

Second Session - Fortieth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

Official Report
(Hansard)

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Daryl Reid
Speaker*

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Fortieth Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALLAN, Nancy, Hon.	St. Vital	NDP
ALLUM, James	Fort Garry-Riverview	NDP
ALTEMEYER, Rob	Wolseley	NDP
ASHTON, Steve, Hon.	Thompson	NDP
BJORNSON, Peter, Hon.	Gimli	NDP
BLADY, Sharon	Kirkfield Park	NDP
BRAUN, Erna	Rossmere	NDP
BRIESE, Stuart	Agassiz	PC
CALDWELL, Drew	Brandon East	NDP
CHIEF, Kevin, Hon.	Point Douglas	NDP
CHOMIAK, Dave, Hon.	Kildonan	NDP
CROTHERS, Deanne	St. James	NDP
CULLEN, Cliff	Spruce Woods	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	NDP
DRIEDGER, Myrna	Charleswood	PC
EICHLER, Ralph	Lakeside	PC
EWASKO, Wayne	Lac du Bonnet	PC
FRIESEN, Cameron	Morden-Winkler	PC
GAUDREAU, Dave	St. Norbert	NDP
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Liberal
GOERTZEN, Kelvin	Steinbach	PC
GRAYDON, Cliff	Emerson	PC
HELWER, Reg	Brandon West	PC
HOWARD, Jennifer, Hon.	Fort Rouge	NDP
IRVIN-ROSS, Kerri, Hon.	Fort Richmond	NDP
JHA, Bidhu	Radisson	NDP
KOSTYSHYN, Ron, Hon.	Swan River	NDP
LEMIEUX, Ron, Hon.	Dawson Trail	NDP
MACKINTOSH, Gord, Hon.	St. Johns	NDP
MAGUIRE, Larry	Arthur-Virden	PC
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MARCELINO, Flor, Hon.	Logan	NDP
MARCELINO, Ted	Tyndall Park	NDP
MELNICK, Christine, Hon.	Riel	NDP
MITCHELSON, Bonnie	River East	PC
NEVAKSHONOFF, Tom	Interlake	NDP
OSWALD, Theresa, Hon.	Seine River	NDP
PALLISTER, Brian	Fort Whyte	PC
PEDERSEN, Blaine	Midland	PC
PETTERSEN, Clarence	Flin Flon	NDP
REID, Daryl, Hon.	Transcona	NDP
ROBINSON, Eric, Hon.	Kewatinook	NDP
RONDEAU, Jim, Hon.	Assiniboia	NDP
ROWAT, Leanne	Riding Mountain	PC
SARAN, Mohinder	The Maples	NDP
SCHULER, Ron	St. Paul	PC
SELBY, Erin, Hon.	Southdale	NDP
SELINGER, Greg, Hon.	St. Boniface	NDP
SMOOK, Dennis	La Verendrye	PC
STEFANSON, Heather	Tuxedo	PC
STRUTHERS, Stan, Hon.	Dauphin	NDP
SWAN, Andrew, Hon.	Minto	NDP
WHITEHEAD, Frank	The Pas	NDP
WIEBE, Matt	Concordia	NDP
WIGHT, Melanie	Burrows	NDP
WISHART, Ian	Portage la Prairie	PC
<i>Vacant</i>	Morris	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, May 16, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

Good morning, everyone. Please be seated.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

House Business

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Leader of the Official Opposition. *[interjection]* Opposition House Leader, pardon me. I get it wrong.

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Official Opposition House Leader): That can be a career-limiting mistake, Mr. Speaker. I want to be careful with that.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, in accordance with rule 31(9), I'd like to announce the private member's resolution that will be considered next Thursday is the resolution on 4-H brought forward by the honourable member for Midland (Mr. Pedersen).

Mr. Speaker: It has been announced that the private member's resolution that will be considered next Thursday is the resolution on 4-H brought forward by the honourable member for Midland.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS— PUBLIC BILLS

Mr. Speaker: Now, I'll see if I can get this right. Official Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Goertzen: And now, Mr. Speaker, I believe we are prepared to move to Bill 201, The Regulatory Accountability and Transparency Act, sponsored by the member for Emerson (Mr. Graydon).

Mr. Speaker: So we'll now call the proposed—to resume or continue the debate on the proposed motion.

The honourable member for Emerson—Bill 201, and it's The Regulatory Accountability and Transparency Act, standing in the name of the honourable member for Concordia, who has three minutes remaining.

Bill 201—The Regulatory Accountability and Transparency Act

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): I'm pleased to rise to continue to—conclude, I guess, my comments on Bill 201, and I appreciate the opportunity to do so this morning.

You know, it's interesting when you see a title such as this, and I think I may have referenced this in my earlier comments, but, you know, it's very easy for us to say, well, you know, of course, regulatory accountability and the word red tape, of course, is something that sticks out to most folks. And, in this case, you know, when you see a title like this you think, well, maybe this is to enhance regulation or to further streamline it, but, you know, when we actually look at this particular bill, we see that that's actually not the case.

This particular bill is interesting in that it's something that was directly referenced and directly addressed these sorts of issues in our Throne Speech, and something that this government has prioritized and continues to move forward in addressing.

Just one aspect that I wanted to talk a little bit about, Mr. Speaker, is with regards to some of the support that we've announced and that we've moved forward on with regards to supporting small business. I have a—my own experience with this, my father was a small business man his entire life, owned his own company—well, actually, a variety of companies that he's operated and worked with.

And it—just this last—or during the winter months, I guess, at the end of last calendar year, he decided that he was going to move on and that it was time for him to retire. And as a small business man, we know that folks are very much on their own and that they don't always have all of the support that a larger business or a larger corporation would have. And so, when my father was looking at retirement, this was something that he really needed was that

support from—you know, from the government to help in his planning and his movement on to the next stage.

So this is something that we've moved forward on in our Throne Speech, our government announced the combination of both the company's office and our small business support programs, which will streamline operations and improve service delivery and reduce duplication and provide a one—new one-stop shop of supports for businesses and small start-ups.

And I see that my time is expiring here, unfortunately. I'd like to speak further on this, but I do appreciate the opportunity this morning, and look forward to hearing more from other members in my caucus and also in the opposition caucus in discussing this particular bill.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Dennis Smook (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, it's an honour to get up and support Bill 201 today. This bill requires the government to develop formal procedures to make the process for enacting regulations more transparent. It also requires government departments to develop regulatory reform plans to eliminate unnecessary regulations and encourage restraint in making new regulations. Both the government procedures and department plans must be made public.

Small business is a very important part of my life. I've always been involved in small business, and it's also very important to the economy of Manitoba.

Small business—you know, there's plus—100,000-plus small businesses in this province who employ a lot of people. And one of the things that I've found, listening to this Legislature, is a lot of people don't understand small business. In order for small business to flourish, they need to have funding; like, they need to be selling product; they need to be in control of their costs; they need to be in control of—you know, there's a number of different things.

But this government seems to put regulations in place that make it difficult for small businesses to function. They—it takes time to look at a lot of these regulations and it makes it difficult for the small businesses. There are currently tens of thousands of provincial regulations in place in Manitoba. As a result, the normal small business owner in Manitoba spends 10 hours of each month complying with government regulations—that's nearly a week out of

every month. And when you're looking at what your bottom-line costs are, time is important.

I mean, a small business can't just go to the bank to say that, well, I need to hire three more people, because if you don't bring the profit into the business to hire the people, you can't pay somebody to do it. It's not like government where we can run a debt or run a deficit. It just doesn't work in small business, because small business is going to go broke if they do that.

* (10:10)

And one of the things that I heard a lot of when I was campaigning is entrepreneurs who are frustrated with every time they turn around there's a new legislation brought out that takes time for them to administer. And we're not looking at eliminating regulations because we know that safety—there's a lot of different things that are very important to not only the entrepreneurs but the—to the consumer. So we need to look at legislation that's in place that's been either redundant or does it really apply to where it's being used.

And one of the things this government has done is they've introduced a lot of extra costs to small business with regulations. The 2 per cent—or 2 cents a litre gas tax they introduced last year did not help. The increase on the PST on insurance—I know there are small businesses out there that pay approximately \$10,000 a year in insurance.

So when you add another \$800 to the bottom line of a business to take it out of there, that's \$800 of profit that has to be made before that invoice can be paid.

So there's a lot of things that are happening to small business that are making it very difficult for these small businesses to exist in this province. I mean, user fees, a lot of different things that are coming out that are taxing the consumer also makes it a lot harder on them. But an important part of small business is the regulations that this government is imposing on them. The hydro increases hurt small business. There's a 'noomer' of things.

Talking about taxes small business pays is one of the things that I'm trying to illustrate here. When you have a lot of extra costs involved in running your small business and you take the taxes—you add taxes to the consumer so the consumer isn't purchasing in your business, that means your bottom line is going down. So one thing the member opposites have to realize—that if you're not making

any money, you don't pay any taxes anyways. So that's—it's kind of important that they realize that as what they have to look at when they make legislation.

I mean, hydro increases 8 per cent and hydro increases. Those are things that take a definite effect on small business. It's all about the, you know, rules and regulations that they impose that are hurting them.

You know, there's—I talk to a lot of small business owners and they're telling me that they would not invest in a new business in Manitoba; they're just hoping to possibly sell out because they don't like what's happening. Their consumer is losing confidence in this government and so is the small business. I mean, CFIB Business Barometer has fallen almost 10 per cent of the—what's happening to small business in Manitoba.

According to a recent Canadian Federation of Independent Business report, Prosperity Restricted by Red Tape, the total cost of regulation to Manitoba business is \$945 million annually. And it's very hurtful on small business when you have all these extra expenses.

Eighty per cent of the respondents of Prosperity Restricted by Red Tape report said that simplifying existing regulations would help their business better comply with regulations because a lot of small business owners don't understand these regulations at times and a clear-language policy to make a lot of these regulations simpler would be very helpful.

Twenty-two per cent said if they had known about the burden of regulation, they might not have gone into business at all because the extra stress, the time they have to put into working with the regulations takes away from their time spent in trying to grow their business. And if your business is not growing, your profit is not growing and therefore you're not going to be a helpful part of society if you go bankrupt.

The regulatory burden is highest to small business, which pays almost five times more per employee than the larger counterpart that comply with government regulation.

In talking with a number of people here in the small business industry, they really are concerned with what this government is doing. Like Bill 201 requires the government to look at these policies and change them so that way it would be a lot easier for small businesses to work.

And like I was saying before, it's not about deregulating everything for small business, but to look at it so it—simplify matters so that small businesses could operate with a lot less—not restrictions, but ease of ability to do this.

And I hope the members opposite will be listening to what I have to say here or what my colleagues are going to say, because small business is a great part of Manitoba's economy. The member from Concordia was talking about his father and how important small business was to them. So it is a very important part of our economy.

In other jurisdictions they have already moved to reduce regulatory burden on small business. British Columbia has moved aggressively to cut red tape and stimulate growth. As of November 28, 2010, straightforward B has—BC has achieved a 42.6 per cent reduction in regulatory requirements totalling 206,488 requirements. Many other governments such as Newfoundland, Labrador, Nova Scotia, British Columbia have already taken up that challenge.

So I would ask members opposite to support this bill, as what it does it'll lessen red tape and that will benefit everybody, not just business owners. Because of—if you have a thriving business, they employ more people and it helps the total economy of the province. And businesses will have more time to focus on their customers, and when they do this they generate more business and further employ more people and create more taxes, which is what we want to see. We want to see businesses create more taxes in the system so there'd be more money to go around.

The last time we introduced this bill, the government wasn't really interested in supporting it, but I would ask every member opposite to take a good look at it and, hopefully, support us in this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Dave Gaudreau (St. Norbert): I'm glad I can get up today to speak on Bill 201.

There's a couple things that the member opposite was quoting from. The CFIB and—if you look at—in Manitoba's cost of regulatory compliance in the last few years it's actually decreased by \$127 million or 12 per cent. So we love small business in this province, and it's 50 per cent of the businesses in this province are actually small business and we're very supportive of them.

The CFIB, who the member opposite also quoted, indicates that Manitoba has the lowest cost of complying with regulations for employees with

firms under five. So, you know, just by our record you can see that we do take it seriously and that we support small business. The CFIB, again—once again, has said that compared to the red tape in other jurisdictions across the country and across the United States that we're actually one of the better ones, and that if any duplications in licenses are found that we will look at them and that we've actually been willing to work with them and try to narrow that gap, Mr. Speaker.

I see this bill in two different ways. I think that the members opposite have not recognized that the regulations are significantly different than red tape. The members opposite want to deregulate the workplace by eliminating rules that protect average Manitobans, rules like in health and safety. They see them as nothing more than red tape, but these regulations actually are for people's safety and for their lives. And without having these kind of regulations in place we would end up having more injuries in this province, and I'm certain that the members opposite don't support that. But, you know, they did support in their budget cutting mass amounts from all of these departments, which would actually see less workplace inspections and less workplace inspectors. So maybe I'm wrong, Mr. Speaker, maybe they do support having less regulations in the workplace and less safety for the workplace.

Budget 2013 actually increases the small business tax threshold to \$425,000, an extra \$25,000 where there's a no-tax zone. And if you look at our record on small business, we took it from 8 per cent tax when the members opposite were in government, to zero. So that's a huge move for small businesses. That—in the last 13 years that saved them billions of dollars. I'm wondering if the members opposite are suggesting that we put it back to when they were last in power, that we go back to the 8 per cent regulation and maybe cut out some of the other stuff that they're saying, but charge them those billions of dollars in taxes that they were—that they are now under our government 'reforded' the relief of.

So, you know, Mr. Speaker, when they're talking about small business and streamlining and regulation, we've shown great strides in the last 12 years on giving them really big tax breaks and—from 8 per cent to zero in taxes, \$425,000 now in the tax-free zone. I mean, cutting so-called red tape is actually a wolf in sheep's clothing for cutting safety and services, and we've seen that that's what they're all about when they came out and spoke against

Budget 2013, that it's all about cutting and not about what's going to happen to the people on the other end of those cuts, Mr. Speaker.

* (10:20)

We know that the opposition would abandon the rent controls, that protect Manitoba families, from skyrocketing. They consider that to be red tape too. How would those families feel about their rent getting jacked up and being completely out of control without those kinds of—and I'm putting in quotations—red tape? The continuing of tightening on the rental housing market demonstrates the need that we need to have a rental system in place that protects tenants, and, you know, we've been giving landlords new powers to evict tenants and—who break the law, such as drug dealers, because illegal activity can create an unsafe environment for tenants and real problems for landlords. I guess they would see that as red tape too, but we see that as a protectionary measure for both tenants and landlords, Mr. Speaker.

The legislation that we put in require landlords to compensate tenants for moving costs, as well as higher expensive rent with landlords who have purposely created an undesirable living condition for those people. So, once again, they would see that as red tape. We said it's a protectionary measure so that landlords aren't unduly pushing people out of their apartments and out of their rental houses and not looking at the side of how much it's going to cost them to move.

We are also making additional changes to the landlord and tenancy act to charge higher pet damage deposits so that it works on the—it's a balanced approach. We're working on the landlord's part where, you know, having a pet can quite possibly add to the costs of cleaning of the carpets or damage that a pet might do. But, once again, would that be considered in quotations, red tape, as the members opposite suggest? Regulations need to be in place to protect both the small business owner and people in our communities. If we didn't have these kinds of regulations then just think of what would happen. And what if we had no damage deposit at all, Mr. Speaker? Then the landlord when he has—he wouldn't have any course of action against somebody if they did damage to their house, and the opposite goes for the tenant if they had no regulations in place the landlord could jack the rent up, doubling it, tripling it, who knows? We can't afford to have that kind of reckless kind of regulations put in place or lack of regulations in place.

I think that it's kind of interesting that they talk about accountability and transparency. I mean, all you have to do is read any of the government documents, the budget, all of it is laid out there to be completely accountable and transparent. I like when the members opposite were in power and there was actually two sets of books bound. The one set of books that they would put towards the public and everybody could see their numbers so to speak, and then the other set of books that was hidden under the desk that actually had the real numbers and the real budget that was actually much worse than it was.

So, you know, it's interesting that the members opposite are interested in changing accountability and transparency, but what they're really talking about is stripping regulations from people and protecting people at—be at workplaces or landlord and tenants or even in businesses, Mr. Speaker. I mean, businesses rely on health and safety workers to come in and help them make a safer workplace for their workers. An employee at work—a healthy employee at work is good for business. It's good for everyone. That employee works and then contributes back to society through purchases and other businesses. If we were to cut that kind of red tape, as they—so they call it, and allow certain businesses who aren't as reputable to injure employees, that has a giant cost on the system. And then all of those other businesses would now be paying more in workers compensation rates and that would affect small businesses again, because they would be the ones who would be bearing a brunt of the cost because, as you know, The Workers Compensation Act, it establishes people in a certain group.

So let's say that 10 restaurants are fantastic employers but one of them isn't and we don't have inspectors anymore underneath the lack of red tape that they're—they're sort of so-called red tape, then the inspector wouldn't get out to the bad workplace and all of those employees at that bad workplace that are getting injured would drive up the compensation costs to all of the other businesses that are actually really good employers, Mr. Speaker, because we know most employers are good employers and they want to comply with the laws and they don't want their employees injured, and they want their employees every day. But there are some employers who need a little shove, need a little push along the way to make sure that they're acting in the best interests of their employees and keeping safe work environments for those employees.

So I think that cutting red tape is one thing, and we've done that; we've cut WRHAs from 11, which, actually, the members opposite brought in. And at one time they were, what, up to 15? And we brought them down from 11 to five, so we've cut red tape there.

We've actually—if you read the newspapers yesterday, we've—it was all over the paper—we've cut red tape in the liquor control commission act too. We went from 13 different regulations down to four, so now there's four categories which people can apply for The Liquor Control Act. And there's actually small business in the paper yesterday quoting how fantastic they think this is and it's going to be great for their business.

So we are listening, Mr. Speaker, we're taking advice from Manitobans and making real changes where it counts and not doing reckless cuts as the members opposite would suggest, like in health and safety. We're taking real things and turning it into real ideas that help Manitoban businesses. And, in the year ahead, we're going to introduce new supports to ensure business owners are adequately prepared for business succession, including the creation of a Manitoba succession and resource centre. We're going to be further streamlining more Crown corporations and creating a one-stop shop for supports and businesses to streamline their operations and improve service and delivery of their operations.

Two new programs, AccessManitoba and the business program and service BizPaL, help small businesses and entrepreneurs set up shop in Manitoba. This didn't exist underneath the opposition, so for them to say that we're just going to recklessly cut regulations—these regulations are actually helping small businesses in our province. So, really, what you have to take from it is that the opposition would actually rather harm small businesses by reimplementing an 8 per cent small business tax, or cutting inspectors which would have more employees get hurt and certain bad business creating higher workers' compensation rates.

Well, with that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much for allowing me to have a chance to stand up today in the House.

Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Lac du Bonnet): It gives me great pleasure to stand up today and put a few words on the record towards and speaking in support of Bill 201, which was brought forward by the member

from Emerson, The Regulatory Accountability and Transparency Act.

Now, the act—or the bill requires the government to develop a formal procedure to make the process for enacting regulations more transparent. It also requires government departments to develop regulatory reform plans to eliminate unnecessary regulations and encourage restraint in making new regulations. Both the government procedures and departmental plans must be made public.

It's very interesting, Mr. Speaker, that we're chatting and speaking today on this bill, and we, on this side of the House, are speaking in favour of Bill 201. It's basically bringing in some of the public's view, some public consultations, making sure that the government, whenever it's going to make some changes, that they actually have to throw it out there to the public, get some words of advice, get some public opinion.

We're seeing more and more examples of this government not listening to the people, as the member from St. Norbert put some false words on the record just a few minutes ago about actually listening to what Manitobans have to say. Over the last few years we've seen those examples going all the way back to the election, Mr. Speaker. They promised in the last election that they were going to balance the books by 2014 without raising taxes, and what ended up happening in Budget 2012, they came up with \$184 million in new fees and services in hidden taxes which directly affected small businesses, business goods, services such as gasoline, property insurance, automobile insurance, haircuts, manicures, pedicures—just to name a few.

This year, Mr. Speaker, in Budget 2013, they were a little more bold than they were of sliding in the hidden \$184 million in taxes from last year. They decided to—without, again, public consultation, they decided to proceed and put in the dollars that they're looking at of \$277 million on the backs of local taxpayers, with the raise in the PST from—which is one point, from 7 per cent to 8 per cent, which is basically a 14 per cent increase.

*(10:30)

So with that, we're not quite sure how they're listening to people, how they're listening to Manitobans, Mr. Speaker. Because from what I understand and from what I'm receiving as far as the amounts of emails and phone calls that I'm getting in regards to the PST hike is outrageous—for a

government to stand up today and for the past month or so, doing the PST hike and not listening to all those Manitobans.

I believe there are probably just about 37 of them that are in favour of that PST hike, but, Mr. Speaker, I think that even some of those 37 NDP MLAs on the other side of the House, I'm pretty sure that they're going back in their—into their constituencies and are giving some sort of excuse as well. You know, we sort of have to toe the party line or things like that, because I can't see them actually going back into their constituencies and facing their constituents face to face and being okay with the 14 per cent increase.

Some of the other fees that have been raised is government services by \$114 million, Manitoba Hydro rates 3 and a half per cent, and not only for this year, Mr. Speaker. It's—we're talking for the next 16, 18 years, many, many, many more fees that are hitting Manitoban families quite hard right in their pocketbook.

The most recent fees over the last couple years, Budget '12 and Budget 2013, we're looking at about \$1,600 coming out of a family of four's budget for the year. That means that they're going to have to make some serious tough decisions. They might have to consider cutting back on some extracurricular activities for their kids. They might have to get rid of one of—maybe one of their family vacations or trips or, even worse, maybe it's going to affect people putting clothes on their kids' backs or food on the tables as well.

I know that \$1,600, Mr. Speaker, to some of the members on that side of the House, the government side, the NDP side, \$1,600 isn't very much money to them. But \$1,600 is quite a substantial amount of money, and so if we could look at ways to cut red tape for small businesses, give those opportunities to Manitobans to succeed, and by saving them some of their hard-earned money that's what we should be doing. So that's why we're strongly encouraging the government to let this bill move forward, and so we can have a vote on it and move it so that it does become law.

Mr. Speaker, this cash grab by the NDP that could be better used in businesses and actually allowing Manitobans their say on how that money is spent as opposed to going right into their pockets—I know that we've mentioned quite a few times, and this is fact, it's actually going to come out of our kids', our grandkids' piggy banks as well. So instead

of taking it from them, why not put the word out there and ask Manitobans for it?

Another example of this cash grab, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that they are, the NDP side, are deciding to take the vote tax. That's roughly \$250,000 a year or a million dollars. You divide that by 37 MLAs; we're looking at \$7,000 each that they don't have to get up and get out into their constituencies and ask those hard-working Manitobans for fundraising help or support for their elections or whatever else they're going to use that money for. I'm assuming it's going to be used for maybe some of their advertising and some of their spinning to try to get themselves out of this boondoggle that they've got with this PST increase.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the PST increase without holding a referendum is breaking the law, and we're going to try really, really hard to push this bill, that Bill 20 onto the summer so that Manitobans can see that they actually don't care about the Manitobans that they keep speaking that they do, and they're going to take their voice out of the system and go ahead with the PST increase come July 1st.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, CFIB reported that there's 300,000 jobs that are left vacant. Here in Manitoba they're looking at a rate of 2.3. Now, there's a couple ways to look at that. I know the government's going to try to spin it so that, you know, it's a feel-good story for Manitoba, but basically the fact is, is that maybe we don't have those jobs. Our unemployment rate here in Manitoba is still quite high. Now, why is that? Do we not have the jobs? Are we not attracting the businesses here to Manitoba? Are we not—are we regulating them to the point where we're not as competitive on the national stage, and so we're not attracting the businesses to set up the offices in Manitoba as we should be.

Mr. Speaker, in other jurisdictions across Canada, we see British Columbia has moved aggressively to cut red tape and stimulate growth, and I'd like to stand today and congratulate the Liberal party of BC for, once again, winning that election. It also showed that the polls are a little bit off. But the Premier (Mr. Selinger) the other day on CJOB—I appreciate the member from Elmwood chiming in on how they're the government. The other day, the Premier stood up or chatted on CJOB on how every person's vote counts and that's the right of democracy.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would just like to say that I strongly encourage the amount of red tape

to be cut in this province, cut back. Let's encourage businesses to come to Manitoba, set up shop, create jobs for our future, our kids, our grandkids. Thank you.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to address the member for Emerson's (Mr. Graydon) resolution this morning—or bill—pardon me, Bill 201, and it purports to deal with the issue of red tape. And I can tell you that almost every government and every opposition in this country over the last—I don't know—30, 40 years, maybe more, have been arguing about the issue of red tape, and it sort of sounds like the—to me, like a broken record.

I remember listening to the current Conservative leader doing a statement here in the House a number of years ago when I was the critic for that area, and he was talking about how he was going to eliminate red tape in the Filmon government. This is 1995 or 1996—almost 20 years ago, and actually, even today, as leader of the party and a potential premier of the province—unlikely, but potential—I say potential—but, in his website, he proudly points out in paragraph 4 of his website, he talks about how he eliminated 3,000 pages of statutory regulations as part of the government campaign against red tape. So, presumably, he solved this problem way back 20 years ago. Like, he's kind of slow on progress, isn't he? And now the opposition here is talking about the same thing he was talking about 20 years ago.

But I don't recall him reducing any pages. He's—you know, almost false advertising here. You know, we go to the Advertising Standards Council and make a complaint. He says he eliminated 3,000 pages. I couldn't find any; not even one page. We've had the entire government—we got, what, 15,000 civil servants, according to these guys; we had them look and we haven't found one civil servant yet who could find one regulation that he's eliminated.

So, you know, you got to wonder about the members opposite, and I think that they're a grumpy, grouchy group and for good reason. Very, very negative because, basically, what they see the government doing is eating their lunch. You know, they do not like some of the things that the government actually has been doing, which are exactly what they're talking about here: eliminating red tape. I mean, what do they think we do when we take 11 regional health authorities that they instituted at the time—and there was good reason for it—but

what do they think when we take 11 and we reduce them to five? You'd think they'd be dancing in the street. We've eliminated bureaucrats. We've eliminated government expenses.

*(10:40)

Recently, we closed—or were talking about closing a number of offices and amalgamating. Where's all the accolades coming from this side? It's like they don't want to hear about it. You know, out of sight and out of mind.

Mr. Speaker, we're talking about amalgamating municipalities. Well, look at the outrage here. You know, they're just furious about this, and we're actually doing what they say they want to do. They want—they're looking for efficiencies. They want to eliminate red tape. That's what we're doing.

And what they realize is the public actually likes this. Public likes these things and that's what really gets them riled up because, you know, they're heading into—what?—their fifth election now, and if you look at the progress of incumbent governments since 2011, they pretty well all win. Doesn't matter how bad the government has been, they've all managed to win. And I'm looking at Jean Charest—Jean Charest had hundreds of thousands of students on the streets for months, and he came within a hair of—so this is why they're grumpy, this is why they're grouchy, this is why they're depressed and that's why they're not getting anywhere. They're not resonating with the public.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the government announced in the constituency of River East a \$7.5-million infrastructure program for recreation. Well, you'd think the member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson) would be standing up on her, you know, on one of her points of order, or making a statement in the House, you know, telling us how great it is that we're actually developing facilities in the province. And, you know, she doesn't want to believe it. It's like out of sight, out of mind.

The day before, the Finance Minister gives the opposition concrete examples of where a family of two with a certain income is actually paying less taxes today—\$2,000 less—than they were 12 years ago under the Conservative government. So I remind the member for River East, who is within earshot of me—several times, I might add—that she's better off today than she was when she was a Cabinet minister 12 years ago. And guess what? She says, he's not telling the truth. You know, like even when she's

presented with the facts, she won't believe them. You know, it's out of sight and out of mind.

Now, just recently—in fact, today—if the members would take the time to read the paper, they would see that there's more good news. You know—well, to them, bad news—but more good news for the taxpayers of Manitoba in that we are now changing liquor regulations. Now, this is a group that has complained for years, including their small business associations about, you know, too much regulation in the liquor industry; things should be loosened up. And here we've given them, you know, everything they want and more—and more, Mr. Speaker—and I'm listening to speakers for the Conservative Party get up to speak on this bill, and not one of them have recognized the fact that everything they've asked for on liquor deregulation, we just got. They should be having a party today. They should be out partying right now.

And the federation of independent business, they are quick to criticize the government. But where is the recognition from the Canadian Federation of Independent Business of all the initiatives this government has done to reduce red tape. They're complaining about an increase in the PST, which, by the way, half of the business community say they support. I'd like to know where they are. They complain about tax increases and yet their conservative mayor at city hall is increasing the property taxes more as we speak than what people will be paying in PST increases. Matter of fact, the total tax package, according to their newspaper, the Winnipeg Sun, page 5, I believe, on May 5th, you can look it up, folks, and check it—will find that the basket of taxes increased by the City is around, I think, \$539 this year, more than provincial tax increases. So where are the demonstrations at city hall? Where's the outrage? Now, so I think, you know, when they get their friends from the Canadian Federation of Independent Business and their friends in the media, let's have some equal opportunity demonstrating here, folks; let's go down to city hall and complain about our tax increases.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of pieces of information here that should be put on the record that clearly the members are not able to put on or unwilling to put on or want to conveniently ignore. They ignore the fact that the government has decreased regulations by putting programs online. For many years, people had to fill out their PST applications by hand, their payroll deductions by hand. Today, you can simply pay it online, and that

is what the Manitoba government has been doing over the years. Even in their day, they were making some sounds and putting in some effort to bring these programs along, but it's the Manitoba government, the NDP government, in the last 12 years that have actually made it easier for small businesses to file their PST. And on top of that, the fact that we are the only province in the country to have reduced the corporation taxes to zero should have them dancing in the streets.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley): Now that my honourable colleague has warmed up the audience, we'll continue with the next act of the presentation on Bill 201—interesting little creation. It tries to pretend yet again that the opposition actually cares about, you know, proper service delivery to citizens. We all know that when they talk about cutting red tape, they are actually talking about cutting the very services and protections that people need in their businesses and in their lives on a day-to-day basis.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would go so far as to point out that there is something called red tape, which our government's taking some very good actions against, and I'll give some examples of that in a moment. And then there's blue tape. The blue tape is pretty interesting. I'm just going to let that concept sit with you for a while, and we can all think of some examples. Let me talk about the red tape first. So the red tape would be very obvious examples that we've proudly done to make our government run more efficiently.

We received widespread applause and deservedly so for merging a number of the regional health authorities. I thought the particularly innovative piece there was to link Churchill, the north, that part of the province that members opposite don't go to, aren't even aware of, and back in the day when they issued the map of Manitoba they didn't even include it. So that tells you the level of their interest in governing for all Manitobans right there. Maybe that was a red tape exercise. You know, maybe members opposite thought, we're—we got to do something here, we're just going to lop off the entire top half of the province, and we'll save some money on printing for the provincial map. That's about the level of intelligence that they had then, and I don't see it improving any more today. But by linking Churchill and the north straight with the Winnipeg regional health authority, of course,

that actually is a perfect example of good, efficient decision making, because so many of the people in Churchill and in the north, their health needs require that they come down to Winnipeg. And I thought that was a very innovative proposal and a great example of it.

We've even received, Mr. Speaker, some endorsements for our work on efficiency and on the classic definition of red tape, endorsements from organizations which I'm sure are beating down the doors of our provincial office to take out memberships. They just—they haven't quite made it yet. They're close, I'm sure, as well they should be. Something called the CFIB, Canadian Federation of Independent Business. Lots of small business people have every right to be very proud to work with our government. What was their tax rate under the previous administration? Eight per cent. Eight per cent for a small business in Manitoba under the Filmon Conservatives, and today it would be zero.

* (10:50)

All right, hang on, I'm—I know I'm dealing with Conservative math here, let me break out the abacus. I'm going to go out on a limb and suggest that 8 is worse than zero when it comes to taxes. Can we at least agree on that? Maybe? Perhaps all 57 of us—sorry, 56; Mr. Speaker can't comment at the moment.

So the CFIB has noticed that Manitoba has reduced the cost of red tape by 12 per cent just since 2005. Independent endorsement from an organization that doesn't usually spend a whole lot of time singing our praises but you know when you do good work sometimes the facts just get in the way and you have to let people know of that. I love that when that happens in question period, every single day members opposite will come in here spitting fire up one side and down the other and all of a sudden the cold bucket of water—known as reality—hits them right back in the face and they aren't left with a whole lot to talk about afterwards.

The other piece I want to talk about, Mr. Speaker, is not just the red tape—it's that blue tape concept. It's the idea of things that really should be wrapped up in blue duct tape and not ever, ever, ever opened. People should not be protected when they go to school and when they're being bullied. No, we're not going to talk about that. No, they don't like that type of protection; that's called red tape.

Mr. Speaker, or if I'm a worker, as I had been in numerous occasions working everything from light

construction to office or whatever, if there's a dangerous workplace environment, what does that get called? That gets called red tape. Even if I work for a company that is a repeat offender whose operations are such that workers have been injured on the job, the Conservative caucus position is that is unfair bureaucracy, red tape, and needs to be removed because it's a burden.

They would put the private interests ahead of the working people in this province, their health, their ability to go home to their families safe and properly paid for it. That is their version of blue tape. They're going to wrap up private interest for the 1 per cent in blue tape and not ever, ever let that see the light of day.

Let's say I might be interested in having decent health care; well, no, that was called red tape back in the Filmon era when the current leader was a Cabinet minister sitting around the table, endorsing these decisions, defending them to the public. Red tape became, let's cut the number of doctors, let's cut the number of nurses, let's privatize home care. Do you need me to go through the entire list?

It is very clear, Mr. Speaker, red tape, when we hear that from blue Tories, means cuts to vital services and a privatization of profit at the public's expense.

Nobody in their right mind would have any complaint with making any system, whether it's in the corporate sector, the non-profit sector or the government sector, work more efficiently. By that I mean, able to deliver the same service better, faster, cheaper, more safely, more environmentally friendly, more sustainable, more accountable—that's what we're striving for, that's what we are doing on multiple, multiple fronts.

Let's talk about the blue tape that gets wrapped around folks who are refugees. All right? The blue tape from Ottawa said, no, we're going to wrap the blue tape and exclude them from having health care anymore. No more health care for refugees.

When members of the Harper Conservative government came here and sat in that loge right behind the Conservative caucus and tried to intimidate this government; that was one of the funniest displays I'd ever seen in a long time. What was the Conservative response to that, Mr. Speaker? Did they stand up and say no, you are wrong to deny health care to people who just came out of a refugee

camp to Canada to start a new life? That is a wrong thing to do on principle.

It's the wrong thing to do even if you have the interest of the Canadian public at heart. You know, if you—if someone has an infectious disease through no fault of their own, well, the Tory policy is let the infection spread. That's really what it's going to do, and everyone ends up worse off.

No, no, they decided to wrap the blue tape around some people and exclude other people. Not in Manitoba.

It is amazing to me, Mr. Speaker, and it's something that I think all provincial governments in this country need to take a very close look at. They need to follow the Manitoba model. On this and many other things, we're still the only province providing health-care services to refugees when they come to our province. Every other single province needs to do that. I'm exceptionally proud of that.

And continuing with the topic and the theme of people coming to our country to offer us their labour, their culture, their family, their skills and their talents, what just happened yesterday? What just happened yesterday for seasonal workers, the people who help to plant and to weed and to harvest the—much of the produce and the food that we have here? Well, this government just included those folks—included them in health-care coverage for them when they're here working out in very hot summer conditions, as we know.

I don't know how many of you take your family members or go out to visit farms during the summer. I make a point of doing that every year, and we go out. We'll go berry picking. We'll go visit different agricultural facilities. We're involved in lots of different things along those lines, and quite often we have the great chance to be in the same fields as people from Mexico, from Guatemala, from Honduras, and we have a chance to talk to them. I'm going to feel so much better about those conversations knowing that if something happens to them and they end up with a health-care issue, they can go to the same hospital, the same health-care facility, the same clinic that we even built, probably, in the rural constituency that they're working in. They can go there same as I could, same as my kids could, and be covered. That is not red tape, Mr. Speaker. That is social justice.

It is the right thing to do and, even better, it is the left thing to do. I see my time is just about up,

Mr. Speaker, but believe me, there's a whole lot of blue tape on that side of the Chamber. Don't let them tell you differently.

Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk): It's a pleasure to put a few words on the record this morning on this bill brought in by the members opposite.

As the—I think, the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), you know, correctly stated, they just won't take yes for an answer, the members opposite. You know, they won't take yes for an answer when it comes to reducing duplication, when it comes to reducing red tape. He—the member said, the Leader of the Opposition, when he was in government, those dark, dark days ago, Mr. Speaker, he brought in a—he said he was going to eliminate 3,000 pages of red tape. We've yet to find a single one, as the member correctly puts it out.

When we came into government there were 11 health authorities. In fact, the city of Winnipeg had two—two—health authorities here in the city of Winnipeg. We've eliminated from 11 to five. There were 54 school divisions when we came into government; there are now 37. There were—we've recently merged liquor commission with the Lotteries Corporation. That, of course, we know will save spending. It'll cut costs and it'll improve services to Manitoba, and we've seen that yesterday, Mr. Speaker, when the minister responsible for the liquor commission brought in some incredibly innovative and new regulations to deal with the liquor industry here in Manitoba, which I think was the—widely was appreciated by members of the public.

We made a—we're going to be amalgamating these smaller municipalities here in Manitoba, and we had a good, healthy debate on that here yesterday in the Chamber. And I thought—[interjection] And this was the position, I believe, that AMM took, as the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kostyshyn) said. I believe it was the position of the member for Agassiz (Mr. Briese). If I'm not mistaken, the member for Agassiz, when he was the president of AMM, when he was the president of that organization he in fact advocated—he advocated for smaller municipalities. And the member for Swan River was—he was a member of that executive, and he remembers those days quite fondly, Mr. Speaker, where at the time AMM wanted to—they felt it was a good idea to reduce the size of government, to reduce the size of administration costs in the rural area. And now yesterday we had a debate in this House where the

members opposite spoke against that. I can't believe it. They spoke against this trying to reduce administration. They spoke against trying to reduce the size of government—

* (11:00)

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order. When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member for Selkirk will have seven minutes remaining.

The hour being 11 a.m., it's time for private member's resolution, and the resolution being considered this morning is titled the "Integrity of the Finance Minister", sponsored by the honourable member for Spruce Woods.

RESOLUTIONS

Res. 8—Integrity of the Finance Minister

Mr. Cliff Cullen (Spruce Woods): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from Lakeside,

WHEREAS the Minister of Finance and his government misled the people of Manitoba in 2011 when he promised not to raise taxes; and

WHEREAS the Minister of Finance promised to balance the budget by 2014 and broke his promise; and

WHEREAS the Court of Queen's Bench ruled that the Minister of Finance acted illegally by refusing to comply with The Pari-Mutuel Levy Act.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba acknowledge that the people of Manitoba have lost faith in the honesty and integrity of the Minister of Finance; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the Premier to remove the Minister of Finance from his Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker: It's been moved by the honourable member for Spruce Woods, seconded by the honourable member for Lakeside (Mr. Eichler),

WHEREAS the Minister of Finance and his government misled the people of Manitoba—dispense?

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense.

Mr. Cullen: It certainly is—you know, it's unfortunate on our side that we do have to bring this motion forward to the House, but we do think it's certainly very important to enter into a discussion on

this resolution. And, you know, Mr. Speaker, clearly it deals with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Struthers) and obviously his very important role in terms of being the Minister of Finance. I know he's inherited a very troubling position that he's in with the Premier (Mr. Selinger) being the past minister of Finance for a number of years, and we know where he's at in terms of the budgetary constraints that he's at.

Clearly, we're facing some financial difficulty in the province of Manitoba, not entirely of his own making. He has inherited this position from the current Premier, and I know he—the minister is doing what he can to try to get the province out of this situation. Clearly, the minister, the member from Dauphin, has had a tough month, the past month when he brought forward his budget. Clearly, he had very little support, very little support around the province in terms of his budget and where he wants to go in terms of his budget.

Clearly the PST issue, in terms of raising the provincial sales tax, hasn't been a favourable initiative for most Manitobans, and some of the surveys we see certainly lead to that. And I—thinking, you know, the member, earlier this morning in discussion, talked about business community supporting the notion of an increase in sales tax. Well, I'm not sure where the member was getting that information from.

The CFIB survey says that 93 per cent of their members don't approve of an increase in the provincial sales tax, Mr. Speaker, so maybe it's time that some of the members on government side had the opportunity to review some of the surveys that have been undertaken across our great province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance certainly has had some, I would say, mostly negative feedback to his budget over the last month. I know things aren't going very well for the minister, and clearly, this week too, you know, he's a big Toronto Maple Leafs fan. And I know that the Leafs were put out of the playoffs, and I know he's not going to take that very well and unfortunately those things happen. So when things go bad, things really go bad. So hopefully the Minister of Finance has found somebody else he can cheer for, for the rest of the playoffs.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP ran in 2011 on the premise that they would not raise taxes, and I'm not sure if that was the Minister of Finance idea or it came right from the Premier, but the fact remains that was the marching orders. The members on that

side would have ran on the premise, going door to door, that the NDP government was not going to raise taxes.

Well, what happened, Mr. Speaker, a few months after the election, this Minister of Finance brought in his budget, and that budget clearly expanded provincial sales tax on a lot of goods and services. And clearly, that impacts a lot of Manitobans, and clearly they misled Manitobans. They told people, door to door, they were not going to raise taxes when, in fact, six months later, they did. They increased the provincial sales tax on a number of goods and services, and clearly that was misleading Manitobans, Mr. Speaker.

Then a year later, what they did in this current budget, the Minister of Finance decided that the way to get his hands on extra revenue was to increase the provincial sales tax. As a result, we have an increase in the provincial sales tax pending July 1st, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the fact of the matter is we do have legislation on the books. It's the balanced budget and taxpayer protection act, is on—currently on the books, and that legislation says that the government cannot increase a provincial sales tax unless they hold a referendum. The legislation says they have to go to the public to have a referendum before they increase provincial sales tax. Mr. Speaker, that is the law of Manitoba as it exists right now.

So, the Minister of Finance, before he increases the provincial sales tax, the law says he has to go to Manitobans and ask Manitobans' position whether or not they should be allowed to increase the provincial sales tax. That is the law of the land—we say that the minister is superseding the existing laws of the land. He intends to bring in an increase in the provincial sales tax July 1st, Mr. Speaker, whether Bill 20 passes or not.

And Bill 20 is under debate, under consideration of this House, and Bill 20 proposes to eliminate that call for referendum. So it intends to change the current legislation that exists here in the province of Manitoba.

So we will see what happens on July 1st, whether this government goes ahead and changes the provincial sales tax without the referendum, superseding the existing laws of the land, Mr. Speaker. And we challenge that and we challenge the minister, and that's part of the reasons for this particular motion coming forward today.

The other issue where the Minister of Finance, we believe, is stepped over the line, Mr. Speaker—and this is not our decision, but we feel that he has stepped over the line, and this is a result of his actions that he has undertaken in the budget—in the budget document, where he's indicated he is going to take some money back out of the VLT revenue for the Manitoba Jockey Club and he's also contemplating changing the current legislation around The Pari-Mutuel Levy Act.

Now, The Pari-Mutuel Levy Act as it exists right now, lays out the plan for money that's collected from betting at the horse race at Assiniboia Downs during the horse race operations there. That particular money is collected by the Horse Racing Commission. The legislation says this money is to go back to be reinvested in the horse racing industry in the province of Manitoba, and that is the rule of the law as it's spelled out.

Now, the minister took it on his own to hang onto that money and not put that money back into the horse racing industry, Mr. Speaker. And that's where the Manitoba Jockey Club challenged the minister, and that's where the Court of Queen's Bench said that the minister was overstepping the rules of law. He should not be holding onto that money; that money, by law, is to be turned back to the horse racing industry for use in promoting the horse racing industry here in the province of Manitoba.

Now, the minister had indicated in his budget he is proposing to change the legislation in the future, Mr. Speaker. Now, we haven't seen that proposed changes to The Pari-Mutuel Levy Act on the order paper—we haven't seen that proposed changes. So, the letter of the law exists as it's written now, and that says that money has to be allocated back to the horse racing industry here in Manitoba and that's where the judge said that the minister overstepped his authority and that money has to be returned back to the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, and the—I want to say, Justice Dewar said, in his ruling: These monies are not to be considered as a government grant in the traditional sense of the words; indeed, as matters stand, the Province has no proprietary interest in these monies. So those funds are not the minister's funds to deal with as he pleases. Those 'munds'—those funds are going to be used to be reinvested back in the horse racing industry, and the minister clearly stepped over the bounds of the law as it exists, and that's exactly what Justice Dewar said in his ruling.

* (11:10)

Now, I know the minister is contemplating changes to the legislation. We haven't seen what those changes may look like. And the justice—Justice Dewar said the lay—the law of the land, as it exists—the minister stepped past what the existing current law says, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw an analogy. It's like if the Minister of Finance was driving through Dauphin, and he gets stopped for speeding. In a 50-kilometre zone, he's going 65; he gets pulled over for speeding. At that time the speed limit is 50 kilometres an hour. He is guilty of an offence. Now the Minister of Finance can go and change the law today, but he can't go back and change the law when he got his speeding ticket. He could go and change the law that says now maybe the speed limit there is going to be 70 tomorrow. But at the current time, the speed limit there was 50 kilometres an hour; the minister overstepped his boundaries going 65.

And this is exactly what the judge is saying. You have to play by the rules as they're written at the time of the offence, Mr. Speaker, and that's clearly what it is.

Mr. Speaker, it's clear the Minister of Finance has overstepped his boundaries on a couple of different occurrences, I think, and given that, clearly, Manitobans have lost their confidence in him, and that's the basis for the motion this morning, and I certainly look forward to further debate on this this morning. Thank you.

Hon. Stan Struthers (Minister of Finance): I suppose I should say, thank you, Mr. Speaker, for having this opportunity to speak on this resolution. First of all, I do want to point out that, contrary to what the member for Spruce Woods just said, they did—they do have a choice in this. It's—nobody's making them bring this resolution forward. There's nothing saying that you have to do it. You've made the decision to bring it forward. And I do want to say that I have—in the 18 years that I've been in this building, I've never seen anything quite as personal as this one.

But you know what, Mr. Speaker? Over the term—over the time of the 18 years that I've been here, I've been in opposition. I know what it's like in opposition, and I know what it's like to use tactics and use strategy and use things that further the course of action that you take.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to relate to you something that, when I was very first elected, that had a huge impact on the way I see things in this Legislature and in this House. And I look across to the member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Maguire) because it was his predecessor, Jim Downey, that I learned a very, very last—very good MLA—I learned a very valuable lesson from Jim in this House.

You see, when I was first elected, I sat right up at the back there, right at the left—the seat's not—no, it's vacant now. It's not being used. That's the one right there. That's the one that I—the seat that I sat in when I entered this House, and, Mr. Speaker, we got—at that time, we had members' hours at the end of the day, from 5 o'clock 'til 6 o'clock. We came in and we dealt with private members' hours and that one particular day, Mr. Harry Enns was speaking on a resolution, and he was up here and he was speaking, and Harry could get things going pretty good in the Legislature. He was a good speaker; he could get—well, he could get us riled up really good; I remember that. And we were more than willing to go along with the hijinks that Harry would impose upon us here in the House. So I moved from the seat at the back—I moved down closer to get a look at Harry and participate more in the discussion. So I sat down here at the time Len Evans sat in that seat, right on the end in the front bench, and occupied today by the member for Agassiz (Mr. Briese), and I was listening to Harry Enns speak.

Well, Jim Downey sat in the front row, and Jim Downey and I got into some verbal fisticuffs, back and forth, like we do around here sometimes. We got into it. I was just a rookie; I had maybe—I had, I don't know, if I was even here a month at the time, and Jim was a veteran around the place. He was—I think—was deputy premier at the time. He was a senior Cabinet minister, and he was experienced in the ways of this Legislature, and we got into it.

And it was at end of the day, and we were leaving, and I got to admit, I felt quite badly, because I had said some things that I wouldn't normally say. I felt badly about the exchange that we had. So I'm walking out, and as we walked into the hallway, a guy comes up behind me, kind of puts his arm around me and says, hey, young Struthers, how's things in Dauphin? And it was Jim Downey, and I thought to myself, what's he going to do, hit me? Is he taking this outside of the Chamber, or what's going on here? But you know what? Jim Downey showed me that day that you can have a scrap in the House, you can have a good, honest debate, you can

have a good, honest disagreement about the issues of the day, and Jim let it roll off his back like water. Jim understands that we're people first. That we're people first; we're not New Democrats, we're not Tories, we're not Liberals first. We're people first, and when Jim whacked me on the back and said, how are things in Dauphin, young Struthers, and then we stood in the hallway and had a discussion, a real good discussion, a veteran talking to a rookie—somebody who understood that this building is important and that, yes, our integrity does matter in this building, Mr. Speaker, and our honesty matters.

And I have always taken that tack. I've always treated members opposite like they're people first and then they have opinions and positions and they have tactics and they have strategies. I get the tactics and the strategy stuff. I get that, but, Mr. Speaker, my basic fundamental view is that before we do that we're people. Before we do that we treat people fairly and honestly. Before we engage in the discussions that Manitobans want us to engage in I think we need to understand that all of us—every one of us, every 57 of us—are honourable members. We have integrity. We have honesty.

And every single one of us live up to that every day in this House irrespective of our political parties. Irrespective of the skirmishes that we have it is my fundamental belief that every 57 of us are here for the well-being of Manitobans and that every one of us irrespective of our political party come into this building to make life better for Manitobans.

I think we need to start from that premise, Mr. Speaker. We absolutely have to start from that premise. I know that I start from that premise. I would never bring forward something as personal as this and demean somebody's reputation on the other side of the House. I will engage with you over and over. I—point fingers all you like, but every day we have opportunities in this House to prove that we can rise above this kind of stuff, and we do that through our actions. We do it in how we treat each other in this place. And I will—every day of the week, I will defend our government's positions, and every day of the week I'll defend the people of the constituency of Dauphin, and every day of the week I'll defend the people of Manitoba, and every day of the week I will do it with integrity and I will do it with honesty, and every day of the week I'll understand that even members opposite are human first and political animals second.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order, please.

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): I do want to put a few things on the record in regards to the resolution brought forward by the member from Spruce Woods. And listening to the minister's comments, and he did refer to my—the MLA for Lakeside before, Harry Enns, and I also listened to him an awful lot and I got a lot of advice from Harry in the short time after I got elected and one of the things that Harry did share with me is that it's always about integrity.

* (11:20)

But sometimes, whenever that integrity is challenged or questioned, it's not unusual for a minister to be asked to be moved from his position. And if he wants to make it personal, then he can. We're not asking him to resign. We're asking him to be removed as a Cabinet Minister of Finance. Now, that's very clear—that's very clear. What we're saying here is that minister has misled—misled—the folks of Manitoba. And it's very clear—very clear—that the PST was something that they campaigned on, very clearly, that they would not bring in an increase to the PST. That was information that they put on the record, and whenever that information is not right you need to be called to task on it. We're going to be doing that. That's our job as opposition and he should be able to understand that. And I'm sure he's big enough to be able to admit the fact that, in fact, they misled the fine folks of Manitoba, and that's our job to hold them to account and we're certainly going to do that.

Now, in regards to the parimutuel levy, also was a mislead from the government and from this minister. Whenever there's \$50 million at stake, 500 jobs—and he tried to break the law—is another question.

An Honourable Member: Oh, no.

Mr. Eichler: Yes, very clearly. Read it. In fact, I'll help you with it. I can tell you exactly what Judge—Justice Dewar said. It said governments are not immune from judicial oversights. Government ministers cannot do anything they please. They cannot do anything they please. That is the very laws—the very laws—that we bring forward in this Assembly each and every day. We have to keep our integrity. That integrity has been challenged. Mr. Speaker, we cannot make a set a rules and say they only apply to everyone else. Judge Dewar saw that, very clearly saw that. So what did he do? He said to this very minister, you cannot make laws individually, on your own—on your own—to suit yourself and give that money to someone else. That

agreement was done on—as an agreement with the government, and if that agreement wants to be changed, Judge Dewar said, yes, that can be changed, but you can't change it just whenever it suits you. You have to keep that responsibility, and that's what we talked about.

And I'm glad that the member of Finance talked about integrity. I'm from the old school. I'm a handshake guy. My word is my bond. I don't have to go out there and have a piece of paper saying, oh, this is what we got to do, this is what we have to do to make a deal. I mean, I bought hundreds and thousands of heads of cattle on a handshake. Went back, all the cattle were there. When I made a deal with a tractor, I never had a contract from my neighbour saying, I want to buy your tractor. Integrity is what this is all about, and that's what this is truly all about, and once we lose that integrity then that's why things happen as a consequence.

We're asking the First Minister to remove the minister from his portfolio. He can represent his people. He can do what he needs to do. But as Minister of Finance, we feel the public has lost trust in this minister as a Minister of Finance. He's a great guy. I like him personally. We kibitz back and forth. We talk about different things. And he's done the same thing that he talked about with the member from—Jim Downey. He and I, we've never went for a beer together, but certainly we walk down a hall, we talk. We may not agree on everything and nor knew we need to agree on everything.

That's what a good debate is all about. Whenever you talk about an issue, the best decisions are ones that when we all don't agree, otherwise we're not going to draft good policy. We're not going to agree on what is truly best for all Manitobans. We're not going to agree that just because somebody says the carpet needs to be blue, it—but necessarily have to be blue. It could be whatever, white, black, blue.

An Honourable Member: Orange.

Mr. Eichler: We're not—orange. There—orange, I'm all right with orange too. Whatever that's—but we got to have the debate—we got to have the debate.

But we cannot, we cannot take the rights of individuals away, no matter what we say. The law is very clear that there has to be a referendum. Again, the government may change their mind. July 1st they may not institute the increase in the PST. They may very well say, we don't want to break the law anymore. We're going to give those folks in

Manitoba what is truly due to them, and that is, in fact, a referendum. Have them to have the opportunity to go out and say, yes or no. If 37 on that side of the House feel that they're right, and they're—the people out in Manitoba want to give them the mandate to have a 1 per cent increase, go for it—go for it. We're prepared to let the people speak. Let the people be heard. I see nothing wrong with that, that's democracy; that's integrity; that's what we want; that's what we have to strive for in this House. This is what we got to do to have the rights that all those veterans, all those people, all the leaders before us fought so hard and really deeply cared about so that we'd have true democracy and integrity. That the very thing the minister talked about was integrity—we cannot ever get away from that. Once we do that, then we lost respect to the public and we deserve things like we're seeing here today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Jennifer Howard (Minister of Family Services and Labour): I have to say, I think we've—we're at a new low in this House when this kind of resolution brings forward—well, the—you know, the members of the opposition say there's a lot of weeks left, so I hope that's not a promise of things to come. But maybe it is; I mean, maybe the—maybe they have lost all respect for this Chamber and they've lost all respect for the people that sent them here, but this kind of resolution, Mr. Speaker, is not worth the paper it's written on. It's not worth taking up the time in this Chamber.

People send us here to debate the things that are important to them, to pass laws that will help to protect them, that will help to move their aspirations forward. They don't bring us here to gratuitously attack each other. But that's the—that, I'm sad to say, is what's happening more and more in this House, and it's been very clear throughout this session that there is—you know, the rhetoric about aiming higher is nothing more than empty words from the other side.

You want a debate; we can have a debate on whether or not supporting the horse racing industry is a priority over supporting hospitals and daycares. We can have that debate—we can have that debate all day long. That's not what this resolution is about; this resolution is a very clear personal attack on the integrity and honesty of a member of this House. And if they had said that in a speech, Mr. Speaker, you would call them out of order, because one of the things that I think has been clear from your instruction and the history of this House, that we're

all supposed to treat each other as honourable members. And too infrequently these days that's the case, and I think we heard clearly from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Struthers), who, I have to say, I'm incredibly proud to serve with—we are all proud to serve with.

He and I shared the experience of running in a federal election in parts of the province where we didn't peak too soon as New Democrats, and I know the Minister of Finance to be somebody who has served his constituents not only in opposition, but in government. But I also know him as somebody who comes to public service for the right reasons because he has an honest intent to do the best that he can for the people that elect him and the people of this province. And that sometimes means he goes into difficult situations and talks to people honestly about what we have to do, and they don't always like that. And that's something that all of us have to do, Mr. Speaker, we go and we sit down and we talk to people and sometimes they don't always like what we're saying. But I know that this Minister of Finance is known, to even people who disagree with him, as somebody that they are going to get honesty from; as somebody that they're going to hear as a plain-spoken person; who's someone who is going to listen to them; and as someone who's going to make difficult decisions when they're needed. And I think that's what you want in a finance minister.

So it's unfortunate that they chose to bring forward this resolution, but, you know, we've learned a lot in this session about what—not only how the opposition chooses to behave, but about the kinds of things that they're interested in doing. I think we've heard over and over again this session that they are more interested in appealing to the narrowest of interests in this province. They don't have an interest in trying to appeal to the good in people, they don't have an interest in trying to uplift people. You know, we have in this Chamber a Leader of the Opposition who goes to a meeting and jokes about flooding Winnipeg, who goes to a meeting and tries to divide people against each other in a time of threat of natural disaster. I don't think that's leadership, I don't think that's becoming any member of this House, Mr. Speaker, but that's the character of the members opposite.

And I will tell you, you know, what I have learned from this debate is that supporting an industry like horse racing, that I enjoy—I've gone to watch horses race, my family has, my grandfather used to do it. But when I see letter after letter come

from members opposite asking for things in their constituency, asking for money for daycares, asking for money for personal care homes, asking for bridges and roads, perhaps we should start writing back saying, well, this is contrary to the other advice that we're getting from your MLA, that really the priority is to support horse racing. So that is what they've told us now is the priority that they want to follow. So if that's their priority, then they should be honest with their constituents and say, you know, I know you would like a daycare in your constituency, but I believe that that money is better spent on horse racing and so that's the choice that I'm going to make. And that's the way that I'll start communicating on their behalf to their constituents.

* (11:30)

I want to be really clear about a lot of the misinformation that's been put on the record by the other side. What did that judgment say? It said you can change the law as a government.

What did we say in the budget speech? We're going to change the law. That's what we said; that's what the judge said. Clearly, governments have the power to change the law even when it's a difficult thing to do, Mr. Speaker.

So all of the misinformation, all of the mud, all of the questionable ethics aside, Mr. Speaker, this government said it's going to do something and we're going to do it. And we're going to do it for the good of all Manitobans even though it's a difficult decision. It is a difficult decision to make.

And I have to tell you that having to speak to a resolution like this—this is not a day that I'm going to be particularly proud of because I aspired to be elected, I aspired to come to this Chamber to debate the things that are important to Manitobans.

And we've had a lot of good debates during private members' hours; we've had good debates. Just the other day we had a great debate, I think, on the whole issue of family law and family maintenance; something that affects many of our constituents of which we may have differing opinions but it was a civil debate; it was an honest exchange of ideas.

And I think that is what private members' hours should be about. It shouldn't be about assailing the reputations of people on any side of the House. So I'm going to appeal to my friends, who I know are better than this, who I know are better than this resolution, to try to restore a little bit of the dignity

and a little bit of the credibility in this Chamber that I hope they still believe in.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cliff Graydon (Emerson): And I—it gives me great pleasure to rise to put a few words on the record on this particular resolution brought forward by my colleague from Spruce Woods.

This resolution is something that has to be, has to be brought forward in this House. And the very reason for that is the integrity of all MLAs in this House. The integrity—our integrity has been challenged in court, Mr. Speaker, but more importantly, in the court of public opinion, our integrity has been challenged.

It was challenged just prior to the last election when each party puts out their platform—and that's a platform that they put out a vision for the next four years. And we've heard plans for one-year plan, two-year plans, three-year, five-year, eight-year; now we've got a 10-year plan by the member opposite—by the members opposite.

But because prior to the last election it was clear—very, very clear—that the NDP government would not raise taxes nor would they consider raising the PST by 1 per cent. And just as quickly as they were elected, they raised taxes. The integrity of all of the people in this House was tarnished.

And when the member for Fort Rouge (Ms. Howard) stands up in this House and says that she will start answering the people from my constituency who asked to be treated fairly as anyone else in this province, and she will say no because the member from Emerson supported a resolution in the House to maintain the integrity of everyone.

I want to see that letter from that individual when she sends that out. That is not integrity and she is continuing the type of demoralization of the political system that the NDP government engaged in prior to the last election.

And then when this Minister of Finance (Mr. Struthers)—after he'd come out with raising the taxes, suggesting they're going to raise the PST and break the law—but went out and—this was only public opinion written in a paper, I wasn't there when the discussion went on—but he threatened the members of the Jockey Club. Threatened to bury members and many of them are volunteers. He threatened them by

saying a number of things that I'm not going to repeat here because it is—could be gossip.

But what isn't gossip—what isn't gossip is the fact that he withheld money that was legally to be given to the Horse Racing Commission. That is not gossip; that is fact; that is law. And he diminished every one of our—in this House he diminished our integrity. And he did that publicly and he had to be admonished by the Court of Queen's Bench, and then he stands up here and tells us about his integrity. My goodness, we've heard it before when he inadvertently misled the House—inadvertently misled the House—and I don't like to go back in history, but this is very, very close history. This is close history. This is where many, many of his colleagues did exactly the same thing—they did exactly the same thing. They accepted graft. They stepped ahead of the good citizens of this great province. They stepped to the front of the line to take advantage of the positions that they have, and yet we'll get the member from Fort Rouge saying, I'm going to write to your constituents. I'm going to write to them and say that you stood up for the integrity of this province and that's the reason why you will not get any money for daycare, for homecare, for hospitals, for infrastructure. That's what this member today put on the record.

The judge was very, very clear that the member for Dauphin, the Minister of Finance was wrong, that he had actually broke the law. And I know the minister well and I've had a good relationship with him. But please, don't drag me down a road like this about integrity and stand up in here and cry about his integrity when he has broken the law. You do the crime, do the time. And then get over it, admit that you've made a mistake. Stand up in this House and be a man, admit that you made a mistake and we carry on and go forward. But it didn't happen—it didn't happen.

So my colleague from Spruce Woods who understands the benefits to Manitoba, the benefits of the horse racing industry in Manitoba, the spinoffs in Manitoba, in rural Manitoba that provide a huge benefit to all Manitobans—that industry needs to continue because that is a connect. What we have is a large disconnect between urban and rural Manitoba. Many, many, many of the people now who live in the cities are second and third generation disconnects from rural Manitoba.

And this minister—this minister—is making us all look bad.

So the judge stated that if the government—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I've said many times in this House that I'm a believer in a respectful workplace and this is part of our workplace environment as members of the Assembly. I know members here feel very strongly and very passionate about the debate that is occurring here this morning.

But I'm asking all honourable members to be respectful and mindful of the rules that we have in the Assembly, and to allow the honourable member for Emerson and any other member wishing to debate this matter here this morning the opportunity to engage in that debate in a respectful manner. So I'm asking for the co-operation of all honourable members, please.

The honourable member of Emerson, to continue your remarks.

Mr. Graydon: Well, thank you for that, Mr. Speaker.

The judge admonished the minister and he said clearly that the minister cannot delay approval of the Horse Racing Commission's parimutuel disbursement plan past April 1st as that would have a detrimental effect on the horse racing industry in Manitoba, and as I've pointed out, that industry does contribute a lot to the economy of this province. He also said that the government cannot use this money in a parimutuel fund for any other purpose than promoting horse racing unless the act is amended, however, the government cannot delay paying out the money while contemplating amending the act.

* (11:40)

There is no amendment has come forward. The minister had made the move, held the money past April 1st, and he put the integrity of every member in this House at risk. And he showed all Manitobans the bullying that this NDP government has started to use to get their way and forward an agenda that is not good for Manitobans, that is not good by taking away the democratic right to vote on the PST increase, for example, or the fact that they will take a vote tax to supplement each of the members on that side of the House \$7,000 in the vote tax that they will use however they want in their constituency to go out and tell stories that may have a shred of truth in them, but it will not be the whole truth. As we have seen in the past, I'm sure that they'll carry that going forward.

So thank you very much for the opportunity to put these few words on the record, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that we can regain the integrity that every member in this House deserves and have that minister stand up and resign.

Mr. Tom Nevakshonoff (Interlake): I welcome the opportunity to speak to this resolution this morning, and I have to begin by saying that, in my opinion, this is a disgraceful resolution. To personally attack the integrity of a member of this House is—well, the House leader suggested that it was a new low, and I would be somewhat inclined to agree with her if I didn't know of even a greater depth that members opposite have sunk to in times past.

And I only have to look to my own constituency to see that—the Interlake—where the lowest point in Manitoba's political history occurred back in 1995. And I shouldn't say just the Interlake because it also occurred in Swan River and also in the Dauphin constituency, the constituency of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Struthers), so he knows exactly what I'm talking about here. All of us know what I'm talking about here: the attempt to subvert the election in 1995 by creating a new party. Independent Native Voice is what it was called, and it was a deplorable attempt to subvert the Aboriginal people in our province to lure them into voting for a phony political party funded by the Conservative Party in order to steal votes away from us in the Interlake and Swan River and Dauphin. That was the low point as far as I'm concerned in Manitoba political history.

So we need no lessons from members opposite when it comes to integrity, when it comes to discussions about acting legally and so forth. They're the masters of that.

Now, I shouldn't condemn the whole group over there because most of them were not elected at the time, but there was one individual on the opposite bench that was elected at that time and was, in fact, serving in the Filmon Cabinet, I believe, and that is the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Pallister). The member for Fort Whyte knows all about the vote-rigging scandal because he was in the midst of it as it rolled out. So, if you want to talk about integrity, let's look in that direction.

Now, that was a low point in our history, but in 1999, the subsequent election, this may have been even a lower point when they orchestrated a smear campaign against me personally and—oh, it's too bad—there were some young people in the gallery a few moments ago; I wanted some of our youth to be

aware of some of the shenanigans of members opposite, but to draft—to draft a phony police report, which is what they did, a phony police report accusing me of drug trafficking, accusing me of breaking and entering and so forth, and then again, faxing this information to all of the band offices in my constituency—I have eight First Nations communities at the time. Again they tried to subvert Aboriginal people in this province. It's no wonder they don't get any support 'whatsomever'—whatsoever from First Nations people, given how they have attempted to use and abuse them politically in times past. So, throwing words like integrity into a resolution—really, it's quite amazing, the utter gall that they have across the way here, to go down this path.

And they were talking about judges a moment ago. Well, let's go back to Judge Alfred Monnin. What did he say about members opposite? During the investigation that he did, his exact words were, and I quote: Never in all his days had he seen as many liars as had come forward to this investigation that he did. So I guess we know where Justice Monnin lies, in terms of the integrity of the Conservative Party.

So, you know—and we—if we want to talk about judges and going to court and all that, well, let's go back to 1999 again. What happened there? This time they never slipped the noose, because one of their members—and I believe this individual—I won't name her—but I believe this individual was the chief of staff for the Conservative caucus at the time, who came out to the Interlake to be the de facto campaign manager for Betty Green, who ran against me. This was the mastermind behind this plot and, well, ultimately, this individual was convicted—convicted—in court of defamation of a candidate and obstruction of justice. So that's the record of the Conservative Party when it comes to integrity. Again, no lessons—no lessons to teach us.

So, well, you know, let's—I'd like to bring it a little closer to today, as a matter of fact, because, you know, I've been victimized in times past in the Interlake, but I see the same thing under way today by members opposite. And again the Leader of the Official Opposition issued a press release not too, too long ago misquoting me, attributing words to me that I never put on the record, regarding a highways project that we're, you know, currently working on, and it goes into that Okno area: it's Highway 326. And the Minister of Finance and I will soon be going

to visit those very individuals to talk about this project.

But their quote was that I had said, it's not my fault—you built in the wrong place.

Well, that is untrue, and I have—I really take offence to that, that they would go down this road once again, having subverted democracy in 1995, having smeared me in 1999, that it's still the same strategy. It's still the same playbook that they're working from: dirty tricks and misinformation, putting it on the record, having the nerve to actually put press releases out. My goodness, what is not beyond members opposite, when it comes to trying to win?

The member for Lakeside (Mr. Eichler) spoke a few minutes ago. Well, the member for Lakeside, I have to say, is following this same strategy. Supposedly, I was berating people in the Portage Diversion, threatening them that if they didn't get out, that all the money was going to be cut off to them. Well, that is patently untrue as well. The member opposite should be ashamed of himself for taking this tactic. It's—well, you know, I want to use parliamentary language, Mr. Speaker, so, you know, I won't tell you what I truly feel about that type of a tactic. But it is as low as it gets and, again, the member for Lakeside should be ashamed of himself for taking this type of tactic. It's a disgrace and you want to talk about integrity in this Chamber, well, that type of action is an example of the opposite of integrity, I would have to say.

* (11:50)

So, you know, as I said, we need no lessons from members opposite in terms of integrity. If they conducted themselves in an honest and forthright and upright manner, then I'm sure decorum would be a lot better in this House, but historically they've conducted themselves in a deplorable manner and it's extending to this very day. First of all, the false information that they're putting on the record in terms of my commentary and to attack the personal—a personal attack on another member of this House is just absolutely beyond the pale.

So, you know, I think we should all vote on this so that we can actually put it on the record that the majority of the people in this House find this resolution to be complete and utter trash. So let's vote on it and consign it to the garbage bin where it deserves. Thank you very much.

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): Thank you for the opportunity to say a few words on this resolution, Mr. Speaker, and we'll have a chance to see whether or not the government wants to vote on this resolution or whether or not they're going to speak it out, whether or not they're going to speak out the resolution or whether or not they're actually going to allow for a vote to come. I'll certainly give them time to call for the vote, and we look forward to that vote happening.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems that the government has a very short memory because I remember—certainly, I know some of the members weren't here at the time, but I remember the NDP at the time calling for resignations regularly. The member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) admits that he did it at least twice, and there are many other members who were in the government at the time who called for resignations. And you know what? I'm sure for the ministers of the time in the Filmon government, it probably didn't feel good—probably didn't feel good to have resignations called for, but you know what? You know why they didn't necessarily take it personally? Because it's something called ministerial responsibility. It's actually something called ministerial responsibility, and how it is that the government can be so offended—so offended—that there could be a call for a resignation, that they now feel after 13 years that they're above it, that they shouldn't have to be subjected to ministerial responsibility.

This isn't something unusual, you know. We can look at different parliaments, whether it's provincial or federal politics. It actually happens sometimes because we believe that ministers need to be held accountable. And when we were in government, we had members of the NDP who now are sanctimonious and forget about this, who don't remember—in fact, they attacked the Speaker, Mr. Speaker, if you can believe that. They attacked the Speaker, but they also attacked ministers and said that there should be ministerial accountability. And I agree. There should be ministerial accountability, but it works both ways. And when a minister has been found in the court—in the court—to have broken the law because he hasn't changed the law yet—because we will agree that the government has the right to change a law—but you can't do something before you change the law, and that is what the judgment was about: they did something against the law before they changed the law.

Not only did they do it then, but they're planning to do it again on the PST increase. And, of course, we also—I read the judgment; I know a little bit about the law—you should learn yourself. Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that not only did the government break the law by not changing the law first and instituting something, they plan to do it again. But they made promises about balancing the budget, and they didn't do that either.

Now, if that isn't enough—if breaking the law and breaking your promise—I'll include the PST—isn't enough to call for a minister's resignation, I wonder where the bar is. I wonder where the bar is for the Government House Leader (Ms. Howard) when she says, you know what? Breaking the law isn't enough to call for a resignation. Breaking your promise isn't enough for calling for a resignation.

If they don't think those things are enough to have ministerial responsibility, well, I wonder how far they're willing to go in terms of what—not fulfilling promises, not following the law, before they think it would actually be appropriate to call for resignation. Now, the Free Press, the Winnipeg Free Press, not always, you know, a paper that's always on our side—not always a paper that's always on our side, Mr. Speaker, called for a resignation, called for the resignation of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Struthers). Now, I guess the Government House Leader feels that the Winnipeg Free Press now all of a sudden has sunk to a new low. They've gone to a new low over calling for a resignation.

Well, you know, I don't know why she would attack a newspaper here in the province of Manitoba. There are hundreds of Manitobans, I dare say thousands, who have made comments that the minister should resign, while the Government House Leader feels that all of them have sunk to a new low, Mr. Speaker.

Well, you know what? Those Manitobans and the Winnipeg Free Press, I suppose, actually believe in ministerial responsibility. They actually believe in something like that. They actually believe that when you make a promise, you should keep it. They actually believe that if there's a law, you should follow it, Mr. Speaker, but, you know, heaven forbid that some of the very same people who believe in something called ministerial responsibility, at a different time in this Legislature, now don't think it should apply to them. Well, I say what's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. If the minister is so

thin-skinned that he doesn't believe in ministerial responsibility, maybe he should look for a new line of work.

Mr. Speaker: Any further debate on the resolution?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question having been called, is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the resolution?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of adopting the resolution, please signify by saying aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed to the resolution, signify by saying nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In the opinion of the Chair, the Nays have it.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Official Opposition House Leader): A recorded vote, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A recorded vote having been requested, call in the members.

Order. Order, please. The one-hour allocation allowed for the ringing of the division bells has expired. I'm instructing that they be turned off and we'll now proceed with the vote.

The question before the Assembly is the resolution sponsored by the honourable member for Spruce Woods (Mr. Cullen) titled the "Integrity of the Minister of Finance".

Division

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

Yeas

Briese, Cullen, Driedger, Eichler, Ewasko, Friesen, Gerrard, Goertzen, Graydon, Helwer, Maguire, Mitchelson, Pallister, Pedersen, Rowat, Schuler, Smook, Stefanson, Wishart.

Nays

Allan, Allum, Altemeyer, Ashton, Bjornson, Blady, Chief, Chomiak, Crothers, Dewar, Gaudreau, Howard, Irvin-Ross, Jha, Kostyshyn, Lemieux, Mackintosh, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Marcelino (Tyndall Park), Melnick, Nevakshonoff, Oswald, Rondeau, Saran, Selby, Selinger, Struthers, Swan, Whitehead, Wiebe.

Clerk (Ms. Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 19, Nays 31.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the resolution lost.

* * *

Mr. Speaker: The hour being past—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please.

The hour being past 12 noon, this House is in recess until 1:30 p.m. this afternoon.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, May 16, 2013

CONTENTS

ORDERS OF THE DAY		Resolutions	
PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS		Res. 8–Integrity of the Finance Minister	
Debate on Second Readings–Public Bills		Cullen	1323
Bill 201–The Regulatory Accountability and Transparency Act		Struthers	1325
Wiebe	1313	Eichler	1327
Smook	1314	Howard	1328
Gaudreau	1315	Graydon	1329
Ewasko	1317	Nevakshonoff	1331
Maloway	1319	Goertzen	1332
Altemeyer	1321		
Dewar	1323		

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

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