

**First Session – Forty-Third Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**  
**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**  
**Official Report**  
**(Hansard)**

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Tom Lindsey  
Speaker*

**Vol. LXXVIII No. 52B - 1:30 p.m., Tuesday, May 7, 2024**

ISSN 0542-5492

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

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

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, May 7, 2024

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

**The Speaker:** Good afternoon, everyone. Please be seated.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**Bill 213—The Liquor, Gaming and Cannabis Control Amendment and Manitoba Liquor and Lotteries Corporation Amendment Act (Expanding Liquor Retail)**

**Mr. Jeff Wharton (Red River North):** I move, seconded by the member from Interlake-Gimli, that Bill 213, The Liquor, Gaming and Cannabis Control Amendment and Manitoba Liquor and Lotteries Corporation Amendment Act (Expanding Liquor Retail), be now read for the first time.

*Motion presented.*

**Mr. Wharton:** Honourable Speaker, Bill 213 amends The Liquor, Gaming and Cannabis Control Act and The Manitoba Liquor and Lotteries Corporation Act to allow retailers to expand their product selection and expand their services across Manitoba under a five-year pilot project.

For years, Manitobans have been asking for this legislation, Honourable Speaker. This bill is about levelling the playing field for Manitoba businesses. It's about reducing red tape and it's about giving Manitobans what they want: consumer choice and convenience when they go shopping across this great province of Manitoba.

Thank you, Honourable Speaker.

**The Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? *[Agreed]*

Any further introduction of bills?

Committee reports? Tabling of reports? Ministerial statements? Members' statements? On to oral—oh, the honourable member for Riel.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

## Chad Gillert

**MLA Mike Moyes (Riel):** Today I rise in honour of Chad Gillert, a dedicated St. Amant volunteer,

phenomenal early childhood educator and dear friend to many in our Riel community.

Just last week, I had the privilege of presenting Chad with the Laurel Mason award for outstanding volunteerism at St. Amant's 65th anniversary volunteer awards ceremony. For more than eight years, Chad has helped countless young Manitobans with disabilities find inclusion in our province and supported them to live meaningful lives.

When I spoke with Chad about his work at St. Amant, the first thing he mentioned was the incredible St. Amant staff who had inspired him to volunteer. Having attended the St. Amant daycare as a child, Chad knew the positive impact that dedicated staff and volunteers had made in his life and in the lives of others. He wanted to give back and help set more kids on the path to success. I have no doubt that Chad has already inspired many of the young Manitobans he works with to become the next generation of early childhood educators.

Over the years, Chad has dedicated his time and talents to many organizations across the city, including the YMCA, where he works as an inclusion worker, supporting children with specific needs at the daycare.

Through his volunteerism, selflessness and kindness, Chad puts his dedication to our Manitoba community into practice every day. He radiates kindness in every interaction and is always willing to give his time and energy to empower those around him. His humility, perseverance and caring nature truly embody what it means to be a Manitoban.

Honourable Speaker, I ask that everyone please join me in thanking Chad for his tremendous generosity of spirit and to congratulate him on this well-deserved honour.

## Palliative Manitoba

**Mrs. Kathleen Cook (Roblin):** May 5 to 11 marks national hospice and palliative care week in Canada, and I'm honoured to rise today to recognize the incredible work of Palliative Manitoba and all of the palliative-care professionals in our province who work tirelessly to provide Manitobans of all ages with a dignified and comfortable death.

Absolutely every one of us will die one day, and statistics show that most of us will die of chronic disease. The majority of people with a life-limiting illness would benefit from quality palliative care. And as many who have experienced the death of a loved one can tell you, there is such a thing as a good death journey. What that looks like is unique to each individual.

Palliative care focuses on the whole person—the physical, mental and spiritual health of the person experiencing a life-limiting illness.

Manitoba is fortunate to have wonderful palliative care physicians, nurses and health-care aides as well as psychosocial supports and clinicians delivering palliative care programs across the province. They are supported by the work of Palliative Manitoba, whose mission it is to ease the suffering of the dying, the bereaved and their caregivers, through supportive services and education.

They accomplish this by providing bereavement support programs for Manitobans of all ages, as well as their volunteer visiting and education programs. Trained volunteers from Palliative Manitoba will visit people on palliative care in their home or in the palliative units at Riverview and St. Boniface Hospital, and they will also sit vigil by the bedside of those who would otherwise die alone.

Palliative Manitoba also provides a range of education courses and community outreach services, including an extensive compassionate care course for caregivers and health-care professionals.

Jennifer Gurke, the executive director of Palliative Manitoba, joins us in the gallery today. I want to particularly acknowledge her and the work of Palliative Manitoba's staff and many volunteers. Your work is important and deeply appreciated, and thank you for the work you do every day on behalf of the dying, the bereaved and their caregivers.

#### **Dakota Collegiate Lancers Varsity Champions**

**Hon. Jamie Moses (Minister of Economic Development, Investment, Trade and Natural Resources):** Honourable Speaker, today I am so happy to recognize the extraordinary provincial champions from St. Vital.

The Dakota Collegiate Lancers varsity girls basketball team, varsity and junior varsity football teams have demonstrated exceptional skill and determination as the reigning champions of their respective sports.

This year, the varsity girls basketball team won their third provincial championship in a row. They beat the Garden City Gophers in a championship game led by MVP Izzi Fust and all-star player Darya Rom. Along with their team, they have successfully managed to place themselves squarely as a dynasty in provincial AAAA basketball.

The 2023 season marked a remarkable journey for the Lancer football program. The junior varsity team remained undefeated all season, ending in a resounding victory in the championship game against the Oak Park Raiders. This triumph marked their second championship in just three years.

Similarly, after years of dedication and resilience, the varsity team clinched their inaugural championship at the end of the 2023 season. They secured victory in their championship game by defeating the Grant Park Pirates. Special mention goes out to Players Choice Award winner, quarterback Blake Penner.

Honourable Speaker, the accomplishments of the Lancers are impressive. These teams exemplify hard work, sacrifice, teamwork and a strong commitment to excellence. Their dedication has rightfully earned them top spots in the province.

I extend my sincere congratulations to the athletes, the coaches, parents and teachers at Dakota Collegiate, whose dedication and support have earned them these remarkable achievements and for making our community in St. Vital very proud.

I am delighted to share that the teams are here with us in the gallery today. The seniors and team captains are joining us in the gallery, with the remaining members in the Golden Boy Room. I invite my colleagues to join me in applauding the Dakota Collegiate Lancers for their extraordinary accomplishments in sports this past season.

Go, Lancers, go.

*Coaches: Abbas Butt, Rick Morris, Eric Sung*

*Varsity football: Esmond Aigbe, Alejandro Dipas, Asun Ducharme, Dawson Einarson, Dennis Ellis, Sepp Friesen, Mehrum Ghuman, Thomas Gorkoff, Maxuell Grieman, Darren Igben, J.J. Jalloh, Carter Kalcsics, Amid Kanu, Payton McAulay, Noah McCorrison, Gurkirat Nagpal, Augustine Nkundimana, Ryan North, Destiny Okedara, Olamide Olaleye, Stephen Peebles-Smith, Noah Petterson, Miguel Reyes, Jack Shane, David Sindikubwabo, Xander Smith, Shayden Starr, Danny Velaja, Rogan Vergata, Mason Voogt, Gavin Wong*

*Junior Varsity football: Adriel Aigbe, Nolan Archibald, Brandon Bartone, Preston Benjamin, Madden Brink, Treyson Burnett-Joseph, Peytn Clarke, Aydan Domino, Charlie Dudeck, Luke Edmonson, Maddox Globerman, Khaleel Hosein, Derek Igben, Ethan Lalonde, Colton Leuzinger, Griffin MacInnes, Declan Mielke, Reid Monkman, Kenyan Morgan-Desrosiers, Asher Newman, Shemuel Ohuwadare, Brady Penner, Conner Plante, Darius Sapong-Rean, Tryston Scrivner, Abraham Sesay, Quinn Sloggett, Christian Snowdon, Messiah Tagle, Brady Templeton, Marek Vujevic, Jayden Wahl*

*Varsity girls basketball: Shaeffer Grace Anderson, Kalesha Rose Campbell, Sin Yiu Cheung, Payton Brooke Cvetkovic, Isabel Rhane Fust, Dayne Jernberg, Hope Larocque, Ava Isabella Osato, Darya Rom, Taylor Aline Schepp, Anna Kathleen Henrietta Marie Sellers, Abby Sweeny, Maria Juliana Tingchuy*

### **Teulon Curling Club**

**Mr. Trevor King (Lakeside):** I rise in the Chamber today to congratulate the Teulon Curling Club for their 100th anniversary.

In 1924, Teulon had a population of 700, and the average Canadian family spent \$10.13 per week on groceries. Montreal Canadiens won the Stanley Cup, and the Roaring Twenties were in full swing and a curling club started in Teulon.

Curling, unlike hockey, had already gained a foothold in Manitoba during the 1870s and became increasingly popular in the 1880s.

\* (13:40)

Remarkably, it has maintained its prominence even as hockey found its place in the hearts of Manitobans. Curling remains one of the two most important winter sports in the region.

In addition to curling, Teulon has hosted other community events. For instance, the town held its first agricultural fair in 1946, a rural tradition that continued for 68 years. The fair took place in the curling club, later in the arena during the summer months. In 1952, the ag society raised funds of \$1,500, which they generously donated to the building fund for the new curling rink.

The Teulon-Rockwood Arena in Teulon, Manitoba features four curling sheets where enthusiasts can enjoy this exciting winter sport. Whether you're a seasoned curler or a beginner, these sheets provide the perfect icy canvas for strategic play and friendly competition.

The club was able to host the masters men's provincial championship in 2008.

The Teulon Curling Club stands as a testament to community spirit, sportsmanship and enduring traditions.

March 1 to 3, 2024, the Teulon Curling Club hosted a mixed bonspiel of 32 teams and a Saturday night banquet to celebrate the 100th anniversary of their curling club, which I was proud to attend the festivities, bring greetings and share some of my own memories of curling in Teulon to about 260 attendees.

Congratulations to the generations of curlers and volunteers that have committed to a very strong past and the near-50 junior curlers to a bright future for the club for years to come.

Honourable Speaker, please join me in commending the Teulon Curling Club for their 100 years of community spirit.

### **Bryan Kramble**

**Hon. Nello Altomare (Minister of Education and Early Childhood Learning):** Honourable Speaker, today I rise to pay homage to the life of Bryan Kramble, who sadly passed away earlier this year.

Bryan was a beloved member of the Transcona community and a close friend and mentor of mine.

He was a lifelong resident of Transcona, born in 1939; often referred to our area as God's country and spoke often of his love for our community.

Bryan understood what we know well: that Transcona is a beautiful place to call home and raise a family. We have Bryan to thank as one of the inspiring individuals who have helped make Transcona what it is today. His kind, warm and wise character formed a life dedicated to serving community.

After starting as an electrician at the CN Shops, Bryan was accepted into Transcona Police Department in 1962.

That same year, he married Elaine, and they raised four children together: Arlene, Bradley, Heather and Blaine. Elaine and Bryan enjoyed many years together visiting their cottage at Lee River in the summers and travelling across the globe during the winter months.

He quickly became, of course, part of the Winnipeg Police Service and quickly rose through the ranks, retiring as chief-deputy chief of police for the service in 1999.

I am grateful for the advice, guidance and mentorship Bryan offered, leading me to my own life of service. A true, true mentor.

Bryan's family and community will remember him for his genuine and caring spirit.

He is survived by his wife Elaine, four children, two brothers, his grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

I ask members of this House to join me in honouring Bryan Kramble, his family, dedication to serving others. His presence will be missed by myself and the entire Transcona community.

Honourable Speaker, I ask for a moment of silence to honour Bryan's memory.

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

*A moment of silence was observed.*

\* \* \*

**Hon. Jamie Moses (Minister of Economic Development, Investment, Trade and Natural Resources):** Can I ask for leave for—since there were so many student athletes who were winners, so I ask for leave for all of their names to be included in Hansard, even though it might go over the usual limit, and for their names to be included directly after my member's statement.

**The Speaker:** Just bear with us one second.

Is there leave for the member to include his list of names in Hansard, and to have them appear right after his statement? *[Agreed]*

### Introduction of Guests

**The Speaker:** Before we move on to oral questions, I have some guests in the gallery.

I'd like to draw attention of all honourable members to the public gallery, where we have with us today the Philippine Madrigal Singers, who are here in Winnipeg as part of the 2024 Canada Goodwill Concert Tour in celebration of 75 years of the Philippines and Canada diplomatic relations. The singers are guests of the honourable member for Notre Dame (MLA Marcelino).

On behalf of all honourable members, we welcome you here today.

Further, I'd like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the public gallery, where we have with us today Ella Hamlin and Keiran Hamlin, who are guests of the Leader of the Official Opposition.

On behalf of all honourable members, we welcome you here today.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Budget Implementation Legislation Request to Call Bill 37 to Committee

**Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Leader of the Official Opposition):** I'd like to, as well, thank and welcome the Philippine Madrigal Singers. Wonderful, wonderful concert at the steps and the staircase today, and it just sounded so nice in this wonderful building we call home here in Manitoba.

Well, Honourable Speaker, it didn't take long, but we've returned back to the dark days of the NDP. They're hiding 17 unrelated laws under one budget bill without allowing each of them the proper committee process, which is—*[interjection]*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Ewasko:** —undemocratic, Honourable Speaker.

Will the Premier commit to calling each of the separate acts within BITSa to a public committee, yes or no?

**Hon. Wab Kinew (Premier):** I want to also welcome our guests from the Madrigal Singers today. It was pretty cool to hear the voices resonating throughout the Legislature, and so we thank you for brightening up our days.

I also want to acknowledge all the student athletes from Dakota Collegiate and just underline that student always comes before athlete in that phraseology, so good luck with sports, but make sure you keep working hard on the studies.

Any good student athlete will know, however, though, that what matters is your performance on the field. If you start arguing with the referee about the rule book, you're probably not doing everything that you can. So that's what we see from the member opposite once again here today. He's not focused on the people of Manitoba. We are.

While he argues with the referees, we're cutting the gas tax to save you money. We're fixing health care, and we brought in a great budget to do many more great things for the people of this province.

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

**Mr. Ewasko:** I know, Honourable Speaker, that the Premier's favourite sport is wrestling, not football, but I'd also like to extend congratulations to the whole

Lancers teams for their success, and being here to witness once again the leader of the NDP, the NDP Premier, not answering any questions and getting way off topic.

To be clear, Honourable Speaker, Manitobans were prepared to give their feedback. There were presenters registered, listed on bill–presenter lists for a number of the acts rolled into this BITSA bill. Now, since it's in BITSA, it will go to Committee of the Whole, and these Manitobans are denied their opportunity to comment.

Will the NDP stop trying to hide this legislation from Manitobans, introduce it properly and let the public speak to it?

\* (13:50)

**Mr. Kinew:** So for all the guests who haven't had the privilege of being here in the Chamber all spring, I just want to share with you that day after day after day, the PCs have been blocking debate.

They've been blocking the public's ability to hear about important legislation, not just on the issues at hand, but also on cracking down at drug traffickers. Day after day, they block it.

In fact, they brought in numerous procedural challenges arguing that we were talking about these bills too much. They brought matters of privilege saying we were talking about them too much. Now today, they say we're not talking about it enough.

Again, I'll leave it to the PCs to clarify their position, but the members opposite should answer this: How did they block First Nations kids from going to court to collect children's special allowance? How did they raise Cabinet-appointed hydro rate fees?

The answer to those questions is, the members opposite did it through BITSA, when there was never any debate for the people of Manitoba.

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

**Mr. Ewasko:** You know, Honourable Speaker, it's just hilarious to stand up here and listen to the rhetoric put on the record by the NDP leader, who stands up and continues to mislead Manitobans.

Don't take it from me. I quote the MLA for Fort Garry, he said himself, and I quote, and I fear that this omnibus bill is going to forever change our politics here in Manitoba, not for the good.

If the Premier won't commit to calling each separate act within BITSA to a public committee, and he won't withdraw this bad bill to introduce it properly, will the Premier apologize to Manitobans for denying them their democratic rights?

**Mr. Kinew:** I'd say to the members opposite, stop blocking legislation.

We were elected on a mandate to keep people in Manitoba safe, including bringing in an unexplained wealth act. The people spoke clearly. They want this as public safety measure and yet, each and every day, they talk it out. They block. And now they have the temerity, the audacity, the duplicity to come in here and to say that we're not allowing legislation to be considered.

We are doing more than enough to allow legislation to be considered. But the question that the members opposite need to consider is, what were they thinking in the year 2020, when they prorogued this House, brought in a short Throne Speech and then brought forward a BITSA bill only to have it voted on later that Thursday?

Where was the debate and democracy that year?

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

#### **Milk Prices Increase Concerns**

**Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Leader of the Official Opposition):** Honourable Speaker, the only one blocking the NDP legislation is the person sitting three seats to the right of the Premier, their failed House leader.

On this side of the House, we recognize that the cost-of-living crisis is—has not gone away. Despite the claims that this—*[interjection]*

**The Speaker:** Order. Order.

**Mr. Ewasko:** —NDP government. Of course, one of those claims made by the Premier was the threat to grocery stores that if prices rose, there would be consequences, Honourable Speaker. Another empty NDP promise.

I want to give this Premier an opportunity to name a single consequence he has imposed on grocers, perhaps some correspondence he wrote in as—to his store when the prices of premade salads, a meeting with grocer CEOs or even a record of a telephone call, Honourable Speaker.

**Hon. Wab Kinew (Premier):** Well, you know, on a day-to-day level, when you're in the cut and thrust of question period, sometimes you have your lefts and rights confused and so I'll grant some consideration for the member opposite.

Because what he said, that three people sitting to my right, in fact, I'll remind him that our super successful, excellent, dunking-on-Tories-every-day House leader sits three seats to my left and that the person sitting three seats to my right is actually the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kostyshyn).

And, you know, in addition to making Crown lands more affordable, he's also been working with the federal Minister of Agriculture on a grocery code of conduct, one of many measures that we're taking to make your life more affordable.

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

**Mr. Ewasko:** I'm glad that the Premier stood up in his place and admitted that it's actually, in fact, the MLA for St. Johns that's actually blocking the NDP's legislation.

Honourable Speaker, the milk is an important staple in many people's diets and especially important for children and infants. It's a fact that every increase of the milk price—the price of milk has to be signed off at the Cabinet table by this Premier and those members of the NDP Cabinet.

To quote this Premier: The government of Manitoba sets the maximum price of milk.

Considering the rising cost of price of groceries, mortgage payments and hydro, why does the Premier raise the price of milk? Why is he ignoring his own commitments to Manitobans?

**Mr. Kinew:** You know, if you watch QP on a day-to-day basis, you see that the PCs often hear something and then they go confer with their staff, who may or may not be trying to run in a Tuxedo by-election, and then they come back 24 hours later with the rejoinder.

So, again, yes, I pointed out yesterday Heather Stefanson approved a rise in milk prices at the Cabinet table, and that member opposite was there for the discussion. I'll leave it to him to share whether he objected on behalf of the people of Manitoba.

One thing that we are doing, though, is we're repealing Heather Stefanson's fuel tax to save you money. We're also implementing a suite of budgetary

initiatives to ensure that your life stays more affordable. And, of course, our team is working hard, not just to support Manitobans who live here today, but to make this a more attractive province for people to call home for generations to come.

I look forward to sharing more information on that right away.

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

**Mr. Ewasko:** Honourable Speaker, this Premier and Manitobans know that his temporary gas tax break is clearly that: it's a temporary measure. But his milk price hike is absolutely permanent. Less than two years ago this Premier promised Manitobans that the NDP would, I quote, save Manitobans money on the price of milk, end quote. He pounded his desk and made quite the show of it, as we usually see from the Premier.

Unfortunately, for Manitobans, this Premier and his Cabinet decided to break his promise and have raised the price of milk.

Why did the Premier not just simply say no? Why is he raising the price of milk on Manitobans and making life more difficult?

**Mr. Kinew:** I want to point out that not only is our House leader dunking on the Tories each and every day, but she's giving out free milk coupons to many families in need on a regular basis. So that's what they are doing to keep life more affordable.

When we're talking about pounding on the desk, however, I do want to revisit the issue of international student postgraduates with temporary work permits here in Manitoba. I want to share the news with you, Honourable Speaker, that thanks to the intrepid work of our Minister of Labour and Immigration (MLA Marcelino) we've received written confirmation from the federal government today that they are going to put in place a policy to facilitate time-limited open work permits for nomination 'residy,' temporary residents, who have work permits that will expire in 2024.

While they want to use people as political props, we get to work each and every day to make this a welcoming province for people to call home for generations to come.

The work here is not done. We have a lot more work to do to fix the immigration system broken by the PCs. But the good news is we've—

**The Speaker:** Member's time has expired.

### **RRC Primary Care Paramedicine Program Request for Number of Employment Offers**

**Mrs. Kathleen Cook (Roblin):** After we exposed them yesterday for leaving hopeful paramedic students high and dry, the Minister of Health told the media job offers were in their hands for June.

After speaking with multiple persons involved with the primary care paramedicine program this morning, the minister's story just isn't adding up. I'll table two texts I received this morning regarding the NDP's claim that offers were in students' hands. Quoting one: Absolutely not true. Unquote.

Could the minister confirm for the House exactly how many offers were extended to graduates of RRC's primary-care paramedicine program yesterday, and how many were accepted?

\* (14:00)

**Hon. Uzoma Asagwara (Minister of Health, Seniors and Long-Term Care):** Honourable Speaker, you know, it's interesting is that the member opposite stands up in this House time and time again and reminds Manitobans of exactly why there are challenges in health care.

Emergency medical services in Manitoba were cut year over year by the previous government. Heather Stefanson and the PC caucus not only cut EMS stations across Manitoba, they actually refused to hire paramedics. They made a decision to refuse to hire the very paramedics that member claims to be advocating for.

Honourable Speaker, they cut 90 paramedics from rural Manitoba. That member and that caucus—

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

**The Speaker:** Order.

**MLA Asagwara:** —have no credibility on this issue, and Manitobans will keep reminding them of just that.

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

**Mrs. Cook:** At 11 a.m. this morning, Shared Health reached out to these paramedic students, this time asking them to confirm a June 3 start date by 1 p.m. this afternoon. That's funny. What starts just after 1 p.m.? It looks like the minister was trying to save face after they took liberties with the truth yesterday.

Manitobans want answers.

Can the minister confirm: Did the offers go out last week, yesterday or three hours before question period?

**MLA Asagwara:** Honourable Speaker, the member opposite stands up in this House time and time again and puts false information on the record. Last week we ensured that once we heard from paramedic students that the structure organized by Heather Stefanson and the PC caucus to refuse to hire paramedics consistently throughout the year was indeed in need of our government taking a different approach, which is exactly what we did in making sure we contacted those students and offered the jobs in Manitoba.

The structure of that service right now is due to the previous government's cuts. I'll table Province to close 23 EMS facilities. If she's not sure what I'm talking about, maybe she can ask the member for Steinbach (Mr. Goertzen).

**The Speaker:** Order, please.

I would caution the member for Roblin before she proceeds with her next question that some of the language she used in her last question is borderline unparliamentary, and I would caution her very strongly to reconsider using such language in the future.

**Mrs. Cook:** This is what happens when the NDP have no tangible staffing plan for health-care workers in Manitoba. They've mismanaged intake days, set students up to fail and left health-care workers looking to other provinces instead of staying here.

The NDP made job offers to students the only major pillar of their lacking plan to staff our health-care system, and they're already messing it up. This Health Minister only takes issues in our health-care system seriously when it's brought to light by the opposition or the media.

When will the minister start being proactive instead of reactive about staffing issues in our health-care system?

**MLA Asagwara:** Honourable Speaker, while the member opposite and her caucus lean into arrogance, on this side of the House we're humble enough to listen to the front-line health-care workers and take action based on what they see needs to happen in health care.

Honourable Speaker, they cut EMS stations; we're investing in them. They fired 90 paramedics; we're investing in bringing more on board and giving them jobs in Manitoba. They refused to hire paramedics across the province; we're giving them letters

of offer before they get accredited to practise on the front lines of health care.

We are cleaning up a monumental mess made by the previous government. Heather Stefanson, that member opposite and members across the House have no idea how to strengthen health care because all they wanted to do for seven and a half years was destroy it.

### **Genesis House Transitional Housing Project**

**Mrs. Carrie Hiebert (Morden-Winkler):** Honourable Speaker, Genesis House is a community shelter for survivors of domestic violence and abuse located in my constituency. They offer a wide range of services that include a 24-hour crisis line, residential services, counselling, support groups and more.

I have previously asked this government about investments needed for Genesis House, as they look to expand the shelter and service capacity with their new transitional housing project. There has been no commitment to the residents of rural Manitoba.

So I ask: When can the Genesis House project expect support from this Housing Minister?

**Hon. Nahanni Fontaine (Minister of Families):** I want to say miigwech to the member opposite for that important question.

I think that what we can agree on on both sides of the House is that Genesis House does phenomenal work. Their team does phenomenal work at offering safe space for predominantly women, alongside their children, that need a place in moments of crisis and vulnerability.

And so on behalf of our government and the minister responsible, as well, we do want to take this opportunity to lift up all of the staff and those front-line folks that are on—doing such important and sacred and critical work on behalf of all of us.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for Morden-Winkler, on a supplementary question.

**Mrs. Hiebert:** Honourable Speaker, rural Manitoba is in desperate need of affordable and transitional housing. Genesis House is full every night since the beginning of the year.

A recent announcement made by this minister focused only on the city of Winnipeg. Service providers like Genesis House in Winkler provide services to individuals from all over Manitoba, including Winnipeg.

There is—where is the funding for communities that are supporting Winnipeg organizations to house vulnerable Manitobans?

**Hon. Bernadette Smith (Minister of Housing, Addictions and Homelessness):** Well, I want to thank the member for that question. And I was actually at the housing—met with a bunch of housing providers this morning, and I actually had an opportunity to speak with the provider of Genesis House, and we did have a good conversation.

And they are going to be putting another proposal forward, and they are working on a proposal with the federal government. And that proposal is going to be coming to us again. It wasn't complete, so we will be working towards supporting Genesis House, and they did recognize that their proposal wasn't completed. So we will be working towards supporting them.

And there are good news coming forward towards projects that are outside Winnipeg. I have been working with—collaboratively with many mayors and reeves outside our province, visiting many different organizations and many good groups that are doing good housing projects.

So more good news—

**The Speaker:** Member's time is expired.

The honourable member for Morden-Winkler, on a final supplementary question.

**Mrs. Hiebert:** We have a responsibility as legislators to appropriately spend public dollars, as we are entrusted by this by the public, and we are—and in—when we are overpaying for one project and saying no to others, this—then this government is falling—failing in its responsibility.

Can the minister explain how she made these funding decisions this last week, and why she's ignored the needs of rural Manitobans and southern Manitoba?

**Ms. Smith:** Well, we—I'm so excited to announce Centre Village, so that was one we just announced. So that's going to be supporting kids that are aging out of care, a gap that we heard time and time again that the previous government ignored.

We know that kids that are aging out of care need housing. Many of them are living in—were living in encampments. And thanks to our government and the partnership between Canada—or, Manitoba renewal corporation and—as well as Spence Neighbourhood Association, Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, those

supports will be coming to support those folks. As well as Transcona will be getting some housing.

And there's more good news to be coming from outside of Winnipeg—

**The Speaker:** Member's time is expired.

### Funding for Social Housing Projects Political Partisanship Concerns

**Mr. Obby Khan (Fort Whyte):** Honourable Speaker, yesterday I referenced how this Premier (Mr. Kinew) is following in the footsteps of his former failed leader, Greg Selinger, by instating the largest education property tax in the history of this province, to the tune of \$148 million on middle-class Manitobans.

This is proof that the NDP are back to their old ways. This weekend, it was revealed that the Minister of Housing is giving an organization led by former political staff and their 2016 campaign manager over \$5.5 million in funding, a property that was already developed under the previous NDP government.

Does this Minister of Housing think it is okay to funnel millions of dollars to her NDP party loyalists, yes or no?

\* (14:10)

**Hon. Bernadette Smith (Minister of Housing, Addictions and Homelessness):** Well, what I will tell that member is, we are taking a different approach on that—on this side.

On that side of the House, what that side of the House did was they sold off housing. They cut maintenance budgets. They left people in tents. They left people living in bus shelters.

We will not take that approach. We will make sure that folks have housing. We are committed to ending chronic homelessness in two terms, something that the members on the other side ignored for years.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for Fort Whyte, on a supplementary question.

**Mr. Khan:** Honourable Speaker, different approach is one way of saying it. I would say, and everyone in Manitoba would say, that this Minister of Housing is simply giving \$5.5 million to their NDP loyalists. That's how it is.

The NDP claims there's no funding for projects like the MLA in Winkler-Morden. Yet, they want to give 5.5 to their loyalists.

Honourable Speaker, \$2.25 million for 15 units and \$400,000 annually works out to—*[interjection]*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Khan:** —\$2,300 a month per unit. *[interjection]*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Khan:** The average price is \$1,500.

Why is this minister paying almost twice the average rental cost in Manitoba?

**Ms. Smith:** What I will say to that member is, they are sitting on that side for a reason.

Manitobans sent them a clear message: they will not stand for member—for Manitobans living in encampments; they will not stand for members living in bus shelters. They want to ensure that member—or, Manitobans have housing, and that's exactly what they told us on this side.

We will continue to invest in housing. We will continue to invest in non-profits that will support Manitobans, something on the—members on the other side failed to do.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for Fort Whyte, on a final supplementary question.

**Mr. Khan:** Honourable Speaker, that's still not an answer.

The Minister of Housing will simply not answer why she gave \$5.5 million to NDP party loyalists. It's that simple. Honourable Speaker, \$1 million in annual funding to pay for units on two separate projects. At this rate, the rent should be zero.

Honourable Speaker, this minister is picking winners and losers and surprising to no one, we're back to the dark days of the NDP where they are picking their party supporters. She is putting party and special interest groups ahead of Manitobans. This minister is responsible for her decisions.

Can she explain—*[interjection]*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Khan:** —why she is simply funneling money to millions and millions of dollars to partisan hacks—*[interjection]*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Khan:** —and party loyalists?

**Ms. Smith:** What I will tell that member, what we are doing is we are putting Manitobans first, something that members opposite never did.

We will continue to support Manitobans in securing housing, so if that member does not want to advocate for members having housing, members that are encampments that need rent supplements, that need housing built, then that member needs to talk to Manitobans and tell them why they should not be building housing in this province.

So, what I will say, our government is committed to ensuring that housing is built and that members in this province have housing that are vulnerable and—

**The Speaker:** Member's time is expired.

### **Labour Legislation in BITSA Request to Call Bill 37 to Committee**

**Ms. Jodie Byram (Agassiz):** This Minister of Labour and Immigration vowed in multiple media interviews that she would introduce her labour bills at the first available opportunity, yet held them back for over a month.

Why? So that they could staple them onto the end of BITSA and sidestep accountability? *[interjection]*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Ms. Byram:** Why is the minister trying to sneak these bills in instead of as the stand-alone pieces of legislation that they should be?

**Hon. Malaya Marcelino (Minister of Labour and Immigration):** First, members opposite said I was talking too much about these bills, and now I'm not talking about them enough. Will they get their facts straight?

So, Honourable Speaker, I have some actual news that Manitobans want to hear and not that kind of garbage that's being spewed on that side.

We have a letter that was dated today from Minister Marc Miller, the federal minister. He's given us—and I'll table it for the House. The federal minister has agreed to our proposal to extend postgraduate work permits that are expiring in 2024—that have expired and are expiring. That's 6,700 temporary residents for families and all the employers that want to hear this news.

**The Speaker:** Member's time has expired.

**Ms. Byram:** Here are the facts, Honourable Speaker. Organized labour had input on these bills. Manitobans

have not. The union bosses had input to the legislation, but ordinary Manitobans will be silenced under the undemocratic NDP strategy.

Every Manitoban deserves the opportunity to comment at committee stage. It is a key part of our legislative process we should all be very proud of.

So I ask this minister, why is she trampling on the history to force through a bill with no public presenters? *[interjection]*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**MLA Marcelino:** With this confirmation from the federal minister, that means those folks who've had their work permits expired or expiring this year will get to stay in Manitoba with their families. They'll get to—they'll continue to be employed here.

That's 6,700 folks and their families that are going to continue to get employed here and continue to contribute to our economy while we work on the issue of our—while we work on the issue of protest—processing our Manitoban Provincial Nominee applications so that we can welcome more newcomers to Manitoba.

Thank you.

**Ms. Byram:** Opposition pressure pays.

Every Manitoban has the right to come into this building and get their time to speak before a committee of legislators and offer their insight, their expertise, their opinions and proposed bills—about proposed bills. This is how this place operates. At least, it was how this place operated until this government was elected.

This bill won't see public committee and is longer than—*[interjection]*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Ms. Byram:** —all the other bills the NDP have introduced to date.

Will the minister do the right thing—*[interjection]*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Ms. Byram:** —and demand her House leader to separate these bills, send it to public committee—*[interjection]*

**The Speaker:** Order.

Let's tone it down a little so that I can hear the question. Maybe you folks don't care what the question is. I need to hear it.

The honourable member for Agassiz, please finish your question—*[interjection]* Agassiz. The honourable member for Agassiz.

**Ms. Byram:** Honourable Speaker, may I restart my question?

**The Speaker:** Yes.

**Ms. Byram:** Every Manitoban has the right to come into this building and get their time to speak before a committee of legislators and offer their insight, their expertise, their opinions about prose—proposed bills. This is how this place operates. At least, it was how this place operated until this government was elected.

This bill won't see public committee and is longer than all the other bills the NDP have introduced to date.

Will the minister do the right thing and demand her House leader separate out these bills, send it to public committee, or does this minister not want to hear from Manitobans?

**MLA Marcelino:** Honourable Speaker, you know, on that side of the House, they did nothing—nothing—to help these 6,700 temporary residents, except to use them for their crass political gains. Right? That was very, very low. These folks are desperate.

On this side of the House, we help Manitobans. *[interjection]*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**MLA Marcelino:** We help the economy grow.

Thank you, Honourable Speaker.

\* (14:20)

### Health-Care System Management Assessment of Current System

**MLA Cindy Lamoureux (Tyndall Park):** Thank you—*[interjection]*

**The Speaker:** Order, please. Order, please.

**MLA Lamoureux:** The provincial specialty lead for internal medicine with Shared Health, Dr. Eberhard Renner, resigned from his role a couple of weeks ago.

In a Free Press op-ed, his characterization of the current health system is troubling. I quote: I resigned because I cannot continue to perpetuate the illusion that things are better now than they were six months ago. They are even worse.

I table this article.

Honourable Speaker, does the government believe the assessments Dr. Renner has made are accurate?

**Hon. Uzoma Asagwara (Minister of Health, Seniors and Long-Term Care):** I thank the member for that question. I've had the pleasure of meeting with Dr. Renner and hearing about his expertise on the front line.

And, you know, I think it's important to note that, under our government, we believe that health-care workers and health-care experts' voices matter. And that includes when they offer feedback, they offer insights that remind us of a government of how much work we have to do to clean up the mess made by the previous Heather Stefanson-led PC caucus.

On this side of the House, we are open to hearing the expertise and the feedback of all health-care workers and experts across our great province. And we're going to continue every single day to fix the mess and the damage done by those members.

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for Tyndall Park, on a supplementary question.

### Governance and Accountability Recommendations

**MLA Lamoureux:** Another quote from Dr. Renner reads: Since the election, I have witnessed increasingly unco-ordinated, ill-advised and micromanaging government that is uninterested to take the critical steps to co-ordinate health service delivery in the province.

Dr. Renner believes that there should be a Shared Health transformation with better clinical governance and an accountability structure and no political interference.

Can the Minister of Health share with the House what they are going to do to address the crisis that the doctor has described?

**MLA Asagwara:** I appreciate that question from the member opposite.

You know, the Premier (Mr. Kinew) and I have been on a listening tour, listening to the front lines, and we've heard very plainly from Manitobans the same feedback they were sharing before we formed—*[interjection]*

**The Speaker:** Order.

**MLA Asagwara:** —government. And that is the additional layers of bureaucracy—and yes, including Shared Health—that were created by Heather Stefanson and the PCs has created a lot of chaos in the health-care

system, which is why we've taken real steps to address those concerns.

Now, I recognize that our government has more work to do. And we're going to continue to listen to experts across our health-care system to get the work done. We also recognize that, after seven and a half years of cuts, closures, chaos and mistreatment, there's a lot of work to be done. But we're committed to Manitobans, to doing that work each and every day.

**The Speaker:** Member's time has expired.

The honourable member for Tyndall Park, on a final supplementary question.

**MLA Lamoureux:** Honourable Speaker, it is very troubling when the specialty lead in charge of an entire medical division resigns because his concerns about the direction of health care are being ignored by this current government.

Dr. Renner said that he felt no longer in control of his own service area but rather caught in a governance vacuum.

Does the Minister of Health believe the governance structure in our health-care system is adequate currently, and if not, what are they doing to fix it?

**MLA Asagwara:** Honourable Speaker, we've been very clear on this side of the House that the additional levels of bureaucracy, the complicated governance 'structure'—structure, rather, created by Heather Stefanson and the previous PC government, needs to be addressed—part of the reason why we disbanded the task force and made sure we're investing dollars and strengthening health care here at home.

It's why we're on a listening tour, listening to folks on the front lines. It's why I will continue to meet with provincial clinical leads and specialists across the province as we work together to clean up the mess and the damage done by the previous government.

Honourable Speaker, I welcome those questions each and every day because on this side of the House, we are accountable, something Manitobans didn't have for seven and a half years—

**The Speaker:** Member's time has expired.

### **Holocaust Education Curriculum Development**

**MLA Mike Moroz (River Heights):** Yesterday I was honoured to observe Yom HaShoah along with my colleagues and members of the Jewish community from across our city.

Anti-Semitism is on the rise, and it's imperative that students learn about the Holocaust. We are one Manitoba that cannot be divided by hatred.

Our government vows to never forget, and we made an important commitment in Budget 2024 to ensure students of today and in the future also never forget.

Can the Minister of Education please update the House on the important announcement made yesterday?

**Hon. Nello Altomare (Minister of Education and Early Childhood Learning):** I want to thank my colleague for River Heights for that important question.

Yesterday on Yom HaShoah, we announced that all Manitoba students will learn about the Holocaust in provincial curricula. The Province has hired dedicated staff and is partnering with the Jewish heritage centre to develop new curriculum guidance on Holocaust education.

The K to 11 mandatory social studies curriculum will be renewed in '24-2025 with a focus on increasing learners' understanding of how contemporary anti-Semitism, racism and inequality issues are entrenched in history, and how we can all work towards unity with that—

**The Speaker:** Member's time has expired.

### **Random Acts of Violence Business Closure Concerns**

**Mr. Wayne Balcaen (Brandon West):** Under this government's short seven months, we've seen multiple business closures citing safety concerns. To quote one earlier this year: me and my staff do not feel it's a safe place to work, and I table this article.

This minister wants to pretend that things are getting better with nothing to support that claim. This Premier (Mr. Kinew) must be keenly aware of the increased violence in the constituency, as he took steps to move his office out of that area. Not to mention the Premier himself refuses to reside in his own constituency and is represented in this House by River Heights.

Why is this minister refusing to acknowledge the increase in random violence under his watch?

**Hon. Matt Wiebe (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Again, Honourable Speaker, talk but no action from the members opposite.

What have they done in opposition? What is their record in opposition is holding up important legislation before this Legislature on unexplained wealth.

Why do they stand against the Deputy Chief Scot Halley, who said unexplained wealth orders will provide a much-needed tool to deter the accumulation of wealth from organized crime and other criminal activity?

Why do they stand—why do they think they know better than Randy Lewis, the acting chief of the Brandon Police Service, who said Unexplained Wealth Act will make it more difficult for criminals to hide their dirty money and provide a mechanism for it to be taken from them?

All they do is obstruct. They do nothing to work with community. We're getting it—

**The Speaker:** Member's time has expired.

The time for oral questions has expired.

### Introduction of Guests

**The Speaker:** And I would like to introduce some guests in the gallery.

We have with us today seated in the public gallery, from Wild Rose School, 10 grade 5 to 9 students under the direction of Reginald Isaac. They're the guests of the honourable member for La Vérendrye (Mr. Narth).

### PETITIONS

**The Speaker:** The—*[interjection]* Order, please.

#### Removal of Federal Carbon Tax

**Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Leader of the Official Opposition):** I just thought maybe the Deputy Premier had a petition or something.

But, Honourable Speaker, I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to this petition is as follows:

Number 1. The federal government—

**The Speaker:** Order. *[interjection]* Order, please.

I previously cautioned members about adding punctuation and spelling words, and I advised members to please cease doing that, so I have to ask the Leader of the Official Opposition to not do it. Read it as it's intended to be read.

**Mr. Ewasko:** I take your advice on not talking about grammar and punctuation, thank you. So I'll start again.

\* (14:30)

Honourable Speaker, I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) The federal government has mandated a consumption-based carbon tax, with the stated goal of financially pressuring Canadians to make decisions to reduce their carbon emissions.

(2) Manitoba Hydro estimates that, even with a high-efficiency furnace, the carbon tax is costing the average family over \$200 annually, even more for those with older furnaces.

Number three—*[interjection]* Honourable Speaker, I'm having difficulties carrying on with the petition with the amount of controversy, it seems, that the Deputy Premier and others are having in the Chamber.

**The Speaker:** Order, please.

I would ask the Leader of the Official Opposition to pick up where he left off reading his petition, please.

**Mr. Ewasko:** Thank you, Honourable Speaker, for your guidance.

(2) Manitoba Hydro estimates that, even with a high-efficiency furnace, the carbon tax is costing the average family over \$200 annually, even more for those with older furnaces.

(3) Home heating in Manitoba is not a choice or a decision for Manitobans to make; it is a necessity of life, with an average of almost 200 days below 0°C annually.

(4) The federal government has selectively removed the carbon tax off of home heating oil in the Atlantic provinces of Canada, but has indicated they have no intention to provide the same relief to Manitobans heating their homes.

(5) Manitoba Hydro indicates that natural gas heating is one of the most affordable options available to Manitobans, and it can be cost prohibitive for households to replace their heating source.

(6) Premiers across Canada, including in the Atlantic provinces that benefit from this decision, have collectively sent a letter to the federal government,

calling on it to extend the carbon tax exemption to all forms of home heating, with the exception of Manitoba.

(7) Manitoba is one of the only provincial jurisdictions to have not agreed with the stance that all Canadians' home heating bills should be exempt from the carbon tax.

(8) Provincial leadership in other jurisdictions have already committed to removing the federal carbon tax from home heating bills.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to remove the federal carbon tax on home heating bills for all Manitobans to provide them much-needed relief.

This petition is signed by Christian Hince, Melanie Laviolette, Nova Coates and many other fine Manitobans.

### Medical Assistance in Dying

**Mr. Josh Guenter (Borderland):** Honourable Speaker, I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly.

To the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, these are the reasons for this petition:

(1) Persons struggling with mental health as their sole condition may access medical assistance in dying unless Parliament intervenes.

(2) Suicidality is often a symptom of mental illness, and suicide is the second leading cause of death for Canadians between the age of 10 and 19.

(3) There have been reports of the unsolicited introduction of medical assistance in dying to non-seeking persons, including Canadian veterans, as a solution for their medical and mental health issues.

(4) Legal and medical experts are deeply concerned that permitting Canadians suffering from depression and other mental illnesses to access euthanasia would undermine suicide prevention efforts and risk normalizing suicide as a solution for those suffering from mental illness.

(5) The federal government is bound by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms to advance and protect the life, liberty and security of its citizens.

(6) Manitobans consider it a priority to ensure that adequate supports are in place for the mental health of all Canadians.

(7) Vulnerable Manitobans must be given suicide prevention counselling instead of suicide assistance, and

(8) The federal government should focus on increasing mental health supports to provinces and improve access to these supports, instead of offering medical assistance in dying for those with mental illness.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

(1) To urge the provincial government to lobby the federal government to stop the expansion of medical assistance in dying to those for whom mental illness is the sole condition, and

(2) To urge the provincial government to lobby the federal government to protect Canadians struggling with mental illness by facilitating treatment, recovery and medical assistance in living, not death.

This petition has been signed by Andreas Epp, Peter Heide, Larissa Epp and many, many Manitobans.

**The Speaker:** No further petitions? Moving on to grievances.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

*(Continued)*

### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

#### House Business

**Hon. Matt Wiebe (Acting Government House Leader):** Honourable Speaker, pursuant to Rule 34(7), I am announcing that the private member's resolution to be considered on the next Tuesday of private members' business will be the one put forward by the honourable member for Thompson (MLA Redhead). The title of this resolution is Affordability in the North.

**The Speaker:** It has been announced that pursuant to Rule 34(7), that the private member's resolution to be considered on the next Tuesday of private members' business will be one put forward by the honourable member for Thompson. The title of the resolution is Affordability in the North.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Wiebe:** Could you please call the continuation of second reading debate of Bill 30, The Unexplained Wealth Act, criminal property forfeiture act and corporations act amendment—amended, followed by second reading of Bill 31, The Captured Carbon Storage Act, followed by second reading of Bill 29, The Body Armour and Fortified Vehicle Control Amendment Act.

**The Speaker:** It has been announced that we will resume second reading debate on Bill 30, The Unexplained Wealth Act, followed by debate on Bill 31, The Captured Carbon Storage Act, followed by debate on The Body Armour and Fortified Vehicle Control Amendment Act.

## DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

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

**The Speaker:** So we are resuming debate on Bill 30 and the proposed motion of amendment brought forward by the member for Interlake-Gimli (Mr. Johnson), that the motion be amended by deleting—okay.

The honourable member—standing in the name of the honourable member for Steinbach, who has 19 minutes remaining. [*interjection*] Four minutes.

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

**The Speaker:** Order, order, order, order. Order. Order. Order.

The honourable member for Steinbach has four minutes.

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

**Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach):** I'm so disappointed, because it felt like I was just concluding my introductory comments yesterday and then my 26 minutes was over.

\* (14:40)

But I do want to then summarize, I suppose, in the four minutes that I have left, to remind the Attorney General, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Wiebe), that the reason we are still debating this bill is because he failed to answer questions related to the bill when he had the opportunity during the question period; questions that were significant and important about how this bill is different in any meaningful way from the legislation that already exists in Manitoba.

*Mr. Tyler Blashko, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair*

I know as I mentioned yesterday, that the very capable officials in his department could provide him the information. I suspect they've already provided him the information he didn't have or didn't understand when the questions were asked now several weeks ago. And he should make an effort to provide those to the House now, or to make an undertaking that he will provide them at the very least, at committee.

But he is the reason why this bill has now been delayed. It is critically important that we as legislators know what it is that we're debating and what it is that we're passing and it's the responsibility, the accountability of a minister to be able to bring forward those answers.

So he has that opportunity still to do that today, to provide the answers. I'm sure that we'd all like to hear them. But in the absence of that, he's going to continue to hear opposition members do their job and ask that those answers be provided before this bill moves on to the next stage.

I am again heartened that the bill didn't get tacked onto BITSA and that we can actually have a debate about it, that it didn't get buried into an 'omnibal' bill like so much of their legislative agenda, Honourable Speaker.

And I think it speaks to the arrogance that this government has quickly assumed: an arrogance that prevents them from wanting to answer questions from the opposition; an arrogance that prevents them from wanting to hear from the public by way of public presentations at committee; an arrogance that says to them that they have the moral authority to take a significant part of their legislative agenda and try to add it onto a budget bill and prevent Manitobans from properly having the democratic right, through the democratic process that we have normally in this House on bills, a process actually that we often—and I've heard the member opposite say, rightfully, that we're unique in Canada with this process, that we value the process of hearing from presenters at committee.

They say those sort of things, but then they don't actually back it up. They say that they lift up individuals with their words but then they let them down with their actions.

Already we've seen a government that has fallen into a strong arrogance; that they don't believe that they have to properly act in this House or fulfill the responsibilities that they have as ministers.

Now, I might hear from individuals across the way or from other places in Manitoba. They might very well say to me, well, you know, what does it matter if the government has become arrogant this early in their legislative term. Actually, I mean, I hear the Premier (Mr. Kinew) talk about walking in humility, but that's not clearly what's happening with their actions.

It doesn't bother me that the government is—become arrogant so early in their legislative term because

arrogance ultimately results in a government being defeated. So the fact that they've become arrogant so quickly after assuming their offices and don't want to answer questions and don't want to have the public hear about their bills doesn't bother me at all because it just means that they'll be out of government faster than they might be otherwise. And I think, for Manitobans, that's a good thing overall.

Thank you very much, Honourable Speaker, for the opportunity to speak to this legislation.

**Hon. Matt Wiebe (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** I—pleased to rise to put a few words on the record with regard to this spurious amendment that's been brought forward by the opposition.

And, you know, it's unfortunate that the former failed Justice Minister missed my original—I guess maybe he wasn't paying attention to what was happening in the House. He missed my original comments which, I think, would have helped educate him on many of the important ways that this bill is different and strengthens the current act that's—that was passed before the Legislature.

He could have listened. You know and, in fact, it's alright because you don't even need to be in the House and paying attention. You can go back to Hansard and he could have read my comments if he wasn't willing to listen to them at the time.

And of course he came into the House and he hijacked the question period. Again, to my critic who came—you know, dutifully came to the bill briefing, asked good questions of officials, you know, understood and seemed to understand the importance of the legislation, spoke, I'm sure, with his former colleagues in Brandon and throughout the province who have been telling him, this is what we're asking for; pass this legislation.

Instead, the former minister of Justice hijacked that question period and decided not to ask relevant, real questions about the legislation, but, in fact, decided to try to just simply defend, again, his record as a Stefanson PC Cabinet minister, and try once again to convince the people, you know, re-litigate the 2023 election one more time, and to say, no, no, no, we were actually—we were totally right and, you know, Heather Stefanson should be the premier again.

Well, of course, Manitobans reject—*[interjection]*

Okay, let the record show that the member for Brandon West (Mr. Balcaen) applauded the former premier, Heather Stefanson, and the deplorable

campaign that she ran of division in this province. And I hope that he takes that message to the good people of Brandon West. The—I hope he takes that message to the good people of Brandon West, that he supports Heather Stefanson and her policies.

But I—what I also heard—and this is somewhat encouraging, actually—is I heard very clearly the former failed minister of Justice say to this House, on the record, that once the questions that he specifically has—because, again, I know that the member for Brandon West knows the answers to these questions; he was at the bill briefing. He's former law enforcement. He knows how important this is to law enforcement.

But the member—the former member, who—I guess he doesn't have a team of people briefing him anymore. It's a lot of work to be in the opposition; I know this. And he has, you know, the opportunity to do a little bit of research on his own, but it can be difficult. So he doesn't know the answers.

But what I heard him say, very clearly, right? And we can go back in Hansard; we can double check this. He said once these questions are answered, once this spurious amendment has been disproven and dispelled, that, of course, the members opposite will support The Unexplained Wealth Act. Well, that's great. It sounds like we're going to move on; we've got important legislation in this House to debate once we get this done. I'm excited; we're going to get this moving this afternoon. So I know that our team is going to be very excited to move forward on that.

So to address, specifically, the issues brought forward by the member opposite. So, first of all, again, he forgot he—I don't know if I should characterize this as forgot or, you know, I got to be careful, my language here, about presence in the House. But I will suggest, though, that the opening statement, so—which is the opportunity for all members to hear, at second reading, a little bit more detail about the bill, which was given to members opposite. He had the opportunity, again, to hear that while I gave it, which was only minutes before his questions, or he could've gone back to Hansard, but he didn't.

And he was concerned, again, about the Cullen Commission, which, of course, is an important development in the area of criminal property forfeiture. Just as a quick history lesson, members opposite—and many are new members, many members on this side of the House are also new members; I've been in the House for a minute now, but there are members who have been here longer. And so, if we're really going

back to the Gary Doer days, the members—some members opposite will be able to educate the rest of their caucus to say that this was actually brought forward under the Gary Doer government.

These kind of orders were leading the country, leading the continent, and I would suggest even leading the world in terms of their efficacy of going after organized crime and using the proceeds of crime to—in a positive way. And so brought forward by a former member—former minister of Justice under Gary Doer's government, and then—and then—*[interjection]*

See, the member from Springfield has—he's been around a few years now, and I don't want to out him exactly how many. I know some members are checking their history books and going back a few pages just to figure out exactly when he showed up in this place.

But he'll remember that Gary Doer brought this legislation forward, and I would suggest—I haven't done the research—but I would suggest there was probably something that was, I hope, supported by all members in the Chamber.

And then members opposite like to talk about the fact that, you know, they came along, and they said, oh, wait a minute, good idea from Gary Doer. Maybe we should do something similar.

\* (14:50)

So, of course, they came along; they tried to strengthen it.

And so then in the 2023 campaign, what we identified was there was additional needs, because of the Cullen—report of the Cullen Commission and because of many other factors, and practical on-the-ground use of this legislation, that it was an opportunity for us to strengthen it.

So did we, you know, hide this in some big policy book or platform book that nobody read? No.

In fact, we went out—well, first of all, while members opposite were taking a vacation last summer, it was the first campaign announcement that we make. I'm looking at members on this side of the House. They remember words from the now-Premier (Mr. Kinew), talking about the importance of public safety throughout the province. He put that on the record as the first plank in our platform and the first priority that we'd have.

And what did we then do dutifully? We went out and we knocked on every door in Manitoba three

times—I'm looking at the member for St. Boniface (MLA Loiselle), and I'm looking at the member for River Heights (MLA Moroz)—well, six times, maybe, the member for Kirkfield Park (Mr. Oxenham)—I think I was with you for at least a couple of those.

We knocked on every single door in the province, and what did we say? We said we're going after organized crime. We're going after organized crime with an unexplained wealth act, and we're going to do it in a way that strengthens the tools that law enforcement have.

That was a our message. That was one of the first things we talked about. It was one of things that we talked about most consistently throughout the campaign.

Members opposite, of course, chose a different path. They chose a different set of issues to talk about, issues that the member for Brandon West (Mr. Balcaen) now says he's very proud to have supported in the campaign, while Manitobans were telling us there was something serious. There was something serious about public safety that needed to be addressed, and one way to do that is to work with our partners in law enforcement, strengthen The Unexplained Wealth Act bring it to the Legislature, get it done. That's what they told us. Get it done.

What did we do? We brought it forward to the Legislature as one of the first suite of bills that we brought to this place and, you know, and we expected—well, I know the members opposite, you know, certainly didn't run on this issue, but they would see the common sense importance of doing this.

They would pick up the phone and they would call law enforcement. They would talk to their former colleagues, in some cases, or their other connections in their own communities, and they would say, hey, so there's an Unexplained Wealth Act. It strengthens the unexplained wealth orders that have been in place before, and is this an important tool that you could use?

And they'd hear unanimous support of this. That's what they would hear. I know they would. But did they do that? No. Apparently not.

In fact, what ended up happening from the members opposite is, well, you know, new members, I guess they don't know exactly the strength of their voice within caucus, or maybe they just don't have, you know, the confidence to do this at this point.

But instead of standing up, instead of stepping up, supporting law enforcement and making—doing the right thing, making a good decision for the people of Manitoba, instead they listened to political operatives behind the scenes, maybe, or maybe even sitting right in this House; folks who put politics ahead of what's right for Manitobans.

And I got a big problem with that, because while members opposite will know, I'm somebody who takes his partisan job very seriously. And I will do that at every step, when it comes to serious, important legislation, when it comes to things that will make a difference in the public safety of our province, when it comes to things that law enforcement has been calling out for. Well, that's beyond politics to me. That's where we get together and we pass important pieces of legislation.

I hope that members opposite are having these conversations in their caucus. I hope that it's a tough lobbying effort from members who share that viewpoint. I know it's tough to sometimes break through the former Heather Stefanson Cabinet ministers who continue to obstruct and do things the old way. But we're one Manitoba now, and so it's a time to put that in the past, but what was in the past, when the past come together support this kind of good legislation.

But anyway, I will maybe just answer more directly some of the concerns that the member opposite, particularly the member for Steinbach (Mr. Goertzen), had.

So the amended provisions that we're talking about here today factored in the specific recommendations as put forward by the Cullen Commission. This was a public inquiry into money laundering in Canada, and it came out of Manitoba's original legislation.

So, again, we were leaders in the country. We're simply saying it's time to retake that mantle and be, once again, leaders across the nation.

Manitoba's director, here, of Criminal Property Forfeiture testified before the commission as an expert witness. And, you know, maybe I'll just take a quick pause, Deputy Speaker, to say how thoroughly impressed I am with the work of our public service, of all the members and individuals in the Department of Manitoba Justice, but specifically within Criminal Property Forfeiture. These are high-level, incredibly talented, incredibly smart, incredibly dedicated folks who do this work, who bridge, in many cases, the gaps or the—make connections between law enforcement, between the Crowns and between some of the folks

who are doing some of these most intense investigations in law enforcement and throughout our province.

The kind of co-ordination and collaboration that's done behind the scenes is incredible. It's incredible. And she is somebody who testified before the Cullen Commission as an expert witness. This is the kind of talent that we bring—Manitoba brings—to the table. When we had directors from across the county come, I guess it was in the fall—*[interjection]*—yes. And member opposite from Brandon West knows this well, we were able to hold our heads high to say we've been leaders, we've got great staff in the department and we are bringing forward the unexplained wealth act to shoot us right back to the top of the list in terms of being effective against organized crime.

So this was a proud moment for me, as minister, to say, you know, it's a step in the background, this is really the work that's being done. And it's being done because of the work of the Cullen Commission, the identified gaps that are—that exist, and again, working with the department, we know that this is a need.

The amended provisions were designed to deal with specific jurisprudential challenges in other jurisdictions. In particular, there's a challenge in a case out of the UK known as Baker. Those changes represent important differences, for example, by redefining who can be the subject of an order to ensure that carefully laundered dirty assets are in Manitoba. They cannot evade justice.

This is an important point that I want to highlight for members opposite, because we know that, while organized crime certainly operates in Manitoba, we also know that there are serious connections that have developed to international organizations.

And so as they become more sophisticated, we need to become more sophisticated. And this is the incredible work that our investigators are doing. And what they're asking for now is the tools to be able to go across jurisdictions and be able to do this kind of work.

This is an important point and a point—important point—that the members opposite, once this is passed, will want to go to their constituents and say, this is how we're going after organized crime.

And finally, the amendments are—also carefully considered innovations from British Columbia, which introduced the device in 2023 and are currently applying it in three different cases before the courts.

So this is an important point to make, is that these tools are not being used. The members opposite say, well, it already exists in Manitoba. We already have these tools. They're not being used because they don't—they're not robust enough. They're not robust enough for law enforcement and for our folks to be able to use them in the way that members opposite may have intended them to be used.

So, like, again, we can argue about who came first and who's going to stand up taller when it comes to getting this done, but the reality is, is what the members opposite are doing are actually preventing real-world cases from moving forward because they're blocking this legislation.

\* (15:00)

This is real. This isn't just a debate. This isn't just words in this Legislature. These are real effects that law enforcement are feeling out in the field.

So why wouldn't we move this forward? We can have the argument afterwards about who did it first or who did it best, or, I don't know—even know what the—I don't even know what the conversation is anymore.

What is this debate about? I hear members one after another get up and say they support this. I look over at the member for Brandon West (Mr. Balcaen) during my entire speech here, he's nodding his head. He's nodding his head the entire time, right? I mean, members opposite see this.

So, they agree. In fact, they're—they were very careful in their—well, it's called a reasoned amendment, but I mean, let's get real here. I think any reasonable Manitoban would see this is posturing and political games that are happening here.

But I see the member opposite nodding his head the entire time I'm speaking. He knows this to be true, and so I just simply ask him to put the politics aside for a day and get this done so that Manitobans can be safer and that law enforcement can feel that we are supporting them as legislators. That's what we do here. They're doing the work out in the field; what we get to do is we get to support them and show them support. So I hope that the members opposite will do that.

Bill 30 contains—excuse me, Honourable Deputy Speaker—Bill 30 contains an interpretive provision for the proposed subsection 1(2), which provides much greater detail on what constitutes an interest in a property. This provision states that persons who have beneficial interest in the property through one or more

trusts, corporations or other arrangements have an interest in the property. This provision also recognizes persons who can exercise control over a property through a family or a business relationship that also have an interest in that property.

This clarifying language better reflects the difference—different arrangements used by criminals to launder funds and requires judges to look beyond persons who have a clear, documented interest in the property.

When a respondent is a corporation or a partnership, Bill 30 also allows a responsible officer of the respondent to be named as a respondent. This is in subsection 2.4(3). This enables the director of Criminal Property Forfeiture to compel information from a specified director, officer or partner who may have a better understanding of the complex relationships involved to provide information rather than a puppet figure who may be offered up by a respondent, corporation or partnership.

Again, this is nation-leading legislation. This is exactly what law enforcement has been asking for. The criminal organizations get more sophisticated; we need to keep up. That's why we ran on this in the campaign, that's why Manitobans supported us. Now it's time for these members opposite to put down their partisan affiliation. Heather Stefanson is gone, Honourable Deputy Speaker. They don't need to placate her priorities or her direction in the party anymore.

They need to stand up, they need to have a backbone and they need to stand with law enforcement. There's no supervision anymore. It's now up to each individual member to look into his or her conscience and understand how important this legislation is.

The current act, bill—17.18, imposes a rebuttable presumption that property is the proceeds of unlawful activity or an instrument of unlawful activity. It does not provide all of the required information by the specified deadline in a CSO, or in a CSO.

Bill 30 provides that this consequence will apply if the respondent knowingly makes a false or misleading response, or provided documents in a response to an unexplained wealth order that are not authentic. This is the opportunity that we have as Justice, as the Department of Justice, as the support to the work that's being done by investigators, to compel evidence, or compel answers about where this property is coming from, where this unexplained wealth is coming from.

Because we know that when you go after organized crime, when you go after individuals who

have this property, they have no answers, right? Because it's been obtained illegally.

And so that—this is where our opportunity comes. This is where we have an opportunity to have an influence in what's happening on the streets in a very real way.

And again, I'll just put it on the record, Honourable Deputy Speaker, because, you know, members opposite—I'm sure, I hope—have picked up the phone. They've talked to their own folks, their own contacts within law enforcement. I hope that they've heard this message loud and clear about the importance of this.

But just to put it on the record, the president of the Manitoba Association of Chiefs of Police—this is Deputy Chief Scot Halley, he's with the WPS; many folks will know Scot. And, again, when I'm talking about kudos to those folks who are doing this work, I am absolutely blown away by the professionalism and by the effort that's put in by law enforcement.

We had an opportunity—as an aside, Honourable Speaker—to be at the Winnipeg police headquarters just the other day to see a very significant bust that was made by the Winnipeg Police Service in conjunction with the Brandon Police Service, in conjunction with the police service in Toronto and over in BC, to go after organized crime. I sat a few feet away from 3-D-printed handguns—3-D-printed handguns—that are—that were taken off the streets because of the work that was done by the Winnipeg Police Service.

This is the kind of work that we want to support. This is the kind of work—Bill 29, literally, the work that we're asking members opposite to get out of the way for so that we can get to Bill 29, so that we can pass that bill as well on hidden compartments in vehicles. This is—we literally have a \$450,000 vehicle that won't be able to be used in Manitoba for training or other purposes because members opposite are holding up the legislation. Like, this is happening right now. This is literally, go down to the Winnipeg police headquarters and you can talk to them there, and they'll tell you all about the work that they did to 'confiscate' this vehicle.

So members of the law enforcement, members of the Winnipeg Police Service, including Deputy Chief Scot Halley, called for this. They said, quote, unexplained wealth orders will provide a much-needed tool to deter the accumulation of wealth from organized crime and other criminal activity.

We heard from Randy Lewis, the acting chief of the Brandon Police Service. I know for a fact the

member opposite from Brandon West knows this outstanding officer well. Had a chance to meet and chat with him this past week, of course, constituency week this last week, we were away from the House, gave me an opportunity to travel. Spent some time in Swan River meeting with folks there. I know that the member for Dauphin (Mr. Kostyshyn) here is passionate about public safety in the Parkland and up in the Swan Valley; he's talked to me and brought issues to my attention many times, issues of concern.

We had some time up in the Swan Valley, and then we had an opportunity to come down to Brandon and to meet with folks in the Assiniboine Community College public safety program, where we actually had a great conversation with the mayor, with the chief of police, with the various police forces that work together to keep people safe out in Westman and in Brandon.

And so it's not a surprise, because when I, you know, in terms of the public comments. I talked with the chief just last week, and so when I saw this quote, I thought this lined up very closely with what we had talked about and some of the concerns that they had brought forward. But it was Randy Lewis who said, quote, The Unexplained Wealth Act will make it more difficult for criminals to hide their dirty money, and provide a mechanism for it to be taken from them.

So there it is. A member of the law enforcement that the member from Brandon West knows well, respects, I hope is listening to, is telling this member directly that it's time for him to do his job, now, in this Legislature. Because now he has a chance not just talk the talk, but walk the walk. Make the changes that will support law enforcement, make the changes that they are asking for. He has an opportunity now.

\* (15:10)

He did good work out on the streets as chief of police in Brandon, and then he gets to this place and he loses his spine. He forgets those people who are doing the work. He forgets the people who are out on the front lines working every day to keep our communities safe. And he plays political games, and he listens to people who have never experienced the work that he did, that have no idea—that have no idea—what it's like out in the communities that he used to represent.

They think it's a game, that it's just a bunch of words, but we know we're hearing from people directly who are saying words count. In this case, legislation matters, and if they'd just get out of the way, because

I know a few of them got their foot halfway out the door already—that's not a comment on anybody's presence in the Chamber, merely a rhetorical flourish. Get out of the way. Let members opposite who actually want to do good things get the work done.

It's too important. This legislation is too important to play political games. Every day that we delay this legislation, we deprive law enforcement of these tools, these crucial tools that we have. Every day that we delay this legislation, victims are falling victim to organized crime. Every day we delay this legislation, toxic drugs come into our communities.

So let's get to work, let's do what we're supposed to do in this Legislature and let's support our law enforcement.

Now, I—you know, I just, I heard members opposite say, well, now I'm putting too many words on the record. You know, you just can't win. Some days they say we're not doing—we're not bringing forward legislation. Now we're bringing forward legislation too much, or I'm—you know, they just spoke 20-plus hours on something they all apparently agree on. They all wanted to have their say, and now, they think they all want to have their say again. So I just—I don't think you can win with members opposite.

But I want to be very clear here, Honourable Speaker, because the failed former Justice minister stood in his place and he said, if you simply answer my questions, if you give me examples, if you just tell me—just answer my questions, he says, as if I did, you know, 15 minutes of questions from, you know, good questions, I would suggest, from, you know, members like the member for Brandon West (Mr. Balcaen) and others. You know, if you just answer the questions, we will pass this today; that's what he said.

So here we are, Honourable Speaker, again. Day after day of delay and wasted time by the members opposite. Tactics, political tactics—

**An Honourable Member:** They don't care.

**Mr. Wiebe:** You know, the member for St. Johns (MLA Fontaine) suggests they don't care. I think she's right.

But they have a chance now to prove that they do care. And they have a chance to follow through on the words of the former failed Justice minister. They have a chance to simply say, you're right. We've heard from law enforcement, we know that this is important, we know that this closes some gaps, we know that this will support the good work in the Department of

Justice, and they can just say, we're going to get out of the way. That's all we're asking for. It's not much.

Get out of the way. Let us get to work.

Thank you, Honourable Speaker.

**MLA Jeff Bereza (Portage la Prairie):** I take pleasure with speaking here today, but I also take some exception.

And one of the reasons why—and I'll say this—I was heckling across to the Justice Minister was about Portage la Prairie. Because Portage la Prairie is the constituency that I represent, and I did take some advice from many different people. I went on a listening tour last week, and one of the things that I heard during this listening tour is if I could provide some information to the people of the constituency of Portage la Prairie regarding Bill 30, The Unexplained Wealth Act. And there was some questions I certainly couldn't—I couldn't answer, and again, it's why the amendment that we're talking about here.

So again, before endorsing the enactment of Bill 30, it's imperative to assess the—and this is from notes that I gathered from last week on the listening tour. Before endorsing the enactment of Bill 30, it's imperative to assess the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of existing legislation pertaining to unexplained wealth and illicit financial activities. Legislation passed in 2021 likely addressed similar concerns, necessitating a thorough examination of its provisions and enforcement mechanism.

I guess what the people from Portage la Prairie were telling me on the listening tour was that we needed to listen to them, because again, are we just trying to introduce legislation just because? How much money are we going to spend of these people's money in Portage la Prairie, because I asked the Justice 'minister' several times about Portage la Prairie, and I, again, one of the questions that I didn't hear is who was consulted in Portage la Prairie. Because on the listening tour, from what I understand, nobody from Portage la Prairie was consulted on this.

So an example, the money laundering act passed in 2021 includes stringent measures to combat money laundering and illicit financial activities. It establishes reporting requirements for financial institutions. It imposes penalties for non-compliance. It enhances regulatory oversight. Thus any new legislation such as Bill 30 should demonstrate how it complements or improves upon the existing provisions.

A comparative analysis between Bill 30 and the legislation passed in 2021 is essentially identifying any substantive differences, innovations introduced in the proposed bill. This analysis involves scrutinizing the scope, objectives, enforcement mechanisms and procedural safeguards outlined in both legislative frameworks. Again, how is the bill that is being proposed right now, how is it any different?

If Bill 30 introduces new enforcement tools or expands definition of the explained wealth beyond what is covered in existing legislation, it must clearly articulate it and substantiate it with evidence demonstrating the necessity for such a provision.

For instance, if the proposed bill introduces civil forfeiture provisions targeting unexplained wealth acquired through criminal activity, it should be accompanied by data illustrating the 'inaquacies' of existing forfeiture mechanisms in deterring illicit financial flows. Again, if there's no difference that we're talking about here, then why are we spending taxpayers' money?

Is it important that we are here speaking—and I'm elected here to speak upon these amendments that we're talking about here. If it's not up to all of us, we're all out there to look after all Manitobans, and some of those Manitobans that we are looking after are the ones in the Portage la Prairie constituency where I was on the listening tour. Fulfill responsibility. It's all about this legislation to make sure that we are fulfilling that. Sorry.

\* (15:20)

Honourable Deputy Speaker, comparative analysis between Bill 30 and the legislation passed in 2021 is essential in identifying any substantive differences or innovations introduced in the proposed bill. This analysis involves scrutinizing the scope, objectives, enforcement mechanisms and procedural safeguards outlined in both legislative frameworks.

If—again, if Bill 30 introduces new enforcement tools or expands the definition of an unexplained wealth beyond what is covered in the existing legislation, it must be articulated. For instance, if the proposed bill introduces civil forfeiture, targeting unexplained—it needs to be illustrated.

Evidence-based approach. Central to the amendment is the instance on an evidence-based approach to legislative decision making. The absence of evidence or data highlighting the necessity for the distinct legislation raises concerns regarding the justification for enacting Bill 30.

Policymakers must demand comprehensive evidence demonstrating of—existing laws and novel legislative intervention. If proponents of Bill 30 argue that existing legislation lacks sufficient provisions to address the complexities of the unexplained wealth acquired through 'cypro'—sorry, cryptocurrency transactions, they should provide case studies, expert analysis and stakeholder testimonies demonstrating the 'inaquacy' or current regulatory frameworks in this regard.

Without such evidence, it is challenging to justify the need for additional legislative measures targeting this specific issue.

I want to make it clear that I've spent a number of hours speaking with the member from Brandon West, looking for his expertise on this to see where the differences are, because I—you know, I was concerned that maybe some of my constituents in Portage la Prairie, that we were missing something. But again, from the information that we gathered here, there just wasn't enough information provided.

Transparency and accountability. Furthermore, transparency and accountability are fundamental principles that underpin the legislation process. The reasoned amendment emphasizes the importance of transparency in explaining the rationale behind the proposed legislation and ensuring accountability in safeguarding the public interest. By demanding evidence sustain the need for Bill 30, legislators uphold these principles and reinforce public trust in the legislative process.

An example of that is transparency in legislative decision making entails publicly disclosing the consultations, research and analysis undertaken to formulate and justify proposed laws. If proponents of Bill 30 conducted stakeholder consultations or commissioned research studies to assess the effectiveness of existing legislation and identify gaps, they should make these findings available to the public and legislative colleagues.

This transparency fosters informed debate and enables stakeholders to assess the validity of the proposed amendments. Again, the member from Brandon West, it was some of the questions that I've asked him. And one of the reasons that I've asked him those questions is because my constituents that I represent are asking me.

The reasoned amendment advocating for clarifying and—for clarity and evidence in support of Bill 30, The Unexplained Wealth Act, in Manitoba, is grounded in the principles of transparency, accountability and

evidence-based policymaking. By scrutinizing the necessity and distinctiveness of the proposed legislation, laws passed in 2021, legislators uphold their responsibility to enact laws that are effective, efficient and responsive to the evolving challenges of combatting illicit financial activities and preserving the integrity of our financial system.

Again, all I'm trying to do here is making sure that everybody is represented here. But I can't speak outside of my constituency of Portage la Prairie because that's where I listen to my constituents to hear that.

As the opposition party, it's imperative to strategically approach the reasoned amendment proposed to Bill 30, The Unexplained Wealth Act in Manitoba, to make it more attractive and compelling to both lawmakers and the public by adopting a proactive, strategic approach. On this side, we effectively leverage—on this side, we can effectively leverage its position to advocate for substantive changes and enhancements to the proposed legislation.

This comprehensive analysis will explore various strategies and tactics that the opposition party could employ to enhance the appeal of the reasoned amendment and garner broader support for its adoption.

Number 1: they emphasize the importance of evidence-based policy making. One of the central pillars of the reasoned amendment is the insistence on evidence-based policy making by highlighting the absence of compelling evidence demonstrating the differentiation between Bill 30 and existing legislation passed in 2021. We, the opposition, can position itself as a champion of transparency, accountability and informed decision making. And that's what the people that elected me in Portage la Prairie have asked me to do, and this is what I'm bringing forward today.

Advocate for comprehensive comparative analysis. In advocating for the reasoned amendment, this PC Party can call for a comprehensive comparative analysis between Bill 30 and the legislation passed in 2021.

This analysis should scrutinize the scope, objectives, enforcement mechanism and procedural safeguards embedded within both legislative frameworks by demanding a thorough examination of differences and innovations introduced in Bill 30 through legislative scrutiny and robust policy making.

And again, I didn't hear—and I listened very intently again today for the answers on that—and I did not hear those answers from the Justice Minister today.

Propose amendments to address identity-identified gaps to make the reasoned amendment more attractive, our party can propose amendments aimed at addressing any identified gaps or deficiencies in Bill 30. These amendments could include provisions to enhance the effectiveness, clarity and accountability of the proposed legislation, thereby garnering broader support across party lines, by offering constructive suggestions for improving Bill 30, our team can position itself as a proactive and constructive force in the legislative process.

Engage stakeholders and solicit expert input to bolster the credibility and persuasive appeal of the reasoned amendment can engage with stakeholders, experts and affected communities to solicit their input and feedback.

And again, I want to ask again, because I asked it earlier today: What did the people of the constituency of Portage la Prairie have to say, or were they not important enough to be asked?

\*(15:30)

By hosting public forums, expert panels and stakeholder consultations, the opposition—the government can gather valuable insight and perspectives to inform its advocacy efforts. By amplifying the voices of stakeholders and experts, the government can demonstrate its commitment to inclusive and 'participatory' policy-making.

Leverage public opinion and media outreach. In advocating for reasoned amendment, can leverage public input and media outreach to amplify its message and mobilize support. By disseminating key messages through press releases, op-eds, social media campaigns and public statements, we can raise awareness together about the importance of evidence-based policy-making and the need for substantive changes to Bill 30.

By framing the reasoned amendment as responsible to the public concerns and a reflection of democratic values, we can gain public support. We want to make sure that the public knows that we are not wasting money on just another piece of legislation. Is this enhancing what we already have? We can gain public support and have the government reconsider its position.

Part—it—conclusion to this part of it is a party—that this party has a critical role to play in enhancing the appeal of the reasoned amendment to Bill 30, The Unexplained Wealth Act in Manitoba by strategically advocating for evidence-based policy-making, calling

for comprehensive analysis, proposing constructive amendments, engaging stakeholders and leveraging public opinion.

This PC Party effectively positions itself as being proactive. Through proactive and strategic advocacy efforts, we can garner broader support for the reasoned amendment and the advanced principles of transparency, accountability and effective governance.

I don't think anyone here—anyone here that believes that the police are not doing an effective job are wrong. They're doing the work of many people; and again, this amendment—again, Bill 30, the way it was set before the amendment was proposed, is again, what are we doing to enhance an already proper bill?

The introduction of reasoned amendments to Bill 30 in Manitoba could potentially impact various aspects of government—governance and law enforcement, including issues like sports betting, human smuggling, cigarette smuggling, telephone scams.

Sports betting, for instance. If the reasoned amendment leads to modifications or additions to Bill 30, it could include provisions related to regulating sports betting, particularly if unexplained wealth is suspected to be linked to illegal gambling activities, enhanced measures for monitoring and investigating suspicious financial transactions could be implemented to combat money laundering associated with sports betting.

Human smuggling—excuse me just for a second, Honourable Deputy Speaker.

Thank you, Honourable Deputy Speaker.

Human smuggling—the reasoned amendment might prompt amendments to Bill 30 aimed at addressing human smuggling and trafficking by targeting the financial aspects of these criminal activities. By strengthening provisions related to identifying and confiscating unexplained wealth linked to human smuggling, law enforcement agencies could disrupt this financial networks supporting such illegal operations.

Cigarette smuggling. Again, when we talk about cigarette smuggling and that, too, we have to look at the extent of what issues could be happening with cigarette smuggling. Again, it's an issue with health. It's an issue with illegal money that's coming in.

So, again, cigarette smuggling, amendments from the reasoned amendment could 'include' measures to combat cigarette smuggling by targeting the financial proceeds derived from the illegal trade. Enhanced enforcement mechanisms, such as increased penalties for individuals involved in cigarette smuggling and

expanded asset forfeiture provisions, could be introduced.

Telephone scams, which, again, we hear from all over the world; no one is immune to telephone scams. Amendments to Bill 30 prompted by the reasoned amendment might incorporate provisions aimed by addressing telephone scams and other forms of fraud by targeting, again, the financial flows associated with fraudulent activities such as freezing and confiscating assets acquired through telephone scams. Law enforcement agencies could deter perpetrators and protect consumers from financial exploitation.

Overall, the introduction of reasoned amendments to Bill 30 in Manitoba has the potential to strengthen the legislative framework for combatting various forms of criminal activity, including sports betting, human smuggling, cigarette smuggling and telephone scams. And, again, that is just a few of the issues that we're dealing with here and, again, the reason why I'm standing here to support the amendments, by focusing on the financial aspects in enhancing enforcement measures.

I want to talk a little bit about why I'm supporting this as well, too. And again, under the unexplained wealth orders, the court may make an order that requires a person to provide information about how they acquired property, of any interest in property, if it appears that their known sources of income and assets would not be sufficient to do so in a person or closely related person have been involved unlawfully.

Where's the differences? I'm just—I'm missing something here. Most privately held corporations are required to disclose information about any person who is significantly—significant control over corporations to police and certain government officials for proposes set to the regulation. And that is what's done with this evidence here.

Some background. In 2021, the PC government made legislative changes to the legislation to strengthen the ability of Criminal Property Forfeiture Unit to quickly act on securing money that was believed to be used for money laundering. In 2022, the PC government explained the Criminal Property Forfeiture Unit to combat money laundering by hiring two investigators and a financial analyst.

In 2022, BC released its final report to the commission of inquiry in the money laundering, which encouraged the government to use mechanisms like criminal property forfeitures that target organized crime. Again, it's in place; it's here now.

The NDP position, and I want to quote the Justice Minister, our government is cracking down on drug traffickers and organized criminals by making it easier for police to proactively investigate their assets, seize proceeds of crime and strike a financial blow. Where—

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

**MLA Bereza:** Again, while the Justice Minister is cheering that, I'd like to ask, where's the teeth and where's the difference from where we were before?

**An Honourable Member:** There is none.

**MLA Bereza:** There is none. Again, Justice Minister—  
[interjection]

I'm sorry; did the Justice Minister have something to say, I—do I need to sit, or do I carry on? [interjection]  
Okay.

\* (15:40)

Again, a quote from the Justice Minister, we're giving police more tools to go after the people who get rich off drug crisis and making it easier to launch investigations into criminal organizations.

So again, I ask the Justice—and where do we go with this? Where are the tools that are different? Why are we doing this?

During the leaders' debate, the Premier (Mr. Kinew) said—the Premier-elect, now, said that they will take action to address crime by introducing an unexplained wealth act that will mean if there's a gangster driving a \$100,000 car, we're going to ask, how did they get that. So are—[interjection]—so I must ask this question. Are we going to—again, as part of this amendment, here, are—is it possible that we ask everyone that's driving a Ford Lightning if they are involved in a criminal activity? Again, where is the teeth? Why do we need to change this?

The former PC government took steps to combat money laundering and was among the leaders in the country against this organized crime. When BC announced their new law in March of 2023, the Attorney General was quoted as saying, there is—similar piece of legislation in place in Manitoba. So what is wrong with the current legislation that we have now?

Questions: Can the minister explain who—so can the minister explain how the Manitoba legislation will differ from legislation in other jurisdictions, such as British Columbia?

No, I didn't hear the answer to that. Will there be additional staff needed for the—in the Criminal Property Forfeiture branch? No, we didn't hear that.

Again, that is why we, on this side of the House, are proposing these amendments like this. And, again, I must say again, and my apologies for heckling, but I did ask and hope to get an answer of how the constituency of Portage la Prairie was consulted on these amendments. The reason I asked that is because, again, on my listening tour I heard from the people, the constituents of Portage la Prairie. I toured across the area, including places like Oakville, Sandy Bay—no, Sandy Bay's not in my constituency. They are a very important person to the Portage community. Dakota Tipi, Long Plain, Dakota Plains.

And, again, one of the things that they said to me—I said, were you spoken to about this? And they didn't know what I was speaking about. So again, I thought it was critically important that I stand here today regarding the Bill 30, The Unexplained Wealth Act, and talk about the amendments that we have proposed, because those amendments are needed. We do not need to spend extra money doing things that are not required, that have the proper teeth in them now.

So with that, Honourable Deputy Speaker, thank you so much for your time today.

**MLA Mike Moroz (River Heights):** I am grateful for the member from Portage for asking about the comparison between the acts. I am fortunate enough to have some of those answers to that question right here in front of me, that I'll happily provide.

Let's begin with a little bit of background, if we can. The Criminal Property Forfeiture Act was amended in 2021 to enable the director of Criminal Property Forfeiture to obtain preliminary disclosure orders. These orders could be obtained before forfeiture proceedings were instituted and required a person to identify their interest in the property, how they acquired their assets and sources of income. If a person held the property in trust for another person, they are required to identify the beneficial owners and provide details of the trust.

To date, no applications for preliminary disclosure orders have ever been made in Manitoba. Bill 30 would replace preliminary disclosure orders with unexplained wealth orders. The opposition has objected to Bill 30 on the basis that there are no differences between the two types of orders. Let me explain the differences.

For example, when can an application for a preliminary disclosure order or unexplained wealth order be made? Preliminary disclosure orders can only be obtained before forfeiture proceedings are commenced, subsection 2.31. Unexplained wealth orders can be obtained before forfeiture proceedings are commenced, at the same time as forfeiture proceedings are commenced, or after forfeiture proceedings have been instituted, subsection 2.31.

Other differences. Who are the parties to an application for a preliminary disclosure order or unexplained wealth order? The current act and Bill 30 both provide for the same parties: owner of property, person in possession of the property and person the director believes has an interest in the property to be named as respondents in an application for a community safety order or unexplained wealth order.

However, Bill 30 contains an interpretive provision in the proposed subsection 1(2), which provides much greater detail on what constitutes an interest in property. This provision states that persons who have a beneficial interest in the property through one or more trusts, corporations or other arrangements have an interest in the property. This provision also recognizes persons who can exercise control over a property through a family or business relationship also have an interest in that property.

This clarifying language better reflects the different arrangements used by criminals to launder funds and requires judges to look beyond persons who have a clear, documented interest in the property.

When a respondent is a corporation or partnership, Bill 30 also allows a responsible officer of the respondent to be named as a respondent, subsection 2.43. This enables the director of criminal property forfeiture to compel information from a specified director, officer or partner, who may have a better understanding of the complex relationships involved to provide information rather than a puppet figure who may be offered up as a respondent corporation or partnership.

Let's also look at the requirements for orders. For the most part, there are no significant differences between the current act and Bill 30 in terms of what information a court may require a respondent to provide. Both orders require a respondent to identify their interest in the property, how they acquired their interest in the property, provide particulars of their assets and sources of income.

The current act, clause 3.1(d), provides that if the respondent holds the property in trust for another person, they are required to identify the beneficial owners and provide details of the trust.

In contrast, Bill 30 requires the respondents to identify any persons who may have an interest in the property. As noted above, the broader interpretation of what constitutes an interest in property set out in the new subsection 1(2) provides greater flexibility since trusts are not the only device used to hide persons with an interest in a property.

\* (15:50)

How about grounds for making an order? There are no meaningful differences between the current act and Bill 30 in terms of the test the court applies when deciding whether to make a preliminary disclosure order or an unexplained wealth order. The only difference is that the minimum value of the property that can be the subject of an unexplained wealth order is increased from \$100,000 to \$125,000 to reflect inflation, clause 2.5(1)(b).

How about the consequences of non-compliance with an order? The current act, 17.18 imposes a rebuttable presumption that property is the proceeds of unlawful activity or an instrument of unlawful activity, does not provide all of the required information by the desired—or, by the deadline specified in the CSO. Bill 30 provides that this consequence will apply if the respondent knowingly made a false or misleading response or provided documents in response to a UWO that are not authentic.

How about any other amendments? The opposition objects to Bill 30 on the basis that there is no difference between the two types of orders. Clearly that's not the case. There are several meaningful differences between the two types of orders.

However, it is also important to note that Bill 30 also contains other amendments to The Criminal Property Forfeiture Act, creating new presumptions, and also makes a number of new administrative changes to the act.

I trust now that we've made clear to the opposition the fundamental differences between the two acts.

Thank you.

**Mr. Josh Guenter (Borderland):** I appreciate the opportunity to rise and share a few words on the reasoned amendment that has been put forward by the honourable Opposition House Leader.

And I think it's important that we, as legislators, all get the opportunity and all take the opportunity to share a few words on legislation, to ensure that it is properly scrutinized and that our constituents and their interests and their concerns are fairly represented in the legislative process, in the—in this place where, as I said—and as I've said before—that government wields enormous power relative to the—to its citizens, to the citizens of this province and this country.

And so that—it's incredibly important that we take the time, as legislators, to make sure that we are deliberating in a way that does not 'inappropriate' or improperly impinge on our constituents and on the individuals, the residents of Manitoba. So it's important that we, as legislators, take the time to go through and debate legislation and make sure that it's fit for purpose and that it does the job.

And, unfortunately, we're here debating this reasoned amendment because of a failure of the government to properly articulate—beyond some semantics that they've put forward—but a failure of the current government to properly articulate differences between Bill 30 and previous legislation that has been put forward in this Chamber, in particular, in 2021 by the previous Conservative government. And so here we are, and we're debating this reasoned amendment. And I think it is a debate worth having.

I think it's interesting that, while the government, again, as I said, beyond a few semantics, insists that this bill is different, I think it's interesting to point out that police have had, for some time now in Manitoba, the ability to go after unexplained wealth. And that power has existed for some time, since 2009. And in fact, some of this information is available online, but since 2009, Manitoba's Criminal Property Forfeiture Unit has operated under the authority of The Criminal Property Forfeiture Act. And so that act was brought in 15 years ago, in 2009. And so since then, the act allows the director of the unit to start civil forfeiture proceedings against property believed to be the proceeds or instruments of unlawful activity.

So that is clear. So that power has existed since 2009, and yet, this government insists that somehow, Bill 30 is—does something different than legislation already on record—on the books.

A judge of the Court of Queen's Bench decides whether to order forfeiture. Civil proceedings under The Criminal Property Forfeiture Act are entirely separate from criminal law. They do not rely on criminal prosecutions. They are initiated against property, not

people. They do not create criminal records, and they do not create findings of guilt or innocence.

In 2012, The Criminal Property Forfeiture Act was amended to allow a simpler process known as administrative forfeiture through which personal property valued at \$75,000 or less may be confiscated without involving the courts. So again, this power already exists. The police have the authority to go after the bad guys.

I understand that the government, the NDP, campaigned on an unexplained wealth act—they put that forward, that's Bill 30, The Unexplained Wealth Act—and yet—and yet—we see that this authority has already existed since 2009. So this ability for the police to be able to do this is already, in fact, being acted on. And they use this authority quite frequently.

But further significant amendments—and this is also interesting, Honourable Speaker—further significant amendments in 2021 expanded the legal information-gathering tools and authority to identify and secure unlawful money before it can become untraceable and disappears. The ultimate goal is to forfeit property which is derived from unlawful activity.

Proceeds of confiscated property are deposited in the Criminal Property Forfeiture Fund and managed or distributed as provided for in section 19 of The Criminal Property Forfeiture Act. Uses might include operating expenses, victim compensation and programs promoting safer communities.

If you go back to 2009, the bill includes—The Criminal Property Forfeiture Act—includes an explanatory note that provides a helpful explanation for legislators here and for Manitobans who may be interested in getting a perspective on a bill in terms of—in layman's terms, and it may be helpful for members opposite to take a look at the explanatory note, which reads: this bill enables a police chief or the commanding officer of the RCMP in Manitoba, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in Manitoba, to apply to the Court of Queen's Bench for an order forfeiting property to the government. Property may be forfeited if the judge is satisfied that it was acquired as a result of unlawful activity or it is likely to be used to commit certain unlawful activities.

The note goes on to say that the judge may make orders to protect people who have interests in property that is subject to forfeiture. Specified interest holders are entitled to automatic protection. Other interest holders must prove to the judge that they did not know about the unlawful activity or did all that reasonably—

or did all that they reasonably could—or did all that reasonably could be done to prevent the property from being used to engage in unlawful activity.

\* (16:00)

Forfeited property must be sold by the government after paying expenses related to the forfeiture and sale of the property. The balance of the sale proceeds will be paid to the Victims Assistance Fund to support Victim Services or crime prevention programs and to the legal aid services society of Manitoba. So that's the explanatory note for The Criminal Property Forfeiture Act that was presented and passed in this Legislature in 2009.

Now again, in 2021, further significant amendments were made and these further expanded those powers that police were given to be able to go after unexplained wealth. And this bill, the explanatory note says that at that time, in—prior to 2021 or up until the passage of these amendments, that forfeiture proceedings had to begin before a person could be required to answer questions about property believed to be an instrument or proceeds of unlawful activity.

And so the amendments in 2021 allowed the court to make two new orders before forfeiture proceedings could begin. A preliminary preservation order, which prevents a person from disposing of property if the court is satisfied that there is a serious issue to be tried in forfeiture proceedings and, secondly, a preliminary disclosure order which requires a person to answer questions about their acquisition of property believed to be an instrument or proceeds of unlawful activity.

The bill adds—added in 20—the amendments in 2021 added new presumptions concerning cash, vehicles and other property, and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Wiebe), referenced apparently the—in his words, the inability of the police to go after certain vehicles.

And yet, that's precisely what the amendments in 2021 were all about and that they included. The court is to presume, unless the contrary is proven, that cash found in close proximity to a controlled substance or bundled in a manner that is not consistent with standard banking practices is proceeds of unlawful activity. The court is also to presume, unless contrary is proven, that a vehicle is an instrument of unlawful activity if the vehicle is used in a dangerous manner to flee from a peace officer, or the vehicle contains items associated with—and this is key—unlawful activity, or has been modified in a manner consistent with its use in unlawful activity.

A further presumption is provided that, unless the contrary is proven, a person's property is an instrument or proceeds of unlawful activity if the property is subject to a preliminary disclosure order and the person fails to disclose all the information about the property required by the court.

If the director has reasonable grounds to suspect that a person has property that is an instrument or proceeds of unlawful activity, and the person has dealings with a financial institution, the director can collect any information about the person's dealings with the institution directly from the institution. The information may be used only to determine whether to seek forfeiture of the property and in any forfeiture proceedings.

This bill—again, the bill that—which made the significant amendments to The Criminal Property Forfeiture Act brought forward by the Conservative Party in 2021, makes knowingly providing false or misleading information or failing to comply with a requirement to provide information under the act an offence.

The bill also amended The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act to prevent a person from making a claim against the director with respect to forfeited property in small claims court. The claim must be pursued in the Court of Queen's Bench.

So, Honourable Speaker, that is a pretty thorough overview of exactly what power has already existed under The Criminal Property Forfeiture Act, as I said, put forward in 2009 and expanded on significantly in 2021 by the previous PC government in order to allow the police to go after money launderers and those who are profiting illegally from the proceeds of crime.

So those powers are already at work in this province, and so it kind of undermines the whole notion that the NDP government has put forward, that Bill 30 is somehow new or revolutionary or groundbreaking, that Bill 30 somehow addresses a problem that this Legislature has not yet addressed or that previous legislation has not yet addressed. That much is clear, that we do have legislation on the books and, again, which is why Bill 30 fails to do anything new. And more than—further to that, Honourable Speaker, the Minister of Justice himself failed to articulate how Bill 30 does anything beyond or new that previous legislation in 2021 and in 2009 failed to address.

So that much is clear, and, in fact, the government of BC—the NDP government in BC—cited Manitoba as an example that they wish to follow when dealing with money laundering. And we've talked about, in this

debate, the Cullen Commission, which was tasked several years ago with finding out and tackling the causes of money laundering in BC, in British Columbia, after a media report—media reports came out and talked about the problem of money laundering in BC and, frankly, the very substantial issue of money laundering. In fact, a number of \$5 billion—\$5 billion—is believed to have been laundered through the Vancouver real estate market. That's incredibly substantial. So a very real problem.

So when the government, when the NDP government of British Columbia, looked to tackle the problem of unexplained wealth and money laundering and those profiting from the proceeds of crime, they looked to Manitoba. And they looked to Manitoba at a time when the PC government was in charge. And we had just made, in 2021, as I've already cited those amendments and read the explanatory note of that bill, but they looked at that legislation that the previous PC government put forward in 2021 and they said, we want to follow Manitoba's example.

And so it's an impossibility that if the NDP, this current NDP government, somehow, as they say, that Bill 30 is somehow different, well, then, how is it that the NDP government in BC looked to the—to Manitoba before the NDP had even formed government, before the fall 2023 election had even been held? And they looked to the Province of Manitoba and to what our PC government had done with the amendments that we brought forward in 2021 to tackle money laundering and to go after the bad guys. It's an impossibility that they would have done that if, again, as I said, these powers were not already at work.

\* (16:10)

And so I think it's pretty simple. It's pretty straightforward. It's not hard. By getting into the weeds, I am perhaps making it sound a little more complicated than it is, but it is very straightforward and pretty simple.

But I think it begs some broader questions. And those questions are: Why would the NDP government spend day after day after day after day debating Bill 30, putting it forward and then now going through this reasoned amendment? Why would they go through this process? And I suspect it's because, while they are feigning concern, while they are feigning activity in their seven months now in government, they really are doing nothing. They're really doing nothing substantial.

On a number—on a number—of files, they're making some symbolic changes here or there, and it gives the

appearance of activity. It gives the appearance of government taking an interest in matters. They'll—they put forward Bill 30, The Unexplained Wealth Act, and a piece of legislation which does nothing new, nothing different than legislation, The Unexplained Wealth Act, which we are debating, and the reasoned amendment to the—to Bill 30.

But again, this government, seven months in, puts forward a piece of legislation that does nothing new, nothing different than legislation that is already on the books, that police are already using those very substantial powers. By the way, they are very substantial powers.

Civil libertarians—by the way, every single one of us living in a democracy ought to be a civil libertarian, because that is the bedrock of our democracy and our freedom. We are nothing if we do not safeguard and stand up for and cherish and protect and fight for our civil liberties.

And there is an argument—a very valid argument—that government having the ability to compel someone to explain their wealth undermines a 800-year precedent of—a tradition of innocence until proven guilty. And so that is a very, very valid concern and a very valid argument to be had. And we heard from those folks and we heard from, in particular, civil liberties organizations, I should say, to be more exact, and their concerns about this legislation.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order.

So I've been listening carefully, and I'm not sure how the member's current comments are relevant to the reasoned amendment we are currently debating. To be clear, we are not debating Bill 30 right now, we are debating the reasoned amendment to that bill listed on the Order Paper.

For reference for all members, this is the relevant component of the amendment: because this House has not received satisfactory evidence or assurance that this bill is different to the existing legislation that was brought forward and passed in the House in 2021.

I would ask the member to share how his remarks relate to the amendment.

**Mr. Guenter:** I appreciate your intervention, and I am—you know, appreciate that we are debating the reasoned amendment to Bill 30. And I have spent probably the greater chunk of my time just outlining how legislation that was put forward, The Criminal Property Forfeiture Act, in 2009 and the substantial amendments in 2021 to that act, which expanded the

powers of police and law enforcement to apply to a court to be able to go after unexplained wealth—how that that legislation already gives, as I said, police and law enforcement the ability to go after unexplained wealth.

And so Bill 30 fails to outline, really, any new path or any new powers or any new direction in this area of unexplained wealth and allowing law enforcement to go after it.

So I think I've outlined that, and I've spent my time there kind of outlining the purpose of legislation that is already on record and how that this reasoned amendment really does nothing new.

And I appreciated, in this debate, hearing from the former minister of Finance, who did a great job, and you know, I took some umbrage at the current minister—sorry, I said minister of Finance—minister of Justice, the member for Steinbach (Mr. Goertzen), in his comments. And I took some umbrage when the current Minister of Justice (Mr. Wiebe) referred to him as a failed Justice minister.

I would suggest to the members opposite that it was that very Justice Minister, the now member for—the member for Steinbach, who eliminated catalytic converter thefts in Manitoba. Was a very real problem only a few years ago and a very substantial problem that vexed our public insured, Manitoba Public Insurance, and was the subject of numerous media articles and headlines on the matter, and frustrated and angered many Manitobans who were affected by catalytic converter thefts, and it was—

**The Speaker:** Order.

I'll remind the member to stick to the amendment topic.

**Mr. Guenter:** Honourable Chair, I was just—and I appreciate your intervention. I was just talking about how the member for Steinbach, in his capacity as minister of Justice, was a very effective minister of Justice and is someone who has contributed substantively, in his 20-plus years as a legislator in this place, to the debate in this Chamber and to the legislative process, and is someone who I think has something to say on these matters.

And so I appreciated listening to his 30 minutes of debate yesterday, and he also shared that already in Manitoba under the Criminal Property Forfeiture Act, there is the ability, as a result of those 2021 amendments to the act that this House voted on and passed, the ability to have an unexplained wealth order.

It allows the Criminal Property Forfeiture director and the mechanism within that area of government to explore an individual's finances to see if there might be questions—see if there might—is an explanation for their wealth. And he also referenced—and this is perhaps where I was going with the—with some of my comments around the civil liberties side—but he referenced the concerns around civil liberties.

And, again, the purpose for the reasoned amendment today is that Bill 30 does absolutely nothing new. So I don't—you know—and I think I—but where I was going was that I wonder if the reason why we're having this debate—why we're having to have this debate—is because the NDP government, in their seven months of government, don't have a plan when it comes to justice.

They broke their 100-day bail reform promise. And so is that why they brought forward Bill 30? And is that why we continue to have this debate? And is that why they've allowed this process to get to the point where we're now having a—we're debating a reasoned amendment, because they have nothing else to offer?

\* (16:20)

And so they're not—we see that they're not delivering results on crime. We see criminals getting back onto our streets when they shouldn't be. And the public is getting this idea that this NDP government is soft on crime, soft on the causes of crime, and—

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order.

I appreciate the member would like to wonder, but I would ask that the member stick to the amendment, and I feel like I've been generous thus far. So you have a minute and 20 seconds left.

**Mr. Guenter:** It is important to be relevant, and I—it is important to ask, as opposition, to ask the government, what is their motivation for continuing with this debate on Bill 30 and now the reasoned amendment. And, I mean, I think we've laid out in debate how that—in this debate, on the reasoned amendment, how that previous legislation that's already on the books is not—already does what Bill 30 tries to do.

So there's no purpose for Bill 30, and so we're having this debate on this reasoned amendment, which is, I think, a debate that we now need to have as opposition, because we're dealing with a government that is failing Manitobans when it comes to crime, that, again, as I said, broke their 100-day bail-reform promise.

They're not delivering the results on—that Manitobans expect on crime. Criminals are getting back out on our streets, and we have an NDP government here that's spending day after day after day after day debating a piece of legislation that does nothing that previous legislation on the record doesn't already do.

Thank you, Speaker.

**Mr. Konrad Narth (La Vérendrye):** Thank you for this opportunity to speak to the reasoned amendment to Bill 30, The Unexplained Wealth Act. Again, as I've stated before, I'm slightly confused as to why Bill 30 has been brought forward to this House, because I feel that it doesn't go far enough to combat the crime that we see throughout Manitoba.

I've said it before but I'll say it again; I represent the far southeast corner of Manitoba, the La Vérendrye constituency, which is one of the fastest growing regions in Manitoba, and along with it we're seeing issues of crime, issues of crime that are concerning to my constituents. And when I speak to my constituents, as we just came back from a constituency break week, I had the opportunity to touch base with community members and see what is changed in recent weeks, in recent months, and, unfortunately, I was enlightened with the continuation and struggles that law enforcement have throughout my constituency and my corner of the province.

So it gives me great pleasure to speak to some of those concerns and the reason for the reasoned amendment that we bring forward today, because the previous government had made great advancement and changes to The Criminal Property Forfeiture Act and the unit that was actually established back in 2008. So I know the government wants to tout that it was an NDP government that brought it forward, and sure, we'll give that credit where credit is due.

But luckily, in 2021, it was a PC government, the previous government in this House, that had made significant legislative changes to quickly act on securing money that was believed to be used for money laundering. Along with that, significant changes were made to give law enforcement further authorities to seize assets that could clearly be seen to be the result of criminal activity.

I was surprised to see that the now-Premier (Mr. Kinew), then-leader of the NDP during last year's election campaign, had run on a promise to bring forward an act as this is.

*Mr. Diljeet Brar, Acting Speaker, in the Chair*

I then, because I wanted to know the platform that the NDP were running on, to see what I could support and what I wouldn't be able to support, representing my constituents in the southeast corner of Manitoba. And Bill 30, which is now brought forward; at that time was just a promise. But doing some quick research, could easily see that not only did we have an act in place that dealt with criminal property forfeiture, it was recently upgraded. It was recently changed and recently had given law enforcement further, stronger tools to carry out the enforcement of those crimes.

So when we saw Bill 30 being brought before this House, it raised questions on what is the intent? Was the intent just a knee-jerk promise, and that's why Bill 30 had been brought forward without any research whatsoever? And that's why I speak to the reasoned amendment today, is because seeing the legislation that the current government has been bringing forward, it leads me to believe that they haven't done their homework.

We saw the member from Steinbach, he had asked questions of the Justice Minister, and unfortunately wasn't able to get any answers. The member from Steinbach was the previous Justice minister, and Justice minister during the time when this act was upgraded, for lack of better terms, when it was strengthened in the previous term in government.

So obviously during that time, the member from Steinbach, the then-Justice minister, would've been well read on the background, the rationale behind the changes that were made and the belief in making that act stronger to support law enforcement, which is what we want to do and which is why I spoke positively to Bill 30 previously, is because anything that we can do to strengthen the ability for law enforcement to carry out actions of keeping the criminals at bay, is what we need.

But today I speak to the reasoned amendment, because we don't see enough change. In fact, the current government had said that they would want something similar—in The Criminal Property Forfeiture Act—similar to what British Columbia has. Well, British Columbia released a report in 2022, just two short years ago, which encouraged government to use mechanisms like a criminal property forfeiture act to target money laundering and organized crime—it was a hot topic at that time—shortly after the Manitoba government strengthened their Criminal Property Forfeiture Act.

\* (16:30)

Then further to that, in 2023, BC brought in amendments very similar to Manitoba. And in March 2023, when BC's Attorney General brought forward their changes, he was quoted with saying, there is a similar piece of legislation in Manitoba. So—which leads me to believe that British Columbia was modelling the act that was already working in Manitoba, seeing results, confiscating assets that were the result of criminal activity, whether that be money laundering, drug trade or any other illegal activity, and BC saw the results and saw that the results were staggering and wanted something very similar to combat their issue with organized crime.

So it leads me to believe is this something that BC had directly copied because of the results that they were seeing in Manitoba? And you know what they say, imitation is the most sincere form of flattery, and I truly believe that that was the case with BC copying what the Manitoba PC government had brought into law.

So I'm proud to represent the political party who held office at the time when that legislation was amended and changed and strengthened.

I'm also honoured to see that during, a campaign promise, the now-Premier (Mr. Kinew) of Manitoba had said that he wanted to copy something very similar to what BC had. So if BC copied Manitoba, and we're proud of it because it's what we were able to establish, and now the new Premier of Manitoba is wanting to copy BC, again, imitation is the most sincere form of flattery, and we're flattered—on this side of the House, we're flattered that the now-government, the NDP government, wants to imitate legislation that we had brought forward.

And that's why I speak to this reasoned amendment is because the NDP campaigned on The Unexplained Wealth Act admitting that they would be following what was done in BC. And as we established, what was done in BC was what we had done here in Manitoba.

So I'd like to highlight the importance of bringing legislation forward that actually means something to Manitobans. Those are the pieces of legislation which get support from both sides of the House. Those are pieces of legislation that make a difference.

So when we see smart policies, we see the results of those, not just campaign promises. This isn't political ideology leading the direction of the government. When you can actually come up with well-thought-out policies, they do work.

And it's easy to see. It's easy to be skeptical about a lot of things these days, and some of those are promises of quick solutions. Whether in the—whether they be political or commercial, they're rarely delivered on, and that's what makes people skeptical on the results that these changes in policies make for Manitobans.

And that's why I need to speak to this reasoned amendment, because when I go back into my constituency and ask constituents what, in fact, makes a difference to them, and when I enlighten them and tell them to read further on Bill 30, they come back feeling that this isn't a valuable use of time.

So now, having the opportunity to speak to the reasoned amendment on Bill 30, I'd like to highlight that smart policies are what we need to be focused on. And take, for example, the issue of catalytic converter theft. This particular crime was an epidemic across Manitoba just a short while ago. This was an issue that we not only saw in Manitoba, but we had been seeing across the entire country.

And this is an example of when you come up with smart policy that can be supported by both sides of the House that changes can be made. At that time, thieves were stealing catalytic converters from the mufflers of cars because the metals of them could be sold easily and for a good price. Very similar to the issues that now the NDP government bring forward in Bill 30, that—

**The Acting Speaker (Diljeet Brar):** Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. Order, please.

Just wanted to remind the member that we are debating the amendment. So can you please bring your remarks relevant to the amendment, not the bill. Thank you.

**Mr. Narth:** Again—yes, I'm speaking to the reasoned amendment to Bill 30. And I'd like to show that with some examples and then some—and an example that I'm trying to highlight to show the government the difference between policy in the Bill 30 that we would support, and why we bring forward the reasoned amendment is because we don't see a difference between the legislation that was—or is—currently an act and what is being proposed. There isn't a significant enough difference.

But an example that I highlight is the issue of catalytic converter theft that we had seen throughout Manitoba. This is a prime example of how Bill 30 can be amended in a way that we bring forward with the reasoned amendment, and potentially show the government on something that will actually give teeth to law enforcement.

At the time when the catalytic converter issue was a great concern, there were some, including the opposition at the time, that thought that it would be impossible to curb the crime. After all, it had become a problem across all sorts of—all jurisdictions across our country.

The cornerstone of the strategy that was being brought forward for legislation would require scrap metal dealers to maintain a record for the purposes of identification from each individual selling that precious metal, and also identifying where it had come from.

This is legislation that had value; this is legislation that actually gave authorities the power to make a difference. This is a specific issue that had been causing harm across all communities, especially in communities of more dense population. These were parts of cars in cities like Winnipeg that were being taken in the middle of the night.

These additional measures that were taken into legislation gave the police the ability to crack down on these crimes. There was a partnership between Crime Stoppers, law enforcement and the Province of Manitoba by enacting the new legislation.

In the same period of time, same month in 2024, versus a time period in the year prior to this legislation being brought forward, the difference was 236 reported thefts of catalytic converters to 12. And the reason that I bring this up is to show the rationale for our reasoned amendment. It shows good policy, smart policy does work.

So what we're doing right now is we're taking Bill 30, which we already have an act in place, we already have a Criminal Property Forfeiture Act—

**The Acting Speaker (Diljeet Brar):** Order, please. Order, please.

\* (16:40)

Again, I remind the member that we are debating the reasoned amendment. So please note. Thank you.

**Mr. Narth:** Yes, thank you again. I am honoured to have the opportunity to speak to the reasoned amendment that we bring forth. And the reason for it, again, is that we don't feel that there is enough of a difference to give law enforcement the abilities that they need to enforce these crimes.

My constituency of La Vérendrye has a growing concern of personal property crime. This concern has grown over the past decade or more and it's getting

worse. I spent 12 years on my municipal council getting quarterly reports from law enforcement on personal property crime and law enforcement stating their concern that they need more abilities to enforce the laws. That's what law enforcement is looking for, is the ability to have increased capabilities, and Bill 30 does not show that. That's the reason for the reasoned amendment.

What we'd like to see is that we give more strength to law enforcement, more strength to municipalities, more strength to Manitobans to allow them to not be concerned about the personal property crimes that are happening within their communities.

These are the real issues. These are the issues that we see on the street. And we see that Bill 30 does not change enough from its current form to satisfy us, as legislators on this side of the House and as Manitobans that we represent as legislators on this side of the House, to make all of us feel satisfied that it's a bill worth debate and it's a bill worth making change.

It leaves many great questions onto what exactly was the purpose of this. Again, as rounding back to how I started, was it knee-jerk reaction to a campaign promise or is there further intent in the legislation? So we don't see enough change, but what we see is that the court may make an order that required a person to provide information about how they acquired property or an interest in property if it appears that their known source of income and assets would not be sufficient to do so and if the person or closely related person have been involved in unlawful activity.

If a person fails to provide the information required under an unexplained wealth order or provides false or misleading information, the property that is subject of the order is presumed to be proceeds of unlawful activity unless the contrary can be proven.

So, as my colleague, the member from Borderland, had stated some concerns on civil liberties, we're—as we dive deeper into Bill 30, we're seeing at face value that there isn't enough of a change to give law enforcement additional authorities to make a difference for Manitobans.

I'm concerned that it doesn't give enough to address the issues that people deal with crime in communities across our entire province. Communities like mine, communities like my colleague's, we don't see the red Ferraris pulling up to communities, dispersing drugs that are causing the issues that we see on the

street. We don't see the organization of crime at all. Not saying that organized crime isn't an issue within our province, isn't an issue within the country, and it's something that we need to deal with and law enforcement needs to deal with.

This isn't addressing the serious concerns that we have for public safety each and every day. And if we didn't have any of this legislation set in place today, I could stand up and say that I completely support Bill 30, because we do need a—we do need an act for criminal property forfeiture. We need to be able to combat organized crime and take those assets from the criminals that have unlawfully obtained them.

But that's not what we see. We have an act in place already that has been effective and efficient, and again, as the now-Premier (Mr. Kinew) had committed during the campaign when he was the leader of the NDP, had made a commitment that we would make changes similar to British Columbia. And we were copied by British Columbia, so it doesn't convince me or my constituents that there is enough of a difference.

So it leaves the court to presume, unless the contrary is proven, that cash is the proceeds of unlawful activity if it is mailed or shipped with no information or false information about the sender. This type of change, is it going to make a big difference to the intent of the act? We don't believe that it—I don't believe that it—makes any difference. It's greatly concerning to me that we bring these types of concerns to light in Bill 30 and don't provide any additional abilities for law enforcement to act out on the true crime that's happening within our communities.

The changes that are being made in this act are concerning. The changes that are being made in Bill 30 don't speak far enough to add any type of additional credibility to an act, to provide support for law enforcement. There's several minor administrative changes that we don't believe are worth the time—I don't believe are worth the time—for us to be debating day in and day out.

So those are things like crypto assets, such as cryptocurrency, are added to definition of property. The issues that I have in my community with unlawful activities, petty drug crime resulting in petty property crime that makes residents of my communities feel unsafe. The crypto-asset component to this bill does not add any level of security to my local law enforcement, nor does it to the community members.

Again, a change in this bill to the maximum value of property that can be subject of administrative forfeiture proceeds is increased from \$75,000 to \$125,000.

Again, we—if we're talking about large-scale organized crime, we're going to need to be worried about assets that are—far exceed \$125,000. When you look at a vehicle costing north of \$100,000 today, there isn't a lot of additional value changing it from \$75,000 to \$125,000. This—these are assets of your regular middle-class Manitoban. These aren't the assets that are going to be the result of large-scale organized crime.

So again, we're missing the mark, and we see a real big issue with personal property crime, break and enters. Those are the crime that constituents of mine are concerned about, Manitobans in general are concerned about. These are the true issues. And then large-scale organized crime that is transporting drugs and laundering money throughout our province at a large scale. These are the issues that we have, is large-scale organized crime and the rampant petty drug-fuelled property crimes. Those are the issues that the current legislation—

\* (16:50)

**The Acting Speaker (Diljeet Brar):** Order, please. Order, please.

I would like to remind all members, and I would read this quote, the relevant part, from the amendment, quote: Because this House has not received satisfactory evidence or assurance that this bill is different to the existing legislation that was brought forward and passed in this House in 2021, unquote. Maybe this would help all the members who are debating the reasoned amendment, not Bill 30.

Thank you.

**Mr. Narth:** Sorry that it seemed like I was straying off and debating Bill 30, but, in fact, I'm thankful to have the opportunity to speak to the reasoned amendment and, yes, as you had stated, my belief that the proposed legislation doesn't make enough of a change from legislation that was amended back in 2021 that made significant changes and improvements to legislation that was first brought before this House in 2008.

And that's why I feel that this type of legislation doesn't bring value to Manitobans. And like I had stated before, we should be focused on smart policies that do work, similar to the catalytic converter policies brought before this House last year.

Thank you.

**Mr. Richard Perchotte (Selkirk):** I always enjoy an opportunity to get up and put some words on the record. I represent an area, Selkirk, and the RM of St. Andrews, and I—every time I stand I want to make sure that I do the people proud who elected me to be here.

So when we sit down and we debate bills in this House—and prior to being elected I'm a little bit naive on the fact; I thought when it comes to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba that we would work together to enhance what's—what we're here for, for the people. I thought we'd present bills and we'd go back and forth across the House to put our own—*[interjection]*—information back and forth to improve the bills, not to just be partisan and talk over top of each other, which the member across loves to do.

*Mr. Tyler Blashko, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair*

But I thought we would work together collaboratively to represent our constituents at the best possible way, with the highest amount of respect for the office that we hold. I thought we would come up with legislation that would be new and protecting the citizens, to give opportunities forward for—not just for today, but for generations to come. I thought bills would come forward that would be directly impactful.

But what we're seeing here is a bill that has been recycled, and it's a recycled gift from the PC government. It's been wrapped up and given back.

We've looked back at this bill and we—unfortunately, we spent way too many days and way too many hours looking at this poor legislation that's been brought forward, because the new Bill 30 is no different than what was brought forward in '21.

And there's been some differences that happened in 2022 where the—we extended—the PC government extended the staffing capacity in the Criminal Property Forfeiture Unit.

This proposed Bill 30 is no different than what we've had before. We've asked several times and people got up and they talk about different words that have been added to the bill, and I'd like to call that fluff. They put some fluff in there to present it as a new bill, but it's not a new bill. It's the same old bill.

And I think we owe the people that elected us a little bit more respect. And I try to wonder, how did we get here? How are we recycling bills?

And I know that the members opposite were very fortunate to win the election. And I think they got caught. I think they got caught high-fiving themselves

in the parking lot instead of sitting down and writing new legislation to bring forward, something substantive that we could look at and say, yes, we can get behind that. As opposition, this represents what we have.

But what we see is the same old stuff that we had done. So thank you for reintroducing our stuff that was introduced here as well as in BC, and then back here again. There's very little difference.

When I take a look at some of the amendments that are brought forward, amendments to The Corporations Act, most privately held corporations are required to disclose information about any person who has significant control over the corporation to police and certain government officials for the purpose to set out in the regulations.

This exists already. This is it. It's federally done. Every time you file your annual corporate return, you have to submit a declaration of who are the owners of the company. So that is nothing new.

Well, they add in other amendments. Okay, crypto assets such as cryptocurrency are added to the definition of property. So that's like saying, okay, my children—either my son or my daughter. Well, they'd be your children, or whatever pronoun they go by; they'd still be your children. We don't have to specify it; it's already there. It's nothing new.

Assets are assets. When we do balance sheets, you have your liabilities and your assets. It's not assets plus cryptocurrency assets; it's listed under assets. You could have cash, hey, inventory, crypto assets. It could be listed all right there.

To specify some fluff pieces to bring forward legislation just because you want to bring forward legislation because somebody got caught not doing their job and said, oh my goodness, we need to get some legislation here.

And we seen it in our first sitting: the dismal number of pieces of legislation brought forward from a government-in-waiting. Nothing new.

And anything substantive was already recycled. It was, here is the PC gift box. We'll take the blue wrapping off of it and we'll put some orange wrapping and here's a new bill.

But it's not a new bill. It's the same old bill. And we're wasting time. We're wasting taxpayers' time and money every day that we come in here and debate stuff that's already been done. I think we could be better than this. I think that if you're going to come forward with a bill, put the homework in it. Find out.

I've talked to many, many people in my constituency. I've talked to friends of mine who are in law enforcement about this bill. I've talked to them. Just tell me, what am I missing? What is different about this?

I've talked to prosecutors, federal prosecutors and provincial prosecutors, that I know and said, can you tell me what is different in this bill?

And they said, just legalese. They put some different words in here and they've done stuff. To the police officers that I know and respect tremendously

who have looked at this with me, they said, I don't get it. It's exactly the same as what we have now.

Yes, so a vehicle or an asset went from \$75,000 to \$125,000. That's—just should be a minor correction. This is not a new bill. It's almost embarrassing when we stand up—

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order.

When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member will have 23 minutes remaining.

The hour being 5 p.m., this House is adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow.

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, May 7, 2024

## CONTENTS

<b>ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS</b>			
<b>Introduction of Bills</b>		Funding for Social Housing Projects	
Bill 213—The Liquor, Gaming and Cannabis Control Amendment and Manitoba Liquor and Lotteries Corporation Amendment Act (Expanding Liquor Retail)		Khan	1649
Wharton	1641	Smith	1649
<b>Members' Statements</b>		Labour Legislation in BITSA	
Chad Gillert		Byram	1650
Moyes	1641	Marcelino	1650
Palliative Manitoba		Health-Care System Management	
Cook	1641	Lamoureux	1651
Dakota Collegiate Lancers Varsity Champions		Asagwara	1651
Moses	1642	Holocaust Education	
Teulon Curling Club		Moroz	1652
King	1643	Altomare	1652
Bryan Kramble		Random Acts of Violence	
Altomare	1643	Balcaen	1652
<b>Oral Questions</b>		Wiebe	1652
Budget Implementation Legislation		<b>Petitions</b>	
Ewasko	1644	Removal of Federal Carbon Tax	
Kinew	1644	Ewasko	1653
Milk Prices		Medical Assistance in Dying	
Ewasko	1645	Guenter	1654
Kinew	1646		
RRC Primary Care Paramedicine Program		<b>ORDERS OF THE DAY</b>	
Cook	1647	<i>(Continued)</i>	
Asagwara	1647	<b>GOVERNMENT BUSINESS</b>	
Genesis House		<b>Debate on Second Readings</b>	
Hiebert	1648	Bill 30—The Unexplained Wealth Act (Criminal Property Forfeiture Act and Corporations Act Amended)	
Fontaine	1648	Goertzen	1655
Smith	1648	Wiebe	1656
		Bereza	1661
		Moroz	1665
		Guenter	1666
		Narh	1671
		Perchotte	1675

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

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