minister's indicated that transparency is an objective, and I think that's been the case since day one. And we have spent a lot of time and a lot of effort in this province with respect to this act. I'll speak to some shortcomings, hopefully, in the last while.

I simply say at this point that the clarification helps in this respect in this sensitive area—an area that is often heavily represented by the legal profession, and I would have liked to have heard their opinion with respect to this. But the exempt—the exceptions that you have listed before you under this act are ones that you would generally find in the courts of law in our country under these circumstances, so everyone is comfortable with that when we're looking at professional misconduct and its actions within any professional associate—any professional entity that is self-regulated.

So the only offer and somewhat question that I have at this time is where it indicates that the council must ensure that the reasons for not holding a public meeting are given orally at the meeting and are made available to the public in writing.

Now, in terms of fairness to the public, often, like, meetings like this—you get very little notice. And I think it's important that perhaps there could be some consensus around the table that two weeks' notice to a date when this hearing would be heard was well-known to particularly the direct participants and others that may have interest including the media. Now, The Regulated Health Professions Act of Manitoba provides all meetings to be open. This further emphasizes that, so it is a good feature.

We have a lot of expertise in our legal community with respect to professional misconduct and the act also—it's a very powerful act. The Health Minister has lots of power under this act if you read through—have a chance to read through it. And the Health Minister can intervene almost at any time for any reason. And it has—of course it would be handled cautiously, I would imagine. But it also has an advisory committee. And I might add that the advisory committee for issues like this, and others that may come up in the next while, can be—have expertise added to it. It can be used by the minister to review those matters which are of contention and it would help the process.

I might observe at times the advisory committee was busy, and I represented massage therapists who made application under the advisory committee

responsibility and that amounted to two years of dialogue before that was—that decision was made.

Now, the other thing—we have a short amount of time to—here today for a matter that's of—always been of interest to me. But the members of the committee and the members of the House should understand that at the present time, it only applies to 20 per cent of the health professions. Manitoba has lagged behind over the years—both sides of the Chamber, I might add—in terms of having the transition occur. You'll hear about transitioning. So only 20 per cent have transitioned, doctors, nurses leading the way.

Lots of excellent work done, but we're not there yet—that's after 21 years. Approval of the act in 2009, for example, and the provisions amendments that were made, approvals given to have applicants make application. And we have one organization. And I'm retired; I have no skin in the game here, if I could use that term.

The massage therapists have been waiting, they were approved by Health Minister Blady in 2015, together with the paramedics. And the paramedics were selected to proceed in the year they did, in 2018, and left behind were the massage therapists, 1,500 of 'thim'—them. Many of them you have probably—some of them you would know, some of you, perhaps, have had an opportunity to receive treatment.

The other leading provinces under the RHPA act have already in that time frame reviewed their RHPA acts twice in—overall.

Because this act that we have, I am afraid is going to just build in a bold way amendment after amendment after amendment. And so it's becoming a messy piece of legislation.

And the other thing I would add just very briefly here is the province of Ontario began a serious educational program amongst professionals in the health professions act in discussing policies of zero tolerance, and particularly defining them, and that began in 2003.

I think education around these matters and some of the concerns that have been in the media need that type of education and that type of addressing.

So I know you have lots of work to do, but I would say pay attention to it. It involves a lot of important professionals in our community offering great service and are ready to continue that under—in the case of massage therapists—under The Regulated Health Professions Act.

Thank you.

**The Chairperson:** Mr. Fraser, thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

**Hon. Uzoma Asagwara (Minister of Health, Seniors and Long-Term Care):** Just want to say thank you, Mr. Fraser, for making the time to be here this evening, and thank you for making the time to be here to present this evening.

And your feedback is really strong. You've made a couple of points that I look forward to looking into further.

But certainly appreciate that you've made the time to share your own perspective and expertise on this particular legislation. And I can reassure you the work will be ongoing.

**The Chairperson:** Mr. Fraser, if you wish, you may respond to the minister.

**G. Fraser:** Pardon me?

**The Chairperson:** You may respond to the minister if you wish.

**G. Fraser:** Oh, thank you, yes. I am available, I have opinion and I can share that with you. More than willing to.

**The Chairperson:** Any other questions?

**Mr. Greg Nesbitt (Riding Mountain):** Thank you very much for coming out tonight, Mr. Fraser. We certainly appreciated hearing your views and your wealth—with your wealth of experience with the regulated health professions.

And, again, thank you very much for providing your views to the committee tonight.

**The Chairperson:** Mr. Fraser, if you wish, you may respond.

\* (19:00)

**G. Fraser:** I would just add, we had a very positive experience with Mr. Goertzen, when he selected the paramedic model for selection, in terms of the application process of paramedics to become part of a transitional council, which the minister has—any minister of Health has the power to put in place, and he did. And the model worked very well, one that I had recommended be considered seriously by the—for the massage therapists. Again, we're sitting outside of everything, no regulation, no licensing, nothing.

**The Chairperson:** Any other questions? I see no more questions.

Thanks for your presentation, Mr. Fraser.

I will now call on David Grant.

David Grant, do you have any written material for distribution to the committee?

**David Grant (Private Citizen):** No, I do not.

**The Chairperson:** You may please proceed with your presentation.

**D. Grant:** I guess, I'm strongly in support of this bill and the changes that it makes, and I'm hoping that the Cabinet will proceed to go beyond this. There are other professions where there are travesties and they could be easily prevented by updating the law and updating the way these groups regulate themselves.

I think back to—I'm a retired engineer, no longer a member, no longer practising, but very familiar with how that system worked in Ontario and here. And I'm reminded that we had a centennial of engineering regulation in Manitoba just a few years ago and we think back to a hundred years ago when doctors and lawyers were first starting to regulate themselves in the public interest. It was a very different time.

If you were a rich person and owned a law firm or whatever and you bent the rules, who's going to say anything? My contention is that the rules in those days, for regulation, did a good job of an engineer whose building falls down, like the grain elevator, or somebody who runs off with all the money. But as far as minor transgressions, relatively, I think in those days they did a very poor job.

And I think the interaction between government and the self-regulated industries, organizations, is something that I'm not proud of and I think it's worthy of maybe moving away from that relationship, in that the experts in the field may be tempted to protect that industry more than to protect that sick person over there. And I think that's something that we should all be very concerned about.

And, but one of the things is, in those days, it was important not to be smart, a law firm owner or an engineering company owner, by suggesting they made a mistake or did something very wrong. And we have to be more in the direction of protecting the public. If a complaint comes in and is processed by the organization, and I'm reminded that in some places the organization that regulates does not decide on the guilt of an accused person. There's a separate government

organization that does that. That way it's more court-like. When you let the foxes decide whether that fox got into the henhouse or not, you may not get the right answer.

And so anyway, that's a concern. And I think that the idea of keeping things secret is a problem. If you have a complaint comes in and before it's all adjudicated, you obviously don't want it getting to the media with the guy's name or the company name and so on, but the—when the complaint comes in and is routinely thrown out, not enough evidence. We didn't look for any. You know, you had a: this happened and well, you didn't provide transcripts or something else, so we just throw it out.

So throwing out a complaint should come with an obligation by the organization throwing it out to explain what they did to investigate and why they couldn't find anything because it's too easy for an organization to say: no evidence; throwing it out; or we couldn't open your attachment, throwing it out, which does a good job of hiding everything. Because when that happens, nobody's allowed to know about.

Now I think if you keep the names secret, redact those, but proceed with all the details of here's what happened, this person did this harm, and here's a lead on the evidence, and if the organization does nothing, the organization should be in trouble. That should be on a website. We threw it out because we didn't bother looking.

You know, that should be a very incriminating statement, and it should be out there for the public. So exactly what you're doing, Ms. Agwara [*phonetic*], is something that could be done for other organizations, and I think not keeping everything quite so secret is essential; and also that the—getting back to what the last person said, the idea of public is invited to these meetings. In general when there's a hearing for discipline of a professional, theoretically they're public, but not everybody knows about them. But then what happens is the media shows up, the person holding the hearing says, get thee hence. No media allowed.

Which is, since we have a million people affected, plus, and we have eight people in the room, if you kick out the media, then you've pretty much made it a secret meeting. So I think, if you're going to make changes, that's one. If it's a theoretically public meeting, they should have to well publicize why it can't be public. And if they're going to boot the media out, say why, because I consider that just a way of keeping things under the carpet.

And so it's just some things that have gone wrong in the past, and the idea of throwing out evidence and claiming—I've got probably a dozen examples in professional regulation of very serious complaints coming in, and the organization says, not enough evidence. We couldn't find anything. And you ask them for the minutes of the meeting that they looked. Oh, there are no minutes. We didn't have a meeting. So they admit it: they didn't even look.

So those are things that are very important, and as I mentioned to the Justice Minister, I think this is—this bill is very good, and it moves in the right direction, and I think there's a great opportunity in the next year or two to move on to developing changes to the engineers, architects and Law Society acts, because—which ironically were revised in 2015, last time I spoke on this topic here.

I think—and doing that with public input, you know, people like me and the last speaker, and not so much from the organizations themselves, because I know these organizations have teams of lawyers working on tweaking the rules to make them more favourable for them, and I'm not sure that's where you should be going when you develop new rules. I'm pretty sure on this one, this bill is because of your good ideas, not because of the regulated industries' ideas.

So, you know, you're working out to protect the public and that's what you should be doing, and I would suggest, you know, that a program be undertaken to consider some of the other regulated professions and tweak their rules to make them less secret and to make sure all the pertinent things, the ways that crookedness could happen, are all up there on the billboard, up there on the blackboard for everybody to see.

So thank you very much for bringing the bill forward, and I support it.

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

Do the members of the committee have a question for the presenter?

**MLA Asagwara:** Well, thank you so much, Mr. Grant, for your presentation and your remarks. I really appreciate you leaning into transparency and accountability, and the expressing and reiterating the value of speaking to those who have a lived experience and expertise outside of these organizations themselves. And so I take all of those points very seriously and really appreciate that you've made the

time to be here this evening to share your expertise with us, so thank you.

**The Chairperson:** David Grant, if you wish you may respond to the minister's comment.

**D. Grant:** Sure. Thank you very much, Minister, and yes, the whole idea is accountability, and transparency is essential if you're going to have people accountable. Because those who want to work really hard with great skills to avoid being accountable will use non-transparency as their primary tool.

And so that's very important, and the lived experience thing is important too, and I—that's why I think having a consultation, whoever it's with, but certainly with those who know, who've experienced bad stuff. You know, somebody whose doctor messed up, or whose lawyer did some bad things. Hearing from those people will help you to help the government to do—put together changes to acts that better protect the public, and thank you.

**The Chairperson:** Any other questions?

\* (19:10)

**Mr. Nesbitt:** Well, thank you very much, Mr. Grant, for your insights tonight, not only on Bill 36 but also on some perhaps 'proposed' changes to other professions that are—that can be regulated by the government. And thank you very much again for taking the time to come and present to—on both—two bills tonight. Very much appreciated.

**The Chairperson:** David Grant, if you wish, you may respond to Mr. Nesbitt's comment.

**D. Grant:** Thank you for the nice words and it would have been easy to come up and say that her—that the Health Minister's bill is good and I support it, but I think the—explaining why it's important and why we have the great opportunity here. That was important to me, anyway. Thank you.

**The Chairperson:** Any other questions? I see no more further questions. Thank you for your presentation.

I will now call on Ms. Shannon Hancock for the second time. Shannon Hancock for the second time? Ms. Hancock has been struck from the list as she has been called for the second time.

As the committee is aware, a written submission was received from Heather Fast as a private citizen to Bill one—31. This has been distributed to the committee members on the MLA portal.

Does the committee agree to have the document appear in Hansard script of the meeting? *[Agreed]*

That concludes the list of presenters I have before me.

\* \* \*

**The Chairperson:** In what order does the committee wish to proceed with the clause-by-clause consideration of these bills?

**Hon. Matt Wiebe (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Well, actually, could I suggest that we consider the bills numerically with one small change, and that would be to move—to group Bill 34 with bills 29 and 30 so that we can avoid the shuffling of staff and others in their seats. So the order would be 29, 30, then 34, then 31, 33, 36, 201 and 211.

**The Chairperson:** It has been suggested that we will proceed with Bill 29 first, then 30, then 34, 31, 33, 36, 201 and 211.

Is the committee agreed? *[Agreed]*

#### **Bill 29—The Body Armour and Fortified Vehicle Control Amendment Act**

**The Chairperson:** Does the minister responsible for Bill 29 have opening statement?

**Hon. Matt Wiebe (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** The proposed amendments to The Body Armour and Fortified Vehicle Control Act which are before the committee today in Bill 29, will prohibit after-market hidden compartments in vehicles and provides limited exceptions for hidden compartments designed by the manufacturer for after-market installation, as well as those that are widely available to the general public.

Privately owned vehicles including cars, trucks, semis and boats are the primary means drug traffickers and other organized criminals use to move money, drugs and firearms across the country. In many cases, these vehicles are outfitted with sophisticated concealed compartments involving hydraulics installed after the vehicle has been purchased or financed.

The amendments in this bill will allow police and inspectors to seize and forfeit these vehicles on the sole grounds that they have an after-market hidden compartment. Once in force, this bill will get these vehicles off our streets for good, deterring and preventing drug trafficking and other criminal activity.



These proposed amendments also remove the requirement for Manitoba Justice to destroy fortified vehicles and vehicles with after-market hidden compartments that are forfeited to the province. This will allow the police and inspectors with our Public Safety Investigations unit to use these vehicles for training purposes, helping law enforcement detect drugs, firearms, and other illegal contraband more effectively.

The amendments in Bill 29 also address the significant gap in the current legislation. Currently, under The Criminal Property Forfeiture Act, vehicles with after-market hidden compartments are presumed to be instruments of unlawful activity for the purposes of forfeiture proceedings initiated by the director of the Criminal Property Forfeiture branch. However, police do not currently have grounds to seize these vehicles unless there is other evidence of unlawful activity associated with the vehicle, such as drugs or cash found in the vehicle.

These amendments address a loophole in the legislation by allowing police and inspectors to seize vehicles on the sole grounds of having an after-market hidden compartment.

During the recent provincial election, our Premier (Mr. Kinew) promised that the government would be tough on crime and tough on what causes crime here in Manitoba.

This legislation will allow Manitoba Justice to get tougher on drug traffickers profiting from the distribution of toxic drugs that are hurting our community.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the minister.

Does the critic from the official opposition have opening statement?

**Mr. Wayne Balcaen (Brandon West):** As a former law enforcement officer who has worked under this act, I'm pleased to be a member of the PC Party, a party who unequivocally supports justice in our province.

In my time with the Brandon Police Service prior to here, a member under my command stopped a vehicle with a sophisticated after-market hidden compartment and found within that compartment was \$2.2 million, the proceeds of criminal activity.

I was pleased, while I was chief, to be able to do an electronic transfer to the director of the Criminal Property Forfeiture Unit of \$2.2 million and the

Criminal Property Forfeiture director was then able to provide funding to law enforcement to ensure that the proceeds taken from criminals were used for effective justice initiatives.

So, with those few words, thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the member.

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

Also, if there is agreement from the committee, the Chair will call clauses in blocks that conform to the page, with the understanding that we will stop at any particular clause or clauses where a member may have a comment, question or amendment to the proposed.

Is that agreed? [*Agreed*]

Clauses 1 and 2—pass; clauses 3 through 6—pass; clauses 7 through 9—pass; clause 10—pass; clauses 11 through 13—pass; clauses 14 through 17—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

\* (19:20)

### **Bill 30—The Unexplained Wealth Act (Criminal Property Forfeiture Act and Corporations Act Amended)**

**The Chairperson:** Now we will move on to Bill 30.

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

**Hon. Matt Wiebe (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** I do. I'm pleased to bring Bill 30, The Unexplained Wealth Act (Criminal Property Forfeiture Act and Corporations Act Amended) to—for consideration to the committee.

This legislation is about protecting our communities, about doing everything in our power to challenge organized crime and about giving law enforcement the tools that they need to crack down on those bringing toxic drugs, chaos and misery into our communities. During the recent election campaign, our government promised Manitobans we'd be tough on crime and introduce this Unexplained Wealth Act targeting the assets of drug traffickers and other criminals throughout our province. This bill fulfills our promise to Manitobans.

To assist with drafting Bill 30, Manitoba Justice worked with Jeffrey Simser, one of Canada's leading experts on asset forfeiture and money laundering. He served as a lawyer and legal director in—with Ontario's

ministry of the Attorney General for over 30 years, and he recently appeared as an expert witness at the Cullen Commission of Inquiry into Money Laundering in British Columbia. He helped our government identify how organized crime in Manitoba uses the secrecy of beneficial ownership and numbered companies to hide their assets and, more importantly, how we could go after them.

Under Bill 30, proposed amendments to The Corporations Act would require Manitoba corporations to disclose their beneficial ownership information to law enforcement, to regulatory bodies, and to the director of Criminal Property Forfeiture. This will help law enforcement across our province to investigate the serious criminals that we need to get off of our streets.

We have also identified areas of improvement in The Criminal Property Forfeiture Act to provide the director of CPF with more tools to investigate, seize and forfeit proceeds and instruments of unlawful activity.

The amendments will establish unexplained wealth orders and require a person to provide information about how they acquired property if it appears that their known sources of income and assets would be insufficient and if the person, or closely related person, have been involved in unlawful activity. If they fail to provide the information or if they provide false or misleading information, the property is presumed to be the proceeds of unlawful activity, unless they could prove otherwise.

There's a clear fact that should be highlighted here. Preliminary disclosure orders, the regime we have now in place for the types of assets where moving forward we would use unexplained wealth orders, have never been used in this province, never once. And so it stands to reason that we need to make improvements. We need to continue to make sure that the legislative regime keeps pace with the increasingly complex nature of organized crime. And that's what this legislation does.

Under Bill 30, unexplained wealth orders will include not just the owner of the property, but also any responsible officer, which may be a business partner or director. The director of CPF may also require the disclosure of specific records and documents and require a person to answer questions about their assets prior to a civil property forfeiture proceeding.

The act also requires the courts to presume, for the purposes of simple forfeiture, that recovered cash is the proceeds of unlawful activity if it is mailed or

shipped with no information or false information about the sender, and that a building is an instrument of unlawful activity if a controlled substance is found in the building in a quantity or in circumstances consistent with drug trafficking.

The act also adds crypto assets, including cryptocurrency, under the definition of property. Crypto assets are increasingly common way for organized crime to hide unlawful proceeds, and this amendment will allow the director to pursue these assets for criminal forfeiture.

Finally, the act makes several minor amendments, including: increasing the administrative forfeiture threshold to \$125,000 to reflect inflation and the significant wealth generated from crime; increasing the maximum length of interim orders from 30 days to 60 days to provide more time to serve defendants; and modernizing the administrative forfeiture notification requirements so they are published online rather than in a newspaper.

As a final word, in the course of getting this legislation through the House to the committee stage, we tabled three letters from law enforcement, giving their strong support for the measures contained in Bill 30. The Winnipeg Police Association, the National Police Federation and the Manitoba Association of Chiefs of Police all back, wholeheartedly, the measures contained in this bill.

I appreciate that the changes are detailed, but they have been explained now to members opposite many times, and I hope that we can proceed now, quickly, here this evening.

Thank you very much.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the minister.

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

**Mr. Wayne Balcaen (Brandon West):** Again, I'm proud to be a member of a party that unequivocally supports, has always supported, and continues to support, justice within our province.

At this time I'd like to put some words on the record and thank the director of Criminal Property Forfeiture, her staff and all of the law enforcement members that work diligently within our province day after day, year after year, to ensure the safety Manitobans.

I've mentioned the name many times in the House, but here at committee, again I would like to

thank Melinda Murray, who is the director of Criminal Property Forfeiture, who I spoke about earlier on Bill 29, which, of course, flows into Bill 30, because money from these unlawful seizures goes to the Criminal Property Forfeiture director, who then is able to provide funding—additional funding—taking money away from the bad guys and giving it to good guys, to law enforcement, to help with projects, to help with equipment or to help with programming, but more importantly, to help with the victims of crime first and foremost.

Thank you very much.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the member.

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

Also, if there's agreement from the committee, the Chair will call clauses in blocks that will—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 the proposed.

Is that agreed? *[Agreed]*

Clause 1 and 2—pass; clause 3 through 6—pass; clause 7 through 12—pass; clause 13 and 14—pass; clause 15 and 16—pass; clause 17 and 18—pass; clause 19 through 23—pass; clause 24—pass; clause 25—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

#### **Bill 34—The Liquor, Gaming and Cannabis Control Amendment Act**

**The Chairperson:** We will now move on to Bill 34.

Does the minister responsible for Bill 34 have an opening statement?

**Hon. Matt Wiebe (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Just a few short remarks on Bill 34, The Liquor, Gaming and Cannabis Control Amendment Act. The repeal—this repeal would align Manitoba with provinces across Canada by allowing adults aged 19 and older to grow up to four cannabis plants per residence as permitted under the federal Cannabis Act. The proposed legislative amendments also create the authority for robust safety and security requirements to be established in regulation so that we can keep our kids and communities safe.

\* (19:30)

We know that consumer interest in growing their own cannabis will vary, as the vast majority of Manitobans will continue to purchase it through well—through the well-established retail market. However, this bill provides Manitobans flexibility to grow cannabis at home if—should they choose to, while abiding by the measures we will bring in to ensure safety and security for kids.

Recreational cannabis has been legal in Manitoba for over five years. Eight other provinces allow homegrown cannabis including—in addition to Yukon and the Northwest Territories. And so, as we move forward, we will have the benefit of learning from best practices and other jurisdictions, specifically those related to safety and security. The regulatory framework will be developed with robust consultation with organizations like MADD Canada, with law enforcement and with others to prioritize public safety, with a focus on protecting youth.

I look forward to moving the bill through the committee this evening.

Thank you very much.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the minister.

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

**Mr. Wayne Balcaen (Brandon West):** First and foremost, I think it's important to put some words on the record that safety matters, and the safety of all Manitobans matter. And we've been a leader in this province on this legislation, or at least we were up until this time.

My concern involves our youth. It involves our children, and it involves our vulnerable people within our communities. Unintentional ingestion can happen at any time. Children are very curious, and when they see something, oftentimes when they're very young, in the baby stage, it's hand to mouth, and I'm very concerned about this additional substances that can cause issues for youth to be readily available and grown.

Also, I look forward to seeing the regulations rather than just hearing that they're coming and looking to see what regulations are put in place to protect our youth, our children and our vulnerable population, but more importantly, what the safety causes are going to—or sorry—what the safety objectives are going to be from a bill such as this.

We have to also look at the tax ramification that comes through regarding this bill. The sale of cannabis that is already controlled and taxed. Those monies go to social programs to ensure that people who are suffering from substance youth-use issues or other social issues are addressed, and removing that taxation will only cost government and ultimately the taxpayers more money.

My concern also is starting with the legalization of growing and moving into further legalization of illicit drugs throughout our province. Something that I think we've seen loud and clear across this country is the call not to see any more legalization, especially in the hard drugs area.

I'd be remiss if I didn't add that this legislation will be a segue for organized crime into a very lucrative black market sales, and I believe that this will open up the doors for organized crime to find ways into this business and certainly gain further financial gains within our province.

Lastly, I'd just like to put a few words on the record for those that are landlords that run apartment buildings, that have revenue properties. During my time as an investigator in the drug units and also in our major crime units, we saw very large grows and even smaller grows that rely on aquaponics or hydroponics. There's chemicals used in some of these, and these all damage homes—can cause mould, can cause infestations in homes—and then landlords or people that own these properties are on the hook for that damage caused by then-absent tenants.

I asked in the House who would take first place in this, whether it would be the landlord and tenancy act or whether it would be this act. I was told the landlord and tenancy act would be first thought of, but I'm hoping that those words are codified within this act to make sure that that does in fact happen. Millions of dollars can be at stake for homes or for apartment buildings that need to be remediated or that are closed down specifically.

Finally, my final words is I would hope that the government would reconsider this bill. Thank you.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the member.

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

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

**Bill 31—The Captured Carbon Storage Act**  
(Continued)

**The Chairperson:** We will now move on to Bill 31.

Does the minister responsible for Bill 31 have an opening statement.

**Hon. Jamie Moses (Minister of Economic Development, Investment, Trade and Natural Resources):** Yes. I just wanted to start off by again thanking the presenters who spoke to the bill this evening and all those who had input on its creation as well as our department staff.

So captured carbon storage is a management tool that governments use as part of their overall strategy. It captures carbon and stores it; it's a subset of carbon management and it involves prevention of greenhouse gas emissions, including carbon dioxide, from entering the atmosphere by utilizing a process and sequestering that CO<sub>2</sub> underground permanently.

So carbon capture generally is the capture of carbon at a facility or directly from air and then pressurized and injected and stored at 800 metres underground or deeper. This—there the carbon will gradually solidify at that depth. Carbon can be safely injected in specific underground geological formations called reservoirs. The carbon fills the pore space of these 'reservoirs' and like holes in a sponge, the pore space is the space between the particles of sand or between rocks.

Once the reservoir has reached its capacity it is capped off and monitored in perpetuity. The geological formations have a ceiling as a confining layer which prevents the carbon from escaping to the surface.

\* (19:40)

So the carbon captured storage act requires both Environment Act licence as well as licence of construction facility and licence under the carbon storage act, and these are part of the efforts to ensure that this regulatory framework is done in the safest way possible.

The act also defines the term of pore space as undersurface of the land and it also indicates the captured carbon may be stored and that those are belonging to the province. It sets out a licensing system for the subsurface carbon storage projects. It

also governs the surface and subsurface rights related to these storage activities in these storage areas and carbon cabbage—carbon storage licence as well as well licences are conditional on the applicant having the necessary surface and subsurface rights.

And so throughout this process overall, this is focusing on the capture and storage only throughout this bill. Utilization of carbon is not necessarily part of this bill; that is a process that is done above ground, so not including the storage underground.

Again, the environmental act licence and The Captured Carbon Storage Act licence would be required for this process. It places liability along—for the captured storing with those proponents and it also involves a board, which is meant to deal with subsurface rights access and compensation issues with a director in the department also having authority in that area.

And again, this is part of our efforts and one part of our efforts to work towards decarbonization and emission reduction in Manitoba. It's one piece of a broader suite of initiatives that our government is looking at taking to reduce emissions in Manitoba. And this Bill 31 is one aspect as part of that broader suite of initiatives, so we're—present this bill here today.

Thank you.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the minister.

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

**Mr. Greg Nesbitt (Riding Mountain):** I want to thank the minister for bringing this very extensive bill here—68 pages. And I know the devil will be in the details here as it starts to roll out.

I think—I just want to caution the minister and his department to listen to the presenters tonight and work with them. They certainly came with some cautions, questions and details of carbon 'capper'—capture storage in other areas of the world. And I guess on this side, we're not one hundred per cent convinced that this is the right way to go.

But again, I think as long as the minister and the department keep the public and these concerned groups informed at every step of the way, it's very important.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the member.

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

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

Is that agreed? [*Agreed*]

Part 1—pass; part 2—pass; part 3—pass; part 4—pass; part 5—pass; part 6—pass; part 7—pass; part 8—pass; part 9—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

**Bill 33—The Change of Name Amendment Act (3)**  
(*Continued*)

**The Chairperson:** We will now move on to Bill 33.

Does the minister responsible for Bill 33 have an opening statement?

**Hon. Lisa Naylor (Minister of Consumer Protection and Government Services):** I do. I am pleased to speak today about Bill 33, The Change of Name Amendment Act (3).

This bill proposes amendments to exempt the publication requirement of a legal name change in the Manitoba Gazette if the reason for the name change relates to the person being transgender, Two-Spirit Indigenous, non-binary, or gender diverse. The amendments also update the legislation with gender-neutral language.

These changes demonstrate our government's commitment to a Manitoba in which the 2SLGBTQ+ community members are safe and valued.

The proposed amendments align with other jurisdictions that also exempt, through their regulation or legislation, the publish requirement if the applicant is a transgender person.

Currently, once a legal name change has been approved by the Vital Statistics branch, the individual's new name and former name are published in the Manitoba Gazette. The current process does have an option for an individual to request a publication waiver, but it is an unnecessary barrier for those individuals.

For example, when the publication requirement is waived under the current Change of Name Act the Vital Statistics branch is not able to provide the new name and reports being sent to other service partners,

like Manitoba Public Insurance, Elections Manitoba, and the Canada Revenue Agency.

This means that applicants encounter barriers when applying for other identification. Applicants must first contact the Vital Statistics branch and confirm they are who they say they are by answering security questions or providing proof of their name change to these institutions in order to link their former and current names.

By removing the publication requirement altogether the proposed amendments will ensure that all legally changed names will be provided by Vital Statistics branch to Elections Manitoba and other service providers.

For members of our 2SLGBTQ+ community, the current requirement to publish a person's previous name and new name can cause unnecessary harm and may put individuals at risk for further discrimination or harassment.

The proposed amendment aligns with other provinces that either provide a similar exemption for members of the community or that simply no longer require a notice to be published in their gazette related to any change of name application.

This bill demonstrates that our government continues to support the rights of gender-diverse individuals and will advocate for the right of self-expression and identification for all Manitobans.

**The Chairperson:** Many thanks to the minister.

Does the critic from official opposition have an opening statement? There's no opening statement from the official opposition.

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

Also, if there's agreement from the committee, the Chair will call clauses in blocks that conform to the page, with the understanding that we will stop at any particular clause or clauses if the member may have comment, questions, or amendments to the proposed.

Is that agreed? [*Agreed*]

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

\* (19:50)

### **Bill 36—The Regulated Health Professions Amendment Act** (Continued)

**The Chairperson:** We will now move on to Bill 36.

Does the minister responsible for Bill 36 have an opening statement?

**Hon. Uzoma Asagwara (Minister of Health, Seniors and Long-Term Care):** Bill 36, the regulated health professionals amendment act, will increase a transparency of proceedings and accountability of health profession regulatory colleges in determining if the registration or certificate of practice of a member of a college should be cancelled because the member has been convicted of an offence that is relevant to their suitability to practise.

The need for these amendments was highlighted when a physician was convicted and the public was not permitted to attend the proceedings by the regulatory college. Concerns were raised that the lack of transparency in the decision-making process was harmful to the integrity of the health system overall. We shared those concerns and took steps to help address them.

Health-care professionals hold an esteemed position and have a solemn duty to serve the public. Patients trust them in some of their most vulnerable moments, and when that trust is broken and a health-care professional is convicted of an offence, the public deserves to understand how the colleges respond. Transparency in their decision making is important to foster public trust, particularly when responding to situations like this, where there is a significant breach of that trust by regulated health professionals.

Our government is taking steps to restore trust and transparency in health professional colleges through these proposed changes of The Regulated Health Professions Amendment Act. These changes will require that council meetings for regulatory colleges at which cancellation of registration or certificate of practice, or both, of a member of the college who has been convicted of an offence relevant to their suitability to practise, must be open to the public with limited exceptions.

In the exceptional case where a meeting will not be made open to the public, the council must provide the reasons for not holding a public meeting both orally at the meeting and in writing to the public. The exceptions include the following: matters involving public security which may be disclosed at the meeting; financial, personal or other matters may be—

that may be disclosed, and are of such a nature that the desirability of avoiding public disclosure of those matters outweighs the desirability of adhering to the principle that meetings be open to the public; a person is involved in civil or criminal proceedings which may be prejudiced or a person's safety may be jeopardized.

These amendments will ensure increased transparency and accountability in decision making by colleges by enabling the public to observe how they deal with a breach of the public's trust when one of their members commits an offence relevant to their suitability to practise is the norm and not the exception; and ensuring that if they determine that the public should not be permitted to observe how they deal with such a breach to the public's trust, they must provide the public with clear reasons why this is not permitted.

As our government continues to take steps to change the culture in health care, both for those delivering the care and for those receiving it, bringing legislation like this forward will help rebuild that trust and confidence of Manitobans in the health-care system.

Thank you.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the minister.

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

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

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

**Bill 201—The Manitoba Emblems Amendment Act (Provincial Stone)**

**The Chairperson:** Now we will move on to Bill 201.

Does the bill sponsor, the honourable member for Lac du Bonnet, have an opening statement?

**Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Leader of the Official Opposition):** I do.

Definitely, with the passing of Bill 201, The Manitoba Emblems Amendment Act, through committee represents a significant step towards recognizing the mottled dolomitic limestone, quarried near Garson and Tyndall, Manitoba, as significant, also known as Tyndall stone, as a official provincial emblem of Manitoba.

Tyndall stone is a unique limestone found exclusively in Manitoba, and it holds great cultural and historical significance to the province, and the designation of mottled dolomitic limestone, also known as Tyndall stone, as a provincial emblem not only highlights the geological importance of this natural resource but also showcases Manitoba's rich heritage and identity.

The stone has been used in the construction of many iconic buildings and structures throughout the province, including the Manitoba Legislature building and the Canadian Museum for Human Rights and many others throughout Manitoba. Just last week spent some time at the Humane Society, and there, as well, was Tyndall stone.

By passing of Bill 201, the committee has acknowledged the value of the dolomitic limestone, also known as Tyndall stone, and is definitely a symbol of Manitoba's strength, resilience and beauty. This decision will not only raise awareness about the stone's importance but also promote its use in various artistic and architectural products—projects, furthering enhancing Manitoba's cultural landscape.

Also had the pleasure of representing Canada on education at the G7 in Japan last May, May of 2023, and there as well was a prime example of Tyndall stone being used.

The passing of Bill 201 is a positive development that celebrates the unique qualities of Tyndall stone and solidifies its status as a proud emblem of Manitoba. This decision reflects a deep appreciation for the province's natural resource and heritage and paves the way for greater recognition and utilization of Tyndall stone in the years to come.

Thank you, Mr. Chair, and to the committee.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the member.

Does any other member wish to make an opening statement on Bill 201?

Don't see any other member.

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

Clause 1—pass; clause 2—pass; clause 3—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

**Bill 211—The Drivers and Vehicles  
Amendment Act  
(Manitoba Parks Licence Plates)**

**The Chairperson:** We will move on to Bill 211 now.

Does the bill sponsor, the honourable member for Riding Mountain, have an opening statement?

**Mr. Greg Nesbitt (Riding Mountain):** As the former minister for Natural Resources and Northern Development, I was pleased to oversee the creation and designation of Manitoba's 93rd provincial park, Pemmican Island, and launched the province's 10-year park infrastructure renewal plan.

\* (20:00)

We know Manitobans care deeply about their provincial parks and they have continuously shared how important it is to protect and preserve these parks for future generations.

Provincial parks are more than just recreational spaces; they are part of our identity as Manitobans. By passing Bill 211, all members of the Legislative Assembly will affirm their collective commitment to safeguarding these precious assets for current and future generations.

We will work with The Winnipeg Foundation to ensure that the proceeds from sales of this new licence plate go into the Provincial Parks Endowment Fund which are managed by the foundation. In '22-23 a total of \$1.1 million from the endowment fund was used for projects in parks across Manitoba.

Thank you to the committee for the honour of presenting Bill 211, and I hope to see it pass through committee for third reading in the House.

Thank you.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the member.

Does any other member wish to make an opening statement on Bill 211?

I don't see any other member wishing to speak on Bill 211.

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

Clause 1—pass; clause 2—pass; clause 3—pass; clause 4—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

The hour being 8:02, what is the will of the committee?

**Some Honourable Members:** Adjourn.

**The Chairperson:** Committee rise.

**COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 8:02 p.m.**

**WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS**

Re: Bill 201

Hello Chair and Committee members

I am totally interested in this Bill and I don't have any concerns with it passing through the House and looking forward to it getting done through Royal Assent

Thank you

Ben McGillivray

Re: Bill 31

Dear Members of the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development,

The Manitoba Eco-Network has provided this written submission to comment on Bill 31, The Captured Carbon Storage Act. This written submission was developed in collaboration with Manitoba Energy Justice Coalition, the Canadian Centre For Policy Alternatives, and other environmental community members. We have been discussing this Bill with the grassroots environmental community since its introduction in April and were preparing to provide some community education on this new legal approach in mid-June, since there was no public consultation undertaken by the government prior to the introduction of the Bill. We were caught off guard by the Committee Meeting scheduled today. Luckily, we were able to find a last-minute representative from MEJC to provide in-person comments at the meeting tonight.

We recommend that Bill 31 be withdrawn from the legislative process until more meaningful public engagement occurs on carbon capture technology. The environmental community is confused why the Government has invested time and money in developing a regulatory scheme for a technology that not yet been proven to work effectively. If seeking to improve environmental protection and better address the climate crisis, there are a number of other licensing and approval processes under the responsibility of Honourable Minister Moses that should have been prioritized first. For example, the many outdated decision-making and approval



processes under The Mines and Minerals Act, which regulates activities, from exploration to extraction, that are directly responsible for significant negative environmental and climate impacts. There are also a broad range of other climate solutions that are proven more effective, have broader community support, and will cost Manitobans less.

#### Critiquing the Carbon Capture Approach:

Although carbon capture and storage (CCS) technology has been promoted for the last 20 years as an effective climate mitigation measure, it has not been proven to be a successful method of reducing carbon emissions. There are currently only 30 commercial CCS projects operating globally, "capturing a total of around 42.5 MtCO<sub>2</sub>/year, or less than 0.2% of the necessary emissions reduction needed to close the emissions gap by 2030." (IISD, 2023a)

CCS is very energy intensive. There is a significant amount of energy required for the capture and compression of carbon, with additional amounts needed for transportation and storage (IPCC 2022). CCS projects usually increase the energy demand of the facility they capture carbon from by 15-25% on average, which often increases carbon emissions depending on the energy source used. In general, CCS technology is considered to be highly energy inefficient and often results in the generation of additional GhG emissions. Local climate organizations have demonstrated that Manitoba needs all of the power and energy we currently have to heat buildings and fuel our vehicles, we do not have energy to spare for inefficient CCS technology.

CCS technology also has an extremely high cost (billions of dollars), with the bulk of this cost often being borne by taxpayers. Due to the high energy needs of the process and the significant infrastructure required, CCS is one of the most expensive emissions reduction measures (IPCC, 2022). CSS is thus a very expensive approach to decarbonization compared to other measures. The IISD has suggested that "Investing in CCS is a risky investment for taxpayers and comes with a significant opportunity cost for near-term, more cost-effective solutions" (IISD, 2023b).

The community has concerns about who will be paying the extremely high costs associated with CCS developments, and how government will ensure taxpayers are protected from ultimately footing the bill. Based on recent media coverage, it seems that the target (and biggest supporters) of a CCS regulatory

regime are large industrial emitters. For example, Large Final Emitters (LFEs), like the Koch Fertilizer Plant. (Climate Change Connection) The proposed regulatory framework does not appear to include adequate incentive mechanisms or enforcement tools to ensure private industry is willing/required to pay the entire cost of a CCS project, and ensure taxpayers are protected.

Overall, CCS technology continues to be unproven and is not considered an effective approach to reduce emissions. The potential costs are extremely high, with limited benefit in terms of emissions reductions. The proposed regulatory framework also does not appear to protect taxpayers from bearing the costs of CCS developments in the future. For these reasons, Bill 31 should be withdrawn.

#### Better Climate Solutions are Needed:

Instead of investing in CCS, the Government of Manitoba should instead focus on proven solutions to reduce Manitoba's emissions. Many such solutions have been documented in the Climate Action Team's Road to Resilience, including:

- Developing more wind and solar electricity generation projects.
- Reducing the need for vehicle transportation and making all vehicles electric.
- Working with the private sector and federal government to expand charging infrastructure until every community connected by road has enough charging stations.
- Making our buildings as energy efficient as possible.
- Heating and cooling our buildings affordably, without fossil fuel (e.g. using geothermal systems).
- Ensuring that the public has access to reliable climate change education and that progress toward the climate goals is reported upon regularly and that failure to meet targets result in remedial action.

These solutions, among many others, would more effectively support the reduction of emissions than a CCS approach, and would also help reduce energy costs for Manitobans and make people's lives more affordable.

Since elected in 2023, the environmental community has been assured that the current government is a "listening government", looking to rebuild the grassroots connections that have been strained to a

breaking point over the past 10 years. However, there have already been a number of missed opportunities to engage with the grassroots about new legislative developments including the proposed changes to The Environment Act, and The Manitoba Hydro Act, under Bill 37, The Budget Implementation and Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2024. In fact, the introduction of these changes as part of the omnibus budget bill, instead of as stand-alone legislation, has actively prevented public engagement on these changes since there will be no Standing Committee review.

More needs to be done to meaningfully engage with the public and environmental grassroots community about proposed environmental law and policy changes in Manitoba. Withdrawing Bill 31 until a meaningful public consultation process can occur would be a step

in the right direction and would go a long way to prove that the government is in fact listening.

Our organizations welcome future opportunities to engage with the Government of Manitoba, prior to the introduction of new government Bills, to ensure the effective implementation of new legal and policy measures that support sustainable development, address the climate crisis, and ensure the protection of the environment for the benefit of current and future generations.

Sincerely,

Heather Fast  
Director  
Manitoba Eco-Network

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>**