

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

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

Vol. LXX No. 60B - 1:30 p.m., Tuesday, May 30, 2017

ISSN 0542-5492

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Forty-First Legislature

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, May 30, 2017

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Please be seated.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 228—The Life Leases Amendment Act

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): I move, seconded by the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Selinger), that Bill 228, The Life Leases Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les baux viagers, be now read a first time.

Motion presented.

Mr. Swan: I am pleased to introduce The Life Leases Amendment Act. This bill amends The Life Leases Act to allow life-lease tenants to attend, speak and vote at meetings of the landlord's board of directors.

Life-lease tenants pay a substantial entrance fee to the landlords of a life-lease residential complex. This amendment would ensure that life-lease tenants have a voice in any decisions made by the board of directors regarding the development, maintenance or rent increases of buildings in which they reside. This bill will give greater voice and greater protection to tenants by involving them in the decision-making process.

I encourage all members to support better protections for life-lease tenants. Thank you.

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

Committee reports?

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Cameron Friesen (Minister of Finance): I rise today to table the following reports: (1) the Manitoba Employee Pensions and Other Costs, Supplementary Information for Legislative Review, 2017-2018 Departmental Expenditure Estimates; (2) the Manitoba Enabling Appropriations and Other Appropriations, Supplementary Information for Legislative Review, 2017-2018 Departmental Expenditures; and (3) the Report to the Legislature Pursuant to Section 63(4) of The Financial

Administration Act Relating to the Supplementary loan and guarantee authority.

Madam Speaker: In accordance with section 42 of The Ombudsman Act and subsection 51(1) of The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act and subsection 37(1) of the personal health act and subsection 26(1) of The Public Interest Disclosure (Whistleblower Protection) Act, I am pleased to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Ombudsman for the year ended December 31st, 2016.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Madam Speaker: The honourable Minister of Infrastructure, and I would indicate that the required 90 minutes notice prior to routine proceedings was provided in accordance with rule 26(2).

Would the honourable minister please proceed with his statement.

Fire and Flood Update

Hon. Blaine Pedersen (Minister of Infrastructure): The melting snow across the North continues to produce flood conditions along the Churchill River system and its tributaries. The rail line from Gillam to Churchill remains out of service.

Initial resupply flights to War Lake First Nation and the community of Illford have been completed. The Canadian Red Cross is co-ordinating the delivery of critical supplies by air to First Nation communities which rely on the rail line for supplies. We understand VIA Rail plans to restore passenger service between Thompson and Gillam, and in the town of Churchill, Manitoba Hydro and provincial officials continue to monitor the sandbag protection around the drinking water treatment plant.

It is expected the Churchill River will crest June 2nd at around 203,000 cubic feet per second. By contrast, the Red River crested at 65,000 cubic feet per second this spring.

On the wildfire front, the Canadian Red Cross has started the return of evacuees from Red Sucker Lake First Nation, just over 560 residents who were evacuated as a result of smoke and wildfire threats.

And, Madam Speaker, we want to extend our thanks to all those working on the front lines in

all these emergency cases for the safety of all Manitobans.

Thank you.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Northern Manitoba communities are continuing to feel the impact of severe flooding. The Churchill River was flowing at 160,000 cubic feet per second, and the remaining ice has led to unpredictable flows and changing water levels.

The high water levels have left rail lines damaged. No trains have been able to get through. This has led to delays in shipments bringing food and other supplies to these communities. In War Lake First Nation a state of emergency has been declared.

Madam Speaker, communities across Manitoba are facing some of the worst flooding in decades, which has led to power outages, river bank and soil erosion, infrastructure damage and property damage. States of emergency are most frequent and more common, and communities are feeling the impact of climate change here and now.

Manitoba communities are frustrated that this kind of flooding has now become the new normal, and the people of northern Manitoba need this government to take concrete action, not give them meaningless platitudes. We know that the time to invest in flood protection infrastructure is now.

Once again, on behalf of our NDP caucus, we send our thoughts and support to all Manitoba families affected by flooding. We would also like to thank the dedicated first responders and volunteers who are working tirelessly to keep Manitoba families and properties safe.

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

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

Mr. Gerrard: I want to thank the Minister of Infrastructure (Mr. Pedersen) for the update. I want to thank the Canadian Red Cross for all the work that they are doing. It's a tremendous effort to make sure that people have got food in these communities, and in spite of the fact that the rail line is out from Gillam to Churchill, and it's really causing a tremendous amount of trouble, devastation, difficulty in those areas.

It would have been helpful if the minister had told us, because this is a very high flow level, is this a one-in-10 or -20 or -50 or -100-year flood for this area, what can we expect in the future, and what are the minister's plans in terms of preventing this sort of flooding in the future.

I also note that, as well as the Churchill River, that Lake St. Martin is a foot and a half above flood level, and that this is continued, and they probably aren't quite at the peak yet, and it would have been helpful to have an update on Lake St. Martin, because I think that that's a community which deserves some fair attention because of the fact that there have been so many evacuated from there and how things are progressing in terms of the long-run planning there.

So, thank you, Madam Speaker, for this opportunity.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Armed Forces Day

Mr. Jon Reyes (St. Norbert): This coming Sunday, the first Sunday of June, is Armed Forces Day, a day to honour the men and women who, through various branches of the military, keep our nation safe.

Over the last five months, Canadians have been celebrating the 150th anniversary of Canada's Confederation, and this past April, the 100th anniversary of Vimy Ridge, acknowledged as the true birth of a Canadian identity.

I stand in the House today to remind all that the privilege of these celebrations is the result of the duty and sacrifices of Canada's Armed Forces.

Earlier this afternoon, I had the opportunity as Special Envoy for Military Affairs to host three generations of Canadians in my office: veterans, active Armed Forces personnel and students from my alma mater of Sisler High School. Recognition dates such as Armed Forces Day reminds us to honour our fallen heroes and those still serving here and abroad. I was both humbled and proud to witness the interactions between three generations of Manitobans.

I would like to take a moment to acknowledge and thank members of the Armed Forces here with us today. Serving is a very demanding and important role. Please know that your service and efforts are valued and make a difference.

My colleagues in the Legislative Assembly join with all Manitobans in extending to all active service personnel in the navy, army and air force, a happy and safe Armed Forces Day this Sunday, June 4th, 2017.

And to our veterans, a sincere thank you for having defended the core values that define us as Canadians. You are all a source of national pride. *Merci [Thank you].*

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

* (13:40)

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for St. Norbert.

Mr. Reyes: I ask leave to request the names of the—of members in the gallery to be recorded in Hansard.

Madam Speaker: Is there leave to record the names of those in attendance in Hansard? *[Agreed]*

Armed Forces representatives: Warrant Officer Dylan Lee, Captain Morgan Roche

Veterans: Stan Butterworth, Peter Correia, Armand Lavallee, Antonio Neves, Carlos Oliveira, Manuel Oliveira, Joel Roy, Carlos Sousa, John Stoyko

Sagkeeng First Nation European Trip

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): This past April, a group of high school students from my home community of Sagkeeng First Nation travelled to Europe to take part in the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Vimy Ridge.

For two years, the students fundraised \$5,000 each, required to participate in the trip. Additionally, each student was required to research and pay homage to a soldier or veteran.

During the 12 days, the students travelled to Berlin, Amsterdam, Belgium and Poland, visiting Canadian war cemeteries honouring our veterans, culminating in the 100th anniversary ceremony at Vimy Ridge.

The students also had the opportunity to visit the house of Anne Frank.

The trip enabled students to experience first-hand the important role indigenous veterans played in each of the world wars and the Korean conflict. They were touched to hear the sacrifices our people made fighting for our rights and freedoms.

Madam Speaker, a monument stands in Sagkeeng honouring 31 soldiers from our

community, including my grandfather, that I suspect now has more meaning and connection for the students.

Alongside family, friends, educators and Sagkeeng's chief and council, I am very proud of each of these students and look forward to seeing each and every one of your journeys unfold.

Please join me in congratulating Sagkeeng First Nation students on taking important steps in guiding their own education and honouring all Canadian veterans and soldiers.

Miigwech.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for St. Johns.

Ms. Fontaine: Today's member's statement was originally scheduled for April 25th. However, we had to reschedule owing to the tragic death of 19-year-old Serena McKay.

I'm asking leave for a moment of silence in respect of Serena McKay, but for all the young women that have been murdered in my home community of Sagkeeng First Nation.

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

Please rise.

A moment of silence was observed.

Brandon Bear Clan Patrol

Mr. Len Isleifson (Brandon East): Good afternoon, Madam Speaker. I rise in the House today to both bring awareness to a Brandon effort and to congratulate a group of like-minded individuals for their caring and drive to help make the city of Brandon a better community.

I speak of the Brandon bear club—or, pardon me, Bear Clan, Madam Speaker. This citizen-run patrol organization, which currently has 15 grandmother council members, has been organizing since January. I have had the distinct pleasure of attending a number of meetings in the past few months and recently participated in a very heartfelt ceremony to kick off this well-worth project.

I have had the personal pleasure of attending the pipe ceremony that served as a means to start the Brandon Bear Clan Patrol in a good way. Teachings from indigenous knowledge keepers inform us that, like a mother bear protects her cubs, the Bear Clan is responsible for protecting their people. I have

learned that, traditionally, people of the Bear Clan live outside of the village to ensure the safety of the gentler clans inside the village. It is with this teaching at the heart of what we—pardon me, of what they do, the Bear Clan Patrol operates in our province and across our nation.

Madam Speaker, I want to recognize the passion and vision of Tammy Hossack, the Aboriginal Head Start co-ordinator for the Brandon Friendship Centre. Her efforts in creating this conversation with the community has eventually led to the start of the local Bear Clan; it is an important step in community building.

Starting on June 2nd, Madam Speaker, members of Brandon's first Bear Clan Patrol group will set foot on Brandon's streets. The Bear Clan Patrol volunteers will be walking the streets after dark, providing a presence that promotes safety, conflict resolution and crime prevention, while looking out for the city's missing and most vulnerable.

Madam Speaker, I would like to point out that Mr. James Favel, the executive director of the Bear Clan Patrol Incorporated, who was very instrumental in the establishment of the Brandon Bear Clan, is with us today.

Also, Madam Speaker, I know—I now ask all members here to join me in recognizing Brandon Bear Clan President Roberta Mackinnon and her team of volunteers for their dedication to the betterment of the city of Brandon.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for Brandon East.

Mr. Len Isleifson (Brandon East): Well, thank you again, Madam Speaker. I ask for leave to record the names in Hansard of the volunteers that are with us today from the 'bandon'—Brandon Bear Clan.

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

Brandon Bear Clan Patrol volunteers: Giselle Campbell, James Favel, Shannon Favel, Deidre Gregory, Roberta Mackinnon, Ellen Roman, Bernice Soldier.

Kathy Levandoski

Hon. Eileen Clarke (Minister of Indigenous and Municipal Relations): It gives me great pleasure today to recognize a rural Manitoba artist and Agassiz constituent, Kathy Levandoski.

Kathy has been a lifelong artist and has found joy, creativity and inspiration in rural settings. After working in her community, teaching and exhibiting throughout western Manitoba for many years, she enrolled in the Brandon University fine arts program in 2004. In 2013, Kathy completed her thesis show and received BFA honours degree in May of 2014. After graduation she was asked to do an exhibition for the Art Gallery of Southwestern Manitoba where she showcased her series, *Riding the Edge*. Since that exhibition this past October, two of Kathy's pieces have been added to the Province's art collection, where they will be on display for the visiting public to enjoy in Brandon and Winnipeg offices.

Currently, Kathy is completing the series, *Riding the Edge*, the *Sequel*, and will show it at Wasagamung art gallery in Riding Mountain National Park in July.

Not only is Kathy an artist in her community but also a volunteer. She has spearheaded artistic and creative ventures in her rural community of Kelwood. She has organized events such as Harvest Sun Music Festival and art society, Kelwood 'arbortorium' and garden and the Eleanor Rose Outdoor Quilt Show.

On behalf of the Manitoba Legislature, we thank Kathy for her hard work, vision and talent.

Madam Speaker I ask that all members of the House join me in wishing Kathy continued success with her arts career.

Misericordia Urgent Care Centre Closure

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Twenty-four physicians, the Misericordia urgent-care team, have written about the government's plan to close the centre. Their letter says, there is certainly no patient-care justification for this closure. From a cost-savings perspective, the closure of Misericordia urgent care is indefensible. It functions at an exceedingly high level of efficiency and patient satisfaction as an emergency centre for our city, at approximately 50 per cent of the financial outlay that a full emergency centre requires.

The physicians emphasize that Misericordia urgent care serves, in large part, a downtown core population, people who live in the downtown and Point Douglas neighbourhoods, communities made up of many of our city's impoverished, marginalized and disenfranchised, who needs—whose needs can be and frequently are overlooked. Many who live in the

community around Misericordia do not own personal transportation and cannot afford to hire a taxi to seek medical care in the periphery of Winnipeg. Many even struggle with finding resources to purchase bus tickets and make their way on foot to Misericordia. With the closure of our urgent-care centre, many will walk to Health Sciences Centre or St. Boniface, call for an ambulance or not seek care at all. Closing Misericordia urgent care, taking away access to non-emergent 24-hour care in the core of the city, will cost the system more and increase the wait times at the already struggling ERs. The closure of Misericordia will be a huge loss for some of the most needy of Winnipeg's population.

They request—as the Misericordia physician team, we ask strongly that the decision to close Misericordia Urgent Care be reconsidered and reversed.

I ask the government to heed this eloquent plea and to reverse their decision to close the Misericordia—

Madam Speaker: The member's time has expired.

* (13:50)

Introduction of Guests

Madam Speaker: Prior to oral questions, we have some guests in the gallery.

We have seated in the public gallery from Sisler High School 15 grade 9 students under the direction of Ming Di Zhao, and this group is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Burrows (Ms. Lamoureux).

Also seated in the public gallery, from Sunflower Valley Christian School, 15 grade 6-to-9 students under the direction of Shelley Towes, and this group is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Emerson (Mr. Graydon).

Seated also in the public gallery from Ecole Selkirk Junior High we have 80 grade 9 students under the direction of Ms. Joan Cooney, and this group is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Selkirk (Mr. Lagimodiere).

And also in the public gallery we have with us today trustees from the Louis Riel School Division, Josie Landry and Tom Parker, who are the guests of the honourable member for St. Vital (Mrs. Mayer).

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

Speaker's Statement

Madam Speaker: And we have two more pages that will also be leaving us after today, and I'd just like to make a few comments about our pages.

Sydney Puhach will be graduating from collège Béliveau in June and will be working with a Gabrielle-Roy house museum over the summer. She will continue to offer her tutoring services throughout the next year and volunteer with Kani Kanichihk. Her studies will continue next year at the University of Manitoba where she will be attending the Asper School of Business.

Though she is unsure of what exactly the future will hold for her, she is looking forward to beginning the next chapter of her life with the experience and knowledge she has acquired through her job as a page.

She would like to thank everyone who has made her year at the Legislature so memorial and memorable, and wishes everyone a wonderful summer and upcoming session.

Also we have with us Soomin Han, and Soomin will be graduating her high school education as a grade 12 student at St. Mary's Academy. She hopes to pursue psychiatry and will continue working as a lifeguard and swim instructor at the YMCA-YWCA and the Rady JCC.

This summer, Soomin will be participating in the Students on Ice program and will be joining the 2017 Arctic Expedition team alongside students, professors and scientists from all over the world. She will start her expedition at Resolute Bay, Nunavut, and finish in Greenland.

She wanted to thank everyone for making her feel welcomed and appreciates everyone's kindness. This opportunity has been an experience of a lifetime and she will cherish and remember all of the wonderful experiences, including every member's coffee order.

And on behalf of all honourable members, we wish you all the best.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Rural Health Services Plan for Emergency Rooms

Ms. Flor Marcelino (Leader of the Official Opposition): Many, many Manitobans are opposed to the Premier's closure of Winnipeg emergency rooms. The Premier leapt without looking, and we're

now hearing from doctors, nurses and patients that this was the wrong decision.

Now the Premier intends to do the same for rural Manitoba. He's brought in a partisan appointee from Saskatchewan and appointed his head communicator to sell the Premier's plans.

Madam Speaker, when was the Premier planning on telling Manitobans his plans for permanently closing rural ERs?

Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier): Well, Madam Speaker, first of all, I think it is very difficult for the opposition or anyone else to defend the status quo in our province. Currently, we have some of the longest waits for emergency services in the country. We have the—some of the longest waits, as well, for specialized treatment, for diagnosis. These are not easy things to defend, Madam Speaker.

I recognize that change is difficult. I recognize that it is the only thing that has every led to real progress, as well. And so I would encourage all members to realize that we can do better in Manitoba and that is exactly what we intended to do.

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

Emergency Room Services Impact of Closures

Ms. Flor Marcelino (Leader of the Official Opposition): We will continue to hold this government to account for its plans to permanently close rural ERs.

And in Winnipeg, doctors, nurses and patients are standing up against the government's plans. Doctors are saying that the closure of the Misericordia Urgent Care Centre is indefensible and they say that it is a disservice to the vulnerable people in downtown and Point Douglas.

Why is the Premier closing his ears to doctors and the people of downtown Winnipeg?

Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier): Well, Madam Speaker, I know, and it is undeniable that the previous government recognized there was a serious problem in our health-care system. They recognized the distress it was causing people, for example, to wait for hours and hours for emergency care in pain.

They commissioned, as a consequence of that recognition, studies and research reports which they then shelved or discarded and did not listen to. Madam Speaker, Dr. Aleks Chochinov is the head

of the department of emergency medicine at the University of Manitoba. He is the regional director of emergency programming for the WRHA. He's the president-elect of the Canadian Association of Emergency Physicians and he supports these changes and says, these days, emergency departments in hospitalized are specialized so you really need to get the patients to the right doctors, the specialists, the diagnostic and therapeutic equipment, and we need to have the capacity to do that in our system.

Madam Speaker, we're listening. We're listening to the experts that the previous government refused to listen to. We have the courage to act where they were fearful to.

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

Ms. Marcelino: Under the Premier's watch, thousands of Winnipeggers in northeast Winnipeg will be losing local access to their health services. The Premier has seen nurses on the steps of this Legislature and heard from doctors about his misguided plans. And now, thousands of northeast Winnipeggers have shown that they are opposed to this government's failed proposal.

Why won't the Premier listen to Winnipeggers about their health services? Will he reverse his course?

Mr. Pallister: Believe it was Nelson Mandela who said that courage is not the absence of fear; it is a willingness to act in the face of fear.

And we recognize that changes cause fear, Madam Speaker, and we see that in the responses that are natural and quite understandable among many, especially members opposite who attempt—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Pallister: —to magnify the fears. But Madam Speaker, there's a reason that every other major city has addressed these challenges. There's a reason that Vancouver, triple our size, for example, has four ERs, not six, but four. And there's a reason that the wait time on average in Vancouver is two hours, not six.

We need to address these things. We're going to address them. We have the courage to do so. We have the courage to listen. We will continue to, Madam Speaker.

Concordia Hospital ER Services Request to Reconsider Closure

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): Madam Speaker, this afternoon a group of concerned northeast Winnipeg citizens presented a petition with over 5,000 signatures to the Health Minister's office.

These signatures came from families. They came from seniors and they came from health-care workers who are worried what closing the Concordia ER will do for the future of their community. The signatures were gathered by residents themselves, residents like Mr. Granke, who takes a stack of blank petitions and travels around the seniors' blocks on foot weekly. He's personally collected over 30 pages of petitions and he's done so because it hits close to home. His own wife was saved at Concordia Hospital because of the amazing work that's done there.

Will the Health Minister listen to Mr. Granke and the thousands of residents who are asking him to save Concordia's emergency room?

Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier): Let there be no doubt of our respect for the work—and the good work—that people have done in our emergency rooms, Madam Speaker, across the province. We have tremendous respect for those staff and we know that there are numerous stories of their good works and the results of them. But let's not misunderstand the challenges we must face. They are real. Concordia's waits are the longest in Canada for emergency service, twice the national average. People have waited for thousands of hours uncertain of care coming their way. That is not appropriate.

* (14:00)

Dr. Aleks Chochinov, who is a renowned national and international expert in this field, says, these days emergency departments in hospitals are specialized, so you really need to get the patients to the right doctors, the right specialist, the right diagnosis and the right therapeutic equipment.

With these changes we will have the capacity to do that, Madam Speaker. Better care for Manitobans and sooner, that's the goal.

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

Mr. Wiebe: Madam Speaker, another community member, Claudette, a retired teacher from Transcona, called every MLA in northeast Winnipeg trying to get an answer as to why this government thought her area could survive without emergency care. She

brought in pages and pages of names that she canvassed on her own time, and no one she approached ever said to her that they wouldn't sign, they wouldn't support this petition.

Claudette sees how Concordia's closure will impact the hundreds of thousands of people not only living in her area, but the surrounding areas of Transcona, Rossmere, River East, East St. Paul and beyond. All of these communities will be affected.

Will the Health Minister listen to Claudette and the thousands of residents who have signed their name to this petition and save Concordia's ER?

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Health, Seniors and Active Living): Well, Madam Speaker, what is true is that there are thousands of people like Claudette who waited hundreds and thousands of hours in emergency rooms in one year. In one year they would wait hundreds of thousands of hours waiting for service. That is what needed to change.

Manitobans, when they go to an ER, deserve to have service. Driving 10 minutes to an emergency room and then waiting for seven hours isn't service. That is why Dr. Peachey said, more doesn't mean better; having the right services means better. Better care means better services. That's what the member opposite doesn't want to acknowledge, Madam Speaker.

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

Mr. Wiebe: Madam Speaker, another resident who joined us today, Karen, signed our petition as a nurse at Concordia's emergency room. Karen sees how that ER helps people every single day. She knows how distance and income play a huge role in how families make their health-care decisions and the access that they have. She heard from patients every single day. And the staff at Concordia hospital, they see themselves as a family and that family knows that their motto is to put patient care first.

So she is asking, along with the thousands of health-care workers that she got to sign the petition, will this minister not shut the door on the residents, not shut the door on this hospital, keep Concordia ER open and keep it giving service to the people of northeast Winnipeg?

Mr. Goertzen: Madam Speaker, the member continues a dangerous trend of putting false information on the record.

The member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) tried to say that it wouldn't be a hospital anymore, that they'd be taking down the H. The member for Concordia said—and he repeated in some ways, today—that the hospital is actually closing down. Concordia is going to continue to be a critical part of the health-care system in Winnipeg. It is going to have rehab services, unlike it has now—they'll be enhanced; will be 64 beds for orthopedic rehab, there'll be 106 beds with 28 designated for in-transitional care.

I would argue the way the demographics are going in our society, not just in Manitoba, Concordia will be a more important part of the health-care system in the future than it is today, Madam Speaker.

Misericordia Urgent Care Centre Request to Reconsider Closure

Mr. Wab Kinew (Fort Rouge): Some two dozen physicians at Misericordia have written a letter telling this government to cancel its plan to close the urgent-care centre. These doctors, in this letter, which I am tabling, say, quote: there is certainly no patient-care justification for this closure. End quote. And, quote: from a cost-savings perspective, end quote, it is indefensible, quote unquote. They go on to say this closure will hit the most vulnerable people the hardest.

Will this minister or this Premier (Mr. Pallister) listen to these physicians, stand up for Manitobans and reverse their decision to close Misericordia's urgent-care centre?

Hon. Kelvin Goertzen (Minister of Health, Seniors and Active Living): Madam Speaker, what is indefensible was people waiting hours and hours and hours for care when they go to an emergency room. This is about the system and making sure the entire system in Winnipeg works better for all Winnipeggers. This is about building a system so that when people go to an emergency room or an urgent-care centre, they get the right care at the right place at the right time.

What is indefensible and what this member and all the members of the NDP defend is having people wait and wait and wait for service. That is what is indefensible, Madam Speaker, yet they continue to try to defend that.

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

Mr. Kinew: That's not what the physicians at Misericordia say. They say it's this Premier's (Mr. Pallister) plan to close the urgent-care centre that's indefensible.

We all know that the health-care system needs to keep evolving, but in this Premier's rush to make cuts, he's forgotten that he can actually make things worse. That's what thousands of Manitobans have been saying, that the Premier's cuts to ERs and urgent-care centres will make things worse. Tens of thousands of patients will be sent to the remaining emergency rooms, making the backlogs there even worse. And now these physicians have reinforced that call.

Will the Premier listen to them now and reverse his plan to close the urgent-care centre at Misericordia?

Mr. Goertzen: Madam Speaker, of the people who go to the Misericordia Urgent Care Centre, three quarters come from other parts of Winnipeg. The remaining 11,000 or so patients who attend from the downtown area, not all of them are considered to be vulnerable and not all of them need assistance to be linked to primary care.

However, there are already efforts by the WRHA to ensure that those who do need primary care are linked up with that primary care in places throughout the downtown of Winnipeg. Now, that also aren't my words, Madam Speaker, that's Dr. John Sokal, who's the medical director of the Health Sciences Centre. They're already making preparations. They know the plan is right. They know you need to make the system better.

We stand by that plan. It is the right thing to do, Madam Speaker.

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

Mr. Kinew: It seems as though we are entering the era of Pallister-care here in Manitoba. Two dozen—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. Order. Order.

I would remind the member that, when you're referring to another member in the House, that you are to refer to them and all of us are to refer to them as—according to their title or according to their constituency. And in the words that were just chosen, those are not appropriate or allowed by our rules.

Mr. Kinew: Certainly, Madam Speaker. I respect your guidance at all times.

I would like to ask a question of clarification, if I may. We are allowed in this House to ask—we were allowed to say things like the era of the Selinger government. I believe that the grammatical phrasing that I used was similar, so with all due humility, I would like to ask for a clarification. *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order, please. Order.

I would indicate to the member that that is outside of the rules, the clarification he was seeking, nor is this the appropriate time to be asking, during question period. The terms Selinger government, Pallister government, are allowed, and that's as far as it goes.

So I would please ask everybody that—to be cautious here when you are asking questions of the Speaker for clarification, because sometimes there can be a tendency to come very close to challenging what the Speaker is saying, and that is forbidden by the rules.

So, the honourable member for Fort Rouge, to complete his question.

Mr. Kinew: Thank you. I withdraw the previous statement, and I thank you for your guidance, Madam Speaker.

Two dozen Misericordia doctors are raising the alarm. At Misericordia, they had the highest patient satisfaction ratings and they deliver their care under budget.

Apparently, the Premier (Mr. Pallister) believes that there's no place for that type of care under his government. Again, he forgets that his changes can make things worse.

So will the Premier commit to reversing his decision to close the Misericordia Urgent Care Centre as advised by these 23 physicians?

Mr. Goertzen: Madam Speaker, let me remind the member, because he is a relatively new member, what care was like under the Selinger government.

Nineteen hospitals were shut down in rural Manitoba. In Winnipeg, the wait time at emergency rooms was the worst in all of Canada for many years. The former NDP government poured hundreds of millions of dollars into emergency rooms, and yet people waited and waited—*[interjection]*

* (14:10)

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Goertzen: —and waited, and the wait got worse. That is what care was like under the Selinger government.

Now, the member says under his leadership there's going to be a new direction. If that's his new direction, it's the wrong direction, Madam Speaker. *[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order. Order.

Restorative Justice Dissolution of Program

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): Every day we learn more about this government's cuts to successful programs, programs which lead to positive outcomes and actually save money for the people of Manitoba.

Last June in Estimates, the Minister of Justice told me that the only additional investments being made anywhere in the province of Manitoba for restorative justice last year were increases in funding to the Manitoba Metis Federation and the John Howard Society.

Why has this Minister of Justice, just one year later, killed the Restorative Resolutions Program delivered by the John Howard Society?

Hon. Heather Stefanson (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): No longer can we continue down the path of NDP spend-more-and-get-less.

Madam Speaker, there simply was not the uptake, this particular program, so we are realigning those resources to better meet the needs of the community and ensure public safety for all Manitobans.

Manitobans elected us to fix the finances, to repair the services and rebuild our economy and that's exactly what we're going to do as a new government.

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

Mr. Swan: If this minister would take the time to consult with community partners like the John Howard Society, Mediation Services, Onashowewin and leaders and elders in First Nations communities, she would know there is an appetite for restorative justice in this province.

The minister said last year in Estimates there's now an intensive case assessment process, a team of 12 Crown attorneys, including two community

prosecutors, whose job is to review files, including referrals, for restorative justice.

How can there possibly be fewer cases now being diverted to a restorative justice process other than a complete lack of interest and understanding by this minister and her government?

Mrs. Stefanson: Well, again, Madam Speaker, the false assertions continue from this member and other members opposite, and as the member knows we are conducting a review of the criminal justice system, something that, by the way, he never did while he was minister of Justice, resulting in further funding to programs that are not meeting the objectives that we need and that they're intended to do. So we will align those resources to ensure that we get real results for these services.

It's the right thing to do and it's the best interest for safety for all Manitobans.

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

Mr. Swan: Madam Speaker, this Minister of Justice just doesn't get it.

The crime rate is soaring in Manitoba after nearly two decades of steady reductions and the government is making it clear they do not value the work and the abilities of community partners. It's becoming clear this government would rather lock someone up, at a cost to taxpayers in excess of \$100,000 per year, than invest in preventing crime or finding better ways to deal with those charged with crimes, many of whom may have addictions or mental health issues.

Will this minister revisit yet another short-sighted cut to a valuable service?

Mrs. Stefanson: Well, I will take no lessons from members—from the member opposite, who, while he was minister of Justice, had the highest violent crime rates in the country under his watch, so I will take no lessons from the member opposite.

But I will say that that's why we are reviewing the criminal justice system and we recognize the role of restorative justice and the importance of it, and we will ensure that we invest those resources into programs that will provide real results when it comes to reducing recidivism in our province.

No longer can we afford the days of the NDP government spend-more-and-get-less. We will put public safety first and ensure that we invest

in programs that provide real results for all Manitobans, always ensuring that we put the safety of all Manitobans first.

War Lake First Nation Rail Service Shut Down

Ms. Amanda Lathlin (The Pas): Northern flooding has resulted in a state of emergency in War Lake First Nation. Chief Betsy Kennedy says the last train bringing food arrived on May 22nd and all trains since have been cancelled. War Lake is 'isaccessible' by road and poor weather conditions have prevented deliveries by plane.

The government says they're working with different organizations and we applaud the effort of those organizations, but War Lake First Nation is still running out of food.

What is this government going to do immediately to resolve this crisis?

Hon. Blaine Pedersen (Minister of Infrastructure): I thank the member for that question.

War Lake First Nation and Ilford community have received supplies by air. The train has left Winnipeg as of today, I believe it is, and is due to arrive past War Lake and they'll drop it at War Lake and Ilford this—on Friday.

As far as—that train can go as far as Gillam, so supplies are coming in. The Red Cross is on hand to assist these communities to make sure that they are well looked after.

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

Ms. Lathlin: That may be good for a few days, but we're looking for long-term solutions.

There are about 170 residents in War Lake First Nation and nearby Ilford. The timing of the cancelled trains couldn't be worse, since many households go shopping at the end of the month. That means that families were already low on food because this emergency, and MKO is co-ordinating a plan while the train service is cancelled for two weeks.

What is this government's plan to deal with the long shutdown of this critical supply line to the North?

Mr. Pedersen: Well, Madam Speaker, all I can do is repeat the information that's out there, is the train is due to arrive as far as Gillam, which will serve War

Lake and Ilford by this Friday. The line is intact up to Gillam. It cannot go past Gillam because that's where the washouts are in the line between Gillam and Churchill.

But the supplies are coming. The Red Cross is on hand. People are—the Red Cross is making sure that all residents of these communities are looked after and that everyone is safe in their communities.

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

Ms. Lathlin: A real strategy for the North must address food security, real investments in infrastructure and the North's long-term economy, accessible health care and mental health services, conservation and the effects of climate change, reconciliation and a respectful consultation with First Nations peoples. Quite frankly, people in the North don't—just don't see that kind of commitment or understanding from this government.

When is this government going to stop cutting corners, look at the big picture and deliver a real strategy for northern Manitoba's long-term future?

Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier): Madam Speaker, we don't mind doing the cleanup, and we have to do the cleanup from the years of neglect of the previous administration. So I invite the member with her well-phrased question, the third question, where she outlined the key components of a monumentally important strategy. After 17 years of NDP government, I'm sure that plan must have been written up and exists, so I'd like her to table it for us today, and we can certainly follow the lead of the previous government.

In the meantime, Madam Speaker, we're reaching out ambitiously, working with First Nations communities—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Pallister: —working with the northern—working with northern residents to develop new economic strategies, to develop new social strategies.

We are doing the work that was neglected for 17 years by the previous administration.

Federal Health Agreement Timeline for Signature

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows): Madam Speaker, the Premier told reporters last week that it's pointless for anyone to monitor the progress of a provincial health deal with Ottawa.

Madam Speaker, health care is the single greatest expenditure that this Province has, and Ottawa contributes hundreds of millions of dollars each year to support our health-care services.

How does the Premier justify that Manitobans—that—and they shouldn't be concerned with this government's inability to work together with our federal government?

Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier): Well, I thank the member for the question.

We continue to be willing to, and able to, stand up for health care and a better deal for Manitobans on health care. Here's a quote: The health accord negotiations that take place over the next few years will shape health care in Manitoba for the next 10 years or even longer. We need a representative in those negotiations who will stand up for all Manitoba families. While the members opposite are representing Ottawa to Manitoba, we are standing up for Manitoba families, Madam Speaker, and proud to do it.

Here's another quote: We need to remember that our job here is not to protect our political friends in Ottawa. Our job here is to make sure that Manitoba citizens who rely on health care get it, Madam Speaker. That was former Finance minister under the NDP government, Stan Struthers.

* (14:20)

He was right, and Stan has now got someone standing up for health care who's willing to do it, Madam Speaker: this Health Minister and this government. We will continue to do so.

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

Ms. Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, it's time this government faced reality. Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, New Brunswick, Quebec, Prince Edward Island, Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta, what do all these provinces have in common? They have all signed on to a health-care agreement, and that's not even mentioning our territories, who have also signed on.

Madam Speaker, what is it going to take for this Minister of Health and this Premier of our province to get on board and actually communicate with our federal government?

Mr. Pallister: Well, Madam Speaker, what do all these jurisdictions have in common, the member

asks. Here's what they have in common: they all think it's a rotten deal. They all think it threatens the future of health care. They all agree that it's inadequate, given the aging population of our country. Every single premier, every single one without exception, agrees that it's a rotten deal. We agree it's a rotten deal, and we're willing to stand up for a better deal for health care while the member opposite applauds Ottawa at every opportunity.

Here's the most recent study on the issue. The Canada Health Transfer and the federation: past, present and future report, issued by the Institute of Fiscal Studies and Democracy in Ottawa, headed by Kevin Page, the former Parliamentary Budget Officer. Here's his conclusion. The IFCD concludes that provincial and territorial governments should have rejected the federal government's recent offer on health funding and held out for a better deal, as Manitoba continues to do.

Thank you, Mr. Page, for reinforcing the fact that someone in this country cares enough about health care to stand up for a fair deal against Ottawa.

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

Ms. Lamoureux: Given that the government has not been able to show that they can achieve an agreement, when every other province and territory has been able to with Ottawa, why should Manitobans believe that this government is capable of handling the health-care file, a file that makes up 42 per cent of our budget, a file that affects the well-being of every single Manitoban?

Madam Speaker, when will there be a signed agreement?

Mr. Pallister: When there's a deal that sustains health care, I'm sure all provinces will sign on to that one, Madam Speaker, but Manitoba will make sure that such a deal exists before signing on to a bad deal. The federal government is proposing to take hundreds of billions of dollars away from provincial coffers.

The previous premier spoke against the proposal when it was made; he agrees. Half the federal Liberal Cabinet in Ottawa has spoken publicly against the proposal; they agree. All the premiers have stood against this proposal and said it is inadequate and endangers health care for the future.

Madam Speaker, we are standing strong for a better deal for health care because health care is the

No. 1 priority of Manitobans and it's the No. 1 priority of Canadians as well.

Keeyask and Bipole III Projects Public Utilities Board Review

Mrs. Sarah Guillemard (Fort Richmond): Madam Speaker, families in Manitoba are being asked once again to pay for NDP mismanagement. The decision to proceed with Keeyask and Bipole III without proper scrutiny by the Public Utilities Board has created a multi-billion-dollar debt problem that taxpayers and families now have to begin paying for.

Can the Minister for Crown Services please explain to the House how the NDP's reckless decision has left—*[interjection]*

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Guillemard: —Manitobans with the bill?

Hon. Ron Schuler (Minister of Crown Services): I'd like to thank the member for Fort Richmond for that question.

Madam Speaker, the previous NDP government disrespected Manitobans and Manitoba Hydro ratepayers when they refused to let the Public Utilities Board review the Keeyask and Bipole III projects. As a result of the NDP's reckless interference, Manitoba families are now left to pay for the NDP bipole-Keeyask levy.

Our government, and, in fact, all Manitobans, were left with a mess after the NDP decade of debt. Fixing the finances of Manitoba is a huge task, one that this government is committed to do.

Manitoba Housing Units Health and Safety Policies

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): Manitoba Housing residents are asking the Minister of Families to take action on what they describe as bug-infested, crime-ridden buildings with unsympathetic eviction policies.

A group of residents, many of which—that live with mental health issues and physical disabilities, advised their downtown building is routinely infested with cockroaches, mice and bedbugs. Residents deserve to live in a clean, bug-free home. Manitoba Housing management should prioritize the health of their tenants.

Will the minister commit to reviewing Housing pest-control policies, making them more effective and more understanding of residents' limitations?

Hon. Scott Fielding (Minister of Families): Madam Speaker, we most definitely want to serve the people that are in our Manitoba Housing stock.

This is a property that is routinely looked at in terms of pest control; that's a part of it. This is an example of what we can do in the future. Manitoba Housing also does need co-operation with a lot of the residents that are part of it, and we are working with them to rectify the pest and the bug problem that's within the building.

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

Ms. Fontaine: Madam Speaker, it sounded to me like the Minister of Families actually just blamed the residents of the Manitoba Housing unit, saying that they're uncooperative—[*interjection*]

Madam Speaker: Order. Order.

Ms. Fontaine: —wanting to work with Manitoba Housing. I think that's very disingenuous.

Tenants are scared after seeing neighbourhood crime spill into the building. [*interjection*]

Madam Speaker: Order.

Ms. Fontaine: Last year, police uncovered a drug den in the unit across the hall. Last December, there was a homicide in the building, followed by a few serious assaults.

Residents have the right to live in a safe, clean building.

Will the Minister of Families direct his department to invest in enhanced security measures, including cameras, in Manitoba Housing buildings?

Mr. Fielding: I can tell you one thing since inheriting the mess that the NDP government left—over \$500 million in deferred maintenance on properties like this. The reality is—[*interjection*]

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Fielding: —you didn't get the job done, and we're here to get the job done.

We are working with properties such as this. They do provide services and supports in terms of security aspects on an overnight basis, Madam Speaker.

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

Ms. Fontaine: For about a year now, we have actually been hearing from the Minister of Families talk about his housing plan or his daycare plan or his CFS plan, but actually we haven't seen any plan from this minister—no plans from this government and certainly none from this minister.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Speaker: Order.

Ms. Fontaine: The members opposite are clapping for imaginary plans. I don't know what they're clapping for.

The bottom line: Is this minister going to start to do his job that he got a 20 per cent raise for and actually start working for Manitobans in Manitoba Housing units? Is he going to start that today?

Mr. Fielding: Madam Speaker, first of all, the preamble is false. Second of all, we know for a fact that you've left over \$500 million of deferred maintenance in the Housing file. You didn't get the job done; we're here to get the job done.

Our government has committed \$90 million to the federal government in terms of providing housing solutions for Manitobans. We've put—we've invested more in terms of the Rent Assist program that's going to help all Manitobans—over \$36-million increase that's going to help low-income and vulnerable Manitobans more than this government ever did in their time of office.

Investment in Active Transportation Municipal Infrastructure Budget

Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I guess we shouldn't be all that surprised that a government which forgot to acknowledge Earth Day altogether with a ministerial statement, a government which, in the midst of amazing opportunities to reduce the amount of solid waste going to landfill under a plan we had in place, they decided instead to cut the agency known as Green Manitoba and get rid of it altogether. We now have a government which has cancelled the funding increase to municipalities for transit and for active transportation.

Can the minister please explain how the Commuter Challenge happening next week is going to be helped by her government's policies?

Hon. Eileen Clarke (Minister of Indigenous and Municipal Relations): Our government has maintained overall operating support to Winnipeg and other 'municipalities' at the 2016 level. However,

we have streamlined this grant funding by consolidating into unconditional basket funding, providing greater flexibility for municipalities to determine how they best choose to spend those funds. Rather than the funding being allocated to specific City expenditures through numerous complicated grant programs, like has been done in the past, Winnipeg now will be able to target its funding and see what is best fit to address the needs of their citizens.

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

Mr. Altemeyer: Or to put it more plainly, Madam Speaker, what this government is actually doing is they're reducing the amount of funding that municipalities are going to have to work with every year going forward. The municipalities have had the decision making downloaded on them with less money available.

If the minister is so confident that her approach is actually going to help this mythical climate change plan, which the minister sitting next to her is supposed to be introducing at some point in time, could she please tell us: How many more kilometres of bike paths are we going to see in Manitoba this year, thanks to her budget?

Ms. Clarke: We have the support of our municipalities because all levels of government understand the value of sustainable futures for municipalities. Our municipalities also understand the fiscal mess that was left behind by the members opposite.

And as a mature, responsible level of government, Winnipeg is in the best position to determine how they spend their operating funding received from the Province. These spending decisions are best made by those that are closest to the citizens and deliver the programs and the services that the citizens actually want and need.

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

Mr. Altemeyer: Madam Speaker, with all due respect, someone needs to update the note that the minister is reading from off of her desk. She cites the City of Winnipeg. I seem to recall someone who looked an awful lot like the mayor of Winnipeg speaking quite recently about the pain that this decision by the Province is going to cause his government.

It's quite remarkable, Madam Speaker, we have a minister here claiming that all is well, and, meanwhile, all of the evidence points the exact opposite.

Is the Commuter Challenge next week going to hear from anyone in this government that there's been a change in decision, money's back on the table to help people move around in a green and active lifestyle?

Madam Speaker: The honourable First Minister. *[interjection]* Order. Order.

The honourable First Minister.

Hon. Brian Pallister (Premier): As we continue, Madam Speaker, to make progress in building a stronger working relationship with all local governments of our province, we recognize that there is some rebuilding that has to be done in terms of the trust in that relationship.

The previous administration overnight eliminated a third of the local governments in the province, Madam Speaker, without any consultation whatsoever. Their credibility in respect of maintaining support for these governments was undermined by their willingness to jack up and broaden the PST on things like work benefits that are paid for by local governments and on the insurance they have to take out to protect their own buildings and assets from loss.

They went further, of course, and without any consultation or fore-notification, even of their own members, Madam Speaker, but certainly of local government, they went further and undermined the ability of local governments to provide services effectively by eroding their tax base and by taking money away from their revenue column.

So, Madam Speaker, we are maintaining the most generous relationship in Canada with our City of Winnipeg partners and we will continue to build on a relationship. And we'll do it not on the basis of excessive taxation and new taxes but rather on the basis of lower taxes and better trust.

Madam Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

PETITIONS

Taxi Industry Regulation

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

The background of the petition is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

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

And this petition is signed by many, many Manitobans.

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

Northern Patient Transfer Program

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

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) Manitobans recognize that everyone deserves quality accessible health care.

(2) The people of northern Manitoba face unique challenges when accessing health care, including inclement weather, remote communities and seasonal roads.

(3) The provincial government has already unwisely cancelled northern health investments, including clinics in The Pas and Thompson.

(4) Furthermore, the provincial government has taken a course that will discourage doctors from practising in the North, namely, their decision to cut a grant program designed to bring more doctors to rural Manitoba.

(5) The provincial government has also substantially cut investments in roads and highways, which will make it more difficult for northerners to access health care.

(6) The provincial government's austerity approach is now threatening to cut funding for essential programs such as the Northern Patient Transportation Program, which was designed to help some of the most vulnerable people in the province.

(7) The provincial government has recently announced it would cancel the airfare subsidy for patients who fly to Winnipeg for medical treatment, which will be devastating for patients with mobility issues, dementia or who are elderly and need assistance getting to the city.

(8) The challenges that northerners face will only be overcome if the provincial government respects, improves and adequately funds quality programs that were designed to help northerners, such as the Northern Patient Transportation Program.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the federal—the–sorry—to urge the provincial government to recognize the absolute necessity of maintaining and improving the Northern Patient Transportation Program by continuing to respect Northern Patient Transfer agreements and funding these services in accordance with the needs of northern Manitobans.

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

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

The background to this petition is as follows:

(1) Manitobans recognize that everyone deserves quality accessible health care.

(2) The people of northern Manitoba face unique challenges when accessing health care, including inclement weather, remote communities and seasonal roads.

(3) The provincial government has already unwisely cancelled northern health investments, including the clinics in The Pas and Thompson.

(4) Furthermore, the provincial government has taken a course that will discourage doctors from practising in the North, namely, their decision to cut a program designed to bring more doctors to rural Manitoba.

* (14:40)

(5) The provincial government has also substantially cut investments in roads and highways, which will make it more difficult for northerners to access health care.

(6) Provincial government's austerity approach is now threatening to cut funding for essential programs such as Northern Patient Transfer Program, which was designed to help some of the most vulnerable people in the province.

(7) Provincial government has recently announced it would cancel the airfare subsidy for patient escorts who fly to Winnipeg for medical treatment, which will be devastating for patients with mobility issues, dementia, or who are elderly and need assistance getting to the city.

(8) The challenges that northerners face will only be overcome if the provincial government respects, improves and adequately funds quality programs that were designed to help northerners, such as the Northern Patient Transfer Program.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To urge the provincial government to recognize the absolute necessity of maintaining and improving Northern Patient Transfer Program by continuing to respect the Northern Patient Transfer agreements and funding these services in accordance with the needs of northern Manitobans.

And this petition has been signed by many Manitobans.

Taxi Industry Regulation

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

The background to this petition is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

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

Signed by many Manitobans.

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

The background to this petition is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

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

This petition was signed by many Manitobans.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

The background to this petition is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

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

Signed by many, many Manitobans.

Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Grievances?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

(Continued)

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. Andrew Micklefield (Government House Leader): Madam Speaker, this afternoon we would like to call Bill 33, The Minimum Wage Indexation Act, for debate of report stage amendments, followed by debate of third reading.

Madam Speaker: It has been announced that we will—the House will be dealing Bill 33 this afternoon—report stage amendments of Bill 33, The Minimum Wage Indexation Act, employment standards code amendment, followed by concurrence and third reading on the same bill.

* (14:50)

REPORT STAGE AMENDMENTS

Bill 33—The Minimum Wage Indexation Act (Employment Standards Code Amended)

Mr. Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer), the following amendment

THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 3

(a) by replacing the proposed clause 6(2)(a) with the following:

(a) for an employee to who clause (b) does not apply, the greater of

(i) the minimum wage determined under section 7, and

(ii) the minimum wage prescribed by regulation under section 8; or

(b) replacing the proposed section 8 with the following:

Minister's recommendation re: increase to minimum wage

8(1) No later than April 30th of each year, the minister may make a recommendation to the Lieutenant Governor in Council—for the period from October 1 of that year to September 31 of the next year—that the minimum wage should be increased by regulation under subsection (4).

Minister to adhere to living wage principle

8(2) In making a recommendation under subsection (1), the minister must adhere to the living wage principle set out under subsection (3).

Living wage principle

8(3) The living wage principle is that for a person who works full time for a full year, a living wage should enable the person to earn enough through their employment to live above the poverty line.

Regulations re increase in minimum wage

8(4) The—following a recommendation from the minister under subsection (1), the Lieutenant Governor in Council may prescribe by regulation—for the time period set out in the minister's recommendation—a minimum wage that exceeds the minimum wage determined under subsection 7.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Flin Flon, seconded by the honourable member for Wolseley,

THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 3

(a) by replacing the proposed clause 6(2)(a) with the following:

(a) for an employee to whom—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense.

The honourable member—the report stage amendment is in order.

Is there agreement to consider it as printed as the member had made some comments that were not exactly as printed? [Agreed]

THAT Bill 33 be amended in Clause 3

(a) by replacing the proposed clause 6(2)(a) with the following:

(a) or an employee to whom clause (b) does not apply, the greater of

(i) the minimum wage determined under section 7, and

(ii) the minimum wage prescribed by regulation under section 8; or

(b) by replacing the proposed section 8 with the following:

Minister's recommendation re increase to minimum wage

8(1) No later than April 30 of each year, the minister may make a recommendation to the Lieutenant Governor in Council — for the period from October 1 of that year to September 31 of the next year — that the minimum wage should be increased by regulation under subsection (4).

Minister to adhere to living wage principle

8(2) In making a recommendation under subsection (1), the minister must adhere to the living wage principle set out under subsection (3).

Living wage principle

8(3) The living wage principle is that for a person who works full time for a full year, a living wage should enable the person to earn enough through their employment to live above the poverty line.

Regulations re increase in minimum wage

8(4) Following a recommendation from the minister under subsection (1), the Lieutenant Governor in Council may prescribe by regulation — for the time period set out in the minister's recommendation — a minimum wage that exceeds the minimum wage determined under section 7.

Mr. Lindsey: It is an honour to rise today to try and make something half decent out of what this government proposed for minimum wage. I don't know what they have against working people; I don't know what they have against poor people, but clearly they don't like them.

They introduced a minimum wage bill over a year into their mandate, left people—working people, hardworking people—living below the poverty line. This bill that they introduced made absolutely no benefit to those hardworking Manitobans because they waited so long before they ever introduced the miserly amount of increase that they talked about, that really they were worse off.

So, Madam Speaker, by suggesting that when the minister makes amendments to the minimum wage bill in the future that they adhere to the living wage principle will ensure that hardworking Manitobans actually have a chance to not live in poverty, and that should be the goal.

This government talks about lifting people up. Well, it's hard to lift them up when you've got your boot heel on them, and it's a shame that that's the way this government treats Manitobans.

This bill, if it's amended as suggested, will make a living wage a reality. It will make it so that people who work full time at the minimum wage level are above the poverty level. If this government introduces this bill, which I really hope they will—that I hope they'll actually listen to something that somebody has said.

There was any number of presenters came out to committee to talk about what it was like to live on minimum wage.

Mr. Doyle Pivniuk, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

I hope—I hope—that the minister was actually listening to some of those people. Contrary to what it said in the newspapers, there was people there who made presentations who lived on minimum wage. And I would hope that the minister listened and listened carefully to what they had to say, never mind what the experts had to say because they had lots to say as well, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. They had a lot to say about making minimum wage a living wage. That should be the goal of this government so that working people can live above the poverty line, that there's no doubt that we in the previous government were well on the way to addressing these issues by raising the minimum wage by substantial amounts over and above the consumer

price index every year so that people were slowly getting ahead.

What this government did was gave them absolutely nothing for the first year—over a year, really, year and a half of their mandate—they said, you get nothing, while they, ministers, took increases, claimed that they had no choice but to do it, which, apparently, when they gave some of the rest of us an increase, we found a way that we didn't have to take it, but the Premier (Mr. Pallister) said he had no choice, he had to take it. And that's what's wrong with this government, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, it's all about the privileged few. It should be about all Manitobans, and clearly it isn't.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, this amendment to this bill that the government introduced that they should be ashamed of the miserly amount that they talked about indexing, the minister sits and laughs about it. You know, it's not real funny if you have to decide, should I pay the rent, should I buy food, should I try and get the hydro turned back on because I didn't pay that last month? It's not funny. It's very serious business to allow Manitobans who work for minimum wage to live above the poverty line. The minister should stand up today and say, absolutely, that's a lofty goal. It's the right goal. It's the goal that any caring government would stand up and support. It's the goal that any caring individual would stand up and support.

So I look forward to this minister and this government standing up, saying, yes, we will support this amendment, yes, we believe that hard-working Manitobans should live above the poverty line.

Now, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, we've seen this government try and make sure that other working people in the province couldn't get ahead. They've implemented wage freezes on all government employees, well, not quite all because the ministers and the Premier all took a raise. They didn't limit judges' salaries. They decided they didn't want to, you know, play with them and freeze their wages, but everybody else took a wage cut. Minimum wage earners took a wage cut because this government sat on their hands for over a year and did nothing while the cost of living continued to go up and froze their wages, froze the minimum wage earners' wages. And that's a terrible, terrible blow to people who were barely getting by as it was.

So by adhering to the principles of a living wage, it ensures that future governments, regardless of what political party they belong to, will make sure

that hard-working Manitobans that work hard for minimum wage will, in fact—will, in fact—be able to live above the poverty line.

* (15:00)

It should be more than just a lofty goal, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. It has to be the way of the future, the way of the future to lift all Manitobans up to allow them to live properly. And I look forward to this minister standing up and saying, we support this amendment. I look forward to the members opposite standing up and saying, we look forward to supporting this amendment. Let's pass this amendment. Let's make sure that all Manitobans can live a decent standard of living.

So I look forward to the government ministers and government members, if they wish to speak in favour of this bill, to stand up and say we finally heard what people are saying. We're ready to listen to what so many hardworking Manitobans said. We believe that they were right, that we need to listen; we need to make sure that the minimum wage is something that people can actually live on. We need to make sure that the minimum wage is a living wage, that working people are not held in abject poverty simply because they have to work for minimum wage.

So I look forward, really, to the minister in particular, standing up and saying he's seen the light—he's seen the light. Working people in this province deserve respect, deserve the respect of all members of this Legislative Assembly, and I look forward—I look forward, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, to this amendment passing unanimously, as all members opposite come to realize that it's unfair to Manitobans to hold them in poverty.

It's unfair to all those people—the single mothers trying to raise their family, the people that work in all those jobs that are minimum wage. It's unfair, and I look forward to the government finally realizing that they need to listen to all Manitobans, not just the select few, not just the privileged few, but they need to listen to all Manitobans.

And I look forward to this House passing this amendment and making this minimum wage bill something that we can all be proud of in this Legislative Assembly, something that we can all go out and tell Manitobans we've worked together and we've done the right thing for all of you. We've raised you up out of poverty. We've made an actual better Manitoban for those Manitobans.

I look forward to this government being in support of this amendment, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I look forward to Manitobans being able to live and survive above the poverty line and provide a better future for their families. Thank you.

Hon. Cliff Cullen (Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade): The first time today, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's certainly a pleasure to talk about Bill 33 today and certainly interesting to hear the members opposite, the—obviously the—

An Honourable Member: Inspiring.

Mr. Cullen: Inspiring, yes, but it's the party of doom and gloom, you know; it's the party of the sky is falling. One thing we do have determined today with this amendment, we actually—now we can determine what the priorities of the next campaign will be for the NDP. We're actually starting to see some policy come forward from the NDP.

So, as we move forward over the next few years I guess we'll see, as legislation comes through the Chamber, we will see the policy for the NDP government, or NDP opposition—potential—potential government, but we'll see—we'll see about that. *[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. Cullen: And that's the point of the matter, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We had an NDP government for 17 years—17 years they could have implemented their philosophy that they're proposing under this amendment, and they chose not to do that.

Why did they do that? Why did they fail to do that? Why are they bringing forward this philosophy now? It appears now that it is in alignment with the union bosses. We've heard from committee that the union bosses want to go into the concept of a living wage principle, so I guess the NDP figure, well, we better fall in line with the—with what the union bosses are telling us. And we'll see where that goes out. We'll see where it plays out around the various provinces.

Obviously, we heard the announcement in Ontario today where the current government in Ontario wants to go, if they're re-elected. We'll see how Ontarians view that philosophy going forward. It will be interesting to watch over the next few months how that is unfolding.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we know the philosophy of the NDP when they were in government. The philosophy was to tax Manitobans as much as they

could. So, if they did raise the minimum wage, they never allowed those low-income earners to keep more of the hard-earned money. Did they increase the basic personal exemption? No, they did not. So they gave them a little bit in one pocket and took it away in the other.

In fact, the disparity is quite clear, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We have indexed the basic personal exemption in Manitoba. Now Manitobans start paying tax at \$9,271; it was considerably lower under the previous government. In fact, when we indexed that, this year alone we took 2,200 Manitobans right off the tax rolls altogether. So, clearly, that's a move in the right direction.

We do have a long way to go though, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because in Saskatchewan, a Saskatchewan person does not pay tax until they make over \$16,000, that's almost a \$7,000 difference. Do we have a long way to go? Yes, we do, but we're prepared to go there, to leave more money in Manitobans' pockets, especially those ones that are living on low incomes. We think that's very important.

So we've come with a balanced approach, a balanced approach that we think is the right way to go. This indexing allows Manitobans to protect purchasing power going forward, and I think that's the right way to do. So there will be increases; as the cost-of-living increases, there will be increases in minimum wage. And, alternatively, we're also lowering taxes, so that allows Manitobans to keep more of their hard-earned money in their pocket. We think that's the balanced approach. That's the balanced approach that Manitobans have asked us to bring forward. It's the predictable approach, and that's what Manitobans have asked us to do as well. And that's what we heard at committee, and that's what we heard through our budget consultation process as well.

So we believe this is certainly the most consistent approach that Manitobans are looking for. And, certainly, in as far as the range of minimum wage, we're going to be certainly middle of the pack with other provinces, and I think that's where Manitobans have asked us to be.

Clearly, there's a lot of work to do in terms of our taxation levels. We've inherited, certainly, a financial mess the NDP have left us in, so we have to move forward in a balanced way to make sure that

we are protecting Manitobans and protecting those front-line services as well.

So we are certainly supportive of the approach of Bill 33. We're not supportive of the approach that this amendment brings forward. We'll certainly have some time over the next few years to debate this principle, and also we will be watching closely what other provinces are doing when these put these types of proposals on the table.

So, well, and let's have a little comparison too. I know the government is pretty—sorry, the opposition is focused on minimum wage; that's their only criteria they look at. They don't necessarily look at what else is going on in the economy. And, in fact, just released from Statistics Canada was the weekly earnings by province, just in March of this year. And it shows that Manitoba was third highest in terms of the increase in weekly earnings by province. We increased at 2.4 per cent this year, this past year, year over year.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, absolutely—by comparison who do you think was the lowest province in terms of weekly earnings? In fact, it was a negative, a negative earnings year over year. Which province was that? That was an NDP government in Alberta had the lowest weekly earnings by province. That's not a very good approach to what we should be looking at.

So when, if the opposition is focused on minimum wage—*[interjection]*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Cullen: —we have to be looking at the big picture as well. There's a lot more to it than just the minimum wage.

So I appreciate the member bringing forward this policy, his philosophy. We look forward to having this discussion. I'm sure we'll have this discussion for the next few years prior to the next election, and we certainly will be watching and listening to Manitobans in terms of what they have to say.

But we certainly support the principle of Bill 33, but we can't support the principle put forward in this amendment.

* (15:10)

Mr. Wab Kinew (Fort Rouge): Thank you, everybody. I really am grateful to both my colleagues for that roaring round of applause.

Now I do, you know, take seriously some of the comments that the Minister for Growth, Enterprise and Trade put onto the record here, so I will attempt to respond in a sincere fashion that—to some of the concerns outlined.

But I'd first of all, want to thank my colleague from Flin Flon here for bringing forward this amendment—this amendment which will raise the minimum wage to a living wage in our province, which is something that I believe in personally. I'm glad to see my colleagues are supportive of as well.

So perhaps I'll begin just by, you know, making a few points respectfully to the Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade (Mr. Cullen). I actually think that it is perfectly consistent with the Conservative political philosophy to support having a minimum wage as a living wage. There's two main reasons for it.

The first is when you increase the minimum wage, you incentivize work, which is a laudable goal in our society. There are many Manitobans, people around the world, who face barriers to employment, and in some situations, we have heard about how there is a welfare wall—to use a term that's, you know, circulated—in which in some cases there is a disincentive to work if the potential earnings from employment are too low. However, if we could ensure that paying—that the amount paid for a minimum wage was above the poverty line, that would create a huge incentive for people to rejoin the labour force and to participate in the employment market. And that is an important goal, you know, first and foremost, because people deserve to earn good wages so that they can provide for their children, and provide for their families, and have adequate housing, which are social determinants of health and lead to other important, you know, ancillary benefits.

But it's also important because having a job is about more than just the wages you earn. Having a job is also about the sense of meaning and the sense of purpose that comes along with having employment. And those feelings of fulfillment, that sense of pride at the end of a hard day's work make the value of having a job all the much more important. So paying a living wage, paying an adequate wage is important and I think that anybody who ascribes to a Conservative political philosophy can't turn their back on this evidence. They have to, you know, say that, yes, that is a good point,

that having an 'incentivization' to employment is consistent with my values.

The second is that when the minimum wage is higher, it reduces the burden on the social safety net. There's actually been a fair bit of research in the States which has shown that there is a form of de facto subsidy going to large corporations in the form of government assistance programs in the States—like food stamps, for example—whereby having access to those forms of, you know, social safety programs acts as a de facto subsidy for large corporations to pay poverty wages.

Mrs. Sarah Guillemard, Acting Speaker, in the Chair

And so I believe that most people who ascribe to a Conservative political philosophy do want to reduce government expenditures. It seems to me that a policy measure such as a living wage as minimum wage—which would reduce dependency on the social safety net and make people more independent, more able to provide for would actually be a strong rationale for supporting indexing the minimum wage to a living wage. So, to me, these are strong arguments as to why anybody who calls themselves a true Conservative would want to support having a minimum wage as a living wage.

However, since we have yet to hear any of the government members make these arguments, I suspect that there may be something else at work, other than pure concern for working people in Manitoba, when they brought forward this original bill. Perhaps the concern, if I could state it bluntly, is just to protect profits for the owners of large corporations and their shareholders, because if you were to look at the, you know, best interests of working people, those earning minimum wage, then you would be inclined to support tying that to a living wage level.

So we know that having a living wage in Manitoba is very important and that a policy such as this one should be phased in in a fashion that respects working people, not just on minimum wage, but those who earn, say, \$12, \$13, \$14 an hour right now. I was speaking recently, Madam Acting Deputy Speaker, to some workers from the retail sector who work in grocery stores, and they earn, you know, a few dollars more than minimum wage, and their concern was, you know, well, what happens to my wage if the minimum wage rises quickly. And so that's why it's important to strike a balance, so that the hard-earned wage increases that they have negotiated have time to adjust upwards. And I

believe that the amendment that my colleague from Flin Flon has brought forward here today does just that. And that's why I'm proud to support it, because I think it's important.

Mr. Doyle Piwniuk, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

And, yes, I hope that, you know, all members of this House will support having a living wage, because, though there are various policy details that, you know, the more 'wonkish' amongst us so thoroughly enjoy debating, like whether we use the low-income cut-off or whether we use other measures of having the policy—you know, the policy debates on.

There's a simple truth at stake here. And that is that nobody who works full time in the province of Manitoba should live in poverty.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Kinew: Again, I will repeat, nobody who works full time in Manitoba should live in poverty. We hear—and a second round of applause erupts.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Kinew: That is, of course, one of my go-to applause lines. It is one of my go-to applause lines, but it's because it is the truth. We hear many arguments against raising the minimum wage, but never do you ever hear somebody rebut that point. Nobody has successfully argued for a rationale as to why somebody working full time in this province should still live in poverty. It has yet to be done. And that's why I'm pleased to see language that gets and points to that truth here in the member for Flin Flon's (Mr. Lindsey) amendment to the bill.

So, again, we know that this government brought in a de facto cut to the minimum wage last year by freezing it, even as inflation eroded the purchasing power of Manitobans on minimum wage. And, you know, it was interesting and a positive step to hear the Minister for Growth, Enterprise and Trade signal that he was willing to increase the minimum wage this year. However, we've done him the great service and the great favour of articulating the policy that he should have tabled in the bill originally, which was that the increase should not be 15 cents this year, but rather, it should be on a path towards \$15 an hour and then towards a living wage after that.

And so I do expect that since this provides a strong incentive to work, that because it does decrease reliance on the social safety net and because it is fair to all working people in our province

and indeed everybody who lives here, that this amendment from my colleague from Flin Flon should receive support from every member of the House.

* (15:20)

But, again, nobody who works full time in our province should have to live in poverty, and I look forward to hearing any member try to rebut that point.

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows): Just a few short words.

We will be supporting the amendment brought forward by the member from Flin Flon.

The idea of considering and fully understanding the living wage before setting minimum wage here in the province is more than reasonable. This is a good amendment and it would be shameful if the government did not support it, because it is purely knowledge that should be used to make an informed decision for our province.

We are happy to support the amendment. Thank you.

Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley): It is encouraging to see a good piece of legislation brought forward here this afternoon. As my colleague for Flin Flon put it, and I was equally proud to second this motion with him, we are trying to make a rather horrible decision by this government a little less horrible with our amendment here today.

The idea that a government in this day and age would fail to recognize the incredible difference that the minimum wage can play in improving the lives of some of our most vulnerable citizens is really quite remarkable, not in an admirable way, Mr. Acting Speaker, but in a very discouraging way.

I know not all of the members opposite—they might not spend a huge amount of time in Winnipeg's inner city where I have the privilege of representing the fine constituency of Wolseley. It's a very diverse group of neighbourhoods and spanning from some of the poorest income postal codes in our province right up to areas that are doing much better economically. But let's make no mistake about it, Mr. Acting Speaker, the fact that this government feels that it's appropriate to legislate poverty for someone working full-time in this province is shameful.

There is absolutely no way that any of us, any decent person should accept the principle, such as it is, that this government is acting upon. And I want to echo the comments of some of my colleagues who have quite rightly demanded to know from this government what is their rationale for reaching this conclusion. Where is this legislation coming from? To merely index the minimum wage year after year means that the gap between what a minimum wage earner can make if they are working full-time, and most folks, of course, who are working minimum wage are not able to get full-time hours they have to work multiple jobs on a part-time basis at minimum wage in order to attempt to make ends meet.

The government has just provided no rationale for why that is an appropriate circumstance for Manitobans to have to put up with, especially, Mr. Acting Speaker, given that this same government froze the minimum wage in their first year in office. So our lowest income earners in the workforce, tens of thousands of Manitobans, actually lost ground in the first year of the Pallister government's mandate. And it doesn't matter if you are a younger person, a student who is working part-time while attending classes. It doesn't matter if you are a single parent looking after one or more children. It doesn't matter if you are a single person just trying to make your way in the world. The government freezing the minimum wage hurt every single one of those sectors of our society, and now they've enshrined that hurt by merely indexing the minimum wage going forward year after year.

None of those people are going to be able to get ahead the way that they should and the way that they could have if this government actually had a moral compass when it came to helping the most vulnerable in our society improve their own circumstances.

The track record previous to this government was such that the minimum wage—when the NDP first came to office—was \$6 an hour, Mr. Acting Speaker. And I think when you go tell people that, when you remind them of that fact, they are absolutely appalled that the minimum wage was so low not that long ago, and thanks to regular, annual, predictable increases that were done by our government, that minimum wage is now up to \$11 an hour. It is more than double the rate of inflation, which means that low income people, the same tens of thousands of Manitobans, all of whom I hope vote in the next election in response to this government's cold-hearted policies—but every single one of those

people made enormous progress while the NDP was in office.

And it is a truly stark contrast to watch this new government legislate and then turn their backs on the future of these Manitobans, especially when you consider the extra costs that this government is also imposing on many of these people. It's—look at the circumstances for a young person who's now going to have to face quite dramatic tuition increases and who will not be receiving the graduation tax credit back after they graduate. On top of that, if they are also working minimum wage, this government is hurting them on that front as well.

It's quite clear that this government's values do not rest with a fundamental sense of decency and of sharing and of empowerment, and they really need to take a close look at this amendment and realize their mistake and realize that part of their obligation as government should be to help narrow the gap—the growing gap—between the wealthiest amongst us and the poorest.

It's just absolutely unconscionable that someone can work full time and still be living in poverty. We were making significant progress in correcting that historical wrong that we inherited and now this government has just slammed the doors on that progress, and is making sure that tens of thousands of people do not manage to get farther ahead.

And the minister himself, when he was answering a question in question period, gave us a little bit of a hint as to their rationale. He said this is what business wanted. Well, you know, that is a radically different starting point than coming to this Chamber and having a view of the world which says we need to be doing a better job of making sure vulnerable people have an equal shot in life. And if your starting point is, well, I'm not going to do anything unless business—big business says it's okay, well, the chances of lower income people ending up better off—with that type of a starting point—are slim to none, Mr. Acting Speaker.

So I guess I owe the minister a word of thanks of sorts, because he did at least give us a little glimmer into the government's rationale in terms of who they're listening to, because we sure know who they're not listening to, and that is the tens of thousands of people who are going to make their voices known, and who are going to cast a ballot in the next election, and make it very clear that the cold-hearted approach of this government when it

comes to first freezing the minimum wage, cranking up costs for people in a myriad of other ways, cutting their valuable services, and now legislating them at a poverty rate is just not acceptable in this day and age.

And it's not like this is the only province in the country. We can look at what other provinces are doing. Just today, by happy coincidence, the government of Ontario announced their plan for a \$15-an-hour minimum wage. The government of Alberta pursuing a very similar agenda, if I'm not mistaken. This policy approach would get people so much closer to a living wage.

* (15:30)

And I want to thank the Liberal caucus for their support and their member's words just now of support for this amendment. And she made a good point that, you know, you do have to look at the details of what a living wage actually is. I have absolutely no problem with that, and, of course, that living-wage dollar amount is going to be different, depending on the size of your family, depending on the family type, depending on where you live. But the problem here, Mr. Acting Speaker, is not that the government is confused by the details; this government doesn't care about the issue in the first place. They're not even listening to any ideas that others may bring forward, and that's going to come back to haunt them. You just cannot conduct yourself in this manner and expect to make no mistakes. This government is making mistakes every single day, and people are noticing, and you're going to—people are going to make their views known, and this government's going to hear about it. So—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time is up.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): I'm proud to put some words on the record in support of the member for Flin Flon's (Mr. Lindsey) amendment, which is a pretty reasonable amendment in this current economy and current day and age.

Certainly, I would agree with my colleagues that moving towards a living wage is getting more and more attention, and more and more, I think, that governments, as we see, obviously in Alberta and now, again, in Ontario, are understanding the need to move towards a living wage and understanding that they have a responsibility as government to ensure that their citizens, their workers, actually, you know, if they're working full time, shouldn't be living below

the poverty line, and that's what's happening all across the country.

And, you know, we see the consequences of that, day in and day out, which is why I can't figure out why this government would be opposed to this amendment or really, any increase to the minimum wage because we know that when people live in poverty, they have higher rates of illness. They suffer a myriad of different consequences in their daily lives, which brings them for more hospital visits and utilizing a—many different systems that we have in our government, which end up costing the government more money.

And, you know, I do want to follow up in respect of what my colleague from—the member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer) talked about. And, you know, he made a bold statement, a true statement, when he said that this government just doesn't care and that the minister put it, really, on record about what he does care about, and that's businesses only. And we have absolutely nothing against businesses. I think businesses are great. They're necessary. They're needed, obviously, but, certainly, that can't be the only focus and the only commitment by this government. What about Manitobans? What about Manitobans that are working day in and day out at multiple jobs trying to just make ends meet? Like, what makes their lives or their experiences any less worthy or any less, you know, needing commitment than businesses or, you know, the upper echelon that this government seems to be best friends with all the time. I don't understand that. I can't wrap my head around members opposite who would actually applaud day in and day out every time we bring up the minimum wage and we get some ridiculous, you know, I don't even know what it is; it's not an answer. It is just some spewing off of whatever to kind of justify and make themselves feel good, in particular, the Premier (Mr. Pallister) spewing off all of this stuff in respect of—in contravention of the need for a raise to minimum wage and certainly in contravention of the need to move towards a living wage, and the members opposite just clap and they think that that's the greatest thing since sliced bread. Yet we're talking about Manitobans. We're talking about Manitobans that deserve to be able to be paid equitably and fairly for the labour that they're doing.

And every time we bring up, you know, raising the minimum wage, which we know has been frozen for a year, or, you know, now certainly I can just imagine the stuff that's going to be said about

moving towards a living wage, you know, the members opposite try and put on the record about, you know, that we're—well, basically we're in bed with labour and we listen to the union bosses. Like, I don't know what they think goes on in this, like, on this side. That's not what happens. Like, what we do is actually sit and listen to the people. And so I don't know why they keep putting this on the record about us and being in bed with labour and that we take our direction from them. Like, certainly—

An Honourable Member: Does anybody think they're not in bed with business?

Ms. Fontaine: Yes, exactly. You know, they're in bed with business, maybe—I'm not sure. But, regardless—you know, I'm proud to belong to a party that actually listens to, you know, Manitobans that are struggling. And, you know, I think it's—we have to be so—or for me, anyways, you know, if one of our people are struggling, we're all struggling. If one of us is suffering, we're all suffering. We can't divorce ourselves from the experiences and realities of Manitobans that are the most marginalized or economically depressed, and yet they're working. We can't separate ourselves from that.

And, you know, I think that the fact that the members opposite can kind of just bury their head in the sand while their Premier (Mr. Pallister) shows just such disdain and disrespect for Manitobans, I don't get it. I don't understand it. And I like many of the members opposite. I think that they're good people, and I just don't understand why they don't stand up in this House and actually stand up to their Premier and say, yes—no; that's not good direction, and we want to make sure—we want to make sure—that Manitobans are taken care of. That's what we got elected for.

Like, everybody says it in this House: well, we got elected to serve Manitobans, and we got elected for this and that. But, actually, on this side of the House, we take that seriously, and we are elected to represent and fight for all Manitobans, not just a certain segment of Manitobans but all Manitobans.

An Honourable Member: Not true.

Ms. Fontaine: Yes, it is. It is absolutely true, and I'm sorry that the member thinks it's not true. He's more than welcome to come and spend some time with us and come door to door as we go door to door talking to Manitobans, and I'll make the same offer that I made to the Premier. I'll come and pick up the member. My vehicle is clean, so it's all good. I've

gotten rid of the dog hair. So, I mean, I—*[interjection]*—I don't know about baking. I've done a couple of bakings already, so—but I'm willing to pick up anybody from members opposite and we can all go down to Point Douglas together, and we can go talk with people that are struggling, that are really working full time, and they can hear directly that people want to hear and want to know that this government actually cares about them.

And right now what they're seeing, if they watch question period or if they sit in the gallery or if they read the papers, what they see is a minister that—or a Premier, actually—I apologize—a Premier who directed his minister to freeze the minimum wage for a year, because, apparently, Manitobans are not even worthy of a minimum wage for a whole year.

And then what he directed his ministers is to up the minimum wage by 15 cents, like three nickels. And I'm not sure if the Premier thinks that it's still, like, 1950 or 1960, where you could, you know, take your date out to a movie and go to a movie and go get milkshakes and hamburgers and have a—*[interjection]*—yes, and have a really good night out. That certainly is not the case anymore.

So, you know, I don't know if maybe members opposite have to let their boss or their Premier know that it's not 1950 and that they have to let their boss and their Premier know that they're actually standing up for Manitobans, and they also don't agree that three nickels helps anybody.

And, I mean, and, again, why would members opposite stand in support of their Bill 33 that is actually legislating poverty? You know, I would like to see—and I would, you know, I hope that members opposite will see the need and the value of the member for Flin Flon's (Mr. Lindsey) amendment and move us all collectively towards a living wage.

* (15:40)

You know, Manitoba—instead of fighting what is inevitable, and it is inevitable, Deputy Speaker, because people aren't going to put up with it anymore, people—there's always change. The Premier talks about change and tries to make it that we don't like change—he doesn't like change. This is change. Moving towards a living wage is change. And people are not going to stand by and fully just, yes, okay, I'll take three nickels. It's insulting and we can do better. And Manitoba can actually take a lead across the country. We can say, you know what, we're

legislating a living wage in this province for this generation and for next generation.

So, instead of, you know, fighting change, as the Premier always accuses us, the Premier has an opportunity to be, you know, can be a leader in Manitoba and can legislate a living wage, and can help, you know, my children, their children, our grandchildren that will be able to be the first generation that don't work in poverty.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time is up.

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): It's a privilege to stand up but to speak about the report stage amendment to Bill 33, the one and only hour that the government has deigned to set aside to discuss report stage amendments. I'm pleased to say it's a good one. There's a lot of other amendments that this government was either unwilling or was afraid to call for debate, and that is truly a shame.

But I want to commend the member for Flin Flon for this amendment to Bill 30–Bill 33, rather. The member for Flin Flon brought this forward after a lot of thought from having attended the committee meeting and having truly listened to what the presenters had to say.

And I know the member for Flin Flon spoke very passionately just a few minutes ago, and I know he's so passionate because he truly listens to working people in this province, and this amendment comes from a very, very good place, and I'm disappointed to hear the minister suggest that he will not be supporting this bill. I'm hoping his other caucus members will listen to what's been put on the record by my New Democratic colleagues, and also by the Liberal caucus, and will change their minds.

Madam Speaker in the Chair

The reason for this amendment is very, very simple. Workers who put in a full day's work should earn a living wage. And that is a movement that is spreading across North America. It's required governments elsewhere to recognize that the poverty wages—I believe the minister called them not that long ago—are no longer acceptable in our society, and that's why we support the following principle in our amendment and the amendment principle is this: The living wage principle is that for a person who works full-time for a full year, a living wage should enable the person to earn enough through their employment to live above the poverty line.

This amendment will then require the minister to make the necessary inquiries, obtain the necessary information to determine what that living wage should be, and then to make recommendations to Cabinet to have a minimum wage increase.

We haven't specified a particular dollar figure; that's up to the minister to do the work, to find out the information. We're satisfied if this amendment passes that the minister will do a good job of that and we will be able to move forward. But it's long past the time that we respect the work Manitobans do by paying them a living wage.

Now for 17 years the opposition—or the government who act like an opposition sometimes—want to talk about, well, what did you do in 17 years? Well, in 17 years we raised the minimum wage each and every year from the time that we were elected until 2015. And in fact, those minimum wage increases, as the member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer) pointed out, were approximately double the rate of inflation so that each year those working at a minimum wage job were getting closer and closer. Did we finish the job? No, we did not. There is more work to be done and that's what this amendment is all about.

Compare and contrast that, Madam Speaker, with the previous Conservative government which froze minimum wage year after year after year, so that when we came into power in 1999—sorry, got 1919 on the mind—in 1999, the minimum wage stood at only \$6.

And I'm sure every member is familiar with the work the Social Planning Council has done, and they did an analysis of minimum wage in Manitoba and they said, well, what if the law, Bill 33, is unamended, what if that had been in effect in 1999? What would the minimum wage in Manitoba be right now? And their answer was chilling. The answer was \$7.50 per hour. Madam Speaker, \$11 an hour is not enough for minimum wage earners; \$7.50 would be completely inappropriate, but apparently that is the type of number that the minister would much prefer.

And you know, when we raised the minimum wage year after year we expected the same things to happen. Along would come the member for Morris (Mr. Martin), then with the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, who would tell us how the sky was falling and how all his members had said this and that, and then once again the next year out would come the unemployment figures and

Manitoba would continue to have the lowest or the second lowest or the third lowest unemployment figures in the entire country.

So we know. I read into the record when I had the chance to speak at second reading about some of the myths about minimum wage being dispelled, but I think there's still more work that has to be done to educate the members of the Progressive Conservative caucus.

Of course it was my old schoolmate, Hugh McFadyen, who once—after one of our minimum wage increases, said minimum wages—minimum wage increase, it's no more than political candy. That was the view of Hugh McFadyen. Where is he now? Well, maybe—maybe that had something to do with it.

I know the member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Ewasko) is going to want to get up and speak. I will leave him a little bit of time before 4 o'clock so he can get up and put some comments on the record because I'll be very pleased to go and campaign in Lac du Bonnet next time and talk to young people, talk to some indigenous people who have just rejoined the workforce, talk to single women in his riding and let them know that he apparently also opposes a living wage for those people.

One of the great myths, of course, is that minimum wage is only earned by students who are living at home, who are only going to be earning minimum wage for a short time. Nothing, Madam Speaker, could be further from the truth. While there are a number of students who earn minimum wage as they try to save money for tuition, which is getting harder and harder, thanks to this Progressive Conservative government, many people who are earning minimum wage are women, are new Canadians, and are indigenous people, all of whom might be new to the workforce, some of whom may have been earning minimum wage for a long time. And this bill—this amendment to this bill is about giving these people a little more to allow them to get to a living wage so that they don't have to live in poverty.

But we know, unfortunately, this government is not committed to making real improvements in minimum wage, and instead they're committed to legislating a poverty wage for Manitoba workers. If I am wrong in that statement, we can find out very quickly when they can vote with us and support this amendment. If this amendment passes we would be

quite happy to make Bill 33 unanimous, and I think that would be a great thing for everybody in this House to work together to get something done.

You know it's fascinating, of course, to hear what members opposite tell us in these scripted notes they give. Whatever the question may be, they aren't really interested in what the question is. They have their scripted answers and they have no answer for the fact that they froze minimum wage last year. No answer at all for the fact that they actually made it harder and harder and made a living wage further out of reach for Manitobans earning minimum wage.

And, of course, even for young people who they believe are the only ones collecting minimum wage, it's wrong—it's wrong, but for those young people who are earning minimum wage, what else did this government do? Well, they're going to raise the cap on tuition fees. The tuition fees that have been capped and increasing by only 1 or 2 per cent are now going to be increasing by 6 or 7 or 8 per cent per year and make university and college education that much more out of reach for young people, young people like the ones I represent in my own riding, who graduate from Tech Voc or from Daniel McIntyre Collegiate Institute who are working hard, who've been working through the school year, and are going to be working through the summer just to try and make enough money to be able to go on to college and university.

And you know, they froze the minimum wage last year, and what will the increase be this year? Well, they've announced it. They didn't say the amount when they first announced it because they thought maybe people would miss it. The amount, of course, was 15 cents.

The last minimum wage under our government in 2015, was 30 cents. So: 30 cents under us, then a freeze; and 15 cents in 2017, as low income earners continue to fall further and further behind what they would need to have a living wage.

And what, of course, what does the Premier (Mr. Pallister) say?

* (15:50)

Well, what did he say on December 29th while he was—I thought he would be in a good mood because I believe December 29th was one of those short window periods when he'd returned from Costa Rica and he was yet to go back to Costa Rica. He was tanned; I would have thought he'd have been happy, but what did the Premier say about minimum

wage? He said, it's a mitigation tactic that is seen on the surface to be helping but doesn't—but really doesn't reduce poverty.

Well, I've got news for the Premier (Mr. Pallister). He is dead wrong on that. He can read any analysis which will show you that raising the minimum wage is the best way to move people out of poverty, and that's why we'll be advancing this amendment.

So there are many reasons, Madam Speaker, that this amendment will make Bill 33 acceptable, and, as I say, if the government would accept the amendment to Bill 33, I would be pleased to stand with them and to vote in favour of an amended Bill 33 which will do a—make major improvements. They can join Alberta; they can join Ontario; they can make things better for the working poor people of this province. That's what people are expecting. Let's see what they do when this comes to a vote.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to—oh, is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Madam Speaker: The question before the House is report stage amendment of Bill 33, The Minimum Wage Indexation Act (Employment Standards Code Amended).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the report stage amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Madam Speaker: I heard a no.

Voice Vote

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of the report stage amendment, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Recorded Vote

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

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

Order. The question before the House is report stage amendments of Bill 33, The Minimum Wage Indexation Act (Employment Standards Code Amended).

Division

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

Yeas

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

Nays

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

Deputy Clerk (Mr. Rick Yarish): Yeas 14, Nays 39.

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

* * *

Madam Speaker: The time being after 4 p.m., I am now interrupting proceedings, in accordance with rule 2(15), to put the question on the report stage amendments on the following bills: Bill 16, three report stage amendments; Bill 17, one report stage amendment; Bill 18, three report stage amendments; Bill 19, 14 report stage amendments; Bill 25, six report stage amendments; and Bill 26, two report stage amendments.

These amendments will be considered without further debate or amendment, and the House will not adjourn until all applicable questions have been put.

For each report stage amendment, the sponsor will move the report stage amendment and send the motion up to the Speaker, who will start reading the report stage amendment back to the House. The Speaker will then rule on the orderliness of the report

stage amendment. Then the question will be put on the report stage amendment without further debate or amendment.

On Bill 16, the honourable member for Minto.

Bill 16—The Fatality Inquiries Amendment Act

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for The Pas (Ms. Lathlin),

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Clause 18 by replacing the proposed clause 19(2)(b) with the following:

(b) an inquest may enable the presiding provincial judge to recommend changes to laws or public programs, policies and practices that will serve to prevent deaths in similar circumstances.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Minto, seconded by the honourable member for The Pas,

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Clause 18 by replacing—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense?

An Honourable Member: Read it.

Madam Speaker: Okay.

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Clause 18 by replacing the proposed clause 19(2)(b) with the following:

(b) an inquest may enable the presiding provincial judge to recommend changes to laws or public programs, policies and practices that will serve to prevent deaths in similar circumstances.

The amendment is in order.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the report stage amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

I declare the amendment lost.

Recorded Vote

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

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

Order.

The question before the House is the first amendment to The Fatality Inquiries Amendment Act.

* (18:00)

Division

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

Yeas

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

Nays

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

Deputy Clerk (Mr. Rick Yarish): Yeas 14, Nays 39.

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Madam Speaker: The House will now consider the second report stage amendment on Bill 16.

Mr. Swan: I move, seconded by the member for The Pas (Ms. Lathlin),

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Clause 18 by replacing a proposed clause 19(3)(b) with the following:

(b) the death has been or will be reviewed under another Act, and that review has resulted or is reasonably expected to result in public recommendations that will serve to prevent deaths in similar circumstances.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Minto, seconded by the honourable member for The Pas,

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Clause 18 by replacing the proposed clause 19(3)(b) with the following:

(b) the death has been or will be reviewed under another Act, and that review has resulted or is reasonably expected to result in public recommendations that will serve to prevent deaths in similar circumstances.

The report stage amendment is in order.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the report stage amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Madam Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Recorded Vote

Mr. Maloway: I request a recorded vote.

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

* (19:00)

Order. Order. Order please.

The question before the House is the second amendment to the Fatality Inquiries Amendment Act.

I would just ask that while the page is calling out names if everybody could please allow her to not be distracted by noises in the room, please.

Division

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

Yeas

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

Nays

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

Clerk (Ms. Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 14, Nays 39.

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Madam Speaker: The House will now consider the third report stage amendment on Bill 16, the fatalities—The Fatality Inquires Amendment Act.

Mr. Swan: I move, seconded by the member for the Pas (Ms. Lathlin),

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Clause 18 by adding the following after the proposed subsection 19(7):

CME to seek views of relatives

19(8) Before determining not to hold an inquest under subsections (3), (4) or (6), the chief medical examiner must

(a) give written notice to an adult member of the family of the deceased that an inquest might not be held; and

(b) give the members of the family of the deceased or other person representing the deceased an opportunity to make representations to the chief medical examiner on the need for an inquest, in the form and manner and within the time frame set out in the notice.

CME to provide reasons

19(9) If the chief medical examiner decides not to hold an inquest into a death, he or she must give written reasons for the decision to each person who made representations.

Request view by minister—a review by minister

19(10) A person who made representations and is aggrieved by the decision not to hold an inquest may request the minister to review the chief medical examiner's decision.

Actions by minister

19(11) After reviewing any written information provided by the aggrieved person and the reasons given by the chief medical examiner, the minister may

- (a) confirm the decision that no inquest be held; or
- (b) order the chief medical examiner to direct an inquest be held, as provided under section 19.1.

CME to comply

19(12) The chief medical examiner must comply with an order made under clause (11)(b).

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Minto (Mr. Swan), seconded by the honourable member for The Pas (Ms. Lathlin),

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Clause 18—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense? *[interjection]*

* (19:10)

THAT Bill 16 be amended in Clause 18 by adding the following after the proposed subsection 19(7):

CME to seek views of relatives

19(8) Before determining not to hold an inquest under subsections (3), (4) or (6), the chief medical examiner must

- (a) give written notice to an adult member of the family of the deceased that an inquest might not be held; and
- (b) give the members of the family of the deceased or other person representing the deceased an opportunity to make representations to the chief medical examiner on the need for an inquest, in the form and manner and within the time frame set out in the notice.

CME to provide reasons

19(9) If the chief medical examiner decides not to hold an inquest into a death, he or she must give written reasons for the decision to each person who made representations.

Request review by minister

19(10) A person who made representations and is aggrieved by the decision not to hold an inquest may request the minister to review the chief medical examiner's decision.

Actions by minister

19(11) After reviewing any written information provided by the aggrieved person and the reasons given by the chief medical examiner, the minister may

- (a) confirm the decision that no inquest be held; or
- (b) order the chief medical examiner to direct an inquest be held, as provided under section 19.1.

CME to comply

19(12) The chief medical examiner must comply with an order made under clause (11)(b).

The report stage amendment is in order.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the report stage amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Madam Speaker: I heard a no.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Recorded Vote

Mr. Maloway: Madam Speaker, I would like to request a recorded vote.

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

* (20:10)

Order, please.

The question before the House is the third amendment to the Fatality Inquiries Amendment Act.

Order. Order, please.

Division

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

Yeas

Allum, Altemeyer, Fontaine, Gerrard, Klassen, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Lindsey, Maloway, Marcelino (Logan), Selinger, Swan, Wiebe.

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Bill 17—The Court Security Amendment Act

Madam Speaker: This House will now consider the report stage amendment on Bill 17.

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): I move, seconded by the member for Concordia (Mr. Wiebe),

THAT Bill 17 be amended in Clause 3 by adding the following after the proposed section 3:

Exception for medically required substances

3.1 Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a person may possess cannabis (marijuana) or a controlled substance as defined in the *Controlled Drugs and Substances Act* (Canada) in a court area if the person produces one of the following to a security officer on request:

(a) a prescription for the cannabis or controlled substance that is signed and dated by a physician or nurse practitioner;

(b) a letter signed and dated by a physician or nurse practitioner confirming that the cannabis or controlled substance is necessary for the person's physical or mental health.

The person may also possess an item used to ingest the cannabis or controlled substance.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Minto, seconded by the honourable member for Concordia,

THAT Bill 17 be amended in Clause 3 by adding the following after the proposed section 3:

Exception for medically required substances

3.1 Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense? [*interjection*]

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a person may possess cannabis (marijuana) or a controlled substance as defined in the *Controlled Drugs and Substances Act* (Canada) in a court area if the person produces one of the following to a security officer on request:

(a) a prescription for the cannabis or controlled substance that is signed and dated by a physician or nurse practitioner;

(b) a letter signed and dated by a physician or nurse practitioner confirming that the cannabis or controlled substance is necessary for the person's physical or mental health.

The person may also possess an item used to ingest the cannabis or controlled substance.

The report stage amendment is in order.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the report stage amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Madam Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Recorded Vote

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

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

Order.

The question before the House is the report stage amendment for The Court Security Amendment Act.

Division

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

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

* (21:20)

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Bill 18—The Legislative Security Act

Madam Speaker: Order, please. Order.

The House will now consider the first report stage amendment on Bill 18.

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): I move, seconded by the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway),

THAT Bill 18 be amended in Clause 3 by adding the following after the proposed subsection 3(2):

Arrangement to be filed with Clerk

3(3) As soon as reasonably practicable after entering into an agreement with the Speaker, the minister must file a written copy of it with the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly.

Arrangement not to be made public

3(4) The Clerk must not make the arrangement available for inspection by any person or reveal its contents to any person.

Exception for members

3(5) Despite subsection (4), the Clerk may make the arrangement available for inspection to a member of the Legislative Assembly who requests to inspect

it, on the terms and conditions that the Clerk considers reasonable.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Minto, seconded by the honourable member for Elmwood,

THAT Bill 18 be amended in Clause 3 by adding the following—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense?

An Honourable Member: No.

Madam Speaker: —by adding the following after the proposed subsection 3(2):

Arrangement to be filed with Clerk

3(3) As soon as reasonably practicable after entering into an arrangement with the Speaker, the minister must file a written copy of it with the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly.

Arrangement not to be made public

3(4) The Clerk must not make the arrangement available for inspection by any person or reveal its contents to any person.

Exception for members

3(5) Despite subsection (4), the Clerk may make the arrangement available for inspection to a member of the Legislative Assembly who requests to inspect it, on the terms and conditions that the Clerk considers reasonable.

The report stage amendment is in order.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the report stage amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Madam Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Recorded Vote

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

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

* (22:20)

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

The question before the House is the first amendment of The Legislative Security Act.

Order.

Division

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

Yeas

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

Nays

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

Clerk (Ms. Patricia Chaychuk): Yeas 14, Nays 38.

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

* * *

Madam Speaker: The House will now consider the second report stage amendment on Bill 18.

Mr. Swan: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway),

THAT Bill 18 be amended by adding the following after Clause 6(3):

Establishing identity not dependant on government-issued photo identification

6(3.1) Under clause (3)(a), a person must not be considered to have refused to verify his or her identity solely by reason of being unable to provide government-issued photo identification.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Minto, seconded by the member for Elmwood,

THAT Bill 18 be amended by adding the following after Clause 3—after Clause 6(3):

Establishing identify not dependant on government-issued photo identification

6(3.1) Under clause (3)(a), a person must not be considered to have refused to verify his or her identity solely by reason of being unable to provide government-issued photo identification.

The report stage amendment is in order.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the report stage amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Madam Speaker: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Recorded Vote

Mr. Maloway: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

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

The question before the House is the second amendment of The Legislative Security Act.

Division

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

Yeas

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

Nays

Bindle, Clarke, Cox, Cullen, Curry, Eichler, Ewasko, Fielding, Fletcher, Friesen, Goertzen, Graydon, Guillemard, Helwer, Isleifson, Johnson, Johnston,

Lagassé, Lagimodiere, Martin, Mayer, Michaleski, Micklefield, Morley-Lecomte, Nesbitt, Pallister, Pedersen, Reyes, Schuler, Smith, Smook, Squires, Stefanson, Teitsma, Wharton, Wishart, Wowchuk, Yakimoski.

Deputy Clerk (Mr. Rick Yarish): Yeas 14, Nays 38.

* (23:30)

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

* * *

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

The House will now consider the third amendment of The Legislative Security Act.

Mr. Swan: I move, seconded by the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway),

THAT Bill 18 be amended by adding the following after Clause 8:

Application for show cause hearing

8.1(1) A person who is refused entry to or evicted from the Legislative Building or the legislative precinct may apply to the Court of Queen's Bench to require the director to show cause why the decision was just and reasonable.

Decision of the court

8.1(2) On an application under subsection (1), the court may make any order that the court considers appropriate.

Speaker's Ruling

Madam Speaker: I have a ruling on this report stage amendment. There are provisions in this report stage amendment that would provide for persons who are refused entry to or evicted from the Legislative Precinct to be able to apply to the Court of Queen's Bench to require cause to be shown about the decision and which would also allow the court to make orders that the court considers appropriate.

Given this, I must advise the House that this report stage amendment is out of order as these provisions would violate the parliamentary privileges of the Legislature, as one of the collective privileges of the House is the exclusive right to regulate its own internal affairs, including its debate, proceedings and facilities. O'Brien and Bosc advise on page 121 of the Second Edition of House of Commons Procedure

and Practice that, and I quote: "It is well established that, by extension, the House has complete and sole authority to regulate and administer its precinct, without outside interference, including controlling access to the buildings." End quote.

The footnote supporting this principle advises that the courts would be overstepping legitimate constitutional bounds if they sought to interfere with the power of the House to control access to its own premises.

Joseph Maingot also advises on p. 322 of the Second Edition of the Parliamentary Privilege in Canada that, and I quote: McLaughlin, J., [*phonetic*] tells us judicial deference requires the court not to view how the Assembly exercises its right to exclude strangers because it does not want to impinge on their independence. End quote.

I must therefore rule this report stage amendment out of order as it would violate the parliamentary privileges of the Legislature.

* * *

Madam Speaker: This House will now consider the first amendment—

An Honourable Member: Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: The honourable Official Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Maloway: Madam Speaker, with respect, I challenge the ruling.

Madam Speaker: I would indicate that the member is not—our rules do not allow for the challenge of the Speaker at this point.

Order, please. Order, please.

I would urge all members—I know that people are tired, and I would urge all members to be cautious. There is to be no challenging of the Chair on that type of ruling. And I would urge all members, those are our rules, and I would ask all members to respect the rules that have been approved and applied to this whole Chamber.

And I would like to take a moment before we proceed to just have a discussion with our Deputy Clerk about the next amendment.

Bill 19—The Efficiency Manitoba Act

Madam Speaker: We will now consider the first amendment of The Efficiency Manitoba Act.

Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley): I move, seconded by the honourable member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Kinew),

THAT Bill 19 be amended by adding the following after Clause 4(1):

Mandate includes reducing greenhouse gas emissions

4(1.1) In addition to subsection (1), the mandate of Efficiency Manitoba includes implementing and supporting demand-side management initiatives to meet savings targets for greenhouse gas emissions. For this purpose, the lieutenant government in council may make regulations establishing savings targets for reductions of greenhouse gas emissions in Manitoba.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer), seconded by the honourable member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Kinew),

THAT Bill 19 be amended by adding the following after Clause 4(1):

Mandate includes reducing—

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense?

An Honourable Member: Sure. Read it, please.

Madam Speaker: Mandate includes reducing greenhouse gas emissions

4(1.1) In addition to subsection (1), the mandate of Efficiency Manitoba includes implementing and supporting demand-side management initiatives to meet savings targets for greenhouse gas emissions. For this purpose, the Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations establishing saving targets for reductions of greenhouse gas emissions in Manitoba.

The report stage amendment is in order.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the report stage amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: Those opposed please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Recorded Vote

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

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

Order, please. Order, please.

The question before the House is a proposed first amendment to Bill 19, The Efficiency Manitoba Act.

Division

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

Yeas

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

Nays

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

Deputy Clerk (Mr. Rick Yarish): Yeas 14, Nays 38.

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

* * *

Madam Speaker: Before we proceed with the next amendment, I have a special request to make of the House. Is there leave to allow the Speaker to make some statements about our pages before they head home for the evening. *[Agreed]* Thank you.

Denée Ryle will be graduating from College Churchill next year. After graduation she would like to pursue a degree in education from the Université de Saint-Boniface. As a proud member of the York Factory First Nation, she hopes to one day share her culture with her students. This summer not only will Denée be undertaking janitorial work for the Winnipeg School Division, she will also become the eldest sibling of soon to be five, all the while making sure to devote part of her time each week to Awana,

a local youth Bible study. Denée will miss the lively debate in the Chamber as well as being sent off on daring missions carrying valuable reports through unknown halls.

Ceanray Harris-Read, you will remember her as one of last year's pages, and, yes, we had to call in reinforcements for tonight. And I just wanted to inform the House the happy news that Ceanray has been selected to be a page next year in the Canadian Senate.

So, on behalf of all of us here, we wish both of you the very best as you forge ahead with the next steps of your lives. So thank you for everything you've done, and all the best to both of you.

* * *

Madam Speaker: Now I would like to advise the House that I have received a letter from the honourable member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer) regarding his remaining report stage amendments to Bill 19. The member advises that he is not proceeding with his second, third, fifth, sixth, eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth report stage amendments to Bill 19 as they are consequential to the passage of other report stage amendments. The member also requested that all his remaining report stage amendments to Bill 19—the fourth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, and fourteenth amendments—be combined as per rule 139(11).

As a result of this request, the member for Wolseley will move each amendment separately, and once he is finished, then one vote will be held on all six of these report stage amendments on Bill 19.

Mr. Altemeyer: If you are all okay with that.

I move, seconded by the honourable member for Flin Flon (Mr. Lindsey),

THAT Bill 19 be amended by adding the following after Clause 9(h):

(h.1) a description of how the initiatives proposed under clauses (a) to (d) will apply to tenants, and how tenants may benefit from these initiatives.

Motion presented.

Madam Speaker: The honourable member for—oh, the amendment is in order.

The honourable member for Wolseley, on his next amendment.

Mr. Altemeyer: I move, seconded by the honourable member for Fort Garry-Riverview (Mr. Allum),

THAT Bill 19 be amended by adding the following after Clause 14(2):

Limit on monthly charge

14(2.1) The monthly charge under clause (2)(b) must not exceed an amount equal to 90% of the monthly savings achieved by the changes made to improve the efficiency of the building, part of the building or the structure related to the building.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Wolseley, seconded by the honourable member for Fort Garry-Riverview,

THAT Bill 19 be amended by adding the following after Clause 14(2):

Limit on monthly charge

14(2.1)–

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense?

The report stage amendment is in order.

The honourable member, on his next amendment.

Mr. Altemeyer: I move, seconded by the honourable member for St. Johns (Ms. Fontaine),

THAT Bill 19 be amended by adding the following after Clause 14(4):

Length of term

14(4.1) The term of a loan agreement referred to in clause (4)(b) must be equivalent to the estimated useful lifespan of the longest lasting change made to improve efficiency.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Wolseley, seconded by the honourable member for St. Johns,

THAT Bill 19 be amended by adding the following after Clause 14(4):

Length of term

14–

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense.

The report stage amendment is in order.

The honourable member for Wolseley, on his next amendment.

Mr. Altemeyer: I move, seconded by the honourable member for Logan (Ms. Marcelino),

THAT Bill 19 be amended by adding the following after Clause 18(1):

Prohibition — expansion of natural gas service for space heating

18(1.1) Manitoba Hydro must not further expand natural gas service for space heating purposes.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Wolseley, seconded by the honourable member for Logan,

THAT Bill 19 be amended by adding the following after Clause 18(1):

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense.

The report stage amendment is in order.

The honourable member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer), on his next amendment.

Mr. Altemeyer: I move, seconded by the honourable member for The Pas (Ms. Lathlin),

THAT Bill 19 be amended by replacing Clause 34(1)(c) with the following:

(c) a public utility, a First Nation or a municipality that supplies water to its inhabitants, if the utility, First Nation or municipality is prescribed by regulation.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Wolseley, seconded by the honourable member for The Pas,

THAT Bill 19—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense.

The amendment—the report stage amendment is in order.

The honourable member for Wolseley, on his last amendment.

Mr. Altemeyer: I move, seconded by the honourable member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway),

THAT Bill 19 be amended by adding the following after Clause 42:

Transition from Manitoba Hydro to Efficiency Manitoba

42.1(1) *Manitoba Hydro must continue offering its Power Smart programs until the commencement date of Efficiency Manitoba's first approved efficiency plan.*

Assurances to Manitoba Hydro staff on transition process

42.1(2) *At least 90 days before the coming into force of this Act, current staff of Manitoba Hydro who are interested in applying for employment at Efficiency Manitoba are to be provided by Manitoba Hydro with the following assurances in writing:*

(a) *all current salaries, permanent full-time status, and benefits will be continued;*

(b) *all current union or association status and seniority will be continued;*

(c) *no penalty of any kind will be brought against a Manitoba Hydro employee who applies for employment at Efficiency Manitoba;*

(d) *any employee who accepts a voluntary buyout from Manitoba Hydro is eligible to apply for employment at Efficiency Manitoba.*

Information to be provided

42.1(3) *At least 90 days before the coming into force of this Act, current staff of Manitoba Hydro are to be provided by Manitoba Hydro with the following information:*

(a)—if you don't mind—(a) *the organizational structure of Efficiency Manitoba, including the initial number of positions in each job classification;*

(b) *qualifications and work experience required for each position;*

(c) *salary and benefits for all positions;*

(d) *a description of staff opportunities to provide input into program design and implementation at Efficiency Manitoba.*

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Wolseley, seconded by the honourable member for Elmwood,

THAT Bill 19 be amended by adding the following after Clause 42:

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense.

The report stage amendment is in order.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the report stage amendments?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Recorded Vote

Mr. Maloway: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

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

The question before the House is report stage amendments of Bill 19.

* (01:10)

Division

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

Yeas

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

Nays

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

Deputy Clerk (Mr. Rick Yarish): Yeas 14, Nays 37.

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendments lost.

* * *

Madam Speaker: The House will now consider report stage amendments of Bill 25.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Speaker: Order. Order.

The House will now consider report stage amendments of Bill 25.

I would like to advise the House that I have received a request from the honourable Minister of Justice (Mrs. Stefanson) to combine her report stage amendments on Bill 25 in accordance with rule 139(11). As a result of this request, the minister will move each amendment separately and then one vote will be held on all six of the report stage amendments of the honourable Minister for Justice on Bill 25.

Hon. Heather Stefanson (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I move, seconded by the Minister of Health,

THAT Bill 25 be amended in Clause 8 in the proposed definition "cannabis" by adding "item 1 of" before "Schedule II".

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the honourable Minister of Health—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense.

The report stage amendment is in order.

The honourable Minister of Justice, on the next amendment.

Mrs. Stefanson: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health,

THAT Bill 25 be amended in Clause 9 in the proposed subsection 213.1(2) by striking out "or" at the end of clause (c), adding "or" at the end of clause (d), and adding the following after clause (d):

(e) the vehicle is driven by or is under the care and control of a person of a class prescribed by the regulations and the cannabis is stored and transported in accordance with the conditions set out in the regulations.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the honourable Minister of Health,

THAT Bill 25 be amended—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense.

The report stage amendment is in order.

The next amendment, please.

Mrs. Stefanson: I move, seconded by the Minister of Health,

THAT Bill 25 be amended by replacing Clause 15 with the following:

15 Subsection 319(1) is amended

(a) by adding the following as clause (sss):

(sss) prescribing classes of persons and setting out conditions for the storage and transportation of cannabis in or on a vehicle for the purpose of clause 213.1(2)(e);

(b) by adding the following after clause (eee):

(eee)—pardon me—(eee)—pardon me—(eee.0.1) prescribing one or more classes or subclasses of driver's licence for the purposes of subclause 265(a)(b)(ii) and clause 273(1.1)(b);

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Justice (Mrs. Stefanson), seconded by the honourable Minister of Health,

THAT Bill 25—

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: The report stage amendment is in order.

The Minister of Justice, on the next amendment.

Mrs. Stefanson: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Health,

THAT Bill 25 be amended in Clause 19(b) in the proposed definition "cannabis" by adding "item 1 of" before "Schedule II".

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the honourable Minister of Health,

THAT Bill 25—

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense.

The honourable Minister of Justice, on the next amendment.

Mrs. Stefanson: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Oh, the report stage amendment is in order.

The honourable Minister of Justice, on the next amendment.

Mrs. Stefanson: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health,

THAT Bill 25 be amended in Clause 28 in the proposed definition "cannabis" by adding "item 1 of" before "Schedule II".

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the honourable Minister of Health—

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: Dispense.

The report stage amendment is in order.

The honourable Minister of Justice, on the next amendment.

Mrs. Stefanson: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Health,

THAT Bill 25 be amended by adding the following before Clause 32 as part of Part A (Coming Into Force):

Conditional amendment

*31.1 When section 2 of Bill C-45 of the First Session of the Forty-second Parliament of Canada comes into force, the definition "cannabis" in **The Highway Traffic Act**, **The Non-Smokers Health Protection Act** and **The Off-Road Vehicles Act** is replaced with the following:*

"cannabis" means cannabis as defined in the Cannabis Act (Canada); (« cannabis »)

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the honourable Minister of Health—

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: The report stage amendment is in order.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the report stage amendments? [*Agreed*]

I declare the report stage amendments adopted.

Bill 26—The Election Financing Amendment Act

Madam Speaker: We will now consider the report stage amendments of Bill 26.

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): I move, seconded by the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway),

THAT Bill 26 be amended by striking out Clause 3.

Madam Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for Minto, seconded by the honourable member for Elmwood,

THAT Bill 26—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Madam Speaker: The report stage amendment is in order.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the report stage amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Recorded Vote

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

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

* (01:20)

Order, please. Order. The question before the House is the first proposed amendment to Bill 26.

All those in favour of the amendment, please rise. *[inaudible]*

All those opposed to the amendment, please rise. *[inaudible]*

Due to a technical glitch where the microphone wasn't on, we have to apologize, but we are going to have to call the vote from the beginning.

So—order, please. Order. All those in favour of the amendment, please rise.

* (01:30)

Division

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

Yeas

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

Nays

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

Clerk Assistant (Ms. Monique Grenier): Yeas 14, Nays 38.

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

* * *

Madam Speaker: The House will now consider the second proposed report stage amendment to Bill 26.

Mr. Swan: I move, seconded by the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway),

THAT Bill 26 be amended by striking out Clause 5(1).

Madam Speaker: It is been moved by the honourable member for Minto, seconded by the honourable member for Elmwood,

THAT Bill 26 be amended by striking out Clause 5(1).

The report stage amendment is in order.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the report stage amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Recorded Vote

Mr. Maloway: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

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

The question before the House is the second proposed report stage amendment to Bill 26.

Division

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

Yeas

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

Nays

Bindle, Clarke, Cox, Cullen, Curry, Eichler, Ewasko, Fielding, Fletcher, Friesen, Goertzen, Graydon, Guillemard, Helwer, Isleifson, Johnson, Johnston,

Lagassé, Lagimodiere, Martin, Mayer, Michaleski, Micklefield, Morley-Lecomte, Nesbitt, Pallister, Pedersen, Reyes, Schuler, Smith, Smook, Squires, Stefanson, Teitsma, Wharton, Wishart, Wowchuk, Yakimoski.

Clerk Assistant (Mr. Andrea Signorelli): Yeas 14, Nays 38.

Madam Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

* * *

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, May 30, 2017

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
Introduction of Bills		Misericordia Urgent Care Centre	
Bill 228—The Life Leases Amendment Act		Kinew	2600
Swan	2593	Goertzen	2600
Tabling of Reports		Restorative Justice	
Friesen	2593	Swan	2601
		Stefanson	2601
Ministerial Statements		War Lake First Nation	
Fire and Flood Update		Lathlin	2602
Pedersen	2593	Pedersen	2602
Maloway	2594	Pallister	2603
Gerrard	2594	Federal Health Agreement	
Members' Statements		Lamoureux	2603
Armed Forces Day		Pallister	2603
Reyes	2594	Keyask and Bipole III Projects	
Sagkeeng First Nation European Trip		Guillemard	2604
Fontaine	2595	Schuler	2604
Brandon Bear Clan Patrol		Manitoba Housing Units	
Isleifson	2595	Fontaine	2604
Isleifson	2596	Fielding	2605
Kathy Levandoski		Investment in Active Transportation	
Clarke	2596	Altemeyer	2605
Misericordia Urgent Care Centre Closure		Clarke	2605
Gerrard	2596	Pallister	2606
Speaker's Statement		Petitions	
Oral Questions		Taxi Industry Regulation	
Rural Health Services		Maloway	2606
F. Marcelino	2597	Lathlin	2607
Pallister	2598	Lindsey	2607
Emergency Room Services		Taxi Industry Regulation	
F. Marcelino	2598	Saran	2608
Pallister	2598	T. Marcelino	2608
Concordia Hospital ER Services		F. Marcelino	2609
Wiebe	2599		
Pallister	2599		
Goertzen	2599		

ORDERS OF THE DAY

(Continued)

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Report Stage Amendments

Bill 33–The Minimum Wage Indexation Act
(Employment Standards Code Amended)

Lindsey	2610
Cullen	2612
Kinew	2613
Lamoureux	2615
Altemeyer	2615
Fontaine	2617
Swan	2619

Bill 16–The Fatality Inquiries Amendment Act

Swan	2622
------	------

Bill 17–The Court Security Amendment Act

Swan	2625
------	------

Bill 18–The Legislative Security Act

Swan	2626
------	------

Bill 19–The Efficiency Manitoba Act

Altemeyer	2629
-----------	------

Bill 26–The Election Financing Amendment Act

Swan	2633
------	------

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

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