

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

Official Report
(Hansard)

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

Vol. LXX No. 43 - 1:30 p.m., Monday, April 24, 2017

ISSN 0542-5492

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Forty-First Legislature

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, April 24, 2017

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

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

Please be seated.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Madam Speaker: Introduction of bills? Committee reports?

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Health, Seniors and Active Living): Good afternoon, Madam Speaker.

I'm pleased to table the Supplementary Information for Legislative Review for the Department of Health, Seniors and Active Living.

Madam Speaker: Further tabling of reports?

Hon. Ralph Eichler (Minister of Agriculture): I am pleased to table the Supplementary Information for Legislative Review for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year ending March 31st, 2018.

Madam Speaker: And further tabling of reports?

Hon. Heather Stefanson (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Oh, sorry.

Madam Speaker: Further tabling of reports?

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Madam Speaker: The honourable Minister of Justice. The required 90 minutes' notice prior to routine proceedings was provided in accordance with rule 26(2).

Would the honourable Minister of Justice please proceed with her statement.

Holocaust Memorial Day

Hon. Heather Stefanson (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Today is Yom Hashoah, or Holocaust Memorial Day.

This morning I and many of our colleagues attended Unto Every Person There is a Name to read the names of those who perished in the Holocaust.

The Holocaust is of enduring significance because it teaches us important lessons about human rights and responsibilities, the power of hatred and discrimination and the challenge of democracy in multi-ethnic and multicultural societies.

The term Holocaust is derived from the Greek term for a burnt offering. In contemporary literature and history, the term is used to refer to systematic Nazi destruction of European Jewry, which began in 1933 when Adolf Hitler was appointed Chancellor of Germany.

The Holocaust is estimated to have reduced the world's total Jewish population by over one third.

While Jews were a primary target during the Holocaust, the Roma people, Jehovah's Witnesses, homosexuals, people with disabilities and political enemies also suffered from Nazi persecution and violence.

We remember the Holocaust—and the international complacency and social and political conditions that allowed it to occur—so that we may avoid similar events today and in the future.

As Canadians work to build a compassionate and just society, understanding and knowing and learning from the Holocaust is vitally important. It teaches us about the importance of resistance, solidarity, resiliency and survival even in the face of unimaginable horrors. It teaches us that democratic institutions, values and human rights are not a given, nor are they automatically sustained. Rather, they must be appreciated, they must be nurtured and they must be protected.

The Holocaust teaches us that silence and indifference to the suffering or persecution of others or to the infringement of civil and human rights in any society can, regardless of intention, perpetuate the suffering.

The Holocaust was not an accident in history. It happened because of prejudice and hatred and it happened because of the indifference of those who could have helped prevent it. It is for that reason that we must never forget the Holocaust; it is for that reason that we must and we will remember the terrible things that happened so that they may never happen again.

And, Madam Speaker, following the comments from my colleagues, I ask that we have a moment of silence to remember all of those who perished in the Holocaust.

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): I thank the minister for her statement today and I acknowledge colleagues from all parties who gathered for the memorial on the lawn today or the event downstairs earlier today.

People all around the world joined together to observe Yom Hashoah, Holocaust Memorial Day, and honour the memory of the 6 million Jewish people persecuted and murdered by the Nazi regime during the Second World War. Millions more, including members of the LGBTTQ community, the Roma people, Jehovah's Witnesses, persons with physical and intellectual disabilities, political dissidents and others were also murdered under the Nazi regime.

The Holocaust continues to have a profound impact on Manitobans. Home to one of the largest Jewish communities in Canada, thousands of Manitobans are family members of Holocaust survivors and those who perished in the Holocaust. Some survivors are still with us today and serve as a powerful link to the not-so-distant past. Their stories are reminders of what can occur when our most basic rights are denied and ignored.

This day is a memorial but it is also a call to action to say never again. While progress has been made over the years, the day serves to remind us that we must remain vigilant against acts of hatred, discrimination and intolerance in our society.

Like some other members of this Legislature, I have had the chance to visit Yad Vashem, which commemorates the Holocaust, in Israel. The despair from experiencing the exhibits inside is balanced by a majestic view of Jerusalem at the end of the visit.

Most members, I hope, have had the opportunity to visit our own Canadian museum of human rights right here in Winnipeg, which includes information about the Holocaust as part of its journey of human rights.

Madam Speaker, I ask all Manitobans to take a moment to remember the millions of people who lost their lives during the Holocaust. We honour those victims' memories by continuing to fight for those who suffer persecution in our world today.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Speaker, I ask leave to speak to the minister's statement.

Madam Speaker: Does the member have leave to speak to the ministerial statement? [*Agreed*]

Mr. Gerrard: Madam Speaker, several years ago, Naomi and I visited Yad Vashem, the World Holocaust Memorial Centre in Jerusalem. It was a very moving day. The day we were there it was raining, and it felt that there were untold tears falling all around us.

Today, outside our Legislature, snow came down as we remembered those who perished in the Holocaust outside in the ceremony, and I remembered, as I stood there in the snow, our day at Yad Vashem. Earlier this morning in the Golden Boy Room, reading the names of those who were killed in the Holocaust, it was emotional realizing that every name represented one of the 6 million who died, and that the names of children represented only a single child out of one and a half million who were slaughtered.

During the Second World War, while genocide and war raged abroad, sadly Canada and the US were slower than we should have been to act and even denied entry to hundreds of refugees who would later die in concentration camps.

The theme of today is never again, and yet as we stand here, people are being killed and running for safety for themselves and their families, trying to find a new life in Canada so they won't be taken and slaughtered at home.

In Canada we have enormous privilege to be safe and protected. But we should not—we should guard that privilege and we should share it with others. We should continue to welcome refugees so we won't respeak—repeat the mistakes of history and truly ensure never again.

We have a long—come a long way in Canada with respect to human rights and standing up against prejudice, hatred and anti-Semitism. But we still have more to learn and a considerable journey yet to go, and today, as we remember those who were

murdered, we commit ourselves to a better future where understanding and empathy replace hate and we can work toward a world where there's much less hate and much less anti-Semitism. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Is there leave for a moment of silence? *[Agreed]*

Please rise.

A moment of silence was observed.

Further ministerial statements?

The honourable Minister for Infrastructure. The required 90 minutes' notice prior to routine proceedings was provided in accordance with rule 26(2).

Would the honourable minister please proceed with his statement?

Spring Flood Update

Hon. Blaine Pedersen (Minister of Infrastructure): Good afternoon, Madam Speaker.

Manitoba Infrastructure's Hydrologic Forecast Centre reports that the ice has moved out of both the Saskatchewan and Carrot rivers. The ice jam, flood-related warning in The Pas area is no longer in effect. The Province will continue to monitor future precipitation and possible impacts on rivers such as today's forecast for snowfalls for the south and southeast areas of the province.

The Province has noted wind-driven ice pileup alerts for today on large lakes. Property owners should take precautions and remove valuables close to shorelines.

Most southern rivers and tributaries have crested and are receding to seasonal levels. As the Red River and its tributaries are on the decline, the precipitation could prolong the return to seasonal levels on major rivers. The Red River Floodway channel is no longer taking on river water and the channel is receding. The Red River Floodway gates are no longer diverting flow into the channel. They did so for 22 days this spring.

The Portage Diversion will continue to be in operation for a number of weeks as high water from the west continues to flow into the province.

The Manitoba government will make disaster financial assistance available for eligible municipalities, homeowners, farms and small businesses with impacts from flooding this spring.

Once again, we applaud the efforts of our response partners, the emergency management teams and First Nations, the Red Cross, municipalities and communities impacted by the 2017 spring flood. The people who were evacuated from many First Nation communities are slowly returning to their respective communities.

We also acknowledge the elected leaders who clearly understand the importance of reducing the risk of disaster impacts on their communities through effective emergency preparedness. Finally, we would like to thank all Manitobans across the province that volunteered their time and effort during the 2017 spring flood.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Recent snow and precipitation is not expected to have a major impact on flood levels, as most waterways have already peaked. Manitobans with property along the southern shore of Lake Manitoba are encouraged to remain vigilant, as high winds could have a devastating impact on property. While all ice is melted on major rivers in southern Manitoba and the risk of overland flooding has subsided in these regions, ice jamming on northern rivers and overland flooding continues to disrupt the lives of many communities in Manitoba's North.

Most recently, due to ice jamming on the Saskatchewan River, the Opaskwayak Cree Nation became the sixth First Nation community to undergo evacuation, with 100 members being forced from their homes. At present, over 380 First Nations have been forced from their homes due to flooding this year; 60 per cent of the evacuees are children.

Thankfully, 60 members from Long Plain First Nation finally got to return home last week, however, 37 residents are still displaced.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the NDP caucus, we continue to send our sincerest thoughts and support to all Manitobans whose lives have been disrupted by the flooding.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): I ask leave to speak to the minister's statement.

Madam Speaker: Does the member have leave to speak to the ministerial statement? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Gerrard: Madam Speaker, even while we relax a little bit as the pressure for flooding problems around Lake Winnipeg and southwestern Manitoba decreases, it is still important that we remember that

the situation on Lake Manitoba can be quite critical yet and that we could have water as high as eight, fourteen, which is a potentially dangerous level. It is also important to remember that communities around Lake St. Martin where the flood will not peak likely until late May or early June are still at considerable risk.

Indeed, I—last night, I was at a funeral for Marina Letander, who was an evacuee from Dauphin River, and she was evacuated back six years ago. The impression was that people would be back in a couple of weeks. She, unfortunately, sadly, never got to go home. She and her husband were amazing entrepreneurs, running the tourist camp in Dauphin River for many years, and so just, mark her passing and recognize the passing of somebody who was affected by the flooding in the past and who we need to remember today.

Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Members' statements.

Oh, prior to members' statements, the honourable Minister of Education.

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Ian Wishart (Minister of Education and Training): I ask for leave to table my Estimates.

Madam Speaker: Is there leave for the minister to table his Estimates? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Wishart: I would like to table the Estimates for the 2017-2018 Department of Manitoba Education and Training departmental Estimates.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Monsignor Michael Buyachok

Hon. Ron Schuler (Minister of Crown Services): Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to recognize Monsignor Mitrat Michael Buyachok, pastor of the Ukrainian Saints Vladimir and Olga cathedral at 115 McGregor Street, here in Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Monsignor Michael Buyachok was born in Strasbourg, France, and in 1947 moved with his family to Winnipeg, Canada. In 1964, he entered St. Josaphat's major Ukrainian Catholic seminar in Rome, after which he returned to Winnipeg to commence his priestly duties. Ordained to the priesthood in 1969 at the Blessed Virgin Mary church, he has served as a member of the clergy for the Ukrainian Catholic 'archepathy' for over 47 years.

In 1985, Monsignor Buyachok was appointed Prelate of Honour, monsignor, by His Holiness Pope John Paul II with the title of right reverend monsignor. In 1992, he was honoured with a commemorative medal for the 125th anniversary of the Confederation of Canada and in 2012 he received the Queen jubilee—Queen Elizabeth II Diamond Jubilee Medal.

Monsignor Buyachok has been an active member of the Knights of Columbus for over 58 years and has held various positions. He has served as a state chaplain for the Manitoba jurisdiction for two years, he has been an elected public school trustee for Duck Mountain School Division and was also elected as a school trustee for the Transcona-Springfield school board for over 20 years. Monsignor Buyachok has also been the president of the Canadian national federation of council of priests and the vice-chair for the City of Winnipeg Race Relations Committee.

In addition to all of this, he has also volunteered his time to many local committees and boards. These include: the Oserodok Ukrainian culture and education centre, Dauphin Regional Hospital Board, St. Paul's Nursing Home, the advisory board of the United Way, the Dauphin Ministerial Association, the Dauphin National Ukrainian Festival, the National Youth Orchestra of Canada, the Manitoba Gaming Commission, the 2005 national—Nation at Prayer, and currently, Monsignor Buyachok is a member of the Consistory of the 'archepathy' of Winnipeg.

Monsignor Michael Buyachok's many years of dedication and service to the Ukrainian Catholic Church and our community are truly an inspiration and a blessing to us all.

* (13:50)

Please join me in recognizing the Right Reverend Monsignor Mitrat Michael Buyachok.

May God continue to bless Monsignor Michael Buyachok and the great things he does for the church and our communities.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I ask for leave to table a list of those attending this afternoon.

Madam Speaker: Does the member have leave to table the list of people attending this afternoon?

Mr. Schuler: If I can try this one more time.

May I have it in Hansard, the list of those attending today?

Madam Speaker: Is there leave to include the names in Hansard of the members that have attended today? *[Agreed]*

Ron Bell, Lesia Borys, Bohdan Buyachok, Msgr. Michael Buyachok, Yaroslav Chubenko, Ostap Hawaleshka, Tatiana Hawaleshka, Anna Katchanovski, Elaine Kisiow, Margaret Saray, Bohdan Sawczuk, Oksana Sawczuk, Lubomyr Shulakewych, Oksana Shulakewych, Eugene Waskiw, John Zacharuk.

Vincent Massey Women's Hockey Champions

Mr. James Allum (Fort Garry-Riverview): Madam Speaker, on March 14, the Vincent Massey girls hockey team made our Fort Garry-Riverview community very proud when they won the first ever championship in the Winnipeg Women's High School Hockey League A division.

These student athletes, who are joining us in the gallery today, are aged 14 to 18 years old, and they are passionate participants in the academic and athletic life of their school. Their auspicious achievement last month is a crowning example of this enthusiasm, which they demonstrated by their hard work all season.

Coach Colin Wolfe praises their dedication to early morning CrossFit sessions, practice after school and commitment to academic success.

The Trojans entered the championship as No. 2 seed and defeated the No. 1 seeded team. It was an impressive accomplishment for the players and the coaching staff.

Not only did they win, but their opponents were kept off the scoreboard due to an outstanding performance from their goalie, Taylor McDermott, and a total commitment to team defense. Not surprisingly, Taylor received the most valuable player award for her efforts.

Vincent Massey's principal, Tony Carvey, has also commended the team's coaches, trainers, parents and fans for their invaluable contribution to this achievement.

These nineteen young women are congratulated not just for winning but for the sense of 'esprit' de corps they developed, the adversity they overcame and for seeking to improve every single day.

No matter their level of experience, all 19 players were motivated and each rose to the challenge.

Like every great team, they demonstrated commitment, dedication and good old fashion Canadian hockey heart.

Bravo, well done and congratulations on this great achievement.

Ann Bailey

Hon. Heather Stefanson (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Madam Speaker, I'd like to extend our condolences to the family of Ann Bailey, who worked with the Legislative Counsel Office for more than 30 years.

Ann grew up in Morris and Winnipeg, Manitoba and attended the University of Winnipeg, and later the University of Manitoba, where she earned a bachelor of law degree. She practiced family law with the firm Krawchuk Galanchuk before joining the Legislative Counsel Office as Crown Counsel in 1986. Ann will be remembered for the excellent service she provided to all members of the Assembly in this position for the last 30 years.

During her time with the Legislative Counsel Office, Ann drafted a multitude of acts and regulations. For many years she was responsible for drafting the rules of the Court of Queen's Bench and the Court of Appeal. She was also an expert in family law and drafted many laws for the Department of Families, including Child and Family Services, adoption and child daycare.

Intelligent and hard-working, Ann was liked and admired throughout government. I personally knew Ann for many years. As a newly elected MLA in opposition, she helped draft many of my private members' bills.

Most of us in the House know how hard it is to get legislation passed in opposition, but Ann was always professional and thorough, regardless of which side of the House you were on.

I'm told she always instructed her colleagues to keep, and I quote, the seat of the pants on the seat of the chair until the job is done and done well. End quote. Her practical approach to her work and her wonderful sense of humour will be missed by so many here at the Legislature, and in government as a whole. On behalf of all members, I wish to express our condolences to Ann's family, friends and colleagues, who are with us in the gallery today.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I ask for leave to have the names of Ann's family members and 'friends' who are with us in the gallery today included in Hansard.

Madam Speaker: Is there leave to include the names of the family attending in Hansard? *[Agreed]*

Gary Craven, husband; Sara Craven, daughter; Ron Bailey, brother; Mary Stanger, sister; Robert Bailey, brother; Curtis Craven, nephew; Brigitte Insull, sister-in-law; Ian Craven, brother-in-law; Barb Craven, sister-in-law; Sandra Craven, sister-in-law; friends: Lynn Romeo, Bob Sly, Linda Pettit; colleagues from Legislative Counsel office and Department of Justice.

Earth Day

Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I was very pleased to attend multiple events over the weekend celebrating Earth Day.

What was very concerning, however, is that this government has let Earth Day come and go without a single word of mention. Past practice in this very room has been for ministers responsible for the environment to issue a ministerial statement celebrating Earth Day and committing their government to further action. We heard nothing last week before Earth Day and we heard nothing today after Earth Day.

Now, this government probably wouldn't have had much to say in their ministerial statement had they got up to make one. This is the second year in a row where they have promised to take action on climate change in their Throne Speech, and in their budget 'speet' which follows, the word climate change is not even mentioned.

This is also the same government which linked—the Premier (Mr. Pallister), actually—linked whether or not he would participate in the national climate change strategy to his completely failed and botched health-care negotiations with the federal government.

It would, however, be a tragic mistake to think that this government is merely absent when it comes to environmental issues and not paying attention. On several occasions they have taken actions which directly weaken existing environmental laws or they have blocked progressive legislation that have come before this Chamber which would have improved the livelihoods of Manitobans now and into the future.

So many of these relate to water; they're too numerous for me to cram into a two-minute member's statement, Madam Speaker. But this is the government, we cannot forget, which is ignoring the Walkerton inquiry's recommendations that water infrastructure be inspected every five years rather than every 10 years. This is the government which has removed the legislative ban on winter spreading of hog manure and this is the government which just last week wiped out an agency called Green Manitoba.

A year from now, I hope the minister actually has some good things to say which I can commend them on as we push them to do more for our planet.

Thank you.

Supper Central

Mr. Shannon Martin (Morris): Madam Speaker, the statistics are daunting: 30 per cent of new businesses fail within the first two years, 50 per cent within five and two thirds within 10. Add to the mix that women only make up one third of business owners.

With that as a backdrop, sometimes you have to wonder what motivated two women from rural Manitoba, both with young families, to decide to go into business for themselves.

However, a pair of enterprising women are helping make it easier for busy families to enjoy home-cooked meals.

Lori Vassart and Crystal Anderson, who both live in La Salle, have been operating Supper Central since March 2009 and have just marked their eighth anniversary. The business, located at Kenaston Common, has been a welcome food option for many who find themselves desiring quality home-cooked meals, but with convenience.

For the uninitiated, meal kits are a kind of bridge between the ready-to-serve meals that a number of grocery stores are now offering and a traditional, made-from-scratch, home-cooked dinner. The kits include all ingredients packaged in exact proportions needed to make a gourmet-quality meal.

Or for the more adventurous, Supper Central features an open area for food prep with space for about a dozen people to work at. Each station has two or three different recipes associated with it, all with the necessary ingredients, tools and a step-by-step guide for assembling your suppers.

Supper Central was the first storefront meal assembly business of its kind in the city when it opened in 2009. Crystal and Lori were inspired to start one here after Crystal witnessed similar success when her family resided in Seattle and, noting meal assembly stores all over the place, she thought it would be a good idea for Winnipeg.

As these entrepreneurs noted, quote: You just need that one good idea to start a business and this one was it for us. End quote.

So on behalf of the Legislative Assembly, congratulations, Supper Central, on your eighth anniversary, and here's to many more.

Thank you.

* (14:00)

Introduction of Guests

Madam Speaker: Prior to oral questions, we have some guests to introduce you to.

I would like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the Speaker's Gallery where we have with us today John and Val Micklefield, who are the parents of the honourable Government House Leader (Mr. Micklefield).

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

Seated to the loge to my left we have Doug Martindale, the former MLA for Burrows, and we welcome you back to the Legislature.

And seated in the public gallery from Peaceful Village Youth Program, 40 grade 8 to 12 students under the direction of Nick Wanwilaiwan, and this group is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Logan (Ms. Marcelino).

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Fiscal Performance Review Release of KPMG Report

Ms. Flor Marcelino (Leader of the Official Opposition): It is long past time for the Premier to come clean with Manitobans. He promised that 97 per cent of the Fiscal Performance Review will be made public. Those are his words, not ours. His departments wrote in the RFP, the contents of the report belong to the people of Manitoba. Those are his words, not ours. He announced to the media

about taking his fiscal performance review to Costa Rica. Those are his words, not ours. Now he has refused to release the report for Manitobans to see.

Will the Premier release the Fiscal Performance Review today?

Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier): I welcome everyone back to the Chamber.

I thank the member for raising the topic of openness; it's something that this government does that the previous government didn't, Madam Speaker, so we're proud to release information and have released already more information in advance of and since the budget than any previous government has in the history of Manitoba.

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

Ms. Marcelino: The Premier expects us to believe that the report he commissioned, the report the people of Manitoba paid hundreds of thousands of dollars for, the report he took to Costa Rica on his vacation is actually the property of KPMG.

The Premier has the ability to prove that he is not breaking his word to the people of Manitoba and wasting hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Will the Premier table for this House a copy of the clause of the contract which shows this report cannot be released?

Mr. Pallister: Madam Speaker, we think the investment in expertise and the consultation that we did in the lead up to the budget is already paying dividends for Manitobans. We're on the road to recovery, and we were on a road to ruin before.

Part of the reason was, Madam Speaker, the previous government's tendencies to cover up spending of taxpayers' dollars. They actually spent more on severance payments to former friends than this report cost. They actually spent several hundred thousand dollars paying former supporters and staffers not to work. They actually spent several hundred thousand dollars paying former friends to leave the province and work somewhere else.

And, Madam Speaker, it gets worse; they actually covered up the amount they spent for over a year and a half. So, while we're being open, they were being secretive. We've learned from their mistakes. Unfortunately, it doesn't appear that they have.

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

Ms. Marcelino: Two very simple questions, no answers. Try again.

For the third time: the Premier does not seem to care what Manitobans think. If he did, he would give them the facts they need to make informed opinions. But he thinks his opinion is more important than the people of Manitoba. He thinks—he seems to think he can spend the money on—of the people of Manitoba without being accountable, but he can take the report with him on vacation to Costa Rica, but he won't show it to the people of Manitoba.

The question: Will the Premier release the Fiscal Performance Review for Manitobans to see?

Mr. Pallister: For the member's question and for her colleagues to have any credibility on an issue that would advocate transparency, an important issue for this government, Madam Speaker, they would have had to have demonstrated some semblance of it themselves.

The member asserts—the member asserts—Madam Speaker—[*interjection*]

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Pallister: —that a process which consulted over 20,000 Manitobans is one which reflects somehow a lack of respect for opinion. Madam Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth.

What would demonstrate a disrespect for the opinions of Manitobans would be for a political organization to take away their right to vote on a tax hike which they promised they wouldn't invoke, or to go to court and take away their right again to vote on raising the PST, which they themselves promised they would not do. This would be behaviour which reflects a total disrespect for the people of Manitoba.

Fiscal Performance Review Release of KPMG Report

Mr. James Allum (Fort Garry-Riverview): Well, Madam Speaker, what's disrespectful is you tell everybody you're going to do better and then you do way, way worse every single time.

Madam Speaker, the people of Manitoba paid over \$740,000 for this report that the Premier's now hiding. He said—he looked Manitobans straight in the eye and he said we're going to release 97 per cent of that report, and then he refused to do it.

Now, this is a Premier who walks around with his business credibility, so presumably he knows how to read a contract. So if the contract is a problem, if he can't release the report, will he just release the contract today so we can see if he's right in what he's talking about?

Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier): So, Madam Speaker, with all due respect to the member opposite, he was part of a government that handed out sole-source contracts like candy to supporters of their party—[*interjection*]

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Pallister: —again and again and again—sole-source contracts, Madam Speaker, untendered, not shopped—[*interjection*]

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Pallister: —unopen behaviour, I would submit. Now, that is not a record of openness.

We have consulted more extensively, in our prebudget exercise, with Manitobans than any government in Manitoba history. We have released more information than any government in Manitoba history and we are in the process of implementing what we heard, much to the chagrin of members opposite, who, by the way, Madam Speaker, by the way, commissioned studies, covered them up and now criticize us for acting on the advice they themselves received but didn't have the courage to act on.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Fort Garry-Riverview, on a supplementary question.

Mr. Allum: Well, Madam Speaker, we sent in a freedom of information request for this report and it was denied because they said it was for Cabinet confidentiality. And then last week they said, oh, no, no, no. It's not about that at all; it's about the proprietary interests of the contractor.

Every day we get a new excuse from the Premier about why he won't release this report. The people of Manitoba paid for this report.

Will he have the decency today to release the report once and for all? Is that a yes or a no? We want an answer right now.

Mr. Pallister: Madam Speaker, I get the more heat-than-light presentation of the member for Fort Garry-Riverview, but his frustration pales in comparison to the frustration felt by the people of Manitoba as they

watched the previous government rebel, turn inward and totally become dysfunctional.

Now, part of the reason that that previous government demonstrated their dysfunction was because of their own habit of lacking transparency and accountability. In fact, the member sitting opposite right now put the knife in the back, figuratively speaking, of his own leader and said that he wasn't listening and he wasn't being accountable, he did things wrong, Madam Speaker.

Look, this kind of criticism the members opposite generated towards themselves by criticizing themselves, we've seen what it looks like. We're not going to portray that behaviour as a new government, Madam Speaker. We will be Manitoba's most open government ever, bar none.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Speaker: Order.

* (14:10)

The honourable member for Fort Garry-Riverview, on a final supplementary.

Mr. Allum: Well, Madam Speaker, we're not frustrated; we're asking on behalf of the people of Manitoba. This should be easy. This is about transparency and about accountability. It's about being up front with the people of Manitoba. It's about keeping your word to the people of Manitoba. They were supposed to release the report. *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Allum: The Premier looked the people of Manitoba in the eye and said 97 per cent of that report will be made public, and yet he's refused to do that.

So can I ask him right now: Will he release the report or did he, as we suspect, just leave it in Costa Rica?

Mr. Pallister: And his third question started out so reasonably, too, Madam Speaker.

Now, the member raises the question of integrity, Madam Speaker, and so of course I must respond. He used the phrase, keeping your word, and I appreciate the opportunity to respond to that as well. *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Pallister: The member who just asked the question sat at the Cabinet table with colleagues. He

sat at the Cabinet table with colleagues—one colleague in particular, who was giving out contracts to his pals. He was doing that without shopping around. He was doing that without disclosing it, too.

Other members—other members of that Cabinet—saw that this was wrong. They stood up and they said so. They launched a rebellion against that kind of behaviour. The member opposite just sat there, quiet, doing nothing. That's not integrity, Madam Speaker, and I don't think the member should ask questions about integrity until he himself can demonstrate a record of putting it on display. He has failed to do that.

Emergency Room Closures Impact on Manitobans

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): Madam Speaker, as hundreds of Manitobans continue to sign petitions and rally, it should be clear that communities will not let this Premier shut down their ERs without a fight. This government dropped a bomb on families when they announced the closure of the three ERs, and they failed to provide any follow-up information to help them cope with this massive change.

The minister's been evasive about the details from the start, and as time goes on, we're really learning just how arbitrary these ER closures really are. The minister's cutting front-line services to meet his unrealistic targets and hasn't provided any assurances to families that the health care they need will be better or faster.

Will the minister explain what families can expect from his massive changes to the health-care system?

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Health, Seniors and Active Living): Well, Madam Speaker, I'm glad that the member has gotten some fight into him because for 17 years, he didn't say a word. He didn't say a word as residents of his constituency and across Winnipeg sat in emergency rooms for eight hours, 10 hours. He didn't say a word when they couldn't get the care they needed when they showed up at emergency rooms. He didn't say a word when families were distraught at how long their loved ones were waiting.

Now, suddenly, he has fight, but for 17 years he didn't say anything. We're taking the right course of action, and we'll continue down that road, Madam Speaker.

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

Mr. Wiebe: Madam Speaker, thousands of health-care workers are wondering how this snap decision will affect their ability to provide the quality front-line care that they do. They haven't been told if and when they'll be transferred, moved or let go, and so their lives are full of uncertainty right now.

Without any immediate investments into the existing ERs, staff are wondering just how they're going to deal with the added pressures at the existing emergency rooms.

Will the minister guarantee that additional nurses, doctors and physical space will be in place before the ERs and urgent-care-service centres are closed?

Mr. Goertzen: Madam Speaker, I'm glad the member continues down the same road. I am not unhappy that he's holding community meetings, but he might want to try a bit of a different tack. Instead of starting a meeting at 7 o'clock, he should advertise one of his next meetings at 7 o'clock but then start it at 3 in the morning, and after people have waited at that meeting for eight hours for the member to show up, maybe he could explain to them how waiting for eight hours for an ER is any better. They would have a sense of that frustration. They would have a sense of what it's like to wait for eight hours for service. If he would do that, the people of his constituency would have a much clearer picture of why we're taking the actions we are.

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

Mr. Wiebe: Madam Speaker, these cuts are causing real anxieties in real communities and this minister has a responsibility to simply tell families when the closures will start, how the process will roll out. Will the ERs be closed in six months? Will they be closed in a year? Will they close down overnight or will they start reducing hours and transferring doctors? When will nurses be transferred?

We know that the minister has this information. He had all the numbers on his desk for weeks and he told families that he had no idea.

So we have to wonder, why is the minister deliberately keeping families in the dark?

Mr. Goertzen: Well, Madam Speaker, and I wonder why the member deliberately, for 17 years, did

nothing to try to fix the emergency room problem in Winnipeg.

We lagged behind every other major city in Canada. We were 10th out of 10 in so many different waiting times, yet he said nothing as he sat in government. He didn't defend his constituents or Manitobans or residents of Concordia at that point. He didn't stand up and demand action from his government. He sat silent as hundreds, thousands, of Winnipeggers sat in ERs languishing, waiting for care.

We're taking action that isn't easy. I acknowledge that. Change is difficult. Things can be difficult when you try to make improvements. But it's the right decision, and we are motivated by making the right decision for patients and patients' care, Madam Speaker.

Northern Manitoba Health-Care Concerns

Ms. Amanda Lathlin (The Pas): The health-care needs of northerners are being hit hard by this government. First, the government announced that they will cancel The Pas clinic without any consultation with affected communities. Next, the government demanded millions in cuts to the northern RHA, again, without any consultation or advance warning.

The health-care needs of northerners don't seem to be a priority for this government.

Why has the government refused to make health care for northerners a priority?

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Health, Seniors and Active Living): Madam Speaker, I acknowledge that after 17 years of NDP government, after ignoring many of the priorities in the North, that it's been a challenge to ensure that we are moving in the right direction for those in northern Manitoba.

We were left with a tremendous, tremendous deficit when it comes to services in the North after 17 years of NDP government. You know, they would go to their communities, they would say that they were defending them. When they were in government they would say they were going to work for them, and then they did nothing. Seventeen years, well, except just before the last election, then they promised them everything.

Manitobans understood that that wasn't truthful. It isn't the right way to treat people, and we won't do that to them, Madam Speaker.

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

Ms. Lathlin: If cancelling The Pas clinic was not enough, if cutting millions from the northern RHA was not enough, the government has now ordered the closure of the Grace Lake airport. This means that patients who need to be medevaced will now have to travel 30 minutes out of town in order to receive the medical transportation they need.

Why is this government refusing to make health for northerners a priority? Will it reverse its decision to close Grace Lake airport?

Mr. Goertzen: Madam Speaker, the member will know that we continue to make investments in health care in the North, including communities such as the one that she represents. We continue to make them across the North in many different areas, which are held by the NDP or held by our caucus; it isn't a political decision.

But I can tell you, Madam Speaker, what is greatly disappointing to Manitobans in the—they were made promises over 17 years, many provinces, false expectations, or were told that things were going to happen and they didn't happen, year after year after year, election after election. They were told before the election, we're going to finally do something. That's what the NDP said, and then they did nothing.

We will treat the people of the North and all Manitobans in a respectful and honest way, Madam Speaker.

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

* (14:20)

Ms. Lathlin: The government needs to take responsibility for its actions. If they had talked with members of the community before they announced their plan for closing Grace Lake airport they would've found out that it is important to ensure access to medical services. They would've learned that it's necessary for our patients. Instead, they are further reducing services on top of their cuts.

Will the government reverse their decision and finally put the health-care needs of northerners, our families, first?

Mr. Goertzen: Madam Speaker, the member is not incorrect. Access to services is important. It's been important for a very long time. And that's why we're extremely concerned, coming into government, when we reviewed the reports and we saw that we were last in so many places in health care, not just in northern Manitoba, but in Winnipeg and other places in Manitoba. We were last on so many different things. After 17 years, there'd been no improvements.

Now, the member talks about access today, but I would encourage her to look to the future as well, because Manitobans in the future need access to health care as well. That's why we're looking at sustainable solutions, not just for today but also for the next generations, knowing that our kids and our grandkids and our kids' grandkids also need health care, Madam Speaker.

Privatization of Air Services Consultation Inquiry

Mr. Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon): It seems consultation is not this government's strong suit, at least consultation with regular Manitobans.

The government has announced plans to privatize government air services and last week published an expression of interest on MERX. Lifeflight uses Grace Lake airport.

The government can clean up a lot of confusion with a simple answer. Is the closure of Grace Lake airport part of its plan to privatize government air services? *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order. Order.

Hon. Blaine Pedersen (Minister of Infrastructure): Madam Speaker, I realize that change is difficult for the opposition. We only have to look at their leadership election rules. They haven't changed anything there.

What this is is an expression of interest to find out—our mandate was to find the—ensure the best value for taxpayers all across Manitoba while at the same time ensuring the safety of all Manitobans across this province. And that's what the expression of interest is for, simply to look to see if there's value in doing something different.

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

Mr. Lindsey: It's unfortunate that he missed the question.

We know this government does not listen to regular Manitobans, but they do seem to pay attention to the views of their well-connected insiders. This does not benefit the people of Manitoba, but it does make it easier for the people at the top.

The government needs to come clean: Has the minister or department engaged in any conversations with private-sector groups regarding the closure of Grace Lake airport or the privatization of air services? And if yes, what are their plans?

Mr. Pedersen: Again, Madam Speaker—and I thank the member for that question, but again, I realize for the opposition, research is really, really difficult for them. And the only way you can find out if there's a better way to find value for Manitoba taxpayers is to put out an expression of interest. It does not require us to change anything.

All we are going to do is find the best value for Manitobans, ensuring the safety of all Manitobans. And that's what this government was elected to do. We're on the road to recovery, and that's what we will do.

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

Mr. Lindsey: For many months it's been clear this government does not have any interest in actual consultation. It cuts first, then ask questions later.

We know this government did not consult with the Mathias Colomb Cree nation prior to their decision to close the Grace Lake airport. We know this decision will potentially have huge negative impacts for Missinippi air.

Will the government hold off its decision to close Grace Lake airport to give it time for proper consultation with First Nations and any other groups that use this airport?

Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier): Well, Madam Speaker, finally, a question on a topic that members opposite have some expertise in: no consultation.

No consultation is what they did when they raised the PST on the people of Manitoba. They didn't even consult with each other, Madam Speaker—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Pallister: They didn't consult with their own Cabinet members. They didn't, certainly, consult with the members of their party and they certainly

left out of their consultation the entire population of the province of Manitoba at the same time.

They didn't consult, Madam Speaker, when they gave contracts without tender to their friends. Consultation is not required for that; they didn't consult with each other on that either.

They didn't consult in respect of how they could have addressed the situation to achieve better value for the people of the North or the people anywhere else in the province—no consultation on that either.

When it comes to not consulting and not listening, the members opposite have lot of experience on that file, Madam Speaker.

Emergency Room Closures Government Position

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows): When a government decides to close any emergency service it is perfectly reasonable for the people of Manitoba to ask for transparency and accountability. As of now, there are still no plans attached to the timeline for these health-care changes.

Now, this minister has had ample time to share with Manitobans how closing down emergency rooms can be justified.

When will this Premier restore confidence in this government and share with us any proof to justify closing down the busy emergency rooms?

Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier): Madam Speaker, I thank the member for the question, and I want—as it is my first opportunity to say to her personally, on behalf of the government, congratulations on her entry into the leadership race for her party. I want to also say I know this will be an emotional and fascinating opportunity for her, and I know for her family as well.

I—been around long enough, as has the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), to remember a time in another decade when another person of similar name sought the leadership of this party and had the rules changed at the last minute to defeat his opportunity to win, and he earned the right to win but had it taken away from him. I encourage the member to keep her head up around the organization that she chooses to lead. I hope that does not happen to her; it was an injustice and a chance for redemption, I think, perhaps, in some respects as well.

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

Ms. Lamoureux: Thank you for your kind words.

Back in the '90s, the minister of Health, James McCrae, wanted to close the emergency services at the Seven Oaks Hospital. The announcement had been made and it had become official. But then, our former premier, Gary Filmon, ultimately decided to reverse the Health minister's decision and keep the emergency services open.

So my question is to the Premier: Does he believe that the former premier, Gary Filmon, was wrong in this decision?

Mr. Pallister: No, Madam Speaker, but I do believe that the Liberal Party, provincially, in the 1990s was wrong to change the rules at the last minute and cause a leadership candidate who deserved to win the race and who had worked hard to win the race—they took that opportunity away from him.

The opportunity we want to give the people of Manitoba with our health-care reform is to have better health care and sooner. They deserve that. The people of Manitoba want that and they are going to get that.

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

Health-Care Services Federal Funding Agreement

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows): I appreciate the Premier defending my father, but, relevance?

It has taken this government six months to get to the table to even begin to negotiate a health-care deal with Ottawa. Our province has lost money because of the lack of effort put into it from the provincial government.

When will the Health Minister get off his hands and negotiate an agreement so that Manitobans can get the health-care dollars that they are depending on?

Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier): I had hoped that the member would reflect on the weekend on her triumvirate's stated position as Ottawa-west here in this Chamber and try to assume the responsibilities for which the three members were elected from that caucus, which was to stand up for Manitoba. That is exactly what this Health Minister is doing and what this government is doing.

And so I would encourage the member to realize, even in pursuit of the leadership of her party,

that the party she is seeking to lead is the Liberal Party of Manitoba, not of Ottawa.

* (14:30)

Municipal Relations New Funding Agreement

Mr. Shannon Martin (Morris): Madam Speaker, our government campaigned on a commitment to give municipalities a fair say on how their provincial funding is invested. That means, unlike the previous NDP government, our government listened to the needs of municipalities and gave them a stronger voice and more flexibility when it came to funding decisions.

Can the Minister of Indigenous and Municipal Relations please update this House on how we are providing municipalities with a fair say when it comes to provincial funding?

Hon. Eileen Clarke (Minister of Indigenous and Municipal Relations): And I want to thank the member for that really important question.

Municipalities are actually very excited about our budget plan because we built it with their input. I was honoured to be at the municipal administrators convention this morning in Brandon, and the AMM president endorsed the new opportunities in partnership with our government and openly expressed their support for our 2017 budget that will not only fix the finances in this province but rebuild the economy.

Last year we held the most robust municipal funding consultation in decades, and now we're moving forward with the new basket funding model that they've been asking for. Instead of navigating through a web of red tape, municipalities have more flexibility and autonomy than ever before to choose how they allocate their funding.

Madam Speaker, under this government municipalities will—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Community Organizations Status of Funding Agreements

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): The uncertainty of the Neighbourhoods Alive! grant and funding cuts have meant community organizations like the Daniel McIntyre-St. Matthews Community Association had to cut jobs and stop providing services.

Instead of admitting that the nearly year-long freeze has left organizations barely making ends meet, the minister blamed them for the layoffs. Her office has provided no insight as to whether or not funding would continue past the first quarter of this year.

Will the minister admit that the core funding of her government that—is providing does not give organizations the ability to keep staff and deliver programs?

Hon. Eileen Clarke (Minister of Indigenous and Municipal Relations): And I thank the member opposite for the question. Unfortunately, the information that they bring forward into this House isn't always totally accurate, and we're very pleased that organizations will receive their core funding, and the grants approved prior to the pause have been continued.

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

Ms. Fontaine: This government has left the future of community organizations and the staff who work in them unsure of their future. Community organizations—community associations have multi-year funding agreements which allows them to hire and keep staff and deliver long-term services. These agreements have been up in the air for nearly a year, but the minister of municipal affairs says she has been very clear with the organizations.

Will the minister clearly tell those organizations now if she is planning to honour these funding arrangements?

Ms. Clarke: We make no apologies for the pause that's been, since last August, in these programs. It became very clear, as we were going through them, that they have not been revised, looked at or any input from these organizations themselves for many years, and, consequently, they're outdated and they need to be reviewed. The input from these very people now indicate they want to be a part of this review.

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

Ms. Fontaine: It's actually a shame that the minister doesn't apologize that people have actually lost their jobs, and communities don't have the services that they need while this pause is going on.

Last week the minister insisted that she's been clear with communities about her plans, but many of

them spoke out and said that they haven't heard a single word from her office.

These staff want to do their job, and the minister is making it difficult to know if these jobs will exist for much longer. The Dufferin Residents Association has lost only—all of its staff members who say the government's approach is wearing thin on them.

Will the minister admit that she has not properly communicated with organizations about the status of their funding agreements and leaving community services in the lurch?

Ms. Clarke: And, again, I urge the member opposite to maybe recheck with these groups. They have all been contacted, every single one of them, and the interesting part of that is 98 per cent of them have offered their input to—going forward and look for enhanced services with streamlined processes, and we will certainly accept that.

Building Manitoba Fund Funding in Budget 2017

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): I have a question to the Premier (Mr. Pallister).

The budget cancels the Building Manitoba Fund. The fund ensured that our communities share in the growth of the province. It makes investments that build and repair roads and bridges in our communities. There's been a \$50-million reduction in supports to communities through the Department of Indigenous and Municipal Relations.

Like to get the Premier today to explain how he intends to address an infrastructure deficit with less funding.

Hon. Eileen Clarke (Minister of Indigenous and Municipal Relations): Again, I'd suggest the members opposite get their information correct; Building Manitoba Fund has not been cancelled.

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

Mr. Maloway: The Premier promised last year to maintain or he was going to increase funding for municipalities, yet the budget does exactly the opposite: \$50-million reduction through indigenous and municipal affairs.

I ask again: Why won't the Premier keep his word to increase the funding that improves our communities in Manitoba?

Ms. Clarke: If the member opposite checks, they will find that the funding to our municipalities is exactly the same it was in 2016, and it's interesting that the municipalities are very pleased with this level of funding. They're very pleased with the new process that we have in place, single-window application, basket funding. They asked for a fair say; they're getting a fair say.

Why won't the members opposite accept what the municipalities are saying? *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

The honourable member for Elmwood, on a final supplementary.

Mr. Maloway: Well, Madam Speaker, to the Premier: it's the law in Manitoba that communities share in the growth of the province to help build our communities. The Premier promised that the municipalities would continue to share in that growth, but now there's been a \$50-million reduction in the budget. It's pretty clear, there's no commitment to municipalities to continue to share in the growth of the province.

Why has this Premier broken his word to our communities?

Ms. Clarke: It's very clear that this government has a good working relationship with our municipalities. They've always had a focus on building their municipalities. We all understand that there's an infrastructure deficit and we are all working together to ensure that the dollars from this government are well spent, that there's actually a responsibility on the municipalities for value for money. They agree that this is the way we should be moving forward and we look forward to a working partnership with them. *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Security at the Legislature Increased Safety Measures

Ms. Janice Morley-Lecomte (Seine River): Madam Speaker, I love coming to our Legislature every day and seeing so many different people. There are people working or taking tours of the building on a daily basis. With so many people using the building on any given day, we need to make sure that everyone is safe.

Can the Minister of Justice tell us some of the ways The Legislative Security Act will make the building and its grounds safer?

* (14:40)

Hon. Heather Stefanson (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I want to thank the member for that excellent question.

Of course, we as a government are always looking at ways to enhance the safety and security of all Manitobans. And, in fact, The Legislative Security Act will empower the protective services officers to better protect those who are not only working within the building, but all those Manitobans who love to come and visit our building, and so this will give those police officers the peace officer status they need to ensure the protection of all Manitobans in the building.

We know of the horrific acts of violence that have taken place in Ottawa and in London and elsewhere around the world and believe it is necessary to take action to better protect those who visit our Legislative Precinct.

So I hope that all members of this House will do the right thing and support this bill to help better protect all those who work in the Manitoba Legislature and all those children and families who visit—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Air Services Contracts Tendering Practices

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Speaker, the Premier has spoken out strongly to argue against the government practice of sole-sourcing contracts to friends.

There are concerns that the Air Services contracts might be coming up.

Will the Premier tell the Legislature today that any Air Services health contracts which are done will be fairly tendered and not sole-sourced?

Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier): Madam Speaker, I thank the member for raising the issue of smarter shopping. We are doing the Manitoba thing as a new government and making sure that in every respect we are finding better ways to get value with the taxpayers' dollars that we expend on procurement, on contracting services and goods from suppliers, whether in Manitoba or elsewhere.

We've also taken very positive steps to reduce the barriers to interprovincial trade so that we can make our country's economy work better in partnership with other provinces. We are, of course,

one of the leading trading provinces in the country, and so we are advocating for fairer trade within our confederation to advance that cause.

And I would also encourage the member, as we have already and will continue to do, to have the federal Liberal government change some of the archaic practices that they have in terms of protectionism around procuring goods and services, as this simply does continue the sad legacy of parochial thinking, short-term thinking, at the expense of better value for money.

Madam Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

PETITIONS

Neighbourhoods Alive! Funding

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) Since 2001, Neighbourhoods Alive! program has supported stronger neighbourhoods and communities in Manitoba.

(2) Neighbourhoods Alive! uses a community-led development model that partners with neighbourhood renewal corporations on projects that aim to revitalize communities.

(3) Neighbourhoods Alive! and the neighbourhood renewal corporations it supports have played a vital and important role in revitalizing many neighbourhoods in Manitoba through community-driven solutions, including: employment and training, education and recreation, safety and crime prevention, and housing and physical improvements.

(4) Neighbourhoods Alive! now serves 13 neighbourhood renewal corporations across Manitoba which have developed expertise in engaging with their local residents and determining the priorities of their communities.

(5) The provincial government's previous investments into Neighbourhoods Alive! have been bolstered by community and corporate donations as well as essential support from community volunteers, small businesses and local agencies.

(6) Late in 2016, the minister responsible for the Neighbourhoods Alive! program said new funding for initiatives was paused and that the future of Neighbourhoods Alive! program was being

reviewed, bringing hundreds of community projects to a standstill.

(7) Neighbourhood renewal corporations and their communities are concerned this funding freeze is the first step to a slow phase-out of the Neighbourhoods Alive! grant program, which would have severe negative impacts on families and communities.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

That the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba be urged to support the Neighbourhoods Alive! program and communities served by neighbourhood renewal corporations by continuing to provide consistent core funding for existing neighbourhood renewal corporations and enhancing the public funding available for specific initiatives.

And this petition is signed by many Manitobans.

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

Taxi Industry Regulation

Ms. Amanda Lathlin (The Pas): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

(1) The taxi industry in Winnipeg provides an important service to all Manitobans.

(2) The taxi industry is regulated to ensure there are both the provision of taxi service and a fair and affordable fare structure.

(3) Regulations have been put in place that has made Winnipeg a leader in protecting the safety of taxi drivers through the installation of shields and cameras.

(4) The regulated taxi system also has significant measures in place to protect passengers, including a stringent complaint system.

(5) The provincial government has moved to bring in legislation through Bill 30 that will transfer jurisdiction to the City of Winnipeg in order to bring in so-called ride-sharing services like Uber.

(6) There were no consultations with the taxi industry prior to the introduction of this bill.

(7) The introduction of this bill jeopardizes safety, taxi service and also puts consumers at risk, as well as the livelihood of hundreds of Manitobans,

many of whom have invested their life savings into the industry.

(8) The proposed legislation also puts the regulated framework at risk and could lead to issues such as what has been seen in other jurisdictions, including differential pricing, not providing service to some areas of the city and significant risks in terms of taxi driver and passenger safety.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the Manitoba government to withdraw its plans to deregulate the taxi industry, including withdrawing Bill 30.

This petition has been signed by many, many Manitobans. Thank you.

TO THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA:

The background to this petition is as follows:

- 1. The taxi industry in Winnipeg provides an important service to all Manitobans.*
- 2. The taxi industry is regulated to ensure there are both the provision of taxi service and a fair and affordable fare structure.*
- 3. Regulations have been put in place that has made Winnipeg a leader in protecting the safety of taxi drivers through the installation of shields and cameras.*
- 4. The regulated taxi system also has significant measures in place to protect passengers, including a stringent complaint system.*
- 5. The Provincial Government has moved to bring in legislation through Bill 30 that will transfer jurisdiction to the city of Winnipeg in order to bring in so-called ride sharing services like Uber.*
- 6. There were no consultations with the taxi industry prior to the introduction of this bill.*
- 7. The introduction of this bill jeopardizes safety, taxi service and also puts consumers at risk as well as the livelihood of hundreds of Manitobans, many of whom have invested their life savings into the industry.*
- 8. The proposed legislation also puts the regulated framework at risk and could lead to issues such as what has been seen in other jurisdictions including: differential pricing; not providing service to some*

areas of the city and; significant risks in terms of taxi driver and passenger safety.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the Provincial Government to withdraw its plans to deregulate the taxi industry including withdrawing Bill 30.

Mr. Greg Selinger (St. Boniface): The background to this petition as follows:

The taxi industry in Winnipeg provides an important service to all Manitobans.

The taxi industry is regulated to ensure there are both the provision of taxi service and a fair and affordable fare structure.

Regulations have been put in place that has made Winnipeg a leader in protecting the safety of taxi drivers through the installation of shields and cameras.

The regulated taxi system also has significant measures in place to protect passengers, including a stringent complaint system.

The provincial government has moved to bring in legislation through Bill 30 that will transfer jurisdiction to the City of Winnipeg in order to bring in so-called ride-sharing services like Uber.

There was no consultations with the taxi industry prior to the introduction of this bill.

The introduction of this bill jeopardizes safety, taxi service and also puts consumers at risk, as well as the livelihood of hundreds of Manitobans, many of whom have invested their life savings into the industry.

The proposed legislation also puts the regulated framework at risk and could lead to such issues as what has been seen in other jurisdictions, including differential pricing, not providing service to some areas of the city and significant risks in terms of taxi driver and passenger safety.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to withdraw its plans to deregulate the taxi industry, including withdrawing Bill 30.

Signed by many, many Manitobans, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Concordia Hospital Emergency Room

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

And the reason for this—sorry—the background to this petition is as follows:

Provincial government has announced the closures of three emergency rooms and an urgent-care centre in the city of Winnipeg, including closing down the emergency room at Concordia Hospital.

(2) The closures come on the heels of closing of a—nearby QuickCare clinics as well as cancelled plans for ACCESS centres and personal-care homes, such as Park Manor, that would've provided important services for families and seniors in the area.

(3) The closures have left families and seniors in northeast Winnipeg without any point of contact with front-line health-care services and result in them having to travel 20 minutes or more to St. Boniface's emergency room for emergency care.

* (14:50)

(4) These cuts will place a heavy burden on the many seniors who live in northeast Winnipeg and visit the emergency room frequently, especially for those who are unable to drive or are low income.

(5) The provincial government failed to consult with families and seniors in northeast Winnipeg regarding the closure of their emergency room or to consult with health officials and health-care workers at Concordia to dismiss—sorry—to discuss how this closure would impact patient care in advance of the announcement.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to reverse the decision to close Concordia Hospital's emergency room so that families and seniors in northeast Winnipeg and the surrounding areas have timely access to quality care services.

And this petition is signed by many Manitobans.

Madam Speaker: Prior to proceeding, I would just like to add some clarity to the petition that was read by the member for The Pas (Ms. Lathlin). And I would indicate that the words that she read weren't exactly the same as in the petition, and I would ask, is there leave to have the petition read as printed? *[Agreed]*

Taxi Industry Regulation

Mr. Ted Marcelino (Tyndall Park): Madam Speaker, I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

And the background to this petition is as follows:

(1) The taxi industry in Winnipeg provides an important service to all Manitobans.

(2) The taxi industry is regulated to ensure there are both the provision of taxi service and a fair and affordable fare structure.

(3) Regulations have been put in place that has made Winnipeg a leader in protecting the safety of taxi drivers through the installation of shields and cameras.

(4) The regulated taxi system also has significant measures in place to protect passengers, including a stringent complaint system.

(5) The provincial government has moved to bring in legislation through Bill 30 that will transfer jurisdiction to the City of Winnipeg in order to bring in so-called ride-sharing services like Uber.

(6) There were no consultations with the taxi industry prior to the introduction of this bill.

(7) The introduction of this bill jeopardizes safety, taxi service and also puts consumers at risk, as well as the livelihood of hundreds of Manitobans, many of whom have invested their life savings into the industry.

(8) The proposed legislation also puts the regulated framework at risk and could lead to issues such as what has been seen in other jurisdictions, including differential pricing, not providing service to some areas of the city and significant risks in terms of taxi driver and passenger safety.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to withdraw its plans to deregulate the taxi industry, including withdrawing Bill 30.

Thank you.

Mr. Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background for this petition is as follows:

The taxi industry in Winnipeg provides an important service to all Manitobans.

The taxi industry is regulated to ensure that there are both the provision of taxi service and a fair and affordable fare structure.

Regulations have been put in place that has made Winnipeg a leader in protecting the safety of taxi drivers through the installation of shields and cameras.

The regulated taxi industry system also has significant measures in place to protect passengers, including a stringent complaint system.

The provincial government has moved to bring in legislation through Bill 30 that will transfer jurisdiction to the City of Winnipeg in order to bring in so-called ride-sharing services like Uber.

There were no consultations with the taxi industry prior to the introduction of this bill.

The introduction of this bill jeopardizes safety, taxi service and also puts consumers at risk, as well as the livelihood of hundreds of Manitobans, many of whom have invested their life savings into the industry.

The proposed legislation also puts the regulated framework at risk and could lead to issues such as what have been seen in other jurisdictions, including differential pricing, not providing service to some areas of the city and significant risks in terms of taxi driver and passenger safety.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to withdraw its plans to deregulate the taxi industry, including withdrawing Bill 30.

And this petition has been signed by so many Manitobans.

Dakota Collegiate Sports Complex

Mr. Wab Kinew (Fort Rouge): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) Manitobans recognize how important it is to provide young people with quality learning spaces to succeed in school.

(2) Sport recreation and the spaces to engage in them are critical to the physical, mental and social welfare of students.

(3) All forms of educational infrastructure, including gymnasiums and recreation centres in general, represent an incredible value-for-money investment, whereby the return is the improved physical and psychological health and well-being of students.

(4) Dakota Collegiate spent several years raising money towards the construction of the Louis Riel School Division sports complex to replace the poor condition of its playing field.

(5) Dakota's varsity teams have been forced to play elsewhere because of the poor condition of its playing field.

(6) Dakota Collegiate must put the project out to tender and break ground in a matter of months for the field to be completed in time for this coming school year.

(7) The provincial government, in a regressive and short-sighted move, cancelled funding for this project for political reasons despite the extensive community support, fundraising and engagement.

(8) It is a short-sighted move on the part of the provincial government to undercut the dedicated efforts of students, staff and the community in general.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to recognize the tireless efforts of Dakota Collegiate, its students, parents, staff and the surrounding community; to recognize the need for excellent recreation facilities in all Manitoba schools; to reverse this regressive cut and to provide the funding necessary to complete the Louis Riel School Division sports complex.

And this petition was signed by many Manitobans.

Taxi Industry Regulation

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): Madam Speaker, I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) The taxi industry in Winnipeg provides an important service to all Manitobans.

(2) The taxi industry is regulated to ensure there are both the provision of taxi service and a fair and affordable rate structure.

(3) Regulations have been put in place that has made Winnipeg a leader in protecting the safety of taxi drivers through the installation of shields and cameras.

(4) The regulated taxi system also has significant measures in place to protect passengers, including a stringent complaint system.

(5) The provincial government has moved to bring in legislation through Bill 30 that will transfer jurisdiction to the City of Winnipeg in order to bring in so-called ride-sharing services like Uber.

(6) There were no consultations with the taxi industry prior to the introduction of this bill.

(7) The introduction of this bill jeopardizes safety, taxi service and also puts consumers at risk, as well as the livelihood of hundreds of Manitobans, many of whom have invested their life savings into the industry.

(8) The proposed legislation also puts the regulated framework at risk and could lead to issues such as what has been seen in other jurisdictions, including differential pricing, not providing service to some areas of the city and significant risks in terms of taxi driver and passenger safety.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to withdraw its plans to deregulate the taxi industry, including withdrawing Bill 30.

This petition is signed by many Manitobans, Madam Speaker.

Provincial Nominee Program

Ms. Flor Marcelino (Leader of the Official Opposition): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

The background to this petition is as follows.

(1) The provincial government has proposed regressive changes to the Provincial Nominee Program that create financial and social barriers for newcomers.

Starting this year, successful provincial nominees must pay a \$500 fee as part of their application, adding to the financial burden of applicants.

(3) While the provincial government's stated justification for the fee is that it will be reinvested

into language-support programs, the PNP already requires nominees to have proven English- or French-language skills.

* (15:00)

(4) The provincial government is also changing its criteria from selecting nominees with family and community connections in Manitoba to an employer-driven focus that will only select nominees with approved job offers from established employers.

(5) The shift in focus jeopardizes the PNP's successful 86 per cent retention rate as, without family or community ties, nominees will move to other provinces with larger job markets.

(6) The change provides employers with an incentive to select newcomers based on reduced cost, leaving nominees vulnerable to exploitation.

(7) The business community and the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce have made it clear that the PNP is a successful program, driving the economy with skilled workers.

(8) According to a report in 2014, 94 to 98 per cent of nominees reported employment earnings within their first year of arriving in Manitoba and had the second lowest unemployment rate among immigrants in Canada.

(9) Despite the wealth of economic and social benefits that newcomers bring to the province, the Premier cruelly portrayed them as a burden to society by inaccurately linking provincial nominees to high unemployment rates and social assistance.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to maintain the PNP's nomination criteria, to remove the \$500 fee and to continue to invest in newcomers who build the province, drive the economy and promote diversity and inclusion in Manitoba.

Signed by many, many Manitobans.

Thank you.

Taxi Industry Regulation

Mr. Mohinder Saran (The Maples): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) The taxi industry in Winnipeg provides an important service to all Manitobans.

(2) The taxi industry is regulated to ensure there are both the provision of taxi service and a fair and affordable fare structure.

(3) Regulations have been put in place that has made Winnipeg a leader in protecting the safety of taxi drivers through the installation of shields and cameras.

(4) The regulated taxi system also has significant measures in place to protect passengers, including a stringent complaint system.

(5) The provincial government has moved to bring in legislation through Bill 30 that will transfer jurisdiction to the City of Winnipeg in order to bring in so-called ride-sharing services like Uber.

(6) There were no consultations with the taxi industry prior to the introduction of this bill.

(7) The introduction of this bill jeopardizes safety, taxi service, and also puts consumers at risk, as well as the livelihood of hundreds of Manitobans, many of whom have invested their life savings into the industry.

(8) The proposed legislation also puts the regulated framework at risk and could lead to issues such as what has been seen in other jurisdictions, including differential pricing, not providing service to some areas of the city and significant risks in terms of taxi driver and passenger safety.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to withdraw its plans to deregulate the taxi industry, including withdrawing Bill 30.

Signed by many Manitobans.

Madam Speaker: Grievances.

Oh, sorry. Further petitions.

Neighbourhoods Alive! Funding

Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to this petition is as follows:

Since 2001, the Neighbourhoods Alive! program has supported stronger neighbourhoods and communities in Manitoba.

(2) Neighbourhoods Alive! uses a community-led development model that partners with neighbourhood renewal corporations on projects that aim to revitalize communities.

(3) Neighbourhoods Alive! and the neighbourhood renewal corporations it supports have played a vital and important role in revitalizing many neighbourhoods in Manitoba through community-driven solutions, including: employment and training, education and recreation, safety and crime prevention, and housing and physical improvements.

(4) Neighbourhoods Alive! now serves 13 neighbourhood renewal corporations across Manitoba which have developed expertise in engaging with their local residents and determining the priorities of their communities.

(5) The provincial government's previous investments into Neighbourhoods Alive! have been bolstered by community and corporate donations as well as essential support from community volunteers, small businesses and local agencies.

(6) Late in 2016, the minister responsible for the Neighbourhoods Alive! program said new funding for initiatives was quote, paused, end quote, and that the future of the Neighbourhoods Alive! program was being, quote, reviewed, end quote, bringing hundreds of community projects to a standstill.

(7) Neighbourhood renewal corporations and their communities are concerned this funding freeze is the first step in a slow phase-out of the Neighbourhoods Alive! grant program, which would have severe negative impacts on families and communities.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

That the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba be urged to support the Neighbourhoods Alive! program and the communities served by neighbourhood renewal corporations by continuing to provide consistent core funding for existing neighbourhood renewal corporations and enhancing the public funding available for specific initiatives.

And this was signed by Bea Bruske, Kim Ferris, Sharon Grehan and many, many more Manitobans.

Madam Speaker: Grievances?

**ORDERS OF THE DAY
GOVERNMENT BUSINESS**

House Business

Hon. Andrew Micklefield (Government House Leader): Madam Speaker, in accordance with rule 77(8), I would like to table the sequence for the consideration of departmental Estimates.

Madam Speaker, I'm informed that further consultation may be required. I'll be tabling these later.

* * *

Mr. Micklefield: Also, Madam Speaker, as per subrules 2(11) and 2(15), later today, without seeing the clock, the questions will be put on the second reading motions for the remaining specified bills on the Order Paper.

I would like to seek the unanimous consent of the House to not see the clock following the last question today to allow me to make committee announcements.

Madam Speaker: Is there leave of the House to not see the clock, following the question on the last second-reading motion today, to allow the Government House Leader to make committee announcements? Is that agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Madam Speaker: No. Leave has been denied.

Mr. Micklefield: Finally, Madam Speaker, I would like to call for resumed debate on second reading of Bill 28.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

Bill 28—The Public Services Sustainability Act

Madam Speaker: It has been announced that the House will now resume second reading of Bill 28, The Public Services Sustainability Act.

There are two minutes left in this question period. Are there any questions? Seeing no questions, debate is open.

Mr. James Allum (Fort Garry-Riverview): I haven't had a chance to speak in the House in a while, so it's fun to get up—back up and put a few words on the record.

I'm well aware that we don't get paid by the word here, Madam Speaker, so I'll try to keep my comments to a minimum today and try to articulate, I

think—along with others who might want to debate this particular bill—try to articulate why we not only don't support this bill, but we are strongly, strongly opposed to it.

It has been one of the constant themes of this government to wage war—political warfare on labour, on unions and most importantly on working men and women and their families in this province.

* (15:10)

And it is hard for us—a party deeply grounded in a partnership with the labour movement—it's difficult for us to be able to find any reason, any rationality, any indication why the government continues down this anti-union, anti-worker path. It—the bill, as you know, establishes this thing called a four-year sustainability period, and I want to say at the outset, the government's use of the term sustainability has been nothing short of outrageous since we got back into the House. My friend from Wolseley says it's actually an Orwellian utilization of the word, and that's absolutely right, though I worry that they might take that seriously and continue to spin Orwell for another three years. So I don't want to give them any reason to continue down this path.

But they call for a four-year sustainability period, and that's fair in the sense that it's the government's prerogative to kind of set the rules of engagement. We concede that they were elected a year ago. That was the democratic will of the people of Manitoba, and we certainly accept that. What isn't right—in fact, what's categorically wrong—is to introduce legislation on this particular subject matter when, in fact, this is something—let's be honest what it is here: a wage freeze. This is something that needs to be done at the bargaining table, over the bargaining table, in discussion at the bargaining table. And it's absolutely wrong that it should be introduced as legislation in this House.

We know for sure that legislation just like this has been introduced in other jurisdictions in Canada, and those pieces of legislation have made their way through the judicial system right up to the Supreme Court. And the Supreme Court has ruled categorically that legislation of this kind is, quite simply, unconstitutional.

But I want to 'plake' a—put a finer point on that. It's, in fact, an illegal law. And so that we're even up debating it is not right. But that it should be introduced into this House in the first place is a grave, grave miscarriage of justice that won't survive—I'm quite confident—a legal test. But more

importantly, Madam Speaker, it's not going to survive a political test.

No Manitoban in any part of this province will accept this kind of dictatorial positioning, this kind of dictatorial legislation when they know for sure that the Constitution—Canadian—Constitution of Canada guarantees the right to collective bargaining. And this is what needs to happen: If the government has a position around a wage freeze, if they really want to punish public servants in this regard, then they're going to have to take that message to the negotiation table and let it be worked out in collective bargaining and not simply try to impose their will on working men and women in this province.

You know, the great irony of all this, of course, is that this is a subject matter of which there was no mention during the—last year's election campaign. Never heard of it. It wasn't mentioned. And, if it had been mentioned, it would have been categorically rejected by the people of Manitoba at that point.

What the government did say, although we were skeptical and suspicious about this particular commitment, was that the government was somehow going to repair the deficit, on the one hand, yet protect front-line services and front-line workers, no matter what.

So this is an abandonment. This piece of legislation, Bill 28, that we're talking about today, the so-called The Public Services Sustainability Act, is, in fact, an abandonment and an abdication of the very commitments made by the government during the election campaign. That's not what Manitobans expected when they elected this particular government. But they're starting to get a sense of actually what they voted for and what they're getting are two diametrically different things; they are utter opposites. And, sooner or later, these kinds of things, these kind of failure to communicate their commitments properly, openly and transparently is going to come back to haunt this Premier (Mr. Pallister) and this Finance Minister and all members of this government. And we would urge them that instead of proceeding down this path, the right thing to do in this particular context is to withdraw this unconstitutional, illegal piece of legislation and get back to the negotiating table, get back to talking with the labour movement and have the very kind of negotiation and discussion that may well resolve issues that ought not to be imposed by government fiat.

Now, I have to tell you, Madam Speaker, that there are any number of pieces of legislation that we have 'flound'—found to be quite egregious in a very short period of time, and we have separated five of those out to be held over for further debate and discussion. They—we need to slow down on those pieces in particular, but there's any number of other pieces of legislation that also need to be slowed down if not withdrawn altogether. *[interjection]*

And my friend from 'Fin Lon'—Flin Flon suggests—and I quite agree with him—that really, in fact, if we'd had the ability to hold them all over, we almost certainly would have done that because none of them—none of them improves the condition for working women and men in Manitoba or their families. In fact, all of them are in some manner a direct attack on those men and women and their families. And it was something that wasn't campaigned on during the election, not something that was put form in a platform, not something that was conveyed to the people of Manitoba, but, in fact, something that now—happening through the legislative back door that should never have happened.

Now, we didn't hold this particular bill up because we think that other things are in store for it going forward. We certainly want to get it to committee sooner rather than later because what we know for sure is that women and men in the labour movement are going to be showing up and talking about this particular piece of legislation, and I have a feeling that they're not going to be all that happy about it when they arrive.

And so, if you're the minister of Labour, you can anticipate—and I'm not sure which of the ministers is the minister of Labour—the—there is on my—*[interjection]*—oh, thank you, I appreciate that. My friend from the government side says there is no minister of labour because—that's because this government wiped out the department of Labour for the first time ever in the history of this province. So I think you want to be careful about outing the fact that the government eliminated the department of Labour, a historical first that makes no sense.

But then their first act in government after that was to put forward Bill 7 which was an attack on the democratic rights of workers which—as offensive and—a bill as there ever was—wasn't talked about during the campaign. Again, it wasn't on any platform that was put forward to the people of Manitoba. It was simply brought in through the

legislative back door in order to—for some reason which is inexplicable to us on this side of the House—somehow make the labour movement pay for 17 years through four elections a progressive government that put their needs and interests forward every single time. And, within a year, that cause has been set back by the new government that continues—continues—to wage political warfare on the labour movement and on working men and women and, yet, for no inexplicable reason except to say that maybe at their core—and it seems just a shot in the dark, but maybe it's just that the government's anti-labour. Maybe it's just opposed to working men and women. Maybe it's just opposed to collective bargaining. Maybe it's just opposed to ensuring that working men and women have fair wages, good benefits and job security. That's what we stood for on this side of the House.

*(15:20)

It begins to become apparent to us, as we think about the government's legislative agenda, that they don't care for any of those things. And the truth is that they're going to leave working men and women and their families out in the cold, hung out to dry and forced to take their battle right into the courtrooms of this country and this province because the government has decided to use a legislative hammer when in fact there was another more collegial, more collaborative, more honourable way to do it, and that's to take it to the negotiating table and work it out with workers right there.

And, instead, the government choose the hammer approach, and that never does anyone any good. It doesn't help anyone. In fact, it creates divisions among people in Manitoba, and for what? To what end? If the government believes that there's some political advantage to doing it this way, they ought to articulate it because it defies explanation. We can't put our heads around it, on this side of the House, why they would take this approach and take this position, except to say that they're anti-labour, anti-worker, and they don't care for the people of Manitoba who not only deserve good wages, good benefits and job security, but also the programs and services that they rely—that they provide to us each and every day.

The truth of the matter is, Madam Speaker, that we care about public services and we care just as much about public servants. I was a public servant. Before I came—was privileged and lucky enough to be elected in 2011, I had a 15-year career with the

City of Winnipeg. I know how valuable those public services are to the—certainly, to the City of Winnipeg, where I worked, but all across Manitoba, in every town, every village, every city, everywhere across the province, south, west, east and, important—more important—most importantly, perhaps, in the North.

These public services are essential to a good, solid, sustainable way of life for Manitobans, and the government has put everyone on notice that those public services and the jobs for public servants are on the chopping block, and that's not how you're going to make Manitoba the so-called most improved province. In fact, it's going to make Manitoba demonstrably, categorically, one of the worst provinces in Canada, and we certainly have no intention of letting that happen.

And when you—and if you think that I'm—I don't have it quite right, if it's not—if it doesn't seem that, somehow, we're speaking correctly or accurately about this, then we only have to look at what kind of cuts have already happened in the very short period of time that this government's been in power.

And this is no particular order and just some and certainly not all: small-class-size initiative kept one-on-one time with parent and student. What happened to hip—it? Gone, cut. Kelvin High School Active Living Centre, what happened there? Cut. The new Brandon school, what happened there? Cut. What—the new school in north Winnipeg, what happened there? The Dakota Collegiate Field of Dreams, what happened there? Clinics in Thompson and The Pas, what happened there? How about the St. Boniface QuickCare clinic, what happened there? A community clinic for St. Vital, what happened there? A wellness centre in Concordia for seniors and families, what happened there? An international 'cenity'—centre for dignity and palliative care at the U of M, what happened there? A new facility for the Pan Am Clinic in Winnipeg, what happened there? Personal-care homes across the province, including two in Winnipeg and one in Lac du Bonnet, what happened to them? A new CancerCare facility—a 21st-century, state-of-the-art CancerCare facility to serve all of Manitobans, what happened there?

Madam Speaker, the list goes on and on of a government dedicated and devoted to austerity agenda that will not make Manitoba the most improved province but will, in fact, take us back to the no-growth '90s that we've simply—just recently

crawled out of, and already they're dragging us back there.

All of the projects that I just referred to not only provided essential services to Manitobans but, at the same time, they created jobs in their construction—and good jobs—good-paying jobs with good benefits. And then those workers take those good jobs and benefits back home so they can put bread on their table for their families, so that they can pay their mortgage, so that they can send their kids to good post-secondary institutions, but, oh my, what happened there?

An Honourable Member: Bait and switch.

Mr. Allum: Yes. Bait and switch. Suddenly tuition's going up through the roof. Tuition rebate program—what happened there?

An Honourable Member: Gone.

Mr. Allum: Gone. So, suddenly, not only are those good jobs—are those important institutions going to be missing—and we're going to see it in the near future—not only were those good jobs gone missing, not only are the salaries and benefits of those good jobs, which were going to support our communities and our families, gone missing, but on top of all of that, it results in taking Manitoba backward into the 21st century at the very time we need to be going forward and investing for the future of our young people, for people who are just entering the primes of their lives and giving them, affording them the same opportunity that we had as we became—as we started to raise our families.

So, Madam Speaker, I'll wind up my comments there for today. I appreciate that our House minister—or our House leader—

An Honourable Member: House minister?

Mr. Allum: We should create that job. If it doesn't exist already—oh, it is—sorry; it is a job—it's half a job, anyways, as far as we know.

But I am going to wind down my comments because the fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, is we not only oppose this bill, we find it an insult to the people of Manitoba. We would encourage the government, and I ask him, looking at the House leader now as best and my most friendly face I can, to say to him quite forthrightly, you have the opportunity, my friend, to withdraw this bill today. Why don't you do the right thing on behalf of working men and women in this province? Withdraw

this bill and get back to the negotiating table right now.

Mr. Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon): It's not really my honour to stand up and speak; it's my duty to stand up and speak against this bill. It is my honour to stand in support of working people in this province which, unfortunately, this government does not support working people.

They started off, when they first came into power, well, let's not increase minimum wage; let's kick those workers while they're down.

Then they said, you know what? We're going to make it harder for workers to join a union. They introduced their Bill 7. Away they went with their ideological attack on working people in this province, Madam Speaker, and here we come with Bill 28—here we come. Now they're going to continue to attack working people.

This Premier (Mr. Pallister) stands up and says he's an old union guy. I'd be hard pressed to find any old union guys that would admit that he was one of their brothers because, Madam Speaker, I know I was and am an old union guy, and I know that as an old union guy, there is not one true union person that believes that dictating instead of negotiating is the correct way to conduct business in this province.

* (15:30)

Madam Speaker, this bill is so egregious on so many levels. You know, it kicks in retroactively so that workers don't know the answer yet. But, when they come to negotiate sometime later this year, well, negotiation would be fruitless and meaningless, because this bill says it kicks back to April 1st. So not only has this government made a mockery of negotiation, they stand up and say that they're all in favour of negotiation when this retroactively kills proper negotiation.

You know, they've said that for the next four years—well, actually, it's more than four years depending on when your contract expires—it could be five years, six years, maybe seven years. You know, they have no idea what the financial future is going to look like for those workers and yet they've imposed that kind of long-term freeze on their wages. They've imposed that kind of long-term inability to negotiate a fair and honest collective agreement that reflects what's happening at that particular point in time.

While they've done that, Madam Speaker, this Premier (Mr. Pallister) and his ministers gleefully accepted 20 per cent increase in their pay, made sure they locked it in. *[interjection]* Now, one of the members opposite is carrying on about that's the law we didn't have a choice—that's the law.

Well, I do believe that that is not entirely true, Madam Speaker. It may very well be the law the same as it was the same law that said that every MLA was entitled to a cost-of-living increase. But we found a way to give that back to the government.

So now will the Premier and all his ministers follow the same path to give back their raises? I don't think so, Madam Speaker. They have no intention of doing that because it's all about their sense of entitlement, that they need to make sure that they keep their well-being safe while attacking working people in this province.

You know, it—it's interesting that this government says that everybody's wages that deals with the government has to be cut. Not just unionized workers now, but they're saying doctors, other health-care professionals have to have their wages frozen as well. The only people that seem to escape the wrath of this particular government are judges. Seems odd that the people that would have the most ability to challenge the law as being unconstitutional are the ones that escape from the very law that probably is unconstitutional or maybe it's just that they hang out at the same club as the government ministers do. I don't know. It seems that this government is more interested in looking after their friends than they are in looking after Manitobans.

You know, we look at what's happening in northern Manitoba. They've mandated that the Northern Health Region has to cut \$6 million out of its budget. But even before they made that edict public, the Northern Health Region was already cutting services that people in the North depended on, making it more difficult for those workers—those northern Manitobans to get anywhere close to the same health care as what people in the south enjoy, because now they've made it financially difficult for people. Things as simple as allowing an escort to travel with somebody is apparently on the chopping block. So grandma is going to come to Winnipeg to get a hip replaced; grandpa can't come with her now. Well, unless he's a rich grandpa, because \$1,200.00 for return air flight would be prohibitive to most northern Manitobans.

This government doesn't care, because this government is the government of the wealthy.

You know, this bill is open to legal challenges because other jurisdictions have tried to implement similar-type legislation, and it's been shown to be unconstitutional.

You know, we talk about this government and the commitment they made prior to the election and afterwards to protect front-line services. This bill is a direct attack on those front-line services. In the North, for example, Madam Speaker, we already have a hard time attracting people to come and work in the health-care field, whether it's doctors, nurses, health-care aides, simply because the cost of living is that much greater in the North, the cost of travel is that much greater in the North. So I'm not sure how this Premier and his government think that freezing workers' wages will attract people to work in those jobs in the North.

Well, quite frankly, Madam Speaker, it won't. We're seeing shortages already because people can't afford those jobs in the North, and now this government has also decided, well, we'll cut out overtime so that those workers that are already overstretched because they're short-handed will now be stretched even further.

So it's a double whammy, if you will, Madam Speaker. First we freeze their wages and then we'll cut out overtime for them, which will be another direct cut in their income that they need to support their families.

I can't stress enough how much we believe this bill is wrong, how much this bill is so egregious to working people in this province. People have negotiated zero per cent increases in the past absolutely, but they've negotiated them. They've negotiated them in good faith with their employers, knowing full well that, at the end of the negotiating period, they would have the ability to negotiate another collective agreement that would recognize the economic realities at that time.

This government has decided that free, collective bargaining is not a right, even though the Supreme Court says different. This government has decided that mandating zero per cent is somehow a form of negotiation when, clearly, it is not. Clearly, it is not any form of negotiation. It is strictly dictating to working people the same as they dictated to people on minimum wage that you get zero. Your family is worth zero.

The fact that things cost so much more—let's have a look at gas prices, for example. I noticed this morning when I was coming to work, Madam Speaker, that the price of a litre of gas, while still outrageous, in Winnipeg is 98 cents a litre, and yet yesterday, when I was driving to the airport in Flin Flon, I noticed that the price of gas was \$1.08 a litre, so perhaps one of these economists—financial literacy experts can explain to hard-working northern Manitobans how they will continue to be able to afford to live when their wages will not go up the same as the cost of living will go up, and not just go up a little bit. When we look at 10 cents a litre difference in the price of gas, that's just one instant. Now, talk about somebody that works in the health-care field further north. The price of gas is \$1.80 a litre, but they get zero too.

* (15:40)

Somehow it's patently unfair that this government—and I shouldn't paint all members opposite with the same brush. That would be wrong of me. I'm sure some of them very clearly care about their constituents. But, clearly, the mandate coming from the top is not to care about those very constituents, many of whom elected not just ourselves but the members opposite as well. It is certainly my hope that in three years those electors will come to their senses and vote a different way, but so much damage can be done in the course of three years, Madam Speaker, as we have already seen in what's been mandated so far by the Premier (Mr. Pallister).

Protecting front-line services means ensuring that people that work in those jobs can afford to be in those jobs. This bill ensures the very opposite. It ensures that people will go looking for work elsewhere. And maybe that's the government's plan that hard-working, unionized people that have fought to get decent wages, to get decent benefits, will go somewhere else, and they'll be able to supplant those workers with people that are willing to settle for less, thereby ensuring that the ones at the top get more and the ones in the middle fall to the bottom, which is so wrong for this Province to think that making Manitoba the most improved province really and truly is only about making a very select few in this province the most improved while everyone else suffers with bills such as this one but also other bills that the government has introduced. You know, working people deserve so much more.

I'm very concerned, Madam Speaker, about what's next. They have got a red tape reduction bill before this House. What red tape will they cut? What red tape that protects working people will they cut? Well, we've already seen some hints of it. They've lessened some rules on rural construction so that maybe those facilities won't be as safe for people that work in those facilities. Will they now start cutting regulation that protects other workers? As we approach April 28th, the national day of mourning for workers killed and injured on the job, I'm sure that message will come from not just organized labour but from workers throughout the province that—don't cut those regulations that protect working people. But we don't know that because this government said they were going to protect front-line workers and they didn't, said they were going to protect front-line services and they didn't, so who won't get protected next is the question.

We need to make sure that people are protected, and people are starting to pay attention, Madam Speaker. There's been so many demonstrations already, and each one getting bigger than the last one. As Manitobans wake up to the fact that perhaps what they thought they'd been told during the election and subsequently isn't quite the reality that they're seeing now. You know, there were several hundred people on the steps of the Leg. here on last Friday. Before that, there was couple of hundred students. You know, the season of protest is going to get worse as this government continues to cut at working people.

It's unfortunate that continually we see this. You know, Manitoba Hydro decides that it's got to cut 900 workers. That's 900 taxpayers that are being not allowed to earn a living anymore.

An Honourable Member: Nine hundred families.

Mr. Lindsey: Nine hundred families—900 families—that wonder where the mortgage payment is coming from, 900 families that wonder where supper's going to come from. And yet, this government appears heartless to those working Manitobans, as they do to people that are subsisting on minimum wage that for the second year no increase to minimum wage. How are people to survive? Many of those people on minimum wage jobs are already working two or three jobs just to try and keep their heads above water. The last time I looked, the price of a loaf of bread wasn't being frozen. Talked about the price of gas—certainly isn't frozen, but this Premier doesn't care about those people; that's quite clear.

Even though he says he stands up and talks for all Manitobans, he clearly does not, clearly does not speak for people that are struggling to survive. He only speaks, it appears, for those at the top, while he appoints his friends to boards to make sure that they get a bigger slice of the pie. He doesn't believe in sharing that pie with those at the bottom.

You know, back in the 1990s, we saw a Conservative government that believed the way to prosperity was to cut, and cut they did: cut nurses, cut construction on hospitals and schools, cut teachers, cut, cut, cut, cut, cut. When we said during the election that that's what this PC government would be all about, they said we were fear mongering. Well, lo and behold, all our fears are starting to come true. Everything that we said during the election that they would be about cutting is starting to come true.

Mrs. Colleen Mayer, Acting Speaker, in the Chair

They're cutting infrastructure spending. They're cutting—cutting—things like the Small Class Size Initiative so that our children have better prospects for the future. You know, they've cut Kelvin High School Active Living Centre. They've cut the new Brandon school. They've cut the new school in north Winnipeg. They've cut the Dakota Collegiate field. They've cut clinics in Thompson and The Pas. They've cut the St. 'Bonifit' 'quickclare' clinic. Cut seems to be the order of the day with this government, Madam Speaker. It doesn't seem to matter which department we talk about; there's cuts, cuts coming everywhere.

An Honourable Member: Sometimes they call it snip.

Mr. Lindsey: Sometimes they call it snip, but it looks like a cut.

You know, they stand up and say that, well, they never cut all those nurses back in the 1990s, and they clearly did because I know some of those nurses that lost their jobs. So, you know, they can say it's not true, but, clearly, they cut back then, and they're following the same playbook that didn't work then; they're doing it now. It's not going to work now. You cannot cut your way to success. You cannot cut your way to an improved province, Madam Deputy Acting Speaker.

You know, this Premier (Mr. Pallister) talks about his ability to negotiate, and yet every attempt he's made to negotiate with the federal government has failed because his idea of negotiate is to bully

and dictate, and not everybody stands for bullying and dictating. You know it's really too bad that this government doesn't listen to Manitobans.

We asked some questions earlier today about why they're doing some of the things they want to do. You know, they talk about open and transparent. Well, clearly, nothing could be further from the truth. They won't tell us why they've decided to shut down Grace Lake airport. Clearly, there's more to the story, but we don't know what it is; they won't tell us. They won't tell Manitobans. They won't tell the very people that operate their successful businesses from that facility. But it's all about the cuts and all about, well, who knows what?

* (15:50)

So, as my time quickly comes to an end here, I fail to see how a public sector wage freeze is going to make this province better. It's not going to attract workers; it's not going to keep workers. It's going to do nothing to make health care better in this province when workers who are already discouraged become more discouraged, more overwhelmed, more over-worked, when there's less of them expected to do more while getting paid less. It's shameful behaviour on the part of this government. Doctors, nurses, zero; health-care aides, zero; cleaning staff at a hospital, zero.

The only people that are going to get a raise are the Premier and his Cabinet, and that's such a shame, 'suts' a—such a slap in the face to hard-working Manitobans.

So, Madam Deputy Speaker, I'll wrap up our remarks at this point and turn the floor over to one of my colleagues, I'm sure who has a few words that they would like to put on the record as well. Let me just wrap up by saying that this bill is wrong. This bill needs to be opposed, and this bill will be opposed.

Thank you.

Hon. Andrew Micklefield (Government House Leader): Madam Speaker, could you please canvass the House for leave to not see the clock following the last question today, or if it's very, very late, I guess that would be tomorrow morning, to allow me to table the Estimates sequence?

The Acting Speaker (Colleen Mayer): Is there leave to not see the clock, following the last question today, to allow the Government House Leader to

table the Estimates sequence? Is that agreed?
[Agreed]

Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley): In my ideal world, I would not be rising to speak to this legislation because this legislation would not exist. It's—it is nevertheless our duty as the opposition to call it as it is, and this is unfair legislation. There's really no reason to sugar-coat it. There's no point in sugar-coating it. This government is attacking the public sector and the valuable public services that are provided by people on the front lines, and those people are getting hammered. There's—by this government, by their legislative agenda, by their political agenda and by their budget.

And this law is now quite clearly just part of that. How on earth the government can feel that it's fair for the most vulnerable members of our society to have to withstand a second year of wage freezes at the minimum-wage level and at the same time demand that all of the public servants be subjected to this legislation that wage conditions be imposed on them through legislation rather than through the constitutionally recognized right to collective bargaining. All this is—I mean, this is legislation, never mind out of the 1950s, it's out of the 1850s.

I mean, we may as well go back to, you know, good old industrial England and the robber barons era, and, you know, that's—that is the attitude behind this, that workers are expendable and that they don't deserve the respect that our government attempted to display. They certainly do not deserve, according to this government, to see any type of wage increases, and, in fact, there are multiple examples of this government breaking its word. This is the same government whose leader, now the Premier (Mr. Pallister), time and time again went to the airwaves to say that there would be no cuts to front-line services, there would be no layoffs of front-line workers.

Madam Speaker in the Chair

And here in Wolseley, we are losing—according to this government right now anyways, we are losing the Urgent Care Centre at Misericordia. I don't know how much more front line the government thinks it can get with its cuts agenda and still look their own mirrors in the face and say, no, we're not cutting front-line services. It's just delusional to believe that getting rid of an urgent care centre in the inner city is somehow not a cut to front-line services.

So the government broke its word, and only members opposite will be able to explain or will try to explain to their constituents the questions that they're going to face. Why did they break their word? Why did they bring in this legislation? Why did they bring in such a regressive budget full of austerity measures when this is not what they campaigned on, not in the least?

And I don't know that we've seen the full political fallout from this government's decision yet. I think there's a lot of voices still yet to come down to the Legislature and let this government know directly just how dissatisfied and betrayed they feel from what is going on, and there's many different groups to choose from.

I mean anyone working, trying to save the Provincial Nominee Program, well, they had a \$500 head tax now imposed on any new members of their families coming to Manitoba. If you're a— heaven forbid, you're a post-secondary university student—any Conservative MLA with a lot of post-secondary education students in their constituency should be very nervous these days because university students are just getting clobbered by this government's budget and by their policies.

How on earth you can expect young people graduating from high school to look at a post-secondary education in the same light when the cap on tuition increases has been blown up and the tax credit that was available when a person completed their degree is no longer there. I've lost track, Madam Speaker, of the number of people who live just in my own constituency who called my office and said this is completely throwing my life out of whack. I went back to school or my partner went back to school on the assumption that we would be able to get a degree for this amount of money. It was predictable; it was public, and we would then be able to get a certain amount of the tuition that we paid back using the tax credit program. And now they might be midway through their program, through their academic program, and that trust between the citizens and this government has been broken.

Where did it say in the Conservative government platform that they were going to hack and slash the standard of living for young people in Manitoba? I don't remember reading that or hearing about that anywhere. I don't think they were upfront with Manitobans. They didn't say it at all.

This legislation that we're debating here today is just an extension of that same arrogant attitude, and

for the government to be asking every single Manitoban to have lower wages and fewer services and longer waits, all the while the top members of their government apparatus, the Premier (Mr. Pallister) and the Cabinet walk off with a 20 per cent salary increase, which they then lock in for the full four years of their time in government, that is just absolutely outrageous and speaks to a sense of self-entitlement.

I'm trying to remember who the—I believe it was a Liberal member of parliament, I'm not remembering the name at the moment, but he famously said when he was being quizzed at a committee meeting that he was entitled to his entitlements. And, you know, that could very well—if the members opposite wanted to step forward into the next election with an honest campaign slogan, I would suggest they use that one. They feel entitled to their entitlements, and they're just looking out for themselves.

The privatization agenda that they have launched is now also rearing its head—

* (16:00)

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

The time being 4 p.m., I'm now interrupting debate to put the remaining second reading questions without further debate or amendment on the following specified bills: Bill 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 28 and 29.

The House will not adjourn until all of the applicable questions have been put.

Bill 16—The Fatality Inquiries Amendment Act

Madam Speaker: I will now call the question on second reading of Bill 16, The Fatality Inquiries Amendment Act.

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

Some Honourable Members: No.

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Madam Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Jim Maloway (Official Opposition House Leader): Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

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

The question before the House is second reading of Bill 16, The Fatality Inquiries Amendment Act.

Division

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

Yeas

Bindle, Clarke, Cox, Cullen, Curry, Eichler, Ewasko, Fielding, Fletcher, Goertzen, Graydon, Guillemard, Helwer, Isleifson, Johnson, Johnston, Lagimodiere, Martin, Mayer, Michaleski, Micklefield, Morley-Lecomte, Nesbitt, Pallister, Pedersen, Pivniuk, Reyes, Schuler, Smith, Smook, Squires, Stefanson, Teitsma, Wharton, Wishart, Wowchuk, Yakimoski.

Nays

Allum, Altemeyer, Fontaine, Gerrard, Kinew, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Marcelino (Tyndall Park), Saran, Selinger, Swan, Wiebe.

Clerk (Ms. Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 37, Nays 15.

Madam Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* (17:00)

Bill 18—The Legislative Security Act

Madam Speaker: I will now call the question on second reading of Bill 18, The Legislative Security Act.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Madam Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Jim Maloway (Official Opposition House Leader): Madam Speaker, a recorded vote.

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

The question before the House is second reading of Bill 18, The Legislative Security Act.

Division

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

Yeas

Bindle, Clarke, Cox, Cullen, Curry, Eichler, Ewasko, Fielding, Fletcher, Gerrard, Goertzen, Graydon, Guillemard, Helwer, Isleifson, Johnson, Johnston, Lagimodiere, Lamoureux, Martin, Mayer, Michaleski, Micklefield, Morley-Lecomte, Nesbitt, Pallister, Piwniuk, Reyes, Schuler, Smith, Smook, Squires, Stefanson, Teitsma, Wharton, Wishart, Wowchuk, Yakimoski.

Nays

Allum, Altemeyer, Fontaine, Kinew, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Marcelino (Tyndall Park), Saran, Selinger, Swan, Wiebe

Deputy Clerk (Mr. Rick Yarish): Yeas 38, Nays 13.

Madam Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* (18:00)

Bill 19—The Efficiency Manitoba Act

Madam Speaker: I will now call the question on second reading of Bill 19, The Efficiency Manitoba Act.

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

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Madam Speaker: No? All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Madam Speaker: It is my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Jim Maloway (Official Opposition House Leader): I request a recorded vote.

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

* (19:00)

Order.

The question before the House is second reading of Bill 19, The Efficiency Manitoba Act.

Division

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

Yeas

Bindle, Clarke, Cox, Cullen, Curry, Eichler, Ewasko, Fielding, Goertzen, Graydon, Guillemard, Helwer, Isleifson, Johnson, Johnston, Lagimodiere, Martin, Mayer, Michaleski, Micklefield, Morley-Lecomte, Nesbitt, Pallister, Pedersen, Piwniuk, Reyes, Schuler, Smith, Smook, Squires, Stefanson, Teitsma, Wharton, Wishart, Wowchuk, Yakimoski.

Nays

Allum, Fontaine, Gerrard, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Marcelino (Tyndall Park), Saran, Selinger, Swan, Wiebe.

Clerk (Ms. Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 36, Nays 13.

Madam Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Bill 20—The Crown Corporations Governance and Accountability Act

Madam Speaker: I will now call the question on second reading of Bill 20, The Crown Corporations Governance and Accountability Act.

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

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Madam Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Jim Maloway (Official Opposition House Leader): I request a recorded vote.

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

* (20:00)

The question before the House is second reading of Bill 20, The Crown Corporations Governance and Accountability Act.

Division

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

Yeas

Bindle, Clarke, Cox, Cullen, Curry, Eichler, Ewasko, Fielding, Gerrard, Goertzen, Graydon, Guillemard, Helwer, Isleifson, Johnson, Johnston, Lagimodiere, Lamoureux, Martin, Mayer, Michaleski, Micklefield, Morley-Lecomte, Nesbitt, Pallister, Pedersen, Pivniuk, Reyes, Schuler, Smith, Smook, Squires, Stefanson, Teitsma, Wharton, Wishart, Wowchuk, Yakimoski.

Nays

Allum, Altemeyer, Fontaine, Kinew, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Marcelino (Tyndall Park), Saran, Selinger, Swan, Wiebe.

Clerk (Ms. Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 38, Nays 13.

Madam Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Bill 21—The Fiscal Responsibility and Taxpayer Protection Act

Madam Speaker: I will now call the question on second reading of Bill 21, The Fiscal Responsibility and Taxpayer Protection Act.

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

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Madam Speaker: No?

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Madam Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Jim Maloway (Official Opposition House Leader): Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

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

* (21:00)

Order, please.

And, prior to proceeding to the vote. I would just ask all members that when the page is calling out the names that everybody please refrain from speaking. This is quite the job for a young person to have to remember everybody's name, and it's a bit distracting for them to hear all the chatter that might be going on. So I would ask your indulgence in that.

The question before the House is second reading of Bill 21, The Fiscal Responsibility and Taxpayer Protection Act.

Division

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

Yeas

Bindle, Clarke, Cox, Cullen, Curry, Eichler, Ewasko, Fielding, Fletcher, Goertzen, Graydon, Guillemard, Helwer, Isleifson, Johnson, Johnston, Lagimodiere, Martin, Mayer, Michaleski, Micklefield, Morley-Lecomte, Nesbitt, Pallister, Pedersen, Pivniuk, Reyes, Schuler, Smith, Smook, Squires, Stefanson, Teitsma, Wharton, Wishart, Wowchuk, Yakimoski.

Nays

Allum, Altemeyer, Fontaine, Gerrard, Kinew, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Marcelino (Tyndall Park), Saran, Selinger, Swan, Wiebe.

Clerk (Ms. Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 37, Nays 15.

Madam Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Bill 22—The Regulatory Accountability Act and Amendments to The Statutes and Regulations Act

Madam Speaker: I will now call the question on second reading of Bill 22, The Regulatory Accountability Act and Amendments to The Statutes and Regulations Act.

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

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Madam Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Jim Maloway (Official Opposition House Leader): Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

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

The question before the House is second reading of Bill 22, The Regulatory Accountability Act and Amendments to the Statutes and Regulations Act.

Division

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

Yeas

Bindle, Clarke, Cox, Cullen, Curry, Eichler, Ewasko, Fielding, Fletcher, Gerrard, Goertzen, Graydon, Guillemard, Helwer, Isleifson, Johnson, Johnston, Lagimodiere, Lamoureux, Martin, Mayer, Michaleski, Micklefield, Morley-Lecomte, Nesbitt, Pallister, Pedersen, Piwniuk, Reyes, Schuler, Smith, Smook, Squires, Stefanson, Teitsma, Wharton, Wishart, Wowchuk, Yakimoski.

Nays

Allum, Altemeyer, Fontaine, Kinew, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Marcelino (Tyndall Park), Saran, Selinger, Swan, Wiebe.

Clerk (Ms. Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 39, Nays 13.

Madam Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Bill 25—The Cannabis Harm Prevention Act (Various Acts Amended)

Madam Speaker: I will now call the question on second reading of Bill 25, The Cannabis Harm Prevention Act (Various Acts Amended).

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

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Madam Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

An Honourable Member: On division.

Madam Speaker: On division.

* * *

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I will now—*[interjection]*. Order.

* (22:10)

Bill 26—The Election Financing Amendment Act

Madam Speaker: I will now call the question on second reading of Bill 26, The Election Financing Amendment Act.

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

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Madam Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Jim Maloway (Official Opposition House Leader): Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

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

* (23:00)

The question before the House is second reading of Bill 26, The Election Financing Amendment Act.

Division

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

Yeas

Bindle, Clarke, Cox, Cullen, Curry, Eichler, Ewasko, Fielding, Fletcher, Gerrard, Goertzen, Graydon, Guillemard, Helwer, Isleifson, Johnson, Johnston, Lagimodiere, Lamoureux, Martin, Mayer, Michaleski, Micklefield, Morley-Lecomte, Nesbitt, Pallister, Pedersen, Piwniuk, Reyes, Schuler, Smith, Smook, Squires, Stefanson, Teitsma, Wharton, Wishart, Wowchuk, Yakimoski.

Nays

Allum, Altemeyer, Fontaine, Kinew, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Marcelino (Tyndall Park), Saran, Selinger, Swan, Wiebe.

Deputy Clerk (Mr. Rick Yarish): Yeas 39, Nays 13.

Madam Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Bill 28—The Public Services Sustainability Act

Madam Speaker: I will now call the question on second reading of Bill 28, The Public Services Sustainability Act.

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

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Madam Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Jim Maloway (Official Opposition House Leader): Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

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

The question before the House is second reading of Bill 28, The Public Services Sustainability Act.

Division

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

Yeas

Bindle, Clarke, Cox, Cullen, Curry, Eichler, Ewasko, Fielding, Fletcher, Goertzen, Graydon, Guillemard, Helwer, Isleifson, Johnson, Johnston, Lagimodiere, Martin, Mayer, Michaleski, Micklefield, Morley-Lecomte, Nesbitt, Pallister, Pedersen, Piwniuk, Reyes, Schuler, Smith, Smook, Squires, Stefanson, Teitsma, Wharton, Wishart, Wowchuk, Yakimoski.

Nays

Allum, Altemeyer, Fontaine, Gerrard, Kinew, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Marcelino (Tyndall Park), Saran, Selinger, Swan, Wiebe.

Deputy Clerk (Mr. Rick Yarish): Yeas 37, Nays 15.

Madam Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* (00:10)

Bill 29—The Health Sector Bargaining Unit Review Act

Madam Speaker: I will now call the question on second reading of Bill 29, The Health Sector Bargaining Unit Review Act.

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

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed to the motion, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Madam Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Jim Maloway (Official Opposition House Leader): Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

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

The question before the House is second reading of Bill 29, The Health Sector Bargaining Unit Review Act.

* (01:10)

Division

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

Yeas

Bindle, Clarke, Cox, Cullen, Curry, Eichler, Ewasko, Fielding, Fletcher, Gerrard, Goertzen, Graydon, Guillemard, Helwer, Isleifson, Johnson, Johnston, Lagimodiere, Lamoureux, Martin, Mayer, Michaleski, Micklefield, Morley-Lecomte, Nesbitt, Pallister, Pedersen, Piwniuk, Reyes, Schuler, Smith, Smook, Squires, Stefanson, Teitsma, Wharton, Wishart, Wowchuk, Yakimoski.

Nays

Allum, Altemeyer, Fontaine, Kinew, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Marcelino (Tyndall Park), Saran, Selinger, Swan, Wiebe.

Deputy Clerk (Mr. Rick Yarish): Yeas 39, Nays 13.

Madam Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

Hon. Andrew Micklefield (Government House Leader): Madam Speaker, in accordance with rule 77(8), I would like to table the sequence for the consideration of departmental Estimates.

Could you please canvass the House for leave to not see the clock to allow me to seek a temporary change to the Estimates' sequence?

Madam Speaker: Is there leave to not see the clock to allow the Government House Leader to seek a temporary change to the Estimates' sequence? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Micklefield: Madam Speaker, could you please canvass the House to leave—for leave to alter the Estimates' sequence such that, for April 25th only, Agriculture replaces Executive Council in room 254.

Madam Speaker: Is there leave to alter the Estimates' sequence such that, for April 25, 2017, only, Agriculture replaces Executive Council in room 254? *[Agreed]*

The hour being way past 5 o'clock, the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, April 24, 2017

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
Tabling of Reports		Fiscal Performance Review	
Goertzen	1465	Allum	1472
Eichler	1465	Pallister	1472
Stefanson	1465	Emergency Room Closures	
		Wiebe	1473
		Goertzen	1473
Ministerial Statements		Northern Manitoba	
Holocaust Memorial Day		Lathlin	1474
Stefanson	1465	Goertzen	1474
Swan	1466	Privatization of Air Services	
Gerrard	1466	Lindsey	1475
Spring Flood Update		Pedersen	1475
Pedersen	1467	Pallister	1476
Maloway	1467	Emergency Room Closures	
Gerrard	1467	Lamoureux	1476
		Pallister	1476
Tabling of Reports		Health-Care Services	
Wishart	1468	Lamoureux	1477
		Pallister	1477
Members' Statements		Municipal Relations	
Monsignor Michael Buyachok		Martin	1477
Schuler	1468	Clarke	1477
Vincent Massey Women's Hockey Champions		Community Organizations	
Allum	1469	Fontaine	1477
Ann Bailey		Clarke	1478
Stefanson	1469	Building Manitoba Fund	
Earth Day		Maloway	1478
Altemeyer	1470	Clarke	1478
Supper Central		Security at the Legislature	
Martin	1470	Morley-Lecomte	1479
		Stefanson	1479
Oral Questions		Air Services Contracts	
Fiscal Performance Review		Gerrard	1479
F. Marcelino	1471	Pallister	1479
Pallister	1471		

Petitions

Neighbourhoods Alive! Funding Maloway	1480
Taxi Industry Regulation Lathlin	1480
Selinger	1481
Concordia Hospital Emergency Room Wiebe	1482
Taxi Industry Regulation T. Marcelino	1482
Lindsey	1482
Dakota Collegiate Sports Complex Knew	1483
Taxi Industry Regulation Swan	1483
Provincial Nominee Program F. Marcelino	1484
Taxi Industry Regulation Saran	1484
Neighbourhoods Alive! Funding Altemeyer	1485

**ORDERS OF THE DAY
GOVERNMENT BUSINESS****Debate on Second Readings**

Bill 28—The Public Services Sustainability Act	
Allum	1486
Lindsey	1489
Altemeyer	1493
Bill 16—The Fatality Inquiries Amendment Act	1494
Bill 18—The Legislative Security Act	1494
Bill 19—The Efficiency Manitoba Act	1495
Bill 20—The Crown Corporations Governance and Accountability Act	1495
Bill 21—The Fiscal Responsibility and Taxpayer Protection Act	1496
Bill 22—The Regulatory Accountability Act and Amendments to The Statutes and Regulations Act	1497
Bill 25—The Cannabis Harm Prevention Act (Various Acts Amended)	1497
Bill 26—The Election Financing Amendment Act	1497
Bill 28—The Public Services Sustainability Act	1498
Bill 29—The Health Sector Bargaining Unit Review Act	1498

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

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